



UNIVERSITY OF  
CENTRAL  
ARKANSAS™

FACULTY  
SENATE

Faculty Senate Minutes

10/14/2025

Chris Craun—Secretary

**Call to order: 12:45**

**Members Present:**

President Davis & Associate Provost Kurt Boniecki

Senate President Dunlap & Vice-President Thomas

At Large Senators: Mukherjee, Spivey, Rosenow

CAHSS Senators: Mayhew, Craun (Sen. Burley—excused absence)

CHBS Senators: Rose, Jamerson

COB Senators: Appiah Otto, McCalman

COE Senators: Couture, Buchannan

COSE Senators: Yarberry, Johnson, Naumiec

Honors Senator: Frank

Library: Renee LeBeau-Ford

**Minutes approved:**

Online Vote: 1 Nay, 16 Ayes, 2 Abstentions

**President's comments: None**

**Provost's comments (Associate Provost Boniecki): None**

## **FS President Comments:**

1. We still need a FS rep on the Faculty and Staff Recognition Celebration Committee
  - a. President Dunlap will find out when they meet in order to facilitate volunteers.
2. There are opportunities for Faculty Senators to participate in:
  - a. **2025 Annual Operation SafeWalk** - This event is hosted by the UCA Physical Plant and assisted by the UCA Police Department. This year's safe walk begins at **5:00 p.m. on November 4, 2025**. We will be meeting at the parking lot area east of the UCA Police Department. If you would like to participate, please be at this location before 5:00 p.m. to sign up for an area that you would like to walk or inspect. As we always say with any of these events, there is no bad idea so when we do our walk, anyone can bring up any safety concern and that item will be written down and discussed.
  - b. **ACIREMA** - A special event that is designed to create awareness of what our international students experience as they apply for admission, visas, travel and arrive on college campuses such as UCA's. The simulation will last one (1) hour, followed by a debrief with a student panel. Even if you can attend just a part of the event, we would very much appreciate it. **See end of document for more details.**  
**When:** November 13, 2025 at 3:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.  
**Where:** McCastlain Ballroom

Please register here:

[https://ucaeducation.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_5pCUAQ3PDJeUZ7w](https://ucaeducation.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_5pCUAQ3PDJeUZ7w)

**President Davis and Associate Provost Boniecki left the meeting.**

## **Constituent Concerns:**

1. When they changed the self-service over to whatever it is now, for some reason they have not allowed faculty to see a student's schedule anymore. We used to have "student's week at a glance". Clicking on the "student schedule" button returns an error that says we don't have access. Why has

this been taken away? We need access to this information to help schedule tests through testing services, coordinate with students about future research hours, etc.

**A. This link now exists as the last option in the list when you log into faculty services in banner.**

2. The new progress report system is terrible. Under the old one, you could flag the people in trouble, and there was a button that let you say everyone else was fine. This one required 2 clicks for each student just to say that they were not in danger! Someone teaching 3 FYS courses and an upper-division class with some probation students would have had to click 142 times to complete the report. This can't possibly be the most efficient way to do this. Please, please, please: can we find out if it is possible to have the ability to say no one else is a problem added? I beg you...
3. (Similar Concern) Recently we were asked to complete progress reports on a number of our students. Because we had to report on each student and not just students who were at risk in our classes, it took me almost two hours to complete this task. I understand the importance of this task; however, can we not just report on specific students? Also, can the system be set up so that we do not need to submit each student individually, but rather can we submit all at once?
4. What is the rationale behind eliminating the grade portion on the Student Mid-Term evaluations? This seems intentionally vague and counter to goals of transparency.

**A. Response from Kevin Thomas, VP Enrollment Services and Student Success:**

**I wanted to share some context and updates that may be helpful for the Faculty Senate's consideration. From our summer pilot through the conclusion of the recent progress reporting period, the feedback from faculty has been invaluable in refining this process. While the initial rollout included some challenges, the collective input has already helped us identify several areas for improvement.**

**A user feedback survey will soon be distributed in early November to gather additional insights for future progress report updates. We fully understand the frustration that can come with managing large course rosters and multiple clicks. Previous systems have had the option of multiple student clicks and options that are similar, and I do believe we can**

**get there in the long term. Our goal is to find a better balance in making the system more efficient, meaningful, and supportive of faculty while strengthening how we identify and assist students in need.**

**We are encouraged by an overall 86.75% faculty response rate this fall, slightly below last year's 91.51% but still above the 86% rate from fall 2023. Notably, more faculty participated this year than last, and we received more feedback on more students. We had feedback on 1,349 distinct/unique students this fall, compared to 1,222 in fall 2024 and 1,313 in fall 2023.**

