

AGENDA
UCA Faculty Senate
C
Tuesday, March 11, 2008
Wingo 315, 12:45 p.m.

- I. Approval of minutes from February 28, 2008 (attachment 1)

- II. President's report
 - A. Faculty Handbook Committee Resolutions (attachments 2,3,4)
 - B. Provost search update
 - C. Elections reminder
 - D. Correspondence

- III. Committee reports
 - A. Executive Committee
 - 1. Progress report: Faculty Development funding proposal
 - 2. Report: Concurrent Enrollment Policy Committee Recommendations (separate attachment)

 - B. Committee on Committees

 - C. Academic Affairs

 - D. Faculty Affairs I

 - E. Faculty Affairs II

- IV. Announcements and Concerns
 - A. Next meeting: Tuesday, April 8, 2008 (12:45 pm)
 - B. Faculty concerns and announcements
 - C. Other

- V. Adjournment

Attachment 1: Minutes from February 28, 2008

UCA Faculty Senate
Thursday, February 28, 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, Bradley, Bell, Wilmes, Wiedmaier, Young, Rospert, McCullough, Lance, Craig, Castro, Mehta, Seifert, Lichtenstein, Ray, Schaefer, Runge, Interim Provost Atkinson. Advised absence: Hebert, Holden, Christman, Jones.

I. Approval of minutes from February 12, 2008. Senator Lance moved approval of the minutes with second by Senator Ray. With corrections emailed from Senator Ray incorporated, the motion passed. [Main correction: "Announcements and Concerns, section B, should say 'A concern was raised regarding the Academic Budget. After many committees have tried to determine how much money has been spent on faculty travel, technology etc. there seem to be no clear cut answers about amounts being spent in any budget category. The senate should request that the entire academic budget be investigated and find out where the money goes.' "]

II. President's report

A. Executive Committee Lunch with President Hardin. President Powers reported that President Hardin is still committed to development of a strategy for funding faculty development more fully. The executive committee advised President Hardin that it would deliver to him, working with Senator McCullough of the Academic Affairs Committee, a fully fleshed out proposal by spring break. On concurrent enrollment and related issues, President Hardin will work hard on communicating with the campus more fully.

B. Faculty Handbook progress report. The Faculty Handbook Committee continues to meet weekly. The first results of that work will be delivered to the senate, for its consideration, at the next meeting of the senate. Work continues on language clarification in several areas, including the departmental personnel advisory committee and the grievance process. [Senator Bradley: There is an urgent need for training sessions for department chairs and deans regarding many provisions of the Faculty Handbook. In many instances they act as if they had never read it, despite in many instances the language having been in place for years. In all instances Faculty Handbook language has been approved by the UCA Board of Trustees and is official university policy.] [President Powers: faculty senators likewise are encouraged to read new language carefully.] [Provost: Department chairs and deans have had only one meeting with the Provost this year, and it is time for another meeting.]

C. Provost search update. The search is proceeding in accordance with the established timeline. The search firm is still conducting its determination of individuals to contact and then to recommend to the campus search committee.

D. Campus technology review update. The visit team's report has arrived. There is a long list of issues and recommendations to address, including the hiring of a Chief Information Officer (CIO) as well as other new positions within the IT organization that will permit the addressing of campus technology issues more effectively. [Provost: the new CIO position will report to the Provost as is true of the IT operation at present. The report is extensive and constitutes a good outline for reform. It recommends reforming the committee structure, to establish a faculty committee, an administrator committee, and a student committee to report to a reconstituted campus technology committee. The report has gotten the Administration's attention and the Provost feels good about future funding to implement the recommendations in the report.]

E. Correspondence.

1. In view of recent campus violence in the nation, the senate will invite the UCA Chief of Police to address the senate to discuss policies and programs for campus safety.

2. Registrar Tony Sitz is reviewing the senate request to elaborate recent policy regarding residence credit for online courses and will come to a future senate meeting this term.

