

AGENDA

UCA Faculty Senate



Thursday, September 25, 2008

Wingo 315, 12:45 p.m.

- I. Approval of minutes from September 9, 2008 (see Attachment 1)
- II. President's report
 - A. Board of Trustees meeting, September 22, 2008
 - B. Information items
 - C. Charges to University Committees
 1. University Safety Committee: *Review the need for and practicality of building a sidewalk along the east side of Farris Road between Student Lane and Bruce Street.*
 2. Parking and Traffic Committee: *Review adequacy of faculty parking east of HPER center and problems related to the use of the parking lot for UCA Band practice.*
 3. Academic Planning and Assessment Committee: *Review the pros and cons of implementing an online student evaluation system and submit a recommendation to the Faculty Senate. Propose specific structured questions to guide student comments consistent with the APAC student evaluation recommendations of 2007.*
- III. Committee Reports
 - A. Executive Committee
 1. Resolution Endorsing the APAC Recommendations for Student Evaluations of Faculty (see Attachments 2 and 3)
 2. Procedures for bringing issues to the Faculty Senate
 3. Meeting with the President
 - B. Committee on Committees
 1. Nominees for Faculty Senate Appointments to University Committees (see Attachment 4)
 - C. Academic Affairs
 - D. Faculty Affairs I

E. Faculty Affairs II

IV. Announcements and concerns

A. Faculty concerns and announcements

B. Next meeting: October 7, 2008

V. Adjournment

ATTACHMENT 1

Minutes

UCA Faculty Senate
Tuesday, September 9, 2008
Wingo 315, 12:45 p.m.

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

I. Approval of Minutes from August 21, 2008. Correction: Senator Schaefer appointed to HLC rather than HOC. Senator Lance moved for approval of minutes with correction with a second by Senator Ray. Motion passed approving the minutes with corrections.

II. President's Report.

A. Board of Trustees Meeting, August 28, 2008. President Hardin offered his resignation with his last day to be September 16, 2008. Under the buyout package the Board of Trustees approved, Hardin will be considered "on sabbatical" for the remainder of the fiscal year. His annual salary is \$253,000 under a four-year contract. After July 1, 2009, Hardin will receive \$670,162 in public money from the trustees' discretionary fund to buy out the balance remaining on his contract. He also will receive \$47,570 in private money from the UCA Foundation, with any further payment left to the discretion of the foundation. Trustee Michael Stanton voted against the buyout.

Tom Courtway was voted in as interim president by a unanimous vote.

Comment: Senator Lance would like exact total of complete buyout. Senator Lichtenstein would also like a copy of this information.

B. Charge to Faculty Affairs I. Faculty Affairs I will be given a new charge – to Review the charge and membership structure of the Budget Advisory Committee and recommend changes, if any, to the Faculty Senate and Faculty Handbook Committee.

Comment: Provost Lance Grahn reported that Interim President Tom Courtway has expressed commitment to budgetary transparency.

III. Committee Reports

- A. Executive Committee. Met with Provost Grahn and Interim President Tom Courtway. The Executive Committee stressed to the Provost and Interim President that during the search for a new president, all stakeholders including faculty need to be involved. Additionally, this needs to be clear to the Board of Trustees. Interim President Courtway reported that he thinks the Board of Trustees will call a special meeting to discuss the search process.

Additionally during this meeting Interim President Courtway's stated that his two main goals this next year will be to: (1) restore the integrity and reputation of the University and (2) get everything out in the open- lay all the facts on the table.

- B. Committee on Committees. *Nominees for Faculty Senate Appointments to University Committees (See Attachment 2)*. Senator Parrack moved for approval of the slate of nominees with second by Senator Bell. Motion passed approving the appointments.
- C. Academic Affairs. Senator Castner-Post: Researching and gathering data regarding retention. (Charge: Prepare a mission statement in response to the proposal, which may be considered at the next session of the Arkansas General Assembly, that ten percent of university funding be based on retention rates.)
- D. Faculty Affairs I. Senator Powers. No report.
- C. Faculty Affairs II. Senator Isom. No report.

