

## **AGENDA**

UCA Faculty Senate



Tuesday, April 14, 2009

Wingo 315, 12:45 p.m.

- I. Approval of minutes from March 10, 2009 (see Attachment 1)
- II. Academic Budget Summary from the Provost
- III. President's report
  - A. Election results
  - B. Final Report from the Concurrent Enrollment Advisory Committee (see Attachments 2 and 3)
  - C. Faculty Handbook Committee
    1. Minutes (see Attachments 4 - 6)
    2. Resolution: Budget Advisory Committee (see Attachment 7)
    3. Resolution: Faculty Handbook Committee (see Attachment 8)
    4. Resolution: Tenure and Promotion of Honors College Faculty (see Attachment 9)
    5. Resolution: Appointment to the Graduate Faculty (see Attachment 10)
    6. Resolution: Award Committees (see Attachment 11)
    7. Resolution: General Education Council (see Attachment 12)
    8. Resolution: Department Tenure and Promotion Committee (see Attachment 13)
    9. Resolution: Extension of the Probationary Period (see Attachment 14)
- IV. Committee reports
  - A. Executive Committee
  - B. Committee on Committees
  - C. Academic Affairs
    1. Resolution: Student Honor Code (see Attachment 15)
  - D. Faculty Affairs I
  - E. Faculty Affairs II
- V. Announcements and concerns
  - A. Faculty concerns and announcements
  - B. Next meeting: April 23, 2009, at 12:45 p.m.
- VI. Adjournment

## ATTACHMENT 1

### Minutes

UCA Faculty Senate  
Tuesday, March 10, 2009  
Wingo 315, 12:45 p.m.

President Boniecki called the meeting to order at 12:45 p.m. Present were Boniecki, Parrack, Seifert, Ray, Jones, Castner-Post, Lichtenstein, McCullough, Lance, Isom, Schaefer, Rospert, Fletcher, Powers, Wiedmaier, Mehta, Moore, Hebert, Bell, and Provost Grahn. Advised Absences: Johnson, Albritton, Castro, and Acre. Absent: Runge and Holden

I. Approval of Minutes from February 26, 2009. (see Agenda Attachment 1)

Senator Ray moved to approve minutes with second by Senator Isom. Motion passed approving the minutes with no corrections.

II. President's Report.

A. At-large election results:

160 people voted but we need a run-off to obtain a majority. The top 3 candidates are Debbie Bratton, Don Jones, and Phillip Spivey.

B. Update on Presidential Search:

The Search Committee met yesterday in executive session. They narrowed the candidates down to ten. We will meet next Monday to narrow that down. Also Provost Grahn has applied for this position as of today so we are now at eleven.

C. Budget Advisory Committee:

Met last Tuesday to hear from the Provost regarding the state of the budget. There is going to be 3 million unexpected dollars, and there was debate as how to distribute/divide this money. Two-hundred thousand dollars went to physical plant; \$2.3 goes to academics; \$500K will go to classified staff raises (3% COL raise).

There was a vote in favor to disengage from concurrent enrollment as much as economically feasible. It is costing the University too much money and we can't afford it at this time. There is a Concurrent Enrollment ad hoc committee chaired by Francie Bolton. That committee will prepare a report and bring that to the Faculty Senate in April.

Comment- Provost Grahn: Concurrent enrollment costs between \$250-500K to run. Scholarships associated with this cost approximately \$1.1 million. This is no longer allowed by ADHE (or me). This will be booked as an expense through AOEP.

Scholarship spending- a motion was made to reduce scholarships across time to 15% of tuition and fees (as directed/recommended) by ADHE-Jim Purcell. Currently we are at 26% +/- 2.

Information Item- BOT meeting last Friday: The BOT looked at 2 action agenda items: they voted to end tuition fee waivers for BOTs and their families and they voted to end discretionary scholarships control through the presidential office.

Also Lu Hardin agreed to reduce his severance by approximately \$85K and the rest of the package will be paid out of private funds (probably UCA Foundation). The BAC will meet to determine where that \$670K will be distributed.

D. Faculty Handbook Committee (see Agenda Attachments 2 and 3):

No action last two meetings; just lots of discussion. See attached minutes.

E. Committee Charge:

1. Fringe Benefits Committee: Review and discuss whether UCA should contribute money to social security or an equivalent retirement account for part-time employees and make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate.

The cost of this is \$183K per year to the institution for this procedure.

III. Committee Reports.

A. Executive Committee:

1. Recommendation from Faculty Scholars Committee (see Agenda Attachments 4 and 5)

Guest: Alma Conley, chair of this committee provided a summary report (Attachment 4).

Senator Schaefer moved to reinstate the *Faculty Senate Scholar* Scholarship with second from Senator Ray. Motion passed approving the reinstatement of the *Faculty Senate Scholar* Scholarship which has been dormant for about five years.

2. Faculty Senate Resolution regarding Structured Questions for Student Evaluations of Faculty (not on agenda).

WHEREAS the Academic Planning and Assessment Committee (APAC) was charged by the Faculty Senate to propose specific structured questions to guide student comments consistent with the APAC student evaluation recommendations of 2007;

WHEREAS the APAC unanimously voted to recommend that the university move to more structured questions to guide student written comments student evaluations;

WHEREAS the APAC voted to recommend the following questions proposed by the Council of Deans:

1. What did you like most about this course?
2. How could this course be improved?
3. Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why, or why not?

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends that UCA add the above questions to the student evaluations of faculty.

Senator Parrack moved to suspend rules to consider this resolution with second by Senator Bell. Motion passed suspending rules.

Senator Parrack moved to approved resolution with second by Senator Lance.

Comment- Senator Fletcher: These questions aren't anymore structured than what we use now.

Response- President Boniecki: The APAC Committee did meet again and approved these questions.

Comment- Senator Schaefer: These seem more like "consumer-based" customer service questions rather than academic questions.

Response- President Boniecki: Noted.

Comment- Senator Isom: Seems like these questions need to be more directed towards "learning" rather than this.

Comment- Senator Fletcher: We dealt with this in September 2008; these questions seem to be in conflict with what we recommended then.

Comment- Senator Parrack: Perhaps this matter needs to be tabled and studied further.

Much discussion ensued. Senator Parrack moved to table issue with second by Senator Isom. Motion passed approving the tabling of this issue (2 against; 17 for).

B. Committee on Committees:

1. Nomination: Jaime Zambrano (CLA) to replace a vacated position on the Graduate Council. Term expires 2011.

Senator Lichtenstein motioned to approve nomination with second by Senator Jones. Motion passed approving nomination.

