

UCA Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of Sept. 13, 2011

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

College of Business Administration: Summer Bartczak (2012), Don Bradley (2013), Jim Downey (2014)

College of Liberal Arts : Phillip Spivey (2012), Jay Ruud (2013), Clayton Crockett (2014)

College of Education: Jud Copeland (2012), Terri Hebert (2013), Shoudong Feng (2014)

College of Natural Sciences & Mathematics: George Bratton (2012), Ben Rowley (2013), Charles Watson (2014)

College of Fine Arts & Communications: Lynn Burley (2012), Kevin Browne (2013), Lanette Grate (2014)

College of Health & Behavioral Sciences: K.C. Poole (2012), Lisa Ray (2013), Melissa Shock (2014)

At-Large Senators: Don Jones (CLA, 2012), Debbie Bratton (UC, 2012), Janet Wilson (CLA, 2013), Amber Wilson (Library, 2013), Brian Bolter (CHBS, 2014), Doug Isanhart (CB, 2014)

Senator G. Bratton moved to move time of adjournment to 2:25, second Senator Bolter. Approved.

I. Approval of Minutes from August 25, 2011 (see attachment)

Moved: Senator Copeland, Second: Senator Hebert

Approved unanimously.

II. Remarks, Interim President Tom Courtway

Offered to come anytime to answer questions. For this academic year goals: work through the strategic plan and enrollment goals and consistent understandable enrollment management plan. Time for enrollment roller coaster to stop. Report to HLC coming up, Budget transparency is vital and always should be. If you have questions we will come and answer them.

Not planning on hiring another person in General Counsel's office.

Pres. Wilson moved suspend rules re: inviting Int. Pres. Courtway to attend meetings, second Senator Hebert. Suspension approved. Moved to invite Pres. Courtway to speak at first 5 or 10 minutes of each meeting. Seconded by Senator Copeland. Approved.

III. Remarks, Provost Lance Grahn

Associate Provost Clay Arnold in Provost Grahn's place. No remarks.

IV. President's Report

A. Part-time Senator

No votes cast in PT senator election. Therefore no part time senator representation on the Senate this year.

B. Status of Board Subcommittee to Investigate Aramark Gift

Pres. Wilson restated her email explaining the subcommittee. The text of the email is as follows:

Senators,

At the Friday, September 9th Board of Trustees teleconference, the Board voted to dissolve the five person committee to investigate the \$700,000 capital investment and authorize the Office of Internal Audit to direct the investigation. This shift in authority to investigate was supported unanimously by members of the original five person committee at a meeting that was held on September 6th. If you are not familiar with the Office of Internal Audit, I urge you to go to the following web site: <http://uca.edu/internalaudit/>. There, you will find information on the four members of the staff, as well as their charter, mission statement, objectives and goals, organizational responsibility, reporting relationships, and scope of work. In addition, you will find Board Policy 213 which creates an Audit Committee of the Board of Trustees. Bobby Reynolds is Chair, and the other two members are Victor Green and Rush Harding, III. As stated in the resolution that was passed on Friday, once the Office of Internal Audit completes its investigation, it will provide a written report that will be presented first to the Audit Committee and then to the full Board of Trustees.

With the Office of Internal Audit now conducting the investigation, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate feels it is imperative that the faculty are able to voice their continued concerns and questions relative to this situation and to have these then relayed to the Office of Internal Audit in a timely fashion. To this end, we ask that each Senator compile a list of the concerns and questions their constituents have shared with them relative to the \$700,000 capital investment "gift." At Tuesday's (September 13th) Faculty Senate meeting, during the IV. President's Report, B. Status of Board Subcommittee to Investigate Aramark Gift stage of the agenda, after I have updated the Senate, I will ask each Senator to state the concerns of their constituents and to turn in a written copy, too. The Executive Committee will then consolidate the written copies into a list of questions and concerns of the faculty that will then be delivered to Pam Massey, Director of the Office of Internal Audit for consideration during their investigation. At the time the letter is delivered to Ms. Massey, an electronic copy will also be sent to you. It is expected that this will be accomplished by the end of the week (Friday, September 16th).