IV. Announcements and Concerns.

- A. Faculty concerns from meetings with Faculty Senators.

1. *Faculty not affiliated with a specific college- Senator Lichtenstein.*

- All six At Large Senators were present plus approximately 15 other faculty.
- Technology Proposal. Follow up on the technology proposal that was presented last year by Faculty Affairs II Committee to the Senate. Student technology fees should go to purposes that directly benefit students, such as updating computer labs.
- Professional Development Funds. Look at how professional development funds (e.g. travel funds) are distributed with respect to faculty who are not affiliated with a college (e.g. University College, Honors College, and Torreyson Library).
- Fiscal Responsibility. Senate should push for more fiscal responsibility. More money should go to support our core academic mission.
- Budgeting. What is the role of the Provost with regard to budgeting?
- Representation. Take another look at representation on the Senate for faculty who are not affiliated with a college. How is this handled at peer institutions?

2. *College of Business Administration- Senator Johnson*

- Record attendance: 25-35 present.
- Student Code of Conduct. There should be codes of conduct for students, faculty, and administration. If there are no consequences, there is no incentive for change of behavior. The university must follow through in order for there to be any significance to the policy. No one wants to administer the program because of the time involved and potential legal action. Getting everyone to agree on how to hold records, conduct hearings and the like may be daunting but must be done. How helpful have the Student Personnel people been on all this?
- Technology. There are continuing problems with Web CT as the conversion to Blackboard begins. There needs to be aggressive training of faculty for the conversion. During Summer 2008 in which exams were on Web CT, students could not get questions to save in a timely manner- sometimes not until the end of the exam. This problem caused students repeatedly to go back and try to re-save answers, resulting in numerous students running out of time. Students reported a high level of stress before and during test-taking because of these problems. If UCA is going to offer online classes, it should support them or not offer them at all. UCA needs to evaluate the IT providers in the same manner as it evaluates faculty and staff. The evaluation should be done by users of the IT services. Resources are grossly lacking for many of the IT function.
- Purchasing. The Faculty Senate should push for reform in purchasing procedures. Often one can buy more cheaply off state contract. Poor quality, high prices.
- Laptops/cell phones in class. Problem with students bringing laptops to class but not using for class work: suggestion to faculty to put abuse issues into syllabus with consequences/penalties for failing to observe. Use of cell phones similar issue of abuse. Needs to be placed in student handbook. Also put into individual syllabi. Florida Atlantic University prohibits in classroom and has drop-off pigeon holes in each classroom to place.
- Retirees. Relative to IT, there needs to be a forwarding service provided to retirees. The suggestion in "announcements and concerns" about additional time on email for retirees was noted. Provide office space and general research help if continuing to do research. Revisit faculty emeritus status (has not been reconsidered since Thompson) to enable more such recognitions (and benefits).
- Fringe benefits. One million dollar total stop-loss coverage is not enough with today's escalating health care costs, as recent cases have demonstrated. Additional number of allowed rehab visits (PT, OT, etc.) needs to be increased; perhaps could implement some policy of differential diagnosis when longer-term treatment is needed.
- University budget not on file. Despite repeated requests, the disaggregated report was not delivered until the last two weeks of the AY in April 2008. This budget had never been placed on file in the library, despite repeated request from deans and senate.
- Early tenure. Current policy (possibility of early tenure with presentation of offer from elsewhere) creates ethical dilemma to faculty who would have to go into the

market, with misleading representations to other institutions, merely to develop the required documentation for consideration here. Areas with stressed markets (high demand for terminally-qualified faculty) will find productive junior faculty tempted away time and again. Inability to anticipate and preclude such developments just prolongs the agony of trying to retain faculty in circumstances that are already difficult. Problematic in recruiting highly-qualified faculty. Highly-qualified faculty can in fact be brought in with tenure, after review by usual committees. But short of that, all that can be negotiated currently on initial appointment is three years for service and accomplishments elsewhere. University should consider a policy of giving up to 5 years' credit on initial appointment, while preserving the principle of the probationary period. Such position candidates will understand the reasons that immediate tenure cannot be granted but that only one year's review will be required. Such an extension of maximum credit should be conditioned on a candidate's accomplishments and prospects.