- C. Academic Affairs: SGA contacted us about the academic misconduct policy. The logistics of how this is to be implemented is being addressed.

- D. Faculty Affairs I: No report.

- E. Faculty Affairs II: We are working on a resolution and are checking on some legal issues with Jack Gillean. We hope to have something next meeting.

IV. Announcements and Concerns.

A. Faculty Concerns and announcements.

1. College elections to be held Friday, April 3. The following senators are responsible for conducting the elections.

College of Business Administration- Bell and Moore

College of Education- Albritton and Hebert

College of Liberal Arts- Castro and Parrack

College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics- Seifert and Isom

College of Health and Behavioral Sciences- K. McCullough and Fletcher

President Boniecki will contact deans; need one person from each college.

2. Senator Schaefer presented the following faculty concern :

I call upon the UCA Faculty Senate vigorously to address the continued disparity between athletic and academic spending. When Lu Hardin sent a memo to faculty and staff to announce the move to NCAA Division I, he assured us in writing that the change would not cost UCA anything at all but would be accomplished using the existing athletic program's budget. Rather, he protested, the move would generate new revenue for the university. It is now clear that Lu was lying, either to us or to himself. Not only has the athletic budget grown at a rate far out of proportion to the academic budget to keep athletics afloat, precipitating the departure of Provost Gabe Esteban. This year, when every other division on campus has suffered crippling budget cuts, the athletic budget has not only remained untouched, but has enjoyed the infusion of new money as the board transfers to athletics the profits from the book store and food services. Likewise, while faculty salaries are frozen and some administrators volunteer to take pay cuts, our already munificently paid coaches received raises.

The national news media report daily the cost cutting measures in athletics on other campuses as colleges and universities struggle to survive the recession. For example, Western Washington University is shutting down its winning football program, sacrificing the jewel in its crown in order to keep its other athletic programs afloat. Thus, it makes all the less sense in the current economic climate that only at UCA are academics being cut in order to buttress athletics.

On the eve of our 10-year reaccreditation examination by North Central, the current board policy is folly, for the only way that UCA can justify the serious damage done to our academic programs is by demonstrating that athletics has suffered even more grievously. How else can UCA explain

the decline of real money for the development of our library collections in the face of a dramatic increase in enrollment? Or the admission of students with ACT verbal scores of 6 or 7 simply to satisfy the NCAA's required minimum enrollment on a Division I campus? (Perhaps board members do not understand that UCA is accredited by North Central, not the NCAA). Likewise, in the wake of the scandals associated with Lu Hardin's self-indulgent excesses, it is political suicide for UCA to be publicly exposed as decimating academics to support athletics. When so many people in the state are suffering from the economic turndown, the last thing that UCA needs is a series of headlines reporting the inability of our athletic program to cut costs and the refusal of coaches to share hardships that everyone else been called upon to suffer. The latter gives the coaches the appearance of being paid mercenaries rather than loyal members of the UCA team.

3. Senator Seifert: Faculty concern regarding the lack of foresight regarding infrastructure funding (technology, library, deferred maintenance), lack of support for grants and research, and staggering teaching loads.
4. Senator Lichtenstein- Update on library fee: Met with SGA last night. I don't know the final vote from last night.
5. Senator Isom: Expressed appreciation of Provost Grahn; wanted to commend his passion for academics.

B. Next Meeting: April 14, 2009 at 12:45 p.m.

V. Adjournment: Senator Lance moved to adjourn meeting with second by Senator Mehta. Motion passed approving adjournment at 1:50 p.m.

ATTACHMENT 2

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Kurt Boniecki, President  
UCA Faculty Senate  
FROM: Francie Bolter, Chair  
University Concurrent Enrollment Policy Committee  
DATE: March 19, 2009  
SUBJECT: Committee Findings & Recommendations

---

As charged by the Faculty Senate, the Concurrent Enrollment Policy Committee has met for a second year in order to complete two tasks:

- 1) To conduct a cost-benefit analysis of the university's Concurrent Enrollment Initiative, and
- 2) To develop an evaluation plan intended to ensure the quality of the concurrent enrollment courses that comprise the program.

The committee presents this report and plan to the Faculty Senate for its review and recommendations.

2008-2009 Committee Members

Voting

Francie Bolter, FAC rep  
Chris Craun, LA rep  
Charles Watson, NSM rep  
Noel Campbell, BUS rep  
Bill Lammers, HBS rep  
Marilyn Friga, ED rep  
Mary Wood, At-large rep  
Ken Barnes, Dept Chair rep

Ex-officio and non-voting

Jonathan Glenn, Provost's Office  
Leonard Seawood, Academic Outreach  
Melissa Goff, President's Office

## ATTACHMENT 3

# **COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF UCA'S CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT PROGRAM**

---

Prepared by the University Concurrent Enrollment Policy Committee  
19 March 2009

The University of Central Arkansas (UCA) is a state-supported institution of higher education. As such, UCA's mission is to provide educational services to the people of Arkansas and beyond. Concurrent Enrollment (CE) programs may be an effective and significant method of delivering education to the surrounding communities. One can safely say that the public appreciates CE programs, for they are popular across the country wherever they are offered. The recent rapid growth of CE programs developed by various institutions in Arkansas testifies to their popularity here. However, to date, UCA has not conducted a meaningful study of its CE program's cost effectiveness, a program now in its third year. In 2008, the Faculty Senate formed an ad hoc committee, the University Concurrent Enrollment Policy Committee, and included in its charge the responsibility for a cost benefit analysis of the program.

### **Executive Summary**

Focusing on explicit costs and applying the most current understanding of allowable revenues,<sup>1</sup> an analysis of the university's Concurrent Enrollment (CE) initiative indicates the program has produced no tangible benefit, absent any plausible numbers regarding matriculation and persistence at UCA due exclusively to the existence of its CE program. However, the university's CE program has incurred costs. Based on data provided by Academic Outreach (Appendix A), the CE program cost the university \$109,000 in the 2006-2007 academic year and \$402,000 in the 2007-2008 academic year, and is projected to cost the university \$471,000 in the 2008-2009 academic year. Additional evidence indicates that departmental expenditures for CE-related activities not contained in these data are at a minimum an additional \$100,000 for 08-09.

Further, the analysis produced no conclusive findings related to the implicit costs and benefits of UCA's CE program. By their nature, implicit costs and benefits are more difficult to articulate and measure; they are the source of the most controversy and disagreement in cost-benefit analyses. The Committee has articulated an inclusive—if not comprehensive—list of the implicit costs and benefits. Some are, by their nature, nearly impossible to measure, e.g., the community's goodwill. Others, such as matters related to UCA matriculation of former CE students, their persistence, and their academic qualification, require time and dedicated resources to track and analyze before any meaningful conclusions can be drawn.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the 07-09 biennium, UCA claimed 110 FTE generated by student enrollment in the University's Concurrent Enrollment program during 06-07, the calendar year on which funding recommendations were based. However, no funds have been distributed to UCA as a result of FTE generated by Concurrent Enrollment in the 08-09 fiscal year. This is the result of formula funding, i.e., the formula for the distribution of state revenue for Higher Education was not fully funded.