Finally, I wanted to let you know that I have discussed with Austin Hall, SGA President, and Dianna Winters, Staff Senate President, our plan to compile and forward a list of faculty concerns and questions to the Office of Internal Audit. I anticipate they will do the same regarding continued concerns and questions of their constituents.

Thank you, Janet Wilson

Explained office of internal audit. A full description follows from the Board Policy 213

AUDIT COMMITTEE

1. **Creation of Audit Committee.** There is hereby created a committee of the University of Central Arkansas Board of Trustees (“Board”) to be known as the “Audit Committee.”

2. **Members of the Audit Committee.** The Audit Committee shall be composed of three (3) members of the Board, consisting of the past-chairman of the Board; one person appointed by the Chair of the Board; and the third member selected by the full Board. Members shall serve for a one-year term commencing with the start of the fiscal year. No member shall serve more than two consecutive years.

3. **Chair of the Audit Committee.** The members of the Audit Committee shall select a chair for the committee. The Chair of the Audit Committee shall be responsible for calling meetings of the committee, and shall also meet with the director of internal auditing, any independent accountants, and management separately to discuss any matters the Chair deems necessary or required.

4. **Purpose; Scope of Responsibility of the Audit Committee.** The purpose of this committee shall be to aid and assist the University, the Board, and the Office of Internal Audit. Nothing herein shall be deemed to abrogate any authority or responsibility of the Arkansas Division of Legislative Audit.

The Audit Committee shall consider and recommend to the Board matters of policy relating to internal and external audits and such other matters as may be referred to it by the President or the Board. Its primary function is to assist the Board in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities by reviewing financial information which will be provided to the Legislature and others, the systems of internal controls which management and the Board have established, and the audit process.

The Audit Committee shall have the power to authorize, oversee and/or conduct investigations into any matters within the Audit Committee’s scope of responsibilities.

5. **Meetings of the Audit Committee.** The Audit Committee shall meet at least four times per year, with each such meeting occurring prior to the regularly-scheduled meeting of the Board. The Audit Committee may meet more frequently as circumstances require. The Policy 213 Audit Committee Page 2 of 4

Audit Committee may ask members of management or others to attend the meeting and provide pertinent information as necessary.

6. **Responsibility for Office of Internal Audit.** The Office of Internal Audit of the University of Central Arkansas shall report directly to the Audit Committee, and no office, department or employee of the University of Central Arkansas shall have any oversight responsibility for, nor exercise supervisory control over, the Office of Internal Audit. Provided, however, administrative responsibility for salaries, budget, travel, and other operating expenses shall be handled by the Chief of Staff, subject to the approval of the Chair. In addition, the Office of Internal Audit shall provide drafts of audits to the Chief of Staff and to the members of the audit committee.

7. Specific Responsibilities of the Audit Committee. In meeting its responsibilities, the Audit Committee is expected to:

- a. Provide an open avenue of communication between the internal auditors, any independent accountant (if utilized), management of the university and the Board of Trustees.
- b. Review and update the responsibility of the Audit Committee, subject to approval by the Board of Trustees.
- c. If necessary or required, recommend to the Board any independent accountants to be nominated, approve the compensation of the independent accountants, and review and approve the discharge of the independent accountants. Independent accountants are ultimately accountable to the Board and to the Audit Committee.
- d. Review and concur in the appointment, replacement, reassignment, or dismissal of the director of internal auditing, or any staff person of such office.
- e. Confirm and take or recommend any appropriate actions to assure the independence of the internal auditor, and if required, any independent accountants. Obtain disclosures regarding the accountants' independence as required by generally accepted government auditing standards and discuss with the accountants all significant relationships to determine the accountants' independence.
- f. Inquire of management, the director of internal auditing, and the independent accountants about significant risks or exposures and assess the steps management has taken to minimize such risk to the University of Central Arkansas.
- g. Consider, in consultation with the independent accountants and the director of internal auditing, and approve the audit scope and plan of the internal auditors and the independent accountants.