3. Human Resources (HR) may undertake a review of the way that fringe benefits are distributed to faculty and staff. One approach is to introduce flexibility for individual employees in allocating fringe benefit dollars—a variation on the "cafeteria" plan. HR wants the Faculty Senate to check what other universities are doing—that is, simply to obtain names of institutions that have undertaken innovative approaches to introduce flexibility, and then to forward those names to HR. It will be HR's job to make contacts and engage in detailed investigation.

III. Committee reports

A. Executive Committee:

1. Procedures for Campus Discussion on Honors Faculty Status. Honors Director Scott has requested certain wording changes regarding in the implementation document, namely:

a. to change from the current wording:

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.

to the proposed new wording:

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.

b. to change from the current wording:

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.

to the proposed new wording:

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.

President Powers moved to approve the change in language as proposed by Director Scott, with second by Senator Schaefer. Senator Johnson moved with second from Senator Boniecki to divide the question so that the two changes could be considered separately. The motion to divide the question passed.

Discussion followed. It was clarified that at present the Director of Honors reports directly to the Provost. On voice vote, the question to approve the language change in part (a) failed without support. On voice vote, the question to approve the language change in part (b) failed without support.

A new motion was made regarding part (b) by Senator Lance with second by Senator Bradley to change the last two words from "Honors program" to "Honors faculty" in view of the orientation of the procedure to faculty issues. Motion passed without opposition.

2. Library Committee Resolution to Increase University Funding for Torreyson Library. President Powers moved to adopt the resolution with second by Senator Lichtenstein. Senator Lichtenstein detailed the recommended percentage increases: 20% for scholarly journals amounts to \$86,783; 35% for the book budget amounts to \$99,028; and repeated requests for other information sources amounts to \$100,000; for a total of \$285,811. Senator Seifert added the perspective of historical percentages for library of E&G expenditures:

Academic Year	Percentage of E&G
97-98	3.78%
98-99	3.60%
99-0	3.54%
00-01	3.35%
01-02	3.32%
...	...
06-07	2.21%
07-08 (budgeted)	2.65%

Senator Seifert noted that in the above time frame, E&G expenditures have increased 100 percent while library expenditures have increased 10 percent, even including the present budgeted amount that represents a special infusion of funds to meet critical needs for the first time in years. Senator Lichtenstein noted with appreciation that special infusion of \$200,000 from the Provost for AY 07-08.

Discussion focused on the increased needs of more faculty, more students, and new graduate programs. [Provost: it makes sense to underwrite these needs with a special fee. It was noted that while there was a short-lived "Library Fee" that really didn't go to the library budget in the late nineties, such a fee has not existed for a number of years.]

Motion passed without opposition.

B. Committee on Committees: no report

C. Academic Affairs: The committee did meet with representatives of the athletic program. The committee is not yet getting all of the data it requested, but it is receiving some. One problem is that the data go back only a limited number of years.

D. Faculty Affairs I: The committee has visited with the Fringe Benefit Committee chair concerning decision processes regarding fringe benefits. The committee did conduct a survey last year on the health insurance program, and seventy-five percent of respondents reported satisfaction with the program. The state requires that benefits be put out on bid only once every seven years, as a maximum time limit. There is a constant tension between having enough time for employees to get used to a new insurer versus going for a bid to see what the alternatives look like. UCA does engage H&H Benefits specialists to keep in touch with price and benefits trends. Parties to the discussion (FA-I, FBC, and HR) have discussed the possibility of a faculty fringe benefits expert on the committee, but it is a big job. In the end, the FBC makes recommendations and not decisions. It is a difficult job to anticipate all of the

consequences (particular quirks of coverage) of a new policy and a new carrier. The HR Director decides if it is worth it (among other things in terms of recent insurance “experience” of the insured employees), to go out on bid. (In “bad” years it makes no sense to go out on bid when our “experience” has been bad.) In summary, Faculty Affairs I reports that as long as we are comparable in coverage to peer institutions, nothing will change—that is the mindset in HR.