According to an Arkansas Department of Higher Education document "Higher Education Formula Funding Process," developed for Legislative Audit January 2009, "In those years when no new funding or limited funding is available, there is little or no impact of concurrent enrollment on funding. When funds are available, the impact of concurrent enrollment on funding is relatively insignificant because [only] the new funds would be distributed by the formula. Only when the formulas are fully funded would there be any real impact from concurrent enrollment."

## A General Point About Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA):

CBA does not attempt to reduce all human aspirations and experience into dollars. CBA attempts to compare highly disparate pluses and minuses but to do so with a common unit of measurement. For example, in adding apples to haircuts, a direct addition of the quantities would be nonsense, but one could add the *dollar value* of apples to the *dollar value* of haircuts. Thus, CBA is conducted in dollars.

## Basic Principles of CBA:

- A benefit is a benefit: no matter who receives the benefit, count them all.
- A cost is a cost: no matter who pays the cost, count them all.
- All benefits are created equal: A particular \$1 of benefit is exactly the same as every other \$1 of benefit.
- All costs are created equal: A particular \$1 of cost is exactly the same as every other \$1 of cost.
- All benefits are created equal to all costs: \$1 is \$1, no matter whether it is a cost or a benefit.
- A cost is a cost and cannot be a benefit, just as a benefit is a benefit and cannot be a cost: Make up your mind.
- Count every dollar exactly once: A dollar is a dollar, not two dollars, three dollars, or four dollars. No multiple counting.
- Implicit benefits and implicit costs are just as real as explicit benefits and explicit costs: count them all and count them as equal to explicit costs and benefits.
  - Explicit benefits: Any source or method by which dollars flow *into* UCA accounts.
    - Student-paid tuition and fees
    - State revenues based on CE Semester Credit Hour (SCH)
    - State special revenue for CE program SCH
    - Local, State, Federal grant revenues for CE programs
    - Privately raised revenues for CE programs
  - Explicit costs: Any source or method by which dollars flow *out of* UCA accounts.
    - Rebates of student tuition/fees
    - Stipends/salary assistance for UCA faculty
    - Stipends or assistance for high school (HS) teachers
    - Expenses for materials provided to high schools
    - Expenses for mandatory training for HS teachers
    - Expenses for travel/materials related to program coordination or management
    - Expenses for UCA faculty travel related to CE programs
  - Implicit benefits: Any stream of benefits accruing to UCA not immediately or directly tied to cash inflow.
    - Community goodwill, owing to the general popularity of CE programs
    - Students matriculate at UCA because of positive experiences with UCA's CE program as a HS student
    - Former CE students elevate overall retention rates because of positive learning outcomes of UCA's CE program
    - HS CE programs attract high quality students, who may then matriculate to UCA.
    - UCA exercises quality control over CE courses.
  - Implicit costs: Any costs incurred by UCA not immediately or directly tied to cash outflow
    - Increased faculty workload or job dissatisfaction
    - Increased use of adjuncts on campus, diminishing overall educational quality
    - Use of scarce faculty time and effort, preventing the development of other beneficial projects at UCA

- If there is a revenue difference between “normal” SCH and CE SCH, lost revenue due to a decline in “normal” SCH as students matriculate with accumulated CE SCH.

Every CBA begins with the obvious: Tabulating the explicit benefits and the explicit costs. Explicit benefits and costs are those where a tangible dollar flow occurs. That is, a bank account opens up, and dollars flow into it or out of it, and these flows will be recorded on the bank statement.

Many analyses stop with the explicit costs and benefits. Although implicit costs and benefits are real and may be substantial, they are very resistant to measurement and often involve judgment calls that provoke disagreement and controversy.

### **Explicit Costs & Benefits**

Useful to the understanding of explicit costs and benefits is an understanding of the operational model of UCA’s CE program. To wit:

Over the past three years, the university has developed affiliations with various high schools and has contracted to offer anywhere from one to numerous sections of a variety of courses. These courses are taught on the high school campuses, using high school facilities and high school personnel, under the guidance of UCA faculty and staff.

A student’s outlay to participate in UCA’s CE program is currently zero per person, and a high school’s final outlay to participate is zero to negligible per school. UCA’s rationale has been that as UCA is using high school resources (classes, teachers, equipment, etc.), the university owes the high schools for the lease of these resources. The high school owes UCA student tuition and fees. For accounting purposes, UCA has assumed the aggregate claim by the high schools is equal to the tuition and fee revenues. Both sides of the exchange have released their claim upon the other. Thus, no revenue is produced by tuition and/or fees.

(This arrangement has not been unusual among Arkansas higher education institutions with CE programs, although the stated rationale may differ. For example, another institution might waive the tuition and fees owing, and call the aggregate waiver a “scholarship” offered to every student who enrolls in a CE course. However, these scholarships must be booked against the state-mandated scholarship cap of 30% of tuition revenue.)

While some have maintained that SCH generated by concurrently enrolled students be counted as “revenue,” as they produce full-time equivalent (FTE) hours, in April 2007, the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board adopted revisions to its Concurrent Enrollment Policy. This directive reads, in part, “Colleges and universities may *not* claim student semester credit hours or funding if (1) tuition is not received by the institution in any form (emphasis added).”<sup>2</sup>

This policy eliminates from UCA’s CE program all state revenues derived from SCH; thus, the program produces no revenue.

Expenses for the CE program include such items as the high school faculty/staff coordinators; UCA departmental expenses for teacher professional development, UCA faculty travel, UCA faculty overload or

---

<sup>2</sup>[http://www.adhe.edu/SiteCollectionDocuments/Academic%20Affairs%20Division/Concurrent%20Enrollment%20Policy/Concurrent Enrollment.pdf](http://www.adhe.edu/SiteCollectionDocuments/Academic%20Affairs%20Division/Concurrent%20Enrollment%20Policy/Concurrent%20Enrollment.pdf)

adjuncts arising from CE program operations; promotional and general expenditures, and salaries/benefits of UCA staff dedicated to CE programs. Three UCA staff members have been exclusively dedicated to CE.

In FY 06-07, CE program costs totaled \$109,210. In FY 07-08, CE program costs totaled \$401,089. Total costs for FY 07-08 are projected to be \$470,805.

