I. Approval of minutes from October 9, 2007 (attached)

II. President's report
   A. Special Guest: Rita Fleming, Director of UCA Human Resources
   B. Updates from around campus
   C. Special Election results: Mike Schaefer introduction
   D. Correspondence

III. Committee reports
   A. Executive Committee
   B. Committee on Committees
      1. Nominations for vacancies on university committees (attached)
   C. Academic Affairs
      1. Progress report: Follow-up on Academic Misconduct policy
      2. Resolution: Proposal for a broader discussion of Honors college faculty status (attached)
   D. Faculty Affairs I
      1. Resolution: Travel money needs assessment and proposals (attached)
   E. Faculty Affairs II
      1. Progress report: Technology funding needs assessment and proposals

IV. Announcements and Concerns
   A. Next meeting: Tuesday, November 13
   B. Faculty concerns and announcements
   C. Other

V. Adjournment
President Powers called the meeting to order at 12:45. Present were Powers, Boniecki, Johnson, Parrack, Bradley, Bell, Wilmes, Wiedmaier, Hebert, Young, Holden, Rospert, Craig, Murray, Mehta, Christman, Lichtenstein, Jones, Ray, Interim Provost Atkinson and SGA officer Roby Butler. Absent: Lance. Advised Absences: McCullough, Lance, Seifert. Note: Senator Bradley did advise of absence for September 27 meeting but it was not communicated to recording secretary of the senate.

I. Approval of minutes from September 27, 2007. Senator Ray moved approval of the minutes with second by Senator Mehta. Senator Mehta requested that the previous communication from a constituent regarding the tenure and promotion process, announced on September 27 under “Announcements and Concerns”, be published in full in the minutes. The statement follows: “Why is there a six-year wait for a professor to apply for promotion? If a faculty member feels ready to submit a tenure or promotion application they should be able to do so at any time. If there is not a good reason for this waiting period it should be removed from the faculty handbook. Do other schools have this restriction?” Original motion passed.

II. President’s report

A. Updates

1. Provost search: the search committee continues to look; the pool of applicants is not as deep as we should be getting. A request is being made to President Hardin that a search firm be engaged.

2. URSA Groups: all faculty senators should now be able to log into the Faculty Senate group and are encouraged to do so. A faculty senator will be able to view two groups: communications for the entire Faculty Senate, and communications for assigned committees. URSA will permit correspondence and preliminary working papers to be shared within the group until they are ready to be released.

3. Budget disclosure: there is no fundamental technical obstacle to electronic posting. Both Faculty Senate and SGA want the same thing: complete posting in as accessible a manner as possible, and availability of a real-time budget reflecting changes as the budget is updated. The budget disclosure process should also be codified so that we do not
have to repeat the negotiations of the last month year after year. Faculty Senate and SGA will work together on these goals.

B. At-large Faculty Senator runoff: the runoff between Donna Bowman (Honors) and Mike Schaefer (LA) will occur this Friday, October 12th.

C. General Education Task Force: The University will be making adjustments to the General Education curriculum, due to comments of external evaluators who came to campus earlier this year. The panel made recommendations that need to be addressed. The task force will be Provost-appointed—one from each college plus others. The report of this task force will be made available to the campus.

D. Director of Human Resources: Rita Fleming will visit the Faculty Senate for comments related to the new pay system under Banner. After her comments she will take questions. She would like to see the questions in advance. Senators should go to the URSA discussion board and post.

E. Processing of student evaluations: from Associate Provost Jonathan Glenn. Per memo of November 16, 2006 from Provost's Office regarding processing, it is clear that students are not to be involved: “students should never be involved in the processing of these evaluations.” If there is a problem, anywhere, adhering to this policy, it should be reported immediately to the Provost's Office.

F. To be posted on URSA: USA Today op-ed article attacking higher education will be posted. Please watch URSA for occasional postings of national press articles regarding higher education.

III. Committee reports

A. Executive Committee
   No report. The committee has yet to meet with President Hardin as the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

B. Committee on Committees
   1. Nominations for vacancies on university committees. Vice President Boniecki brought the report for approve standing university committee nominations as circulated with the agenda. Motion to approve by Senator Bell and second by Senator Wilmes. Note that Professor Wood is MARY Wood. Passed.
   2. Concurrent Enrollment Advisory Committee. In process.
C. Academic Affairs
   Progress report: Academic Misconduct Policy. Committee is still collecting data with good discussion meetings, and is working on including graduate students in the policy. Dean McNiece and Associate Provost Glenn have returned information. The committee has not yet heard from Dean Roden.

D. Faculty Affairs I
   Progress report: Travel money needs assessment and proposals. In process of collecting information needed.

E. Faculty Affairs II
   Progress report: Technology funding needs assessment and proposals. Faculty have returned much information; Administration has returned some. Numbers are hard to come by. Note from chair to make sure that concerns of constituents are registered by senators with Faculty Affairs II. UCA-IT wasn't allowed to purchase bandwidth needed, or related hardware; there was no money. The technology fee is going for Banner. Suggestion that the committee contact John Gale.

