

AGENDA  
UCA Faculty Senate  
C  
Thursday, February 28, 2008  
Wingo 315, 12:45 p.m.

- I. Approval of minutes from February 12, 2008 (attachment 1)
  
- II. President's report
  - A. Executive Committee lunch with President Hardin
  - B. Faculty Handbook Committee report
  - C. Provost search update
  - D. Campus technology review update
  - E. Correspondence
  
- III. Committee reports
  - A. Executive Committee
    - 1. Review: Procedures for Campus Discussion on Honors Faculty Status (attachment 2)
    - 2. Resolution to Increase University Funding for Torreyson Library (From the Library Committee) (attachment 3)
  
  - B. Committee on Committees
  
  - C. Academic Affairs
  
  - D. Faculty Affairs I
  
  - E. Faculty Affairs II
  
- IV. Announcements and Concerns
  - A. Next meeting: Tuesday, March 11, 2008 (12:45 pm)
  - B. Faculty concerns and announcements
  - C. Other
  
- V. Adjournment

## Attachment 1: Minutes from February 12, 2008

UCA Faculty Senate  
Tuesday, February 12, 2008  
Wingo 315, 12:45 p.m.

President Powers called the meeting to order at 12:45 p.m. Present were Powers, Boniecki, Johnson, Parrack, Wilmes, Wiedmaier, Hebert, Young, Holden, Rospert, McCullough, Lance, Craig, Mehta, Seifert, Christman, Lichtenstein, Jones, Ray, Schaefer, Runge, Associate Provost Glenn. Advised Absence: Bradley, Bell, Castro.

I. Approval of minutes from January 24, 2007. Senator Lance moved approval of the minutes with second by Senator Ray. Several name and attendance corrections were incorporated into the corrected minutes, to be web-posted. A major correction was made with regard to part-time faculty fringe benefits, and another correction with regard to the Provost's statement regarding concurrent enrollments credit. Corrected minutes were approved.

II. President's report

A. Faculty Handbook. President Powers reported that the Faculty Handbook Committee that he chairs is undertaking a major reorganization of Chapter Three, dealing with faculty personnel issues. The purpose of the reorganization is to make Chapter Three more readable but without changing content or policy. Also, current wording regarding grievance policy has been found to be cryptic, and a rewriting of that wording, without changing policy, is being undertaken. Changes will be submitted to the senate before the end of the Spring semester.

B. Provost Search Update. Parker Executive Search of Atlanta has been hired and the representative has been on campus to meet with the Provost Search Committee. The purpose of the meeting was to clarify what the University is looking for in a Provost. The timeline will permit having a new provost in place by July. The committee is relatively pleased with the search firm's timeline and general plan.

C. Correspondence:

1. Online courses. A change in academic credit policy, to allow online courses up to six hours to count as "resident hours", has been sent as an information item to the Undergraduate Council, with the Provost's and Registrar's signatures. Considerable discussion and confusion followed. Senator Johnson moved to suspend the rules for the purpose of requesting the Registrar to send a clarifying explanation, presumably written, to the senate. Senator Lance seconded the motion to suspend the rules. Motion passed. Senator Johnson moved to send such a request to the Registrar, seconded by Senator Boniecki. Motion passed.

2. External Technology Review. The report from the external review team has been expected but has not yet arrived. It is now expected within the next week. President Powers will make a follow-up report to the senate.

### III. Committee reports

#### A. Executive Committee:

1. Academic Affairs Committee resolution: Procedures for Campus Discussion on Honors Faculty Status. Director Scott's document has now arrived. It deals with the procedures for the hiring, appointment, evaluation, promotion and tenure of Honors faculty members and the Director's discussion of the role and mission of Honors within the University in that regard. Senator Johnson moved with second by Senator Schaefer to approve the procedures for distributing and considering the document in a campus-wide discussion. The procedures envisage the posting of Director Scott's paper, the solicitation of written responses from faculty to that document, the election of a review committee to review and consider all of the position papers thus generated along with Director Scott's paper, the procedures for that review, and finally the forwarding of the committee's recommendation to the senate for its consideration.

Senator Parrack made a friendly amendment, accepted by the maker of the motion and the second, that members of the review committee be tenured, as originally discussed. This friendly motion (that members of the review committee shall be tenured) included all elected members of the panel as well as the Honors representative appointed by Director Scott. Senator Holden asked if the Honors representative should be elected, as are the other members of the committee. It was agreed that there are too few tenured Honors faculty at the present time for such an election to be meaningful.