A survey of chairs in departments participating in the CE program reveals additional costs to the university unreimbursed by Academic Outreach. Several departments have reassigned faculty to CE, typically a one-course reassignment though a few faculty have two- and three-course reassignments to oversee CE courses. Chairs also report spending on average one to five hours a week on CE-related duties. Additional costs associated with producing materials were also reported by some chairs. Based upon the survey data, costs to the university not captured within the CE budget of Academic Outreach is minimally an additional \$100,000.

### **Implicit Costs & Benefits**

Conversations around campus revealed several consistent sources of implicit benefits. Frequently, one of the first mentioned is good external relations, especially with area high schools and legislators. CE programs are typically popular with parents, who are also voters, and therefore CE programs are often popular with legislators. CE programs also help “build the UCA brand” within the community, helping keep UCA in the public eye in a favorable light.

“Goodwill” is, of course, notoriously difficult to evaluate and rather ephemeral. Goodwill is also notoriously illiquid, especially for not-for-profit organizations. It is difficult to understand how goodwill from CE programs can either be capitalized or liquidated.

Another commonly supposed implicit benefit is the matriculation and retention of former UCA CE students. However, it is not enough to discover whether UCA CE students go on to matriculate at UCA. Many may have done so even in the absence of UCA CE programs.

The Committee would have to determine whether a student chose to enroll at UCA precisely because of good experiences with UCA’s CE program. Doing so would most likely involve tracking these students and administering well-designed surveys. Such activity would require funding, which currently does not exist.

Retention is closely related to academic success. Academic success is very difficult to predict with any precision. The literature indicates that the primary indicators for success and persistence are a student’s standardized test scores and the education level of the student’s parents.

Demonstrating the UCA’s CE program had a significant and causal impact on success and retention would require an extremely complicated statistical analysis covering many years’ of data. The goal of retention efforts is graduating students. For example, although sophomore persistence is one of the better indicators of the likelihood of graduation, it is not perfect. Most schools measure the graduation rate on six-year cohorts.

The first year of substantial enrollments in UCA’s CE program was 2006-2007. Reliable data on graduation rates will not be available until 2012. UCA’s Admissions office has some preliminary data on matriculation to UCA of the university’s former CE students, indicating that roughly one-third of UCA’s CE students enroll at the university. However, the Admissions office has not attempted to survey how many of those students selected UCA instead of another institution *because* of the CE program.

A third common response regarding implicit benefits is quality control. By establishing our own CE programs, we can insist that the high school classes are taught to UCA’s academic standards. However, such a “quality

control” benefit would exist if and only if the CE programs offered by other institutions are of lower quality than UCA’s CE programs. To date, no evidence exists to support the proposition that other institutions’ programs are inferior to UCA’s. Therefore, it is unclear whether such a “quality control” implicit benefit exists.”

There appears to be less agreement on the nature of the implicit costs. Foregone revenue is one of the foremost concerns. Had a UCA CE student graduated high school without CE credit and then enrolled at UCA, the university would earn tuition and fees as well as state money for the SCH. However, this argument assumes that if UCA had not offered a CE program at a particular high school, no other institution would offer CE at that high school. The evidence does not support that supposition.

Another source of foregone revenue is the waiver of tuition and fees. Perhaps UCA could scale back the waiver and collect some revenue from high school students. However, other institutions have shown willingness to waive all student tuition and fees. Should UCA charge any amount above a nominal fee, high schools may be inclined to disassociate with UCA. However, a nominal fee will return only a nominal revenue stream to the university.

One of the most significant implicit costs may be the simple opportunity cost of scarce UCA faculty time and effort. Faculty time and effort is a finite resource, regardless of stipends or overload pay. If the faculty is heavily engaged in CE, there is less time and effort to devote to other on-going university activities or develop new university activities.

## Appendix A: Academic Outreach Fiscal Data

<b><u>AOEP Concurrent Income</u></b>	<b><u>Actual</u></b> <b><u>FY 06-07</u></b>	<b><u>Actual</u></b> <b><u>FY 07-08</u></b>	<b><u>As of 3/6/09</u></b> <b><u>FY 08-09</u></b>
Concurrent Credit Collected Funds	592,978.50	741,038.00	1,400,325.00
	592,978.50	741,038.00	1,400,325.00
<b><u>AOEP Concurrent Expenses</u></b>			
Contract Fee Expense	592,978.50	741,038.00	1,400,325.00
High School Coordinators	655.00	78,129.48	88,000.00
Academic Departmental Coordinators	16,000.00	84,500.00	136,720.00
UCA Staff Members	39,000.00	88,936.98	123,465.00
Instruction Payroll (above the contract fee)	10,200.00	55,950.11	13,482.50
Fringe Benefits	19,560.00	44,474.18	65,038.50
Academic Books for High Schools	3,923.14	12,284.80	20,192.42
Program T-Shirts	3,291.32	2,959.33	4,200.00
Handbook Printing	160.08	7,259.98	5,720.73
Additional Promotional Materials	4,157.73	5,737.68	438.42
Staff/Instruction/Administrator Travel	1,594.53	4,026.36	7,556.10
Miscellaneous Supplies and Services	10,668.84	17,830.84	5,991.91
	702,189.14	1,143,127.74	1,871,130.58
	<u>(109,210.64)</u>	<u>(402,089.74)</u>	<u>(470,805.58)</u>

## ATTACHMENT 4

### **Minutes Faculty Handbook Committee Wednesday, March 11, 2009**

Present: Lance Grahn (Provost), Kurt Boniecki (Chair), Francie Bolter, Clint Johnson, Katherine Larson, Mary Mosely, Susan Moss-Logan, Michael Schaefer, John Parrack (ex-officio), Katie Henry (ex-officio)

#### **I. Procedures for the Tenure and Promotion of Honors faculty**

The committee further discussed language describing the specific procedures for the tenure and promotion of Honors faculty that differ from the established procedures for the tenure and promotion of other faculty. Rick Scott, Director of the Honors College, attended the meeting to answer questions. A new draft of the section, based on input from the committee, will be prepared and distributed to all committee members by Boniecki at the next meeting.

#### **II. Formation of Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committees When There Are Fewer than Three Tenured Faculty in a Department**

A motion and a second were made to add language requiring departmental tenure and promotion committees to have no fewer than three members, with members selected from emeriti, retired faculty, or faculty from allied disciplines until the committee achieved three members. The motion passed unanimously. The change will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for approval.