**For anyone seeking guidance, step-by-step instructions with screenshots are available here: [uca.edu/esss/slate/fs/progress-reporting/](https://uca.edu/esss/slate/fs/progress-reporting/). I would also encourage anyone who has a question can reach out to Drew Richardson in Enrollment Systems at [enrollsystems@uca.edu](mailto:enrollsystems@uca.edu).**

**We deeply appreciate the continued engagement and thoughtful feedback from our faculty community as we work to strengthen progress reporting and student success initiatives.**

5. Now that we know which employees are below 90% of their market value salary, I would like to see a timeline as to when those faculty who are significantly below that target will see some equity. I am currently at 77% of market value and know a few who are below that percentage. Ball-park figures from President Davis are that just under \$1 million dollars are needed to bring employees up to 90% of market value salaries and a 1% across the board raise is about \$1 million dollars. Instead of giving everyone a 2% across the board raise all initial inequities could be addressed with a 1% across the board raise and 1% for salary inequity. After UCA gets everyone to 90% then gradually work on getting everyone to 100%.
6. This past Tuesday, the Rotary Club was back meeting on campus. They meet from 7 to 8 in the morning and park in the lot across from our building (around the cafeteria). Is there some reason they park in this lot, taking up the spots for which faculty and staff have paid for? In the past we were told they are gone by 8 when faculty report for work. But the reality is that a faculty member who teaches an 8:00 class, arrives at work somewhere between 7 and 8 OR early shift Aramark workers come to work around 7. When Rotary Club meets (on Tuesdays), we have no available parking. This is especially true now with the construction taking place and spots being roped off. Can Rotary Club members not be required to park across the street?

**A. President Davis will inquire about this.**

7. How can faculty and administration work together to develop a more inclusive stakeholder-based process for managing UCA's response to a fast-changing political landscape?

UCA has recently made sweeping changes to its campus resources, to its curriculum, to its syllabi, and to its classroom spaces in response to both legal changes and political pressure. In the past two months alone, faculty in my department have been asked to remove inclusive iconography from shared classroom spaces, scrub our syllabi of key values included in the university's mission statement, and seek approval of established course readings with only a week's notice before the start of the semester. Colleagues within my college have had to face the possibility of first year seminar courses being canceled mid-semester or else it was determined that they would not be offered in the future. The university has substantially revised the core curriculum and proposed similar changes to FYS review processes with a notice of only a week or even just days to the associated university committees. All of the above elements—our mission statement, our core curriculum, our FYS program—have been developed over years by content experts following a transparent, accessible, shared governance process, and their rapid dismantling in just a few weeks constitutes not only a violation of the university's stated dedication to diversity, but also to the broader principles of academic vitality and integrity. Even now, faculty are being asked to once again invest time, energy, and resources into the development of a strategic plan, but how can we be confident that the university will follow this strategic plan given the lack of dedication to our current mission?

Of course, UCA and its employees must be compliant with the law, but compliance requires clarity. It is not clear that the ongoing changes are, in fact, required by the ACCESS law. If the current radical abrogation of shared governance and the university's own mission is indeed required by law, then the administration should cite the relevant sections of the law and provide clear written guidance on how UCA employees can remain compliant, rather than leave this important information up to ad hoc, off-the-record interpretations by deans and chairs; if the administration is unwilling to provide a clear written interpretation of the law, then the Faculty Senate should offer its own good-faith reading of the actual text of the ACCESS law. Conversely, if these changes are not a matter of law, but rather a matter of politics, then the university should respect the content expertise and collaborative spirit of the faculty and work together to develop a shared, inclusive process for responding to these political threats to our institution. I appreciate the president's assertion that shared governance includes stakeholders in the governor's office and the Arkansas state legislature, but we only have shared governance if these voices exist in addition to, not in place of, faculty.

I and other faculty members take seriously our roles as public employees who serve the state of Arkansas, and we are eager to help UCA maintain compliance with all state and federal laws. But faculty can oppose the university's current changes and still commit to

following the law. I'm also well aware of the challenging political headwinds for higher education and am eager to work quickly so that UCA can continue to serve students now and in the future. But doing so effectively requires clear communication and a commitment to collaboration, not a constant stream of confusing, unidirectional mandates.