A second friendly amendment by Senator Boniecki, accepted by the maker of the motion and the second, stipulated that the date of the election of the review committee members will be set at the same time and place as the election of college senators, so that there will be a need for just one election in the colleges.

In discussion of the availability to the campus community of Director Scott's paper and other papers written in response, the senate agreed that at some point—probably at the point of the committee delivering its report to the senate—the results of the campus discussion would need to be made available on the public portion of the University's web site. Senator Johnson moved with second by Senator Lance that Director Scott's paper and papers written in response shall first be posted on URSA, to make them available to the University community in preparation for the committee review and open meeting. Thereafter, documents will be publicly listed. Amendment passed. Then the original motion as amended passed.

2. Charge to Faculty Affairs II to craft a clarifying document for nine-month faculty concerning the personal financial implications of moving to a semi-monthly payroll. Rita Fleming spoke to the senate in the Fall term concerning payroll changes. As a service to the faculty, the Faculty Senate needs to prepare such a document and fact-check the procedures that will be in place. The committee especially should point out the difference between Spring 2008 and Fall 2008 (and subsequent) paycheck patterns. The faculty will receive only a partial check in August 2008 and in May 2009 (at the end of August 2008 and in the middle of May 2009), contrasted with receiving two partial checks at the end of the current Spring 2008 term—mid-May 2008 and the end of May 2008. The amounts of the partial checks (given a constant salary) will also be different as between Spring 2008 and Fall 2008 (and subsequently), since Spring 2008 will be 1/20 of salary, while AY 2008-2009 will be 1/18 of salary. The committee should also point out the need for a different pattern of summer savings.

B. Committee on Committees.

1. Recommendation to include the President-elect of the Faculty Senate as an ex-officio member of the Faculty Handbook Committee. The current description of the Faculty Handbook Committee designates the President of the Faculty Senate as the chair of the committee. This is often an awkward arrangement primarily because the President of the Faculty Senate may have little or no experience with the handbook committee prior to chairing the committee. As a result of the chair's lack of experience, year-to-year continuity of committee proceedings is threatened and unnecessary inefficiencies are introduced. The Committee on Committees brought the recommendation that the description of the Faculty Handbook committee membership be revised to include the president-elect of the Faculty Senate as an ex-officio member. Senator Parrack made a motion to such effect with second by Senator Seifert. Senator Johnson made a friendly amendment, accepted by the maker and second of the main motion, that the words "ex officio, non-voting" be substituted for "ex officio." The logic is that without such explicit exclusion from voting, the term "ex officio" contemplates voting rights. Without such exclusion, it would be possible that the Faculty Handbook Committee membership could become highly unbalanced in favor of one or another college, since the President of the Faculty Senate, the ex-officio president-elect, and the elected college representative could all be from the same college. Main motion passed.

2. Recommendation to name replacement to name semester substitute member on Sabbatical Leave Review Committee. Senator Boniecki moved for a suspension of the rules, seconded by Senator Schaefer, for the purpose of naming Professor John Vanderslice as a Spring semester replacement for Professor Lynn Burley, who is on sabbatical. Passed. Then Senator Boniecki moved with second by Senator Lance so to name Professor Vanderslice the replacement. Passed.

C. Academic Affairs. Report on student athlete scholarship and progress. The committee will meet with a representative of the UCA Athletic Department on February

13. The committee expects to receive some good information and will report at the next senate meeting.

D. Faculty Affairs I. Resolution for Faculty Development. Chairman McCullough reported. No one at any university knows, committee research shows, exactly how much is spent on faculty development at a given institution. Everywhere one has to go back department by department and then faculty member by faculty member to determine allocations and actual spending, and that kind of documentation simply is not done. Committee investigation has determined that in AY 2006-2007, the latest data available, a sum of \$704,000 was spent on "academic travel" at UCA. The resolution requests that this amount be budgeted and limited "to full-time faculty development usage only" for 2008-2009, roughly equivalent to \$1,200 per full-time faculty member. (There are currently 581 full-time faculty members.) The resolution further states, "That this number [shall] be adjusted annually to account for cost-of-living [CPI All Urban] increases as well as changes in faculty numbers within departments. It is also recommended that individual departments would be responsible for developing fair and equitable guidelines for distributing the funds based on unique departmental circumstances."