#### **III. Extension of Probationary Period**

A motion and second were made to change the deadline for requesting an extension of the probationary period to May 31 and to add a sentence stating that the provost would notify the faculty member of the decision no later than July 1. The motion passed unanimously. The changes will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for approval. The committee further discussed whether certain events should constitute an automatic one-year extension of the probationary period. The committee decided to table this question until a Faculty Senate subcommittee could review the issue and present a recommendation.

#### **IV. Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 17, 1:00, Wingo 315**

## ATTACHMENT 5

### **Minutes Faculty Handbook Committee Wednesday, March 17, 2009**

Present: Lance Grahn (Provost), Kurt Boniecki (Chair), Francie Bolter, Clint Johnson, Katherine Larson, Mary Mosley, Susan Moss-Logan, Michael Schaefer, John Parrack (ex-officio), Katie Henry (ex-officio)

#### **I. Procedures for the Tenure and Promotion of Honors faculty**

A final draft of language describing procedures for the tenure and promotion of Honors faculty was reviewed and, after minor revisions, a motion and second were made to add the new language to the Faculty Handbook. The motion passed unanimously. The change will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for approval.

#### **II. Changes to Award Committees**

The committee discussed the addition of language to the membership sections of the award committees (Public Service; Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity; and Teaching). The language provides procedures for members who have a conflict of interest to recuse themselves or to be excused by a majority vote of the committee. A motion and a second were made to add the language to the Faculty Handbook. The motion passed unanimously. The change will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for approval.

#### **III. Phased Retirement for Non-tenured Faculty**

The committee discussed a request that phased retirement be extended to non-tenured faculty. It was pointed out that non-tenured faculty members are on one-year contracts and that phased retirement may not be possible because it would require a commitment of employment from the university beyond one year. It was further noted that phased retirement is a Board Policy that cannot be amended by the Faculty Handbook Committee. No motion was made to change the Faculty Handbook.

#### **IV. Changes to the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) Revisited**

Boniecki presented the following requests from the Staff Senate regarding changes to the BAC: (1) greater staff representation, (2) requiring the committee to meet year round, and (3) allowing the chair to be a tenured faculty member or staff member. The committee agreed with the first two requests, but not with the third. The committee noted the protection provided by tenure is essential for the chair of such a politically charged committee like the BAC. The committee further discussed adding language to the charge that would require the heads of university divisions reporting directly to the president to present budget proposals to the BAC. Boniecki stated that he would seek further feedback and draft a revision to the new BAC to bring to the next meeting.

#### **V. Next Meeting: Wednesday, April 1, 1:00, Wingo 315**

## ATTACHMENT 6

### Minutes Faculty Handbook Committee Wednesday, April 1, 2009

Present: Kurt Boniecki (Chair), Francie Bolter, Clint Johnson, Mary Mosley, Susan Moss-Logan, Michael Schaefer, John Parrack (ex-officio), Katie Henry (ex-officio)

#### **I. Changes to the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) Revisited**

After receiving feedback from Carol Daves (Staff Senate President), Bunny Adcock (VP of Finance), John Parrack (Faculty Senate President-elect), and Ed Powers (Chair of Faculty Affairs I of the Faculty Senate), Boniecki presented revisions to the new Budget Advisory Committee that had been previously approved by the Faculty Senate and Faculty Handbook Committee. A motion and second were made to accept the revisions. Discussion followed and further revisions were made to improve readability by splitting the charge of the BAC into two sections: charge and procedures. The motion passed unanimously. The new revision to the BAC will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for approval.

#### **II. Changes to the Faculty Handbook Committee**

If the Faculty Senate president chairs the BAC, Boniecki recommended that he or she not also chair the Faculty Handbook Committee because of the work load. Rather, Boniecki recommended that the immediate past president of the Faculty Senate be the chair of the committee, and the president of the Faculty Senate serve as an ex officio, non-voting member instead of the vice-president. Boniecki also recommended adding language that would give the chair, in addition to the provost, the authority to call meetings. A committee member further recommended that the committee be required to begin meeting in September instead of January. A motion and second were made to approve all these recommendations. The motion passed unanimously. The changes to the Faculty Handbook Committee will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for approval.

#### **III. Appointment to the Graduate Faculty**

A motion and second were made to approve changes to the Faculty Handbook that (1) remove the role of the Graduate Council in the appointment of graduate faculty, (2) make appointment to the graduate faculty automatic for faculty with terminal degrees and in tenurable ranks, and (3) provide authority to the department chair and college dean (after consulting the department's Personnel Advisory Committee) to approve five-year term appointments to the graduate faculty for other full-time and adjunct faculty holding at least a Master's degree. After discussion, the motion passed unanimously. The changes to the section on the Appointment to the Graduate Faculty and to the Graduate Council will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for approval.

#### **IV. Changes to the General Education Council**

The committee discussed a request from the General Education Council to limit eligibility of half the faculty representatives on the council to tenured or tenure-track faculty and to remove the director of academic planning and assessment as an ex officio, non-voting member. It was noted that half the faculty on the council were representatives elected by each college (one from each) whereas the other half were general education instructors elected by general education instructors. A motion and second were made to limit eligibility of the college representatives to tenured or tenure-track faculty and delete the director of academic planning and assessment from the membership. The motion passed unanimously. The change to the General Education Council will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for approval.

#### **V. Next Meeting:** No further meetings are scheduled. The committee will meet as needed.

## ATTACHMENT 7

### Faculty Senate Resolution

**BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate approves the following change to the *Faculty Handbook* recommended by the Faculty Handbook Committee.

**Recommendation:** Delete the stricken language and add the highlighted language to the revision of the Budget Advisory Committee approved by the Faculty Senate on December 11, 2008, affecting Chapter 7, Section I.E.

#### E. Budget Advisory Committee (BAC)

1. Charge:

- a. To review changes and updates to the university budget.
- b. To conduct studies and make inquiries related to university revenues, university expenditures, and the general allocation of university funds.
- c. To present concerns and recommendations to the president.

2. Procedure:

- a. The vice president of finance will provide a detailed copy of the annual budget to the BAC in August ~~September~~ of every year. ~~Furthermore, the vice president of finance should brief the BAC on changes in distributions compared to the previous year's budget. The BAC should analyze the distribution of funds and make recommendations to the university president regarding the annual distribution of budgetary expenditures.~~
- b. ~~The vice president of finance should~~ and will brief the BAC on changes in the distributions of funds compared to previous years. The vice president of finance will also provide quarterly updates to the BAC on university revenues and expenditures. ~~The BAC should review these updates and present concerns and recommendations to the president.~~
- b. The vice president of finance ~~should~~ will keep the BAC informed about projections for future revenues and expenditures. Any changes in assumptions that might alter projections in a meaningful way ~~should~~ will be reported to the committee. The BAC ~~should~~ will review the changes and present any concerns and recommendations to the president.
- c. In February of every year, the heads of each university division that reports directly to the president and is responsible for a category of the university budget will present their proposed budget for the next fiscal year to the BAC, including descriptions of need and explanations for any changes from the current fiscal year. The BAC will consider the proposals along with projected future revenues and make a recommendation to the university president regarding the distribution of expenditures to the university divisions for the next fiscal year.
- d. ~~The BAC has the authority to conduct studies and make inquiries related to university revenues, university expenditures, and the general allocation of university funds.~~

e. ~~Copies of all BAC recommendations should~~ will be presented to the heads of each university division reporting directly to the president, Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, and Student Government.