- Honors discussion. Faculty should be evaluated and judged by people in their academic field. Some misunderstanding on campus about scholarships: scholarships are awarded to Honors students as individual students, based on their qualifications. So they are not really "Honors" scholarships. This honors program is a different Honors model than usually found, in that it constitutes a Minor for students and consists of one course per semester, with students declaring a major in the usual fashion. Problem of evaluation of Honors faculty if done outside a discipline: there are different standards of evaluation in Honors than elsewhere on campus.
- Evaluation for online classes: non-existent; no feedback for faculty; missing part for evaluation.

3. *College of Education- Senator Wiedmaier.*

- Grade appeal process. One year to appeal a grade is too long. Revisit policy regarding grade appeal process; want to change deadlines of the appeal process.
- Sidewalks. No sidewalks on either side of Farris Road poses safety risk.
- Parking. Lot east of HPER center is used for band practice requiring faculty to move cars or be towed.
- Building issues. Several buildings (e.g., Mashburn) have leaking roofs and are in dire need of repair.
- Web CT/ Blackboard. Not always working; slow. See CBA concerns above.
- Appointment Letters. When will they be sent out?

Comment: Provost Grahn - Some of hold up is transition in presidencies; also changing process- now the appointment letters will go through the Provost's office.

4. *College of Fine Arts and Communication- Senator Holden.*

- Cuts in retirement benefits. Francie Bolter wants to go on record saying that the changes to our retirement benefits should have gone through the Fringe Benefits Committee.

- Concurrent enrollment. Students enrolled in our concurrent enrollment courses are growing quickly. Do we have a strategic plan to manage these students and courses?

Comment: Provost Grahn reported that his office is working to develop a strategic framework for enrollment.

Comment: President Boniecki reported that the Faculty Senate has a concurrent enrollment committee and would like to have that chair (Franice Bolter) participate in the Provost's planning.

- Honor Roll. Concerns were raised about the number of Honor Roll students at UCA. Were the statistics recently cited as publicity on our website correct? Do we have grade inflation and/or grade fixing? What are our standards for the A grade as a university?
- Investigation. We should take care to keep items for investigation private until facts are gathered. Recently the media took items on our list for investigation and published them.
- Salaries. What is the status of faculty salary increases? Why can't we be paid over 12 months?
- Reappointment. Where are our letters of reappointment?
- Profiteering. We shouldn't be profiteering from ARAMARK and book store money.
- Calendar designation. Can we get a calendar designation so certain weeks set aside for particular meeting types? Example: Week 1 for faculty meetings. Week 2 for college meetings.
- Plagiarism. We need some accessible means such as a database for reporting plagiarism, and we need a process that follows from the second and third reported offenses that results in consequences when appropriate.
- Budgets. We need an audit of the athletic budget. We need an audit of department budgets. Student fee money does not seem to be going into department budgets.

5. *College of Health and Behavioral Sciences- Senator Fletcher.*

- 55 faculty present, not including the 3 senators.
- Insurance benefits. Insurance benefits not being put out for bid. Faculty Senate asked to do the following: (1) continue to ask for justification for administration doing things this way; (2) assert that this practice is potentially missing opportunity to have more affordable benefits for faculty/staff; (3) assert that current practice by administration is showing no regard for the concerns previously expressed by the Senate, is not transparent, and may include conflict of interest; (4) pay more attention to the regular activities of the Fringe Benefits Committee and do all it can to keep this committee consistently active and accountable.
- Bicycles. Concern about bicycles on sidewalks
- Events involving President Harding and Board of Trustees. Concerns expressed about the impact of these events (and the outcome) on Higher Learning Commission

accreditation criteria in the areas of integrity and fiscal responsibility, as related to the UCA president and BOT.