Senator McCullough moved with second by Senator Lance that the resolution be adopted by the senate. One question in discussion asked about the inclusion of academic administrators in the allocation contained in the resolution. (They are not, since by definition academic administrators are not full-time faculty.) Other questions asked the basis of the figure and whether it would include faculty recruiting travel for departments (it would not). The determination of "academic travel" in 2006-2007 by the committee does not include development monies contained in grant, IDC or URC budgets. Those budgets would continue to generate additional faculty development funding. Senator Parrack moved an amendment, seconded by Senator Seifert, to replace in the above-quoted language the phrase "that this number be adjusted annually" by the phrase "that this line item shall be budgeted at 2.4% of continuing faculty salaries in the Provost's budget." It was pointed out that tying the figure as a percentage to the faculty salary line will take account of future changes in the number of full-time faculty and in faculty salary rates. President Powers pointed out that what needs to happen is to make the UCA Administration keenly aware that when we hire faculty we are undertaking the obligation to support their professional development. Amendment passed. A second amendment was made by President Powers, with second by Vice-president Boniecki, to charge a group composed of the senate executive committee plus one member from Faculty Affairs I to oversee the implementation of this resolution, in terms of working with the Provost. Amendment passed. Then the original motion to approve the resolution from Faculty Affairs I, as amended, passed.

E. Faculty Affairs II Report on Technology. There was nothing new to report. The committee thinks it can report by the next senate meeting on the charge regarding a guide to payroll changes for faculty members, but that is a different issue. Regarding

technology, budgetary detail regarding technology is extremely confusing. We just know that technology needs for faculty, for classrooms, and for students are not being met and that the technology budget is a disaster.

#### IV. Announcements and Concerns

A. The next meeting of the senate is Thursday, February 28.

B. The UCA budget is not clear on technology and the senate should recommend an outside review of the technology budget.

C. Senator Runge followed up on her previous concerns concerning part-time faculty and Social Security. What options are available under the law? The part-time faculty are very concerned with the situation and request senate investigation.

D. The role of the Personnel Advisory Committee needs clarifying. [President Powers: this is on the agenda of the Faculty Handbook Committee.]

#### V. Adjournment

Motion by Senator Ray with second by Senator Seifert to adjourn. Meeting adjourned 2:00 p.m.

Attachment 2:

REVIEW

Procedures for Campus Discussion on Honors Faculty Status

*NOTE: The following procedures for the campus discussion have already been passed by the Senate. However, upon final review, Director Scott of Honors was unhappy with some of the wording and is seeking the two revisions below.*

Honors Faculty Status Discussion

Purpose: ~~To discuss the future status of the Honors faculty at UCA with an emphasis on whether or not Honors should be allowed to hire and tenure faculty members who are otherwise unaffiliated with academic departments at UCA.~~

Proposed language:

Purpose: To discuss whether or not the Honors College should be allowed in the future to hire and tenure faculty members who are otherwise unaffiliated with academic departments in the six colleges at UCA.

Procedure:

1. The current director of Honors will submit a position paper regarding how future Honors faculty members should be recruited, hired, tenured, and promoted. The director of Honors should provide justifications to support the proposed faculty model including (if necessary) reasons for promoting Honors as an independent entity, detached from established academic departments at UCA. The position paper will be made available to the faculty on the Faculty Senate web pages. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be responsible for advertising the link to the document and ensuring that all interested faculty members have the opportunity to view it.
2. Faculty members at UCA are invited to submit formal written responses to the Honors position paper. Responses should include pragmatic suggestions for revising the Honors director's proposal or should present alternative models for Honors program staffing. Group submissions are acceptable. No anonymous submissions will be accepted. The call for position papers will be issued by the end of February, 2008. The deadline for faculty responses is June 30, 2008.
3. A seven-member Honors discussion panel will be selected during the spring semester, 2008. The Honors discussion panel will be comprised of one elected tenured representative from each college at UCA and one tenured faculty member from the Honors program. Faculty senators from each

college are charged with coordinating the nomination and election of representatives from their colleges to serve on the panel. Elections of discussion panel members may be held as special elections or may be held concurrent with spring Faculty Senate elections in April 2008. However, each college must elect a participant by May, 2008. The representative from Honors will be appointed by the director of Honors. The discussion panel will elect a chair from among its members.

4. Submissions of faculty position papers will be reviewed by members of the Honors discussion panel to ensure compliance with the basic guidelines for submission. The director of Honors will also be given the opportunity to review submitted papers and check them for factual errors or misrepresentations of Honors faculty, students, or programs. Position papers that fail to comply with the basic guidelines or papers that are found to contain distorted facts will be returned to their authors for further editing. Position papers that are submitted before the Honors discussion panel is selected will be held by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee until the discussion panel is in place.

5. Once reviewed and approved by the Honors discussion panel, submissions will be posted on the campus web portal (URSA) for the campus to read.