3. Membership:

The budget advisory committee will have the following voting members:

- a. The presidents of the Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, and Student Government Association.
- b. One representative from each college elected by each college from among the tenured faculty in the college. Representatives are elected to two-year terms with (HBS), (ED), and (FAC) electing new representatives in Spring elections of even-numbered years and (BUS), (NSM), and (LA) electing new representatives in Spring elections of odd-numbered years.
- c. One faculty member elected at-large from among faculty members not working within the six formal colleges. The representative is elected as needed to a two year term as part of an at-large Faculty Senate election. All faculty members are eligible to vote for this representative.
- d. ~~Two representatives from Division of Student Affairs, selected by the President from at least three nominees from the Vice President for Student Affairs.~~ A non-classified staff member selected by the vice-president for administration from a list of three nominees selected by the Staff Senate.
- e. ~~One member of the Council of Deans selected by the provost.~~ A non-classified staff member selected by the vice-president for financial services from a list of three nominees selected by the Staff Senate.
- f. ~~The Director of the Physical Plant (or designee).~~ A non-classified staff member selected by the vice-president for student services from a list of three nominees selected by the Staff Senate.
- g. A director of an academic unit that reports directly to the provost (e.g., a dean, the director of the library, etc.) selected by the provost.
- gh. A designee selected by the director of athletic administration ~~(or designee)~~. The director of athletics cannot serve on the BAC.
- h. ~~The Director of Information Technology (or designee).~~
- i. ~~The Director of the Library (or designee).~~
- j. ~~The Chief of the University Police Department (or designee).~~

The committee will also include as non-voting members the presidents-elect of the Faculty Senate, the Staff Senate, and the Student Government Association. The vice president of finance ~~should~~ will attend meetings in a non-voting advisory role to deliver budget reports as required in the committee charge and to answer questions about the budget process. In addition, the BAC ~~should~~ will be assisted by a non-voting committee staff consisting of the Controller, the Director of Institutional Research, a Budget Specialist from the Division of Financial Services and a secretary from the Division of Financial Services.

The chair of the committee will be elected by the voting members of the committee from among the tenured faculty represented under category b of the membership the president of the Faculty Senate. The chair's term extends from August 15 through August 14 of the following year.

3. Meetings:

- a. The BAC ~~should~~ will meet at least once per month from September through August of the following year September through April. Members of the committee should be on-call to meet May-August to provide advice on budget alterations that might be considered during the summer period.
- b. When possible, meetings should be convened in person. However, comments on specific issues and votes may be taken by written proxy (including email) if necessary.
- c. The meeting schedule for every year will be established in September and the schedule will be announced to the university community using whatever communication means are considered most likely to reach the broadest possible university audience.

4. Reports to: President

ATTACHMENT 8

**Faculty Senate Resolution**

**BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate approves the following change to the *Faculty Handbook* recommended by the Faculty Handbook Committee.

**Recommendation:** Delete the stricken language and add the highlighted language to Chapter 7, Section I.I.

**I. Faculty Handbook Committee**

There shall be a standing committee known as the “**Faculty Handbook Committee.**” The committee shall be composed of (i) the provost (or an associate provost designated by the provost), (ii) the **immediate past** president of the Faculty Senate **who will serve as chair**, and (iii) one tenured faculty member from each college of the university selected by the tenured faculty from such college, and to serve for a three-year term. The **current president of the Faculty Senate, the** vice president for administration, the associate vice president for human resources and the general counsel of the university shall also be members of the Faculty Handbook Committee, but shall not have a vote.

The charge of the Faculty Handbook Committee shall be to (a) review the *Faculty Handbook*, (b) accept and consider suggestions for changes, and (c) recommend any revisions, modifications or amendments to the president. Suggestions for the improvement of the *Faculty Handbook* shall be made in writing and directed to the Office of the Provost or to the Faculty Senate president. The committee shall meet in the month of **January-September** each year, and may meet at such other times as the provost **or chair of the committee** may determine. Each member shall be provided with reasonable advance written notice of the date, time and place of each meeting, and be provided with drafts of any proposed changes for consideration at the meeting. Any proposed revisions or amendments to this *Faculty Handbook* shall be voted upon by the committee. Such revisions or recommendations shall be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for its review and recommendations. The revisions and the advice of the Faculty Senate on such revisions shall then be forwarded to the president.

## ATTACHMENT 9

### Faculty Senate Resolution

**BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate approves the following change to the *Faculty Handbook* recommended by the Faculty Handbook Committee.

**Recommendation:** Add the following language to Chapter 3, Section II (current C, D, and E will change to D, E, and F).

#### **C. Honors College Faculty**

Honors College faculty may hold the tenurable academic rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. The tenure and promotion of Honors College Faculty hired before September 1, 2005, will follow the procedures in Board policy No. 303. The following policies will apply only to Honors College faculty members hired after September 1, 2005. Tenure-track faculty positions in the Honors College are initially dual appointments in the Honors College and a discipline-appropriate department. Thus, during the probationary period, any procedure that applies to Honors College faculty that mentions the "department chair" will be read to mean both the Director of the Honors College and the chair of the discipline appropriate department. After the faculty member earns tenure, the position becomes a single appointment in the Honors College. Procedures for the hire, tenure, and promotion of Honors College faculty are the same as those procedures for other tenured and tenure-track faculty except as outlined below.

##### 1. Hiring

Hiring for Honors College faculty positions is done jointly by the discipline-appropriate departments and the Honors College. The Honors College defines the special areas of training, competence, expertise and knowledge needed in the hiring of a potential faculty member. The discipline-appropriate departments will participate throughout the hiring process to ensure that potential faculty members have sufficient breadth and depth in background and training to teach that department's general courses for general education and majors/minors.

##### 2. Probationary Period

A faculty member spends the probationary period for tenure working in both a discipline-appropriate department and the Honors College, with the position funded by the Honors College and by the university with the intention that after the probationary period and a successful tenure decision, he or she will move from a dual appointment to a permanent single appointment in the Honors College. Such faculty will not occupy permanent lines in the department but will occupy positions otherwise filled by other types of temporary faculty. During the probationary period, the faculty member builds a body of teaching, scholarship and service that will be the basis of future evaluation and review by both the Honors College and the discipline-appropriate department. Annual review of faculty will be conducted jointly by the chair of the discipline-appropriate department and the Director of the Honors College. Mid-tenure review is conducted by the tenure committee as described below, the department chair, the Director of the Honors College, and the college dean following the procedures in Chapter 3, Section VII, Part G of the *Faculty Handbook*.

##### 3. Tenure Review

The department-level decision regarding tenure is undertaken by a tenure committee consisting of the discipline-appropriate department's tenure and promotion committee and tenured Honors College faculty. The number of tenured Honors College faculty members on the tenure

committee shall not exceed the number of faculty on the discipline-appropriate department's tenure committee. The tenured Honors College faculty will select which members of their tenured faculty will serve on the tenure committee.

The tenure committee shall make a recommendation for tenure based on all relevant criteria and explain the rationale for their recommendation in a letter to both the chair of the discipline-appropriate department and the Director of the Honors College. The chair of the department and the Director of the Honors College shall jointly write a letter recommending or not recommending tenure. After this evaluation, the application follows the typical review process as outlined in Chapter 3, Section VIII of the *Faculty Handbook*, moving to the college tenure and promotion committee and then dean of the college in which the discipline is housed, before being reviewed by the provost. Except where noted above, all procedures and guidelines for tenure, including time deadlines, procedures for confidentiality, and appeal procedures, will follow those in Chapter 3, Sections VI – XII of the *Faculty Handbook*.

#### 4. Location of Tenure

Following the probationary period served in a department and the Honors College and a favorable tenure decision, a faculty member becomes a full-time and permanent member of the Honors College faculty. His/her tenure follows him/her into the Honors College.

#### 5. Promotion Review

The department-level decision regarding promotion from assistant to associate professor is undertaken by a promotion committee consisting of the discipline-appropriate department's tenure and promotion committee and tenured Honors College faculty. The number of tenured Honors College faculty members on the promotion committee shall not exceed the number of faculty on the discipline-appropriate department's tenure and promotion committee. The tenured Honors College faculty will select which members of their tenured faculty will serve on the promotion committee.

The department-level decision regarding promotion from associate to full professor is undertaken by a promotion committee consisting of all the tenured faculty members of the Honors College and tenured faculty from the discipline-appropriate department. The number of tenured departmental faculty members on the promotion committee shall not exceed the number of tenured faculty members in the Honors College. The tenured faculty members of the discipline-appropriate department will select which members of their tenured faculty will serve on the promotion committee.

The promotion committee shall make a recommendation for promotion based on all relevant criteria and explain the rationale for their recommendation in a letter to both the chair of the discipline-appropriate department and the Director of the Honors College. Positive recommendations for promotion will be placed in priority. The chair of the department and the Director of the Honors College shall jointly write a letter recommending or not recommending promotion. Positive recommendations for promotion will be placed in priority. After this evaluation, the application follows the typical review process as outlined in Chapter 3, Section VIII of the *Faculty Handbook*, moving to the college tenure and promotion committee and then dean of the college in which the discipline is housed, before being reviewed by the provost. Except where noted above, all procedures and guidelines for promotion, including time deadlines, procedures for confidentiality, and appeal procedures, will follow those in Chapter 3, Sections VI – XII of the *Faculty Handbook*.

## ATTACHMENT 10

### Faculty Senate Resolution

**BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate approves the following change to the *Faculty Handbook* recommended by the Faculty Handbook Committee.

**Recommendation 1:** Delete the stricken language and add the highlighted language to Chapter 3, Section XIX.

#### **XIX. Appointment to the Graduate Faculty**

~~The ultimate responsibility for the quality of the graduate program resides with the graduate faculty, the college deans, and the associate provost and dean of the graduate school. The associate provost and dean of the graduate school is responsible for the administration of the graduate school's policies, including the appointment of graduate faculty. Faculty members qualified to perform the functions of the graduate faculty are nominated by their department chair, with concurrence of the college dean, for recommendation by the Graduate Council to the Council of Deans. The university form entitled, "Graduate Faculty Application," details the classification, authority, and qualifications for appointment to the graduate faculty. Permanent Appointment to the graduate faculty is automatic for faculty members who hold both a terminal degree in their field and appointment in a tenurable rank (Assistant, Associate or full Professor). Effective graduate education may also rely on uniquely qualified full-time and adjunct faculty who have expertise and/or experiences not provided by the full-time tenure-line faculty. Term appointment to the graduate faculty requires a Master's degree and the approval of the department chair and the college dean based on the recommendation from the department's Personnel Advisory Committee. Term appointments last five years and are renewable.~~

**Recommendation 2:** Delete the stricken language to Chapter 7, Section II.H.1.

#### **H. Graduate Council**

1. Charge:
  - a. To review and recommend to the Council of Deans new graduate curricula and programs proposed by the various departments and colleges.
  - b. To review existing graduate offerings and make appropriate recommendations to the Council of Deans.
  - c. To initiate and recommend policies relevant to graduate degree requirements, grading and credit policies, academic standards, and related matters.
  - d. ~~To review and recommend faculty for graduate status.~~
  - e. To act as an academic appeal body for graduate students.

ATTACHMENT 11

**Faculty Senate Resolution**

**BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate approves the following change to the *Faculty Handbook* recommended by the Faculty Handbook Committee.

**Recommendation:** Add the highlighted language to the membership description of the following university committees under Chapter 7, Section II.

**O. Public Service Award Committee**

2. Membership: One faculty member from each college elected to rotating two-year terms by the college. Award recipients will serve two-year terms, the second year as chair, beginning the year after receipt of the award. In the event that there is a conflict of interest, committee members may recuse themselves or be excused by a majority vote of the committee. In such cases, the dean will appoint a new college representative for the remainder of the academic year. Neither the committee chair nor the previous year's award winner can be replaced. If the committee chair is recused or excused, the committee will be chaired by the previous year's award winner.

**P. Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Award Committee**

2. Membership: One faculty member from each college elected to rotating two-year terms by the college. Award recipients will serve two-year terms, the second year as chair, beginning the year after receipt of the award. In the event that there is a conflict of interest, committee members may recuse themselves or be excused by a majority vote of the committee. In such cases, the dean will appoint a new college representative for the remainder of the academic year. Neither the committee chair nor the previous year's award winner can be replaced. If the committee chair is recused or excused, the committee will be chaired by the previous year's award winner.

**T. Teaching Excellence Award Committee**

2. Membership: One faculty member from each college elected to rotating two-year terms by the college. Award recipients will serve two-year terms, the second year as chair, beginning the year after receipt of the award. In the event that there is a conflict of interest, committee members may recuse themselves or be excused by a majority vote of the committee. In such cases, the dean will appoint a new college representative for the remainder of the academic year. Neither the committee chair nor the previous year's award winner can be replaced. If the committee chair is recused or excused, the committee will be chaired by the previous year's award winner.

ATTACHMENT 12

**Faculty Senate Resolution**

**BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate approves the following change to the *Faculty Handbook* recommended by the Faculty Handbook Committee.

**Recommendation:** Delete the stricken language and add the highlighted language to Chapter 7, Section II.F.2.

**G. General Education Council**

2. Membership:

- a. Six full-time faculty serve as general education representatives elected by all full-time faculty from among faculty who have taught general education program with the last two years. No more than one representative from each department or general education area may serve.
- b. Six ~~full-time~~ **tenured or tenure-track** faculty serve as college representatives. The full-time faculty within each of the six colleges elect a representative.
- c. Two students are invited to serve on the council representing the Student Government Association.
- d. *The following serve as ex-officio non-voting members:*  
*associate provost and dean of undergraduate studies*  
~~*director of academic planning and assessment*~~  
*the library director, or designee*

The director of the General Education Program serves as the chair of the General Education Council. The council elects its secretary. Each council member serves three years on a rotating basis for each of the first two categories.

ATTACHMENT 13

**Faculty Senate Resolution**

**BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate approves the following change to the *Faculty Handbook* recommended by the Faculty Handbook Committee.

**Recommendation:** Add the highlighted language to Chapter 3, Section VIII.B.1.

1. The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee

The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will consist of all tenured faculty of the department with the exception of the chair. To ensure a fair and professionally responsible review, the tenure and promotion committee will consist of no fewer than three members. In the case that there are not three tenured faculty members in a department, members of the tenure and promotion committee will be sought from departmental emeriti, retired departmental faculty, and/or tenured faculty from allied disciplines until the committee has three members. Those members of the committee who are not tenured faculty in the department will be selected by the department chair and college dean with advance notification to the provost.

The committee will elect its own chair. The purpose of the committee is to receive and review all applications for tenure and promotion and make recommendations to the department chair. The committee will evaluate each candidate's accomplishments, applying to them all relevant criteria.

The committee will make its recommendations concerning tenure before making its recommendations concerning promotion. The recommendation for promotion will be independent of the recommendation for tenure.

Each candidate for tenure will receive a positive or negative recommendation, and the committee shall explain the rationale for this recommendation in a separate letter to the department chair. Each candidate for promotion will receive a positive or negative recommendation. The committee shall explain the rationale for this recommendation in a separate letter to the department chair. Positive recommendations for promotion will be placed in priority order.

The chair of the department committee will provide written notification to the candidate of the committee's recommendation(s) and forward all files to the department chair by October 1.

~~In any department in which there are no tenured members, the first level of review will rest with the department chair.~~

ATTACHMENT 14

**Faculty Senate Resolution**

**BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate approves the following change to the *Faculty Handbook* recommended by the Faculty Handbook Committee.

**Recommendation:** Delete the stricken language and add the highlighted language to Chapter 3, Section XI.

**XI. Extension of Probationary Period**

A faculty member may request a one-year, good cause extension of the probationary period while continuing employment with the university. Good cause refers to personal circumstances that substantially interfere with the employee's ability to perform as a faculty member in one or more areas for a minimum of one semester. Good cause is normally restricted to serious illness or other disability and exceptional family care responsibilities such as pregnancy, childbirth, adoption, or being the primary care-giver of a minor child or other individual who requires extraordinary care and is dependent upon the employee for that care. The request must be made in writing, as soon as possible, but no later than ~~September 4~~ **May 31** of the year in which the employee would otherwise apply for tenure. The request is forwarded through the chair and dean, with recommendations, to the provost, who makes the final decision. **The provost will notify the faculty member, the chair, and the dean of the final decision no later than July 1 of the same year.**

The provisions of this policy are independent of a leave of absence from the university.

ATTACHMENT 15

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION

April 14, 2009

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate charged the Academic Affairs Subcommittee to review the draft of Student Honor Code and recommend changes, if any, to the Student Government Association;

WHEREAS the Academic Affairs Subcommittee reviewed the draft of the Student Honor Code and made recommendations to the Student Government Association;

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate endorses the following Student Honor Code from the Student Government Association:

**University of Central Arkansas Honor Code**

**Purpose:**

We, the students of UCA, have established this Honor Code to promote a culture of academic integrity; to encourage a community of intellectual development; to present an opportunity for individual responsibility for one's actions in said community, and to uphold honesty to oneself and others.

**Honor Pledge:**

As it is the responsibility of each UCA student to uphold academic integrity, I pledge that I will strive for academic excellence in pursuit of my education, and I will do my best to maintain honesty in any and all academic exercises.

**Academic Dishonesty Defined:**

Academic dishonesty is constituted by:

1. Any academic dishonesty in connection with the taking of, or in contemplation of the taking of any examination. (For the purposes of this policy, any student is academically dishonest who (a) knowingly discovers or attempts to discover the contents of an examination before the contents are revealed by the instructor; (b) obtains, uses, attempts to obtain or use any material or device dishonestly; or (c) supplies or attempts to supply to any other person any material or device dishonestly; or (d) during the course of an examination obtains or attempts to obtain unauthorized information from another student or from another student's test materials.)

2. Any misrepresentation of academic work by a student as the product of their own study and efforts.
3. The unauthorized possession, taking, or copying of solutions manuals or computerized solutions for homework or research problems assigned by a professor and/or instructor.
4. Examples of academic misconduct include, but are not limited to: plagiarism, any form of cheating,\* using direct quotation or borrowing an idea without giving credit to the source, using a direct quotation without identifying the source of the quotation, submitting the same paper or portions of the same paper to two different courses without the consent of both instructors, manufacturing data, unauthorized group work, or submitting another person's work as one's own.

*\*Acts of lying, deception, fraud, trickery, and/or imposition that are employed to create an unfair advantage.*

**Responsibility of the Student:**

Each student has a responsibility to become familiar with the Honor Code and what constitutes academic dishonesty. The Honor Code will be published in the UCA Student Handbook.

**Responsibility to Report Violations:**

As academic dishonesty of any kind contributes to the erosion of a culture of academic integrity at this university, it is each student's responsibility to report a violation of the honor code. Violations should be reported to the instructor of the class in which the violation took place.