6. *College of Liberal Arts- Senator Powers.*

- Funding. Funding for the library and faculty development is insufficient. M & O budgets are shrinking, but costs are increasing.
- Wasted allocation of administration resources. We should re-evaluate whether or not certain positions are necessary.

Comment: President Boniecki reported that the Executive Committee discussed related issues with Tom Courtway. President Courtway reports he is reluctant to make any significant personnel changes this year.

Comment: Senator Lichenstein - Faculty get evaluated yearly. Does upper level administration?

7. *College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics- Senator Seifert*

- Sexual harassment training. Why do faculty need to complete the training each year?
- Grants/summer salary. Why are PIs double billed for fringe benefits during the summer, since summer fringe is paid during the year? Where do summer salary fringe benefits go?

Question from Provost Grahm: Does Arkansas state law limit summer salary?

Reply by Senator Isom: Yes. Yearly salaries, including summer pay, cannot exceed the state mandated salary cap.

- Athletics. Minimum GPA for student athletes is too low.
- Tutoring. In the Faculty Senate minutes, it was stated that departments could establish tutoring programs for athletes. What about other groups of students who need tutoring? Why preferentially give athletes tutoring?
- Differential tuition and fees. How will differential tuition be distributed? Will greater funds be provided to those colleges with students that pay higher tuition? Students are already paying lab fees so why another charge? How can student fees not be given to colleges?

B. Other Faculty Concerns and Announcements.

1. Senator Johnson: Any plans on including faculty representation on the Board of Trustees?

President Boniecki: We are currently addressing this issue. Although no employee can legally serve as a Trustee, perhaps a faculty member can be a non-voting ex-officio. We

are also looking into the possibility of a Trustee being designated as a liaison between the Board of Trustees and the faculty.

2. Senator Holden: Speech that President Boniecki gave on August 28 made me proud to be on Faculty Senate. Thank you for what you said and how you handled the situation.
 3. Senator Mehta: Why are health benefits not put out to public bid?
 4. Provost Grahn: 2nd Faculty Convocation will be held on September 23rd; we will have one every semester.
- C. Next Meeting: September 25, 2008. Next meeting will be held on September 25, 2008. Deadline for agenda items is September 22.

V. Adjournment

Senator Ray motioned to adjourn meeting at 1:41p.m. with a second by Senator Lance. Motion passed approving adjournment.

ATTACHMENT 2

University of Central Arkansas Faculty Senate

Resolution Endorsing the APAC Recommendations for Student Evaluations of Faculty

September 25, 2008

Whereas the Academic Planning and Assessment Committee (APAC) was asked by the Faculty Senate in academic year 2006-2007 to make recommendations regarding certain aspects of the reporting, dissemination, and use of the results of faculty evaluation by students;

Whereas APAC submitted recommendations reported to the Faculty Senate as an information item on April 26, 2007;

Be it hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate endorses the implementation of the APAC recommendations regarding the reporting, dissemination, and use of the results of faculty evaluations by students.

APAC Recommendations: Reporting, Dissemination, and Use of Results from the Student Evaluation of Faculty

The Academic Planning and Assessment Committee (APAC) was asked by the Faculty Senate through the provost to make recommendations during AY 2006–2007 regarding certain aspects of the reporting, dissemination, and use of the results of faculty evaluation by students. The committee intends that its recommendations be implemented in the fall semester 2007.

In addition to the recommendations presented below, APAC has during AY 2006–2007 responded to two additional requests related to evaluation of instruction: the committee (1) approved a Distance-Education version of the evaluation instrument used in traditional on-campus courses and (2) recommended, to provide some relief to departments/colleges with extensive general education class offerings, (a) that written comments from students in general education classes may be left untranscribed (at the option of each college); (b) that the comments (as is current practice) should not be provided to the faculty member until after the end of the semester in which the evaluation takes place; and (c) that written comments from students in other courses should be transcribed.