6. After full review of all accepted position papers, the elected panel will conduct a public discussion of the proposal, suggested revisions to the proposal, and submitted alternatives to the proposal. The length of this discussion will be determined by the Honors discussion panel and may vary depending on the volume of proposals received. The discussion date, time, and location will be determined by the Honors discussion panel. However, the discussion must take place no earlier than August 18, 2008 and not later than October 2, 2008. The date, time, and location of the discussion should be announced via the Admin-L email listserv at least five working days before the discussion.

7. The audience to the discussion will be invited to provide written feedback related to the public discussion (however, the audience will not be allowed to participate in the panel discussion). Written feedback must be submitted to the chair of the Honors discussion panel within 5 working days of the panel discussion.



~~8. After the discussion and after written feed back from the discussion has been collected, the discussion panel will have ten working days to make a formal recommendation regarding the future status of the Honors program. The panel's recommendation will consider the original proposal, suggested revisions to the proposal, submitted alternatives to the proposal, and written feedback received from the audience to the discussion. If the recommendation is not unanimous, the panel's vote will be recorded and panel members voting in the minority will be permitted to attach dissenting opinions to the majority's recommendation.~~

Proposed language:

8. After the discussion and after written feed back from the discussion has been collected, the discussion panel will have ten working days to make a formal recommendation regarding whether or not the Honors College should be allowed in the future to hire and tenure faculty members who are otherwise unaffiliated with academic departments in the six colleges at UCA.

9. The discussion panel's recommendation (along with any dissenting opinions) will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for immediate consideration.

## Attachment 3:

### Library Committee Resolution to Increase University Funding for Torreyson Library

#### Assessment of the University Mission and the Library Mission

A university's library is its academic center, and no other campus institution embodies more fully the intellectual aspirations of the academic community. Furthermore, deficits in the quality of library resources and services have insidious and far reaching effects on the ability of a university to attract and retain high quality students and faculty. With this in mind, UCA faculty are concerned that Torreyson Library funding is not commensurate with UCA's mission as a "Center of Learning." In the following, we outline the extent of these deficiencies and propose remedies to alleviate them.

The dissemination of knowledge, public debate and free exchange of ideas are so fundamental to the life of the university that we must address these needs with far-sighted planning. In so doing, we will insure the recognition of the university, the intellectual growth of its students, and the success of its faculty. We live in an increasingly information-driven society, one in which success by both student learners and faculty researchers requires state of the art and comprehensive access to a rapidly expanding body of human knowledge.

It is UCA's mission "to maintain the highest academic quality and to ensure that its programs remain current and responsive to the diverse needs of those it serves." It follows that funding for Torreyson Library must be both far-sighted and consistent with the need to provide our students and faculty with technologically advanced information and knowledge delivery.

#### Dramatic Increases in Enrollment, Costs, and New Services

Recent years have seen a dramatic increase in UCA's enrollment and a marked rise in UCA's standards for student and faculty achievement. At the same time, there has been a significant increase in UCA programs designed for delivery to off-campus student populations. The delivery of scholarly information resources to these students requires that Torreyson Library acquire information resources in electronic format. Furthermore, since the subscription cost of electronic information resources is usually based on a per pupil formula, subscription costs rise as UCA's enrollment grows.

Therefore,

Whereas the Torreyson Library budget for book acquisitions has increased by less than 5% since 1993, and the average cost of academic books has increased by over 35% since 1993;

Whereas the Torreyson Library budget for subscriptions to scholarly journals has increased by less than 40% since 1993, and the average cost of subscriptions to scholarly journals has increased by over 225% (two hundred and twenty-five percent) since 1993;

Whereas the Torreyson Library budget does not presently include a designated line for information resources in electronic format although subscriptions to e-format information resources are very costly;

Be it hereby resolved that the Torreyson Library budget be increased to a level consistent with the Library's responsibility to credibly support the University of Central Arkansas mission of being a premier university for our state, region, and nation.

#### Proposed Solution

More specifically,

Be it hereby resolved that the Torreyson Library book budget be increased by no less than 35% for fiscal year 2008-2009;

Be it hereby resolved that the Torreyson Library budget for scholarly journals be increased by no less than 20% for fiscal year 2008-2009;

Be it hereby resolved that a new line be added to the Torreyson Library budget to support the acquisition of e-format information resources in the amount of \$100,000 for fiscal year 2008-2009;

Be it further resolved that a method of strategic adjustment for Torreyson Library's information resources budget be developed and instituted so that UCA's students and faculty have access to the scholarly information resources required for success at a premier institution of higher learning.