

AGENDA
UCA Faculty Senate
C
Thursday, December 13, 2007
Wingo 315, 2:00 p.m.

- I. Approval of minutes from November 13, 2007 (attachment 1)
- II. President's report
 - A. Budget now located in the Library
 - B. Handbook committee meeting in January
 - C. Correspondence
- III. Committee reports
 - A. Executive Committee
 - 1. Honors discussion update
 - B. Committee on Committees
 - 1. Nomination of John Smith to the Retention Committee.
 - C. Academic Affairs
 - 1. Academic Misconduct Policy Resolution (attachment 2)
 - D. Faculty Affairs I
 - 1. Progress report: Faculty development needs assessment and proposal
 - E. Faculty Affairs II
 - 1. Progress report: Technology funding needs assessment and proposals (see DRAFT of proposal for discussion, attachment 3).
- IV. Announcements and Concerns
 - A. Next meeting: Thursday, January 24, 2008 (12:45 pm)
 - B. Faculty concerns and announcements
 - C. Other
- V. Adjournment

Attachment 1: Minutes from November 13, 2007

UCA Faculty Senate
Tuesday, November 13, 2007
Wingo 315, 12:45 p.m.

President Powers called the meeting to order at 12:45. Present were Powers, Boniecki, Johnson, Parrack, Bell, Wiedmaier, Hebert, Young, Rospert, McCullough, Lance, Craig, Castro, Murray, Seifert, Christman, Lichtenstein, Jones, Ray, Schaefer, Interim Provost Atkinson. Absent: Holden. Advised Absences: Bradley, Mehta, Wilmes.

- I. Approval of minutes from October 25, 2007. Senator Mehta noted in abstentia that the agenda had an outlining error and that the .pdf version of the minutes had a double adjournment. Senator Murray moved approval of the corrected minutes with second by Senator Ray. Motion passed.
- II. President's report

- A. Special guest: John Gale, Chief Technology Officer.

Mr. Gale discussed the state of technology funding at UCA and the impact of Banner system implementation on that funding. M&O in IT is struggling, he stated, reporting the following historical figures (net of Banner):

2004-05	\$2.1 M spent (as opposed to budgeted)
2005-06	\$2.3 M spent (as opposed to budgeted)
2006-07	\$1.5 M available net of Banner
2007-08	\$1.5 M available net of Banner

In 2005 IT was tasked to implement Banner. Among accomplishments with Banner to date, the Finance module, the Admissions and Recruiting module, the Financial Aid module, and the Student Information module have all been implemented, and registration is proceeding successfully under Banner. We can send out grades and get students registered with Banner now. The Human Resources module is due to be implemented January 2008. But the result of success with Banner is shortfalls within IT.

Obviously some budget transfers have occurred to accommodate Banner implementation. The budget shortfall for IT has had a major impact on service, Mr. Gale reported. The IT department, when instructed to pay out of its budget for all outstanding accounts including licensing fees and maintenance contracts, ran into insufficient funds and had to be bailed out by the Provost from other operating funds. Web development has been moved under IT in terms of the servers, but there was no support budget

accompanying the transfer. The standard web server is 1998 vintage; a safe rotation on a server is three to four years. [Senator Lichtenstein: some of these same budget problems, including budget shortfalls because of purchase of necessary databases, have been true of Torreyson Library.]

Mr. Gale has been reassigned to oversee Banner implementation while Terry Brewer has been named interim director of IT. Mr. Gale reported that the present situation is one of daily crisis management. IT staffing at comparably-sized universities is on the order of 55-70 total personnel (UALR has 55-60). UCA IT personnel total 35 full-time staff, including six programmers and four field technicians plus a supervisor. Dormitory IT service is included in their tasks. The GroupWise staffer left two months ago and there have been difficulties in re-staffing the position. The GroupWise backup staffer also left. The Linux staffer also left.

There has been another network problem beyond GroupWise, that being bandwidth. Available bandwidth has become a major constraint. UCA recently attempted to purchase 50 meg of bandwidth from DIS, the sole source provider to state colleges and universities, to bring UCA up to 100 meg. (The maximum that DIS can allocate to an institution is 150 meg.) After surmounting initial purchase obstacles with DIS, now the problem has become to pay for supporting hardware and software. But people should start seeing gradual improvement. Part of the bandwidth problem has been that there is a very large amount of non-academic use of bandwidth (both employees and dormitories).

One future advance in networking is the prospect of UCA's joining the Arkansas Research Optical Network (ARON). This consortium can deliver 10 gig x 8 connection speed and will facilitate high speed Lambda Rail traffic. UCA should be on it by summer 2008.