In the recommendations that follow, TEC2000 refers to the Report of the Teaching Evaluation Committee (2000); the report may be accessed online using the link at <http://www.uca.edu/panda/eval/>.

Recommendation 1: Student Written Comments

The academic Planning and Assessment Committee makes the following recommendations regarding the use and dissemination of student written comments submitted as part of the student evaluation of instructors. This set of recommendations elicited the most discussion in the committee and the most disagreement among a small sampling of faculty members who, although not systematically surveyed, volunteered their opinions to committee members. In particular, these latter opinions tended to be roughly divided between those who favored continuing to include student's unstructured written comments in faculty dossiers for tenure and promotion and those who opposed this practice. Likewise, several administrators expressed support for continuing to include unstructured student comments in faculty dossiers, but this was not clearly a consensus view among administrators either. In its deliberations and final vote, APAC relied heavily on TEC2000; that report's recommendations were based on a systematic review of extant scholarly literature concerning, among other issues, the pitfalls and appropriate uses of written student comments in the evaluation of teaching performance. The TEC2000 report includes a suggested format for structuring student comments to be included in the standardized teaching evaluation instrument.

Committee vote: Yes, 7; No, 1.

A. Recommendations Concerning Written Student Comments Obtained via the Current Teaching Evaluation Instrument

1. In agreement with the TEC2000 Report, the Academic Planning and Assessment Committee recommends that unstructured student comments obtained from the current teaching evaluation instrument should be made available annually to individual faculty members and their department chairs to assist in their mutual assessment of faculty members' teaching performance.

2. In agreement with the TEC2000 Report, the Academic Planning and Assessment Committee recommends that unstructured student comments obtained from the current teaching evaluation instrument should not be included in faculty members' tenure or promotion dossiers.

B. Recommendations Concerning Written Student Comments via a Revised Teaching

Evaluation Instrument

3. In agreement with the TEC2000 Report, the Academic Planning and Assessment Committee recommends that, as part of UCA's standard teaching evaluation instrument, written student comments should be guided by structured questions that focus on particular aspects of an instructor's teaching performance.

4. In agreement with the TEC2000 Report, the Academic Planning and Assessment Committee recommends that structured student comments that focus on particular aspects of an instructor's teaching performance should be made available annually to individual faculty members and their department chairs to assist in their mutual assessment of faculty members' teaching performance.

5. The Academic Planning and Assessment Committee recommends that all written student comments in response to structured questions that focus on particular aspects of an instructor's teaching performance should be included in the faculty member's tenure or promotion dossier.

Recommendation 2: Reporting Format – Calculated Means, Rating Scales, Graph of Comparative Information

The Academic Planning and Assessment Committee recommends that the summary report of student evaluations of faculty (a) should include the mean for items 4-33, (b) should include the rating scales for each section of the report, and (c) should not include the current graphical representation of the departmental and college-level comparisons for items 1-3.

Committee vote: Yes, 8; No, 0.

Recommendation 3: Reported Information – Scope of Comparative Data

The Academic Planning and Assessment Committee recommends that the summary report of student evaluations of faculty not include comparative data for any items beyond the first three items (i.e. #1. How much learned, #2. Rate instructor's teaching ability and #3. Rate course in general).

Committee vote: Yes, 8; No, 0.

ATTACHMENT 4

Nominees for University Committees Committee on Committees, September 25, 2008

Distance Education, NSM:	K.C. Weaver
Graduate Council, BUS:	Paul Jensen
Health and Wellness, NSM:	Rick Tarkka
Institutional Review Board, BUS (expiring 2009):	Yuen Chan
Library, ED:	Mary Mosley
Salary Review, BUS:	Summer Bartzcak
Sustainable Environment... (SEED), At large, environmental science:	K.C. Weaver
Undergraduate Council BUS, Dep't Chair:	Mike Casey
FAC, Dep't Chair:	Scott Payne
BUS:	Pam Spikes
University Calendar, NSM:	Karen Steelman