IV. Announcements and Concerns

A. The next meeting of the senate is Thursday, October 25.
B. Chair reminds senators that the year is short and is front-loaded; if concerns are to get attention, they must be submitted now. The senate can at least address pieces of issues if not the whole cloth.
C. Senator Bell: problem with some classes being scheduled X-period; this detracts from club meeting attendance. Senator Young: there are also overlap problems between 3-4 and 2-3:15 classes, both found on the university schedule. Senator Holden: some general education faculty are informally rescheduling their MWF 2-3 classes to make them 2-3:15 MW without notice or permission. Chair: these issues will be brought to the Provost's attention for review.
D. Senator Christman: problems in mid-term grade reporting and the time availability of Banner. Banner ought to be open 24-7. Comment from floor: Banner cannot distinguish true freshmen.
E. Vice-president Boniecki: the Budget Advisory Committee is hard to populate with appointments. He needs at least 18 nominees (three from each college) to forward to the President (President selects one from each college). Vice-president requests assistance from senators.
F. Senator Bradley: concern regarding graduation rates for Athletics at UCA.

V. Adjournment
Motion by Senator Mehta with second by Senator Christman to adjourn. Meeting adjourned 1:45 p.m.
Attachment 2: Committee on Committees Nominations

October 25, 2007

The Committee on Committees nominates the following individuals for Faculty Senate appointments on the following committees.

Budget Advisory Committee

Senate nominees for Presidential appointments:
  Steve Zeltmann (BUS)
  Tom Oxner (BUS)
  William Friedman (BUS)
  J. D. Swanson (NSM)
  Charles Seifert (NSM)
  Pat Desrochers (NSM)
  Ken Barnes (LA)
  Don Jones (LA)
  John Parrack (LA)
  John Smith (ED)
  Terri Hebert (ED)
  Tammy Benson (ED)
  David Harvey (FAC)
  Lynn Burley (FAC)
  Barbara Satterfield (FAC)
  Shauna Meador (FAC)
  Brian Bolter (HBS)
  Lisa Ray (HBS)
  Sherrye Craig (HBS)

Undergraduate Council

Marc Hirrel (NSM)
Attachment 3: Academic Affairs Resolution (Campus Discussion of Honors College Faculty Status)

Proposed Discussion Plan to Address Status of the Honors College Faculty

The Academic Affairs Committee has developed a proposed plan to conduct a campus-wide discussion addressing the issue of Honors College faculty status. The plan contains the following steps:

1. Invite all members of the UCA faculty to submit a white paper discussing opinions/suggestions regarding Honors College faculty status.
2. White papers will be submitted to the Faculty Senate secretary or person appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
3. The white papers will be presented to members of the focus group at least 30 days prior to the date of the discussion, allowing focus group members to obtain the needed background information to hold an informed discussion.
4. Members of the focus group will include one tenured faculty member randomly selected from each college and an Honors College faculty member.
   a. Random selection of college representatives may be conducted by drawing names from a pool of all tenured faculty members of the college.
   b. One person selected from the Faculty Handbook Committee will attend the focus group discussion as resource personnel to answer questions posed by the focus group members during the discussion. However, the resource person will not be actively engaged in the focus group discussion.
   c. A facilitator will be selected for the focus group discussion, preferably someone trained in this type of discussion.
5. The focus group discussion will be recorded, and the discussion will be transcribed. The transcript will be presented to the Faculty Handbook Committee. The Faculty Handbook Committee will review the transcript and present any recommendations developed from the discussion outcome to the Faculty Senate.

The Academic Affairs Committee strongly suggests this plan be implemented immediately if accepted by the Faculty Senate. The Committee believes it is imperative to address this issue by the end of this academic year.
Attachment 4: Faculty Affairs I Resolution (Faculty Travel Money)

University of Central Arkansas Faculty Senate
Faculty Affairs 1 Resolution for Faculty Travel Money
October 22, 2007

Whereas the Faculty Senate was charged with the task of determining a fair and realistic recommendation regarding the amount and procedures for distributing faculty travel money;

Whereas there has been no significant increase in the travel budget per faculty member in many years;

Whereas faculty were surveyed and given the opportunity to provide suggestions and examples of necessary travel amounts and procedures;

Whereas a majority of faculty reported that they often had to pay out of pocket to attend and present at conferences or in some instances decline the opportunity to present because of there were no travel funds available;

Whereas the University of Central Arkansas is truly becoming the “Center of Learning” not only for Arkansas but is also establishing both a regional and national presence.

Whereas the University of Central Arkansas has a long tradition of visionary growth and academic excellence;

Be it hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate requests that the University of Central Arkansas take this opportunity to make a substantial commitment to faculty development and continued education;

Be it hereby further resolved that the Faculty Senate believes that both attendance and participation in local, regional, national, and international conferences is critical to our ability to build on the tradition of academic excellence as we (the faculty) continue to make a difference for the students of today and tomorrow. Additionally, our presence and participation at these conferences further strengthens the concept (and reality) of UCA as the “Center of Learning.”

Be it hereby further resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that the University of Central Arkansas allow for a minimum of $2000.00 annually per faculty member to travel to conferences. It is also recommended that individual departments would be responsible for developing fair and equitable guidelines for distributing the money based on the unique departmental circumstances.