Policy 213 Audit Committee Page 3 of 4

- h. Review with the director of internal auditing and the independent accountants the coordination of audit effort to assure completeness of coverage, reduction of redundant efforts, and the effective use of audit resources.
- i. Consider and review with the independent accountants and the director of internal auditing the adequacy of internal controls including computerized information system controls and security.
- j. Review with management, the internal auditors, and if necessary any independent accountants, any of the following matters following an examination:
 - i. The financial statements and related footnotes and consider whether they are consistent with information known to committee members.
 - ii. The independent accountants' audit of the financial statements and their report thereon.
 - iii. Significant accounting and reporting issues, recent pronouncements, and complex or unusual transactions during the audit period under review.
 - iv. Significant findings and management responses thereto.
 - v. Any significant changes required in the internal auditors' or independent accountants' audit plan.
 - vi. Any serious difficulties or disputes with management encountered during the course of the audit.
 - vii. Such other matters related to the conduct of the audit, which are to be communicated to the Audit Committee under generally accepted auditing

standards.

8. Review with Director of Internal Audit. Consider and review with management and the director of internal auditing:

- a. Significant findings during the year and management's responses thereto.
- b. Any difficulties encountered in the course of their audits, including any restrictions on the scope of their work or access to required information.
- c. Any changes required in the planned scope of their audit plan.
- d. The internal auditing department's budget, staffing and organizational structure of the department.

Policy 213 Audit Committee Page 4 of 4

- e. The department's compliance with Institute of Internal Auditor's Standards of Professional Practice of Internal Auditing.
- f. Review legal and regulatory matters that may have a material impact on the financial statements and related compliance policies.

9. Report to Board of Trustees. Report Audit Committee actions to the Board with such recommendations, as the Audit Committee may deem appropriate.

President Wilson emphasized number 2 & 5. Broad range of investigative ability. An enthusiastic discussion was had by all.

Senator Bolter expressed concern regarding the ethics of the investigation being conducted by Internal Audit. UCA should have the highest ethical standards and move investigation to Legislative Audit..

Senator Browne concurs. Enormous dissatisfaction with management of UCA board. We should be out in front and our statements should be loud and strong. Show that the faculty is setting an example of high ethical standards.

Senator Copeland concurs. Will forward concerns.

Senator Hebert forwarded concerns to Senator Copeland.

Senator Shock forwarded concerns to KC Poole

Senator Jones: **FACULTY CONCERNS RE: "\$700,000 CAPITAL INVESTMENT GIFT**

1. If the funds were unrestricted in use, how was the decision made to spend it on renovations of the President's house?

2. If this was a business deal, why was it presented as a gift, and who was involved in the decision to present it that way?

3. The questions are regarding the ethical behavior of the university personnel and the ARAMARK contract. Was the contract to be renewed or rebid? Did our comptroller/contracting officers have knowledge of the "gift" in relation to a renewal of the

existing contract? If by bid, what assurance do we have that the next bid solicitation process will be open and fair.

4. My question is really about the internal audit investigation and how far and deep will they probe?

5. Meadors is gone; I was not a fan of Dr. Meadors **recently**, but I think that the Board members were naive in thinking that the \$700K was without strings. BUT, if this is what it took to get rid of him, so be it. NOW we need to LET IT GO! IT'S DONE! By continuing to beat a dead horse, we just add more fuel to the Gazette's stupid editorials, just playing into their hands.

I believe we need to get out of the Housing business for UCA presidents and give a reasonable housing allowance. Turn the upstairs of the President's home into offices for the Foundation and Alumni Staff that are in Buffalo Hall and use the downstairs as a small event center and welcome center, since the parlor in Buffalo is so small.

6. My major question is why the President of the Board of Trustees seems to be getting off scot-free from the criticism that the President took. And why the BofT isn't being held accountable for their decision to hire Meadors over the heads of the search committee in the first place.

7. The Aramark gifts shortcuts the process that the BoT-appointed Committee on the President's Residence is undertaking. They have not presented a final report, but this money pushes the university toward a certain option for the house as an events center, for which Aramark will provide catering. In that sense, Aramark understandably sees the gift as a capital investment in its own business, same as when they renovate other spaces on campus that they will use for their operation. The BoT even voted to contract for architectural plans for the house-as-events-center without waiting to hear what the committee was going to recommend. I think the committee needs to complete its report and make it public before we rush to make decisions on what will become of the house, and that means waiting to accept the "gift" as well.