**A. Copies of the concern were distributed to the senators. The decision was made to put off discussion until the next meeting to enable senators time to digest the document**

8. When will applicants for the Faculty Enrichment Grant learn of the outcome?

**A. Applicants will learn no later than Thursday, Oct. 16.**

**At this point, Dr. Boniecki fortuitously returned to the meeting and answered a few questions.**

9. LMS—Can we get more information about how Bright-Space won the contract to be the new LMS? The consensus seems to be that no one liked it, so did Faculty Feedback factor into the decision?

**A. Yes, Faculty Feedback (based on using each vendor's Sandbox) directly influenced the decision. There were other factors in a multi-tiered review process, but the decision was based on functionality and cost. CETAL and IT will provide training during the Spring semester to prepare for implementation later.**

10. Several questions were raised about the Faculty Salary Review Process—specifically regarding the details of the review process and whether UCA considered Gallagher to have delivered on their contract.

**A. Gallagher's fulfillment of their contract is a question for President Davis, but Gallagher did deliver a methodology and shepherd OIR through the process (including Best Practices) so that UCA could do their own Salary Reviews in the future.**

**B. This Methodology requires periodic updating of peer groups and data. In the last Salary Review, we used the Peer Institutions approved by the Board of Trust which were identified based on Key Performance Indicators from our strategic plan (who we are and who we want to be as an institution). Gallagher expanded this list using**

**additional criteria more relevant to market salary than the KPIs.**

**C. The Faculty Salary Review committee has met and hopes to address the following issues this year:**

- 1. What criteria do we want to continue to use to decide peers long-term?  
The initiative for this came from within the FSR committee.**
- 2. Review the pay structures based on the annual CUPA data (using cluster analysis conducted by OIR to build groups of CIP codes). We currently have 4 groups because Gallagher initially recommended 3-4, but we may consider up to 5 based on OIR's analysis.**
- 3. Look at Standard-Plus salaries (10, 11, 12-Month faculty and faculty with additional administrative duties).**
- 4. Review the structure and criteria for the Longevity Bonus.**

### **Senate Committee Reports:**

#### **Faculty Affairs:**

We wish to discuss the Faculty Salary Review process with Institutional Research and the Faculty Salary Review Committee. We also want to create a survey for faculty regarding their view of the results. We hope to survey faculty in November.

- a. President Dunlap instructed committee to ask whether IRB approval is necessary before survey.

#### **Academic Affairs:**

Met on Friday. 20 applicants, 2 awards. Applicants will learn by this Thursday. Some applications suggested that there is a need for greater clarity on the application form. The committee will review the language and present any proposed changes to the FS for approval.

#### **Committee on Committees.**

Vote is taking place in COB to elect a new member.

### **Former DBIE Committee:**

Submitted a draft proposal to change the committee's name to the Faculty Advocacy and Engagement Committee. **(See Proposal Below)**

### **New Faculty Senate Committee Resolution**

Faculty Advocacy and Engagement

WHEREAS the success and vitality of our academic institution depends fundamentally on the professional growth, well-being, and flourishing of our faculty members across all career stages;

WHEREAS faculty members face increasingly complex challenges in navigating career trajectories, work-life integration, and evolving academic expectations that require systematic institutional support;

WHEREAS current institutional structures may not adequately address the comprehensive needs of faculty members throughout their entire career journey; and

WHEREAS establishing a dedicated subcommittee will provide focused attention on and advocacy for faculty career development and well-being initiatives;

### **RESOLUTION**

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate hereby establishes the Faculty Advocacy and Engagement Subcommittee as a standing subcommittee of the Faculty Senate.

### **Purpose and Scope**

**The Faculty Advocacy and Engagement Subcommittee shall:**

- 1. Engage with Faculty and Report regularly to the Faculty Senate on progress, findings, and recommendations,**
- 2. Monitor and assess the current state of faculty morale, resources and support services across the institution,**
- 3. Evaluate existing programs, policies, and structures that support faculty engagement, and**
- 4. Recommend policy and institutional improvements or new initiatives based on faculty feedback and best practices.**

**Discussion ensued and, while overwhelmingly positive, some edits were suggested. A revised proposal will be presented during the next Faculty Senate meeting.**

## **New Business:**

The Faculty Affairs Committee submitted a proposal to amend the Constitution on several issues. The proposal will be voted on by the Faculty Senate at the next meeting. If it passes, the resolution will be placed before the entire faculty for a vote. **See the full report of the committee and the resolutions below:**

## **Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee, October 9, 2025.**

The Faculty Affairs Committee received a charge to review the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws, identify needed changes and corrections, and make recommendations.