In response to questions: (1) UCA will support MS Office 2003 for the foreseeable future. Depending on the computer in the faculty member's office, it will also be possible to go to Office 2007. (2) However, there is no current policy on scheduled replacement of faculty and lab computers. [Provost: there will be at least some new computers on faculty desks this academic year.] (3) Windows Vista was launched too early by Microsoft and UCA is being careful about implementing it. (4) Web-CT is being converted to Web-CT6. The IDC is coordinating implementation. The increase in bandwidth will greatly help with Web-CT. (5) Mr. Gale asked for civility of university employees in dealing with the IT-Help Desk. (6) There has been a substantial lag factor in bringing operating budgets in IT up to current costs. Heretofore budgets have been kept at years-previous levels, the result being that after the budget has been violated; every

purchase beyond that limit has required separate high-level authorization, which has proved very cumbersome. [Lichtenstein: same problem in Library.] (7) How much does Banner cost? Mr. Gale does not have knowledge of capital or licensing costs, but it takes \$350,000 a year of direct costs to support Banner; indirect/opportunity costs have not been calculated. (8) What is a necessary level of M&O budget to operate IT? At present software costs and present staffing levels, the \$2.2 million that was previously in the budget is just adequate. There has never been any discretionary money to accommodate a growing institution. [Provost: the growth of UCA has produced the inevitable lag effect in funding from the State; some catch-up will occur with the 2009 legislative session; but 2007-08 going into 2008-09 will be lean. Faculty Senate President Powers: UCA needs to have an IT and Library plan, a set of pre-established needs, for allocation to IT and to the Library as funds become available.]

Updates:

- a. Provost search: the committee is in the process of engaging a search firm, now that President Hardin has authorized funding.
 - b. Executive Committee meeting with President Hardin: the president was receptive to funding needs for faculty development and technology. He proposed to look around for funds and to attempt to institutionalize such funding.
 - c. Budget allocations: Available money will be transferred next week to M&O budgets of academic departments in proportion to the number of full time faculty in a department. The total amount of money to be allocated is \$100,000.
 - d. Priority registration for athletes: The SGA did vote to endorse a plan for the priority registration for athletes. (Faculty Senate President: An aspect of the charge to the Faculty Senate committee reviewing athletics is to investigate the impact that priority registration has had on class availability for the balance of the students.)
- B. Board of Trustees meeting of November 2: President Powers gave the scheduled report from the faculty due each semester to the Board of Trustees. The theme of the report was that good things going on at UCA are due to faculty efforts, and that the faculty need development and technology support to enhance their efforts.
- C. Correspondence: Several pieces of correspondence have been received dealing with technology, with the current system of academic advising,

and with regard to Athletics and student athletes. These items will be assigned to the appropriate Faculty Senate committees.

III. Committee reports

A. Executive Committee

- a. The committee recommends the appointment of Francie Bolter to chair the Concurrent Education Advisory Committee. Motion to approve by Senator Bell with second by Senator Parrack, passed.
- b. Additional subcommittee charges will be forthcoming.

B. Committee on Committees

1. Nomination of Kim Hoffman to the Adjustments and Credentials Committee, replacing Susan Adams. The term will expire in 2008. Motion by Senator Seifert with second by Senator Castro to approve the appointment passed.
2. Announcement: The Concurrent Enrollment Advisory Committee will have its initial meeting on November 15.

C. Academic Affairs:

1. Progress Report: Academic Misconduct Policy. A resolution will be ready for the December 13 meeting of the Faculty Senate.
2. Progress Report: Honors discussion. With approval of the minutes of October 25, the executive committee will proceed to advise Director Richard Scott of Honors of the progress to date and will give advice and timelines to college senators for the conduct of elections of college representatives to the special discussion group.

D. Faculty Affairs I

Progress report: Faculty development needs assessment and proposal. Still redrafting the report and resolution to accord with previous senate discussion.

E. Faculty Affairs II

Progress report: Technology funding needs assessment and proposals. FA II will take into account Mr. Gale's report to the senate. Also collecting additional information from college deans.

IV. Announcements and Concerns

- A. The next meeting of the senate is Thursday, December 13 (during finals week).

- B. Senator Young: Last year's admissions forum related certain standards that would be policy; is the Admissions Committee following up on what was stated as policy?
- C. Senator Castro: Lengthy approval period for positions, once requested, means that often UCA misses the peak recruiting market in many academic disciplines. [Provost: replacement position approvals have been made and departments notified; some funds will be allocated to convert some positions to tenure track: I have directed the deans to develop a list of conversion candidate slots in various departments including the cost of conversion, and the Provost's Office will go as far down that list as the available funds will permit. To speed the process up in the future, spring identification of candidate positions would permit specific approvals by the late summer in order to make possible position searches that fall.]
- D. Concern about concurrent enrollment expressed. [Provost: concurrent enrollment is here to stay as a matter of public policy. The control of the results of this policy must occur in the academic departments. We must develop the methodology to make it our own. From a cost standpoint, the university is giving away the low-cost student enrollments and is left with the high-cost student enrollments. This result means that the cost of higher education at the university level in the state is going to accelerate.]
Senator Christman: the Admissions Committee did develop a policy limiting credit to six hours per semester. However, the Admissions Committee has yet to meet this year. [Provost: my impression is that the standard is being adhered to.]
- E. Senator Christman: Physical conditions in Main Hall are not good. Responding to complaints, supervisors say that it is clean to their standards. Then the standards need to be reviewed. Also, there is no additional cleaning after major public events are held over the weekend in Ida Waldran Auditorium.