8. Although there may be a desire to "move on" and disband the committee investigating the incident, a disservice to the university was done when the investigation was dropped into Lu Hardin's activities after Hardin was pushed out. The failure to make a full and proper accounting of what happened and how it happened contributed to the continued atmosphere of fear, intimidation, and powerlessness here on campus during the next presidential search and during President Meador's tenure. Resolving to do better next time is not enough; we need to know how to do better, which means identifying all the ways we went wrong the last go-round, including who in Wingo told whom to do what and on what authority.

9. Why does Mr. Roussel remain a member of the Board of Trustees?

10. The Faculty Senate should consider a vote of confidence/no confidence on the Board of Trustees.

Senator Rudd concurs and expressed support of a no confidence vote regarding Board of Trustees.

Senator Grate :
Comment # 1:

I suggest that the search for the new president be conducted either privately, provided we are able to fund such a search from outside sources, or else, should that prove impossible, the Board should agree to abide by the decision of the faculty this time. During the last search Meadors was 5th out of 5 on the faculty vote, and it turned out that we were right.

I would also like to suggest that, unless the Board is already legally obliged, we do not continue to pay Meadors his salary and benefits when it is clear that he has been guilty of wrongdoing. At the very least, if it is already too late to do anything about this, any future contract with the next president should state that should he or she be found guilty of wrongdoing, the university should have the right to terminate his or her contract at once without further compensation.

Comment # 2:

External.

In regard to: “The official inquiry into the events surrounding the departure of President Meadors and the search for a new president will likely be turned over to internal audit Friday Sep. 9.”

Comment # 3:

I suggest the faculty be allowed to choose the next president. Or, have an equal number of votes as the Board in regard to selecting the next president. Also, we can say the blame lies with the last two presidents; however, it may be time to carefully examine the system that creates entitled administrators who feel they can operate on a different ethical plane than the rest of us.. Some, such as full time and contingency faculty, are paid embarrassingly little to shape the next generation and yet they don't stoop to committing felonies and under the table deals. Ironic if you think about it.

Senator Watson, no additional comments. Reinforce relationship to payoff, if it was wrong doing why payoff?

Senator Poole Is it true that UCA owes Aramark an amount of money which has been included in the existing contract but will still be owed if the contract is not renewed?

If this is true, what is the amount and how will this be paid if the contract runs out without renewal or is terminated early?

Senator Bartczak

#1) What did Diane Newton know & when did she know it? Was she approached by Pres. Meadors or go to ARAMARK on her own? What's the true character of the deal? Kickback, Bribery? Acceptable negotiation?

#2) My greatest concern is the lack of confidence in the UCA Board of Trustees and Administration by faculty, students and taxpayers of Arkansas.

The current investigation must be done with the utmost of professionalism to begin to restore the image of UCA. I am worried that the current planned approach to the investigation will not be effective in enhancing our image.

First, the investigation involves the very highest levels in the University--the Board, the former President and the chief financial officer. The guidelines of the Audit profession require that investigations of this type be conducted at a level higher than the level in the organization in which the issue arose. The investigation should not be done by members of the Board or a staff group such as internal audit that reports and works directly for the Board.

In other words, how can an investigation be viewed as through and objective when the investigators report to those being investigated? In this situation outside audit professionals such as Legislative Audit or an independent CPA should be used. Legislative Audit would be best as it is known by and has the confidence of all parties involved. Independence in both fact and appearance is critical.

Second, I am concerned that no one has mentioned the underlying inappropriateness of the proposed accounting for the \$700,000 transaction. If in fact UCA had received the \$700,000 amount from Aramark, I believe the appropriate accounting would have been a reduction in cost of the Aramark contract and not as a contribution to the University. I do not agree that this type of payment from a supplier is normal business practice.