E. Faculty Affairs II: Senator Craig reported for the committee. There is as yet no document to present concerning payroll change information issues.

IV. Announcements and Concerns

A. The next meeting of the senate is Tuesday, March 11, 2008.

B. Senator Castro: The last chairs’ meeting in CLA took up the subject of the departmental personnel advisory committee as contained in the November 2007 revision of the Faculty Handbook. The request is for the senate to clarify its role in departments. There was also other language clarification requested by the chairs. [President Powers: the Faculty Handbook Committee, in the reorganization of Chapter Three of the handbook currently underway, is addressing these clarification issues, and it will be coming to the senate; however, no new policy is being proposed in the current reorganization of Chapter Three, being undertaken with the collaboration of university counsel Tom Courtway. The departmental personnel advisory committee was proposed last year—and approved by the UCA Board of Trustees—as a means of addressing faculty governance issues and providing a locus for faculty governance responsibilities that were placed into the handbook during the earlier process of AAUP censure removal; that earlier restatement of faculty governance responsibilities was part of UCA’s effort to become compliant with AAUP guidelines and to remove AAUP censure from the institution. The creation of the departmental personnel advisory committee in itself created no new faculty rights or responsibilities; it merely attempted to provide a means for the faculty to fulfill those responsibilities already assigned to the faculty in that earlier “AAUP revision”.]

C. Senator Castro: Have we linked with other university library databases as a means of providing additional information resources to students and faculty? [Senator Lichtenstein: Torreyson Library participates in several such link-ups with other libraries, including ArkLink, AMIGOS, the Michigan Library Consortium, and OCLC. It has been necessary to economize in many ways, and in many ways we wish we had better linkups, but the budget has been a major limiting factor.]

D. Senator Bradley: The Graduate Council is currently considering a process to re-qualify faculty teaching in graduate programs. In a three-way discussion between the Graduate Council, the departments with graduate programs, and the Council of Deans a number of issues remain to be resolved.

V. Adjournment

Motion by Senator Bell with second by Senator Parrack to adjourn. Meeting adjourned 2:00 p.m.

Attachment 2: Faculty Handbook Committee Resolution 1

Clarification of guidelines regulating the activity of the Departmental Personnel Advisory Committee (DPAC).

Background

Obligations of tenured faculty members were clarified in the 2007 Faculty Handbook as including service on a Departmental Personnel Advisory Committee. As stated in the 2007 (current) Faculty Handbook,

“To meet its responsibilities in mid-tenure review, early tenure review, annual review of the appointment status of untenured faculty, appeals in cases of post-tenure review, and long range planning for faculty appointments, the tenured faculty in each academic department shall make its recommendations as the standing Department Personnel Advisory Committee. The committee shall communicate in writing its recommendations in these matters to the chair and, where appropriate, to the dean of the college.” (p.18).

Complaints have been received related to the lack of specific guidelines for structuring and operating this advisory committee. The Faculty Handbook committee unanimously endorses departmental independence in the operation of the DPAC. The Faculty Handbook committee believes it is consistent with AAUP guidelines to require that the tenured members of departments decide for themselves how the advisory committee is constructed and how it will conduct the business of advising chairpersons in personnel-related matters.

Suggested addition to the Faculty Handbook:

The Faculty Handbook Committee unanimously recommends that the following clarification of the Departmental Personnel Advisory Committee be made. A new paragraph should be inserted in Chapter 4, Section IV, (p.41) as follows (the new paragraph is presented below in context, in italics, in a larger font):

VI. Service to the University and Community

The university is at once a community within itself and is part of a larger community. To function as a community, every faculty member must be willing to make contributions beyond teaching and scholarship. University academic policies and procedures should reflect the advice and counsel of faculty. The involvement of the faculty serving on advisory bodies, councils and committees at every level of decision making is essential. The university requires and values this service of the faculty.

Departments will have standing committees to attend to the critical concerns of the department. Likewise, colleges have promotion, tenure, curriculum, and research committees. Every faculty member is encouraged to serve when asked and to make preferences known to department chairs, deans, and the Faculty Senate.