V. Adjournment

Motion by Senator Bell with second by Senator Christman to adjourn, passed.
Adjournment at 1:55 p.m.

Attachment 2: Academic Misconduct Policy Resolution

**University of Central Arkansas Faculty Senate
Resolution for New Academic Misconduct Policy
December 13, 2007**

Whereas the Academic Affairs committee of the Faculty Senate was charged with the development of a new academic misconduct policy;

Be it hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate requests that the appropriate authorities (the Council of Deans, the Provost, the President, and/or the Board of Trustees) approve the attached academic misconduct policy for inclusion in the Student Handbook at the earliest possible date.

Be it hereby further resolved that the Faculty Senate requests that the Office of the Provost maintains on file cases of academic misconduct referred to the Provost through the procedures outline in the attached academic misconduct policy.

Be it hereby further resolved that the Faculty Senate requests that students be required to read and accept a misconduct policy posted on URSA before they are allowed to register for courses every semester. Online tutorials addressing plagiarism may also be posted on URSA.

Be it hereby finally resolved that the Faculty Senate requests that the Provost or a designee of the Provost administer an academic misconduct seminar to any student who has engaged in academic misconduct if the student's attendance at said seminar is deemed appropriate by the instructor and/or Provost.

Respectfully submitted by the Academic Affairs Committee:

Cheryl Wiedmaier (Chair)
Don Bradley
Don Jones
Dee Lance
Charles Seifert

The committee thanks the Academic Affairs Committee of 2006-2007 for the hard work in developing a policy presented during the previous academic year.

Note: The attached document would replace the entire Academic Misconduct Appeals section (including subsections A – F) was proposed during the 2006-2007 Faculty Senate session. Text in italics represents additions and changes to the current handbook and proposed last academic year. Revisions suggested by the current Academic Affairs Committee are underlined.

See the attached .pdf document.

Attachment 3: Technology Funding Proposal (DRAFT)

**** DRAFT ** DRAFT ** DRAFT ** DRAFT ** DRAFT ** DRAFT ****

**Faculty Affairs II Resolution (Faculty Technology Funding)
University of Central Arkansas Faculty Senate
December 13, 2007**

Whereas the Faculty Senate was charged with assessing the current and near future technology needs of faculty on campus;

Whereas there has been no specified amount in department budgets for faculty technology;

Whereas faculty, chairs, and deans were surveyed and given the opportunity to provide suggestions for and examples of equipment, sufficient funding amounts, personnel and procedures;

Whereas a majority of faculty reported purchasing computers, software, and peripherals with personal money and others reported purchasing the afore mentioned equipment with grant-related money due to the fact that the university does not have dedicated technology funds for these items;

Whereas the University of Central Arkansas continues to promote and establish itself as the “Center of Learning,” not only within the state of Arkansas but also in the southern region and across the nation;

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

Be it hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate requests the University of Central Arkansas take this opportunity to sustain and further develop the use of technology by faculty, administration, and students;

Be it hereby further resolved that the Faculty Senate believes institutionalizing the funding of technology is a necessary action for the University of Central Arkansas to take, continuing its long-standing heritage as a leader in teaching and equipping students for the future, further strengthening the conceptual reality of the university as the “Center of Learning;”

Be it hereby further resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends the University of Central Arkansas fund technology to the departments in the following four key areas;

- (1) faculty office equipment,
- (2) classroom technology,
- (3) support and personnel,
- (4) discipline-specific needs.

For faculty office equipment we recommend annual funding of \$1000 per full-time faculty member. Classroom technology should be funded at a rate of \$10,000 per every

**** DRAFT ** DRAFT ** DRAFT ** DRAFT ** DRAFT ** DRAFT ****

50 classes taught. Support and personnel to assist faculty with technology should be funded at a rate of one person per every 100 faculty members. Discipline-specific funding should be funded at a rate of \$250,000 per year. Attached are documents that detail how each figure was calculated and how the monies should be distributed;

Note: Attachments will be available to the senators when the resolution is in it's final form.

Be it hereby further resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends the University of Central Arkansas create a line-item category in the general budget designating and preserving the technology fee collected from students, to be used for student-used technology found in laboratories, studios, or wherever students require technology to advance their learning. The Provost should have annual discretion in determining how this money is utilized in consultation with the Faculty Senate and the Student Government Association.

Be it hereby further resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends the University of Central Arkansas hire an outside consultant to assist with restructuring the budget to reflect the departmental needs for a line-item for technology and the general budget needs a line-item category for the student technology fee. The consultant hired should have knowledge of higher education budgets and technology.