Consistent with this charge we present the following three resolutions regarding an amendment to the Faculty Senate Constitution. This is being presented at the October 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. In accordance with the Constitution and Bylaws, the Faculty Senate will have the opportunity to discuss the resolutions at the October 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. They will then need to be approved by the Faculty Senate at the October 30<sup>th</sup> meeting before being sent to the Faculty Association for evaluation and vote.

The following is a summary and explanation of each resolution. On pages 3-5 the Resolutions are provided with a description and the full text of the resolution. **The text to be inserted into the Constitution is in red. Language to be stricken from the Constitution is indicated with a strike thru and language to be added is underlined in the text.**

Resolution 1: Aligns language in the Constitution with current practice at UCA and language found in the Faculty Handbook. It replaces the term unaffiliated with the Honors College and the Library.

The term unaffiliated was previously used by the University to describe faculty members that were not associated with an Academic College. Due to a reorganization at the university level, the faculty not currently associated with an Academic College are those

in the Honors College and in the Library. At this time, this constitutes approximately 15 individuals.

This resolution designates that one faculty member from the Honors College and one faculty member from the Library will serve on the Faculty Senate. This action reduces the number of Senators by one. The Constitution currently indicates that three unaffiliated senators will serve on Faculty Senate. By designating one member from the Honors College and one from the Library, this reduces the number of Senators from these two groups by one. For comparison, the Honors College and the Library currently have approximately 15 individuals. The next smallest Academic College has 55 individuals.

Resolution 2: Enhances the role of the part-time Senator to have full voting rights as a Senator and aligns the Constitution with Roberts Rules of Order.

The part-time Senator is currently an ex-officio member of the Faculty Senate and is only permitted to vote on matters impacting part-time senators unless approved by the President of the Faculty Senate to do otherwise. Additionally, the part-time Senator serves a one-year term. This resolution would give the part-time Senator full voting rights and establishes a three-year term for the position.

Resolution 3: Amends the Constitution to clarify and clean up the language.

This amendment makes minor changes and does not impact the operation of the Senate. The first alteration is to explicitly state that the Provost, as an ex-officio member of the Faculty Senate, does not have a vote on the Senate. Secondly, it clarifies language indicating that administrators are limited in number or cannot serve on the Senate depending on their position. The latter aligns the Constitution with language in the Bylaws. The final two changes eliminate redundant or unnecessary language.

Respectfully,

Faculty Affairs Committee 2025-2026

Faith Yarberry, Chair (COSE)

Arijit Mukherjee (Senator At-Large)

Brigid Appiah Otoo (COB)

Michael Rosenow (Senator At-Large)

### **Faculty Affairs Committee Resolutions on Constitutional Amendments**

**Resolution 1: Aligns language in the Constitution with current practice at UCA and language found in the Faculty Handbook. It replaces the term unaffiliated with the Honors College and the Library.**

Whereas, Article III, sections 1 and 4, reference membership of unaffiliated faculty in the Senate, and

Whereas, the university has moved away from the term “unaffiliated” as it relates to faculty organization, and

Whereas, the number of faculty who hold positions that previously were categorized as unaffiliated has decreased, and

Whereas, members of the faculty within the Honors College and the Library — the two remaining entities that previously were categorized as unaffiliated — support this amendment, and

Whereas, procedures for electing senators are contained in the Faculty Senate Bylaws,

**Be it therefore resolved that Article III, sections 1 and 4, of the Faculty Constitution be amended to read:**

**Section 1.C.1. College senators: Three Faculty Association members from each academic college, ~~three Faculty Association members from all of the unaffiliated faculty units of the university~~ one Faculty Association member from the Honors College, and one Faculty Association member from the Library shall be elected**

by a secret ballot of the Faculty Association of the respective academic units in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution Faculty Senate Bylaws.

~~Section 4. Each group of senators is divided into three classes, such that within each group, one of the three classes is elected each year. Academic colleges with more than one senator shall stagger elections by electing one senator each year.~~

**Resolution 2: Enhances the role of the part-time Senator to have full voting rights as a Senator and aligns the Constitution with Roberts Rules of Order.**

Whereas, Article III, Section 1, defines the role of a part-time faculty member who serves on the Faculty Senate as a representative of all part-time faculty members (hereunto referred to as part-time senator), and

Whereas, the part-time senator is listed in the Constitution as an ex officio member of the Faculty Senate although Robert's Rules of Order defines ex officio as a person who serves as a member of a board "by virtue of an office or committee chairmanship held in the society" with no provision for an ex officio member to be *elected* to the board, and

Whereas, the Constitution language limiting the rights of a part-time senator to vote is the antithesis of shared governance and ensuring all voices are heard, and