The future of UCA will be significantly impacted by how the public views the appropriateness of this investigation. I believe this due to the volume of comments I have received from my own circle of acquaintances.

I care about UCA. We must get this one right.

#3) The board has lost the trust of taxpayers, faculty, and perhaps students. Trust once lost, is very difficult to recoup. The best way to recoup it is to act in a trustworthy manner.

First, it is a conflict of interest for Internal Audit to conduct the investigation. Parties to the investigation will surely be the former president, the chair of the board, and at least one vice president. It is surely not ethical nor appropriate for internal audit to be charged with investigating those to whom they report. In this case they report to the board. The State has a Division of Legislative Audit that has a sterling reputation and vast experience in this type of investigation. They ought to be contacted.

Second, it is disappointing that the UCA administration and board have not recognized the appropriate accounting treatment of this \$700,000 "gift." Knowledgeable auditors will likely opine that the appropriate accounting treatment for this proposed transaction is a reduction in cost or a loan rather than a gift. This is another compelling reason to get the investigation in the hands of professionals. It is doubtful that an competent auditor would characterize this transaction as a gift or a normal business practice.

A lot of us are proud of this institution. We do not want to see the board, faculty, staff, and students embarrassed by another botched administrative action. We are weary of being joked about at the local civic clubs. We want to trust the board again. We have to get this investigation right. The State deserves it. Thanks.

Senator Isanhart yielded time.

Senator Bradley expressed concern regarding Aramark possibly overcharging students for food.

Senator Burley nothing new to add

Senator Spivey

I attended the presidential forum today at 3 pm, and heard Tom Courtway's response to a question about the presidential search. Tom made clear that a presidential search committee is an extension of the board of trustees, that it operates according to policies made by the board, it makes a recommendation to the board who chooses the president.

Given this reality it is my opinion that the faculty, through the senate, needs to take some action to prevent this board from choosing our next president.

I suggest a vote of no confidence in the board members who were part of the hire of president Meadors. The new members, Reynolds and Green, have distinguished themselves in recent weeks, but the board members who date back to the Lu Hardin years should resign or be removed by the governor.

I suggest a vote of confidence/no confidence by the faculty senate rather than the entire faculty.

Thank you for listening to this petition.

Senator Crocket expressed no confidence in Board

Senator Rowley will forward.

Senator A. Wilson nothing new to add.

Senator Ray motion to suspend the rules, Poole second. Rules suspended.

Senator Ray moved to adopt the following resolution, Senator Copeland seconded.

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION
REQUESTING THE RESIGNATION OF MR. SCOTT ROUSSEL

WHEREAS the mission statement for the University of Central Arkansas was adopted by the Board of Trustees on May 6, 2011; and

WHEREAS the mission statement asserts that “the University of Central Arkansas is dedicated to academic vitality, diversity, and integrity;” and

WHEREAS in carrying out this obligation, the university is guided by the core value of integrity which is described as a commitment extending “to all levels of our campus to foster a climate of ethical conduct, respect, responsibility, and trust;” and

WHEREAS trust is further explained as seeking “to earn the public’s trust in all of our actions and words;” and

WHEREAS Mr. Scott Roussel, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, was cognizant of the conditions described by Aramark in the acceptance of \$700,000 in return for a seven-year, no bid contract for food services on the UCA campus; and

WHEREAS Mr. Scott Roussel, Chairman of the board of Trustees, would or should have been aware of the potential damage to the reputation of the University; and

WHEREAS Mr. Scott Roussel withheld this information from members of the Board of Trustees; and

WHEREAS this action was a violation of trust and ethical at the highest level;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED to formally request the immediate resignation of Mr. Scott Roussel from the University of Central Arkansas Board of Trustees.

A lively discussion ensued.

Bradley moved to table, Rowley seconded.

Vote whether or not to table. 14 in favor, 9 opposed, 0 abstain.

Senator Downing, nothing unique.

Senator G. Bratton 80% of his students view Aramark gift as unethical.

Senator G. Bratton moved suspend rules, Bolter seconds. Approved.

Senator G. Bratton moved , Senator Browne second.

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION

REQUESTING THE RECUSAL OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES CHAIR ROUSSEL PURSUANT TO ARAMARK MATTERS

WHEREAS, former President Meadors and Board of Trustees Chair Roussel publically admitted that they misrepresented ARAMARK'S proposal involving \$700,000.00.

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees bought out former President Meadors contract as a result,

BE IT RESOLVED that the UCA Faculty Senate condemns the actions of Chairman Roussel and requests that Chairman Roussel immediately recuse himself from any Board actions relative to the ARAMARK investigation or other ARAMARK related issues, until the conclusion of the investigation.

A lively discussion ensued.

16 in favor, 6 opposed, 1 abstain

Motion by Senator Hebert, second by Copeland:

Executive Committee will construct letter outlining concerns mentioned above, will forward to senate and it will be approved at next meeting. Then forwarded to Pres Courtway, Internal Audit. 10 in favor, 12 opposed to full senate reviewing the document. Therefore the exec committee will construct letter and send off.

C. Status of Previous Concerns

Concern about confidentiality of chair evaluations. Senator Wilson met with chairs and assoc. deans and brought this to their attention.

V. Senate Committee Reports

A. Executive Committee

1. Overview of Faculty Concerns

Overview of faculty concerns passed out. Will be addressed as the year goes along.

Faculty Concerns:

Summary of the Major Concerns Expressed at the Faculty/Senators Meeting on August 30, 2011

1. General Education
 - a. Who is addressing/examining the legislation that requires a transfer core of only 35 hours in general education?
 - b. Who is addressing/examining the legislation that limits degree programs to 120 hours?
 - c. Discussion of the general education core should be a campus-wide discussion.
2. Salaries, Fringe Benefits, Professional Development Funds
 - a. What does it cost to upgrade Banner to handle 12 month pay for 9 month faculty? Maybe faculty would be willing to pay the price. Could we survey to find out?
 - b. Is the Salary Review Committee being used?
 - c. What is the status of the Salary Adjustment Allocation Model that was developed?
 - d. Can the Fringe Benefits Advisory Committee review the health benefits for the category of 1 plus 2 children rather than 1 plus 2 children having to be classified as family?
 - e. Any salary increase needs to consider across-the-board as well as equity.
 - f. Librarians have a 9 month salary, yet work a 12 month contract.
 - g. Librarians would like to see an appropriate amount of professional development funds.
 - h. University College faculty would like to see an appropriate amount of professional development funds.
 - i. What is the procedure for establishing summer teaching pay? Is it prorated based on the number of students? Is a 6-hour and a 3-hour class paid the same? When are you notified if the class does not make?
3. Faculty Awards and Stipends
 - a. Can the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity Award be split so one is not comparing apples and oranges?
 - b. Can the Teaching Award be split so one is not comparing lecture and studio teaching?
 - c. Currently Chairs determine the merit of a nomination. A nomination should go forward no matter who puts it forward.
4. Strategic Plan and Strategic Planning
 - a. Communication
 - i. How will we make sure information is shared among the Council of Deans, Academic Council and Faculty Senate?
 - ii. Faculty need to be asked to serve on a committee before the Faculty Senate approves of their appointment.
 - iii. Is there a way to notify people of their appointment/reappointment to a committee?

- iv. Should a representative from the Council of Deans attend the Faculty Senate meetings?
 - b. Technology
 - i. What is the strategic plan for technology upgrades on campus?
 - c. Master Plan
 - i. What is the status of the Master Plan?
 - ii. What are the next buildings to be built and are they academic buildings?
- 5. Budget Advisory Committee
 - a. If some funds are generated through cost-cutting measures, how do we allocate those funds and make sure they go where they are supposed to?
 - b. What is the status of the “fees” and what progress has been made to reallocate the fees for their intended purpose?
 - c. Concerns were raised about the legislative-mandated performance funding and its potential impact on standards and first-of-year funding needs.
 - d. Does this committee have any power to effect change?
- 6. Student Evaluations
 - a. There is a poor student response rate and the current format is not useful for tenure and promotion.
 - b. Were there savings in going from paper to online and if so where did it go?
 - c. Is it legal to withhold grades from students who don’t do an evaluation?
- 7. University College
 - a. University College faculty have no link to the Provost under the current published organizational structure.
 - b. There is no clear procedure for promotion since it goes to a Vice-President.
- 8. Aramark Issue and Other Company Contracts
 - a. We need to investigate it (Aramark issue) because it looks like a kickback.
 - b. Are these types of business transactions allowing us to provide the best services?
 - c. Are these business transactions ethical?
- 9. Mentoring for Full Professorship
 - a. What is being done to actively promote more tenured women faculty members to full professorships?
- 10. Media-Related Items
 - a. How can we make sure positive items get forwarded to Jeff Pitchford and Venita Jenkins?
 - b. What is done with them once they are sent forward?
- 11. Nature Reserve Protection
 - a. What protections for the Nature Reserve will be put in place as the Greek Village is constructed?

12. Intellectual Property

- a. The UCA policy needs to be simplified.

13. Parking

- a. Are there any plans to expand parking?
- b. The parking fee went up this year.

14. Food Availability

- a. Are there plans to build something like Java City on the west side of campus?

15. Fall Final Grade Reporting

- a. Should be moved from Monday, December 19th to Tuesday, December 20th.

2. Committee Charges

a. Faculty Salary Review Committee:

Charge: Investigate and make recommendations for a salary increase to be implemented in the 2012-2013 academic year. Please complete this by the December 15, 2011 meeting. In addition, develop a plan to address issues of compression, equity, and merit over a 3-5 year plan. Please include this as part of the committee's formal report at the March 13, 2012 meeting.

b. Faculty Affairs I

Charge: Investigate and make recommendations concerning the possibility of splitting the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity Award. Please complete this by the December 15, 2011 meeting.

B. Committee on Committees

Senator Browne suspend rules, second Rowley. Approved. Sarah Orsborn for graduate council, second Copeland. Approved.

C. Academic Affairs

Senator Jones, no report. Progress being made on charge.

D. Faculty Affairs I

Senator Poole, no report. Progress being made on charge.

E. Faculty Affairs II

Senator Spivey, no report. Progress being made on charge.

VI. Announcements and Concerns

Senator Ray read concern. I would request that the faculty senate spearhead forums to address Act 747, specifically the general education component of the degree. I think faculty should be given the opportunity to discuss whether we should remain with 47 hours of general education or decrease the number of hours for general education in order to assist programs meet the 120 hr requirement by 7/1/2012. These forums would need to be held as soon as possible in order to assist programs in the development of their new degree plans.

Senator Bolter: I'm interested in having the Faculty Senate look into the recent enrollment of international students without appropriate TOEFL scores.

It's my understanding that UCA requires a minimum score on the TOEFL as a requirement of admission (it used to be 500, I think). Has this changed? And if so, was a change approved by the University Admissions Committee? I'm concerned and would ask that you forward my concerns to the Faculty Senate."

Senator Browne moved to suspend rules, second Senator Ray. 21 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstain.

PROPOSED FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION REGARDING NO CONFIDENCE IN BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Whereas the Board of Trustees of the University of Central Arkansas has failed to protect the reputation of this University in the selection and oversight of Presidents Lu Hardin and Allen Meadors and has so failed in the subsequent controversy surrounding the Aramark contribution to the president's house, the Faculty Senate resolves that it has no confidence in the Board of Trustees to govern the University.

Senator Bolter moved to table, Senator Burley second. 20 in favor of tabling, 3 opposed.

Senator Poole: I would like for the faculty senate or the faculty-handbook committee to address ranking of faculty for promotion. I am curious if every college P & T promotion ranks all applicants from 1 to ---(number applying for promotion), or if there are variations in the ranking system? Another larger question is should we be ranking applicants for promotion by specific ranks or better yet why are we ranking? Also, why is promotion not criterion based as tenure is (decided by the criteria set by the department).

Also, is it fair to rank an individual who is seeking a promotion to professor against an individual seeking promotion to an associate professor rank? Is ranking required due to financial reasons? Have we historically approved only a certain percentage of applicants seeking promotion?

Is it fair to rank a faculty member from a department that is responsible for undergraduate education against faculty members who have primarily graduate programs (master and doctoral

programs)? Obviously, faculty with primarily graduate programs should be more productive if their criteria focuses on scholarship and they have graduate students actively engaged in the research/scholarly activity.

Senator Bradley also expressed concern regarding TOEFL scores.

Senator Spivey, As you may know, last year the English Department's annual Banned Book celebration was shut down by the UCA PD for violating Board Policy 406 (details can be found on pages 7-9 of the Faculty Senate Minutes for the October 12, 2010 meeting available here: http://www.uca.edu/facultysenate/documents/AugtoDec2010/Minutes_2010_10_12.pdf).

This year, in hopes of causing no problems, we have reserved the courtyard in front of the student center so that we could use amplification. However, we were informed that Board Policy 406 covers not only the steps in front of the chapel but also the courtyard, and that no amplification may be used at anytime other than X-period so as not to disturb classes. Yet, today on my way to and from my 11:00 class in EDGE Residential College and on my way to and from lunch in the student center, a van from Alice 107.7 was parked by the courtyard, playing amplified music. This concerns me. Why is the policy so sporadically enforced? In fact, it seems as though the only time it is enforced is when faculty or off-campus religious groups want to speak. Blaring amplified music does not violate the policy, but reading into a microphone does.

If you take the time to read the above minutes, you'll notice that though my concern was raised, apparently no discussion was held, or if there was discussion, the discussion was left out of the minutes. In my original letter to my senators, I stated "Whatever you do, please do not allow this issue to simply be noted, put in the minutes, and forgotten." Apparently, this is exactly what happened. So, again, I am asking you to demand a clarification of this issue. This incident may seem insignificant, but it points to the larger issue of the disconnect between administration and faculty (a problem noted by the HLC) and the lack of vision for the university (also noted by the HLC).

This concern was sent to President Wilson by a constituent. During the college meeting on Wednesday, Dean Lee made a point of criticizing Debra Hale-Shelton for her coverage of UCA. He called her pieces "over the top" and made it clear that he thought Ms. Hale-Shelton was picking on UCA and that we faculty members ought to share his disapproval. I don't agree, but, as President Meadors said in his earlier e-mail, we are all entitled to our own opinions. But, I was struck by the fact that Dean Lee's criticism of Ms. Hale-Shelton occurred on the same day as President Meadors's e-mail criticizing her Wednesday article and her general coverage. This coincidence, if coincidence it was, created the impression that something is afoot, that administrators might be joining together to try to foment an atmosphere hostile to Ms. Hale-Shelton because they, or some of them, dislike her efforts to report on UCA. If this is the case, and there at least some evidence that it is, I believe the faculty, through the Faculty Senate, ought to denounce and condemn any such attempt to defame, impede, or intimidate Ms. Hale-Shelton.

As far as I can tell, all Ms. Hale-Shelton has done is be a diligent and conscientious journalist. It is her job to report on the ways UCA carries out its public trust. We may think she is right or wrong, that she has gotten the story or missed the point. We may be annoyed or pleased by what she says and how we appear in her reports. But, none of that has to do with how she does her job. All she has to do is be accurate and generally fair, which I think she has been. To mount a campaign, and a pretty sneaky one at that, intended to punish a journalist for simply doing her job is contrary to the traditions of a university, which is supposed to be a place, if there are no others, where ideas can be explored and argued without fear of reprisal and smear campaigns. I realize that powerful people don't like to be questioned and criticized. Truly, no one does. But, we are a public institution carrying out a public trust and, therefore, must not only expect but desire public scrutiny. We should be grateful to Ms. Hale-Shelton for her determination and professionalism. After all, if she had not been such a good journalist, it's not certain that the corruption of the Hardin administration would ever have come to light. We don't have to like being scrutinized, but, human nature being what it is, we are usually better when we have to answer for ourselves.

A. Next meeting: September 22nd at 12:45 pm in Wingo Hall 315

B. Other Announcements and Concerns

VII. Adjournment moved Senator Hebert and Senator Bolter seconded.