“Further, tenured faculty members in departments will serve as a Department Personnel Advisory Committee (DPAC) to assist the department chair by taking an advisory role in matters related to the academic staffing of the department. The structure of DPAC along with the scope and procedures related to DPAC activity should be determined annually by the tenured faculty of each department. [More information about the DPAC can be found in the Faculty Handbook

Chapter 3, VI. Academic Tenure: Purposes and Obligations, B. Obligations and Responsibilities.]”

Attachment 3: Faculty Handbook Committee Resolution 2

Revision of language in Chapter 3, Section IV, B (1), Definitions of Academic Appointments, Instructor (P.15 of the 2007 Handbook).

Background

It is often the case that new faculty members are hired into tenure-track slots while still completing graduate program requirements. Occasionally, a new faculty member begins a tenure-track appointment before the dissertation is completed, defended, or before the doctoral degree has been officially conferred. In these cases, the handbook specifies that the initial appointment must begin at the rank of instructor instead of assistant professor. Currently, even if the faculty member completes the degree requirements, he or she must remain at the instructor rank until the beginning of the next contract year.

The current process may be a disincentive to the completion of terminal degree requirements because the deadline is effectively pushed to the next contract year. A better process would reward those who finish degrees within the first semester at UCA by allowing promotion to assistant professor to begin at the start of the next semester instead of delaying the promotion until the next contract year. Furthermore, to avoid confusion, all conditions of the tenure-track rank at initial appointment should be clearly stated in writing in the initial letter of appointment. The Faculty Handbook Committee suggests the new language below as an improved policy for those who complete terminal degrees after beginning a tenure-track appointment.

Current wording:

“Initial appointment for faculty without the doctoral degree ordinarily will be at the instructor rank. Any instructor with a tenure-track appointment will be promoted to assistant professor, effective with the next contract year, upon verification of completion of all requirements for the doctorate.” (P.15).

Proposed wording:

“Initial appointment of faculty without the doctoral degree in a tenure-track line position will be at the instructor rank. Any instructor with a tenure-track appointment will be promoted to assistant professor contingent upon receiving the doctorate or appropriate terminal degree (with proof of completion), before the end of the first semester of employment. If the doctorate is received after the first semester but before the start of the next academic year, promotion to assistant professor will be effective with the start of the next academic year. These conditions should be stated in the initial letter of appointment along with an indication of the length of time allowed for completion of the doctorate and any considerations regarding salary incentives and the tenure-track time line.”

Attachment 4: Faculty Handbook Committee Resolution 3

Changes in the description of the Radiation Safety Committee.

Proposed changes to the memberships of certain standing university committees in the Faculty Handbook (strikethrough = delete, underline = add):

Radiation Safety Committee

1. Charge: To administer, regulate, and control the university's radioactive materials.
2. Membership: The university radiation safety officer and all authorized campus users of radioactive materials. ~~Members other than the radiation safety officer are appointed by the Faculty Senate for rotating five year terms. The makeup of this committee is dictated by Arkansas statute. There are no appointed members. All users of radioactive material on campus must be approved by the Arkansas State Department of Health through their licensing requirements. The licensing process originates with this committee. Only approved individuals are eligible for membership on this committee. The radiation safety officer is a permanent member by virtue of position.~~ The committee selects its own chair and designates the university radiation safety officer.

Note: The changes to the membership of the Radiation Safety Committee in the Faculty Handbook have been requested by the Radiation Safety Committee.

Rationale (provided by Rahul Mehta, UCA's Radiation Safety Officer): The radiation safety program comes under Division of Radiation Control of Arkansas State Department of Health. The committee is required under the state rules for our radiation materials license. So we will lose our license without this governing committee. The work of this committee regulates any use of radiation material on campus. Activities this committee engages in are very significant and required by state rules. The faculty senate cannot appoint members to this committee as the membership is governed by the state rules. The state has to approve application from prospective members as authorized use of radiation material.