Whereas, part-time faculty who are willing to serve on the Faculty Senate show a commitment to the university and provide a valuable voice in sharing the concerns and thoughts of their constituency, and

Whereas, no provision in the Constitution or Faculty Senate Bylaws limits the term of a part-time senator to one year, and

Whereas, moving the part-time senator from ex officio to elected senator includes them with all other senators in serving three-year terms,

**Be it therefore resolved that Article III, Section 1, of the Faculty Constitution be amended to read:**

~~B. Ex Officio: (For purposes of this paragraph “part-time faculty” means “part-time employees of the university with teaching included as a responsibility of their appointment.”) One part-time faculty member of the university elected by the part-time faculty of the university. This shall be a non-voting member except on issues that directly affect the part-time faculty of the university as determined by the president of the senate.~~

#### ~~G. B. Elected~~

3. Part-time senator: One part-time faculty member of the university elected by the part-time faculty of the university. (For purposes of this paragraph “part-time faculty” means “part-time employees of the university with teaching included as a responsibility of their appointment.”)

**Resolution 3: Amends the Constitution to clarify and clean up the language.**

#### 1<sup>st</sup> Alteration

Whereas, Article III, Section 3, includes the provost of the university as an ex-officio member of the Faculty Senate, and

Whereas, Robert's Rules of Order includes in its definition of an ex officio member of a board that said ex officio member shall be a voting member, and

Whereas, the university provost has not been a voting member of the Faculty Senate in the past,

**Be it therefore resolved that Article III, Section 3, of the Faculty Constitution be amended to read:**

**Ex Officio: Provost, who shall serve as a non-voting member.**

#### 2<sup>nd</sup> Alteration

Whereas, Article III, Section 3, states “No more than two senators shall be from any single department, and no more than two chairs (or equivalent position) shall be elected from each college. No administrator at the assistant dean or above level shall be eligible to be elected”, and

Whereas, the intent is that no more than two senators from each department or no more than two chairs from the each college serve in the senate, and that administrators at the assistant dean or above level be ineligible to serve in the senate, and

Whereas, a senator who assumes a new position at the university could create a situation contrary to this intent but is not required to resign from the senate, and

Whereas, similar language already exists in the Faculty Senate bylaws,

**Be it therefore further resolved that Article III, Section 3, of the Faculty Constitution be amended to read:**

**No more than two senators shall be from any single department, and no more than two chairs (or equivalent position) shall be elected serve from each college. No administrator at the assistant dean or above level shall be eligible to be elected serve.**

### 3<sup>rd</sup> Alteration

Whereas, Article VI, sections 2 and 3, contain repeated language, and

Whereas, the sections can be combined and rewritten to eliminate redundancy,

**Be it therefore further resolved that Article VI, sections 2 and 3, of the Faculty Constitution be amended to read:**

**Section 2. Any amendment proposed by the senate shall be submitted to a vote of the faculty. Each faculty member shall be notified at least two weeks in advance of such a vote and at the time be furnished with a copy of the proposed amendment. Voting shall be conducted similar to the election of senators as prescribed by the faculty senate bylaws.**

**~~Section 3. Any proposed amendments to the Constitution that are submitted by the Faculty Senate will be submitted to the Faculty Association for a vote. Voting shall be conducted similar to the election of senators as prescribed by the faculty senate bylaws.~~**

### **Alteration 4**

Whereas, Article VI, Section 4, includes the date that section was ratified, and

Whereas, no other section of the Faculty Constitution contains such language,

**Be it therefore further resolved that Article VI, Section 4, of the Faculty Constitution be amended to read:**

**~~Section 4~~ Section 3. In order for an amendment to pass and thus become a part of the Constitution, over half of the faculty association members must vote, and a proposed amendment must receive “do pass” from at least two-thirds of those voting. ~~Ratified August 20, 1990.~~**

**End of New Business:**

**Senator Rose moves to adjourn**

**Mayhew 2<sup>nd</sup>.**

**Meeting adjourns 2:32**

### Introduction to ACIREMA

#### Design

The simulation exercise, ACIREMA, is designed to sensitize participants to the difficulties that international students encounter in their quest for an American education. It acquaints the participants with the procedures students must follow from the initial contact with a U.S. educational institution to their arrival on campus. The cross-cultural aspects of the exercise help to explain why international students do not always accept “no” as an answer (and why they may be perceived as offering bribes in certain situations).

#### Objectives

To assist participants in identifying emotionally with international students coming to your institution and be more prepared to be patient and understanding.

To assist participants in identifying certain cultural elements involved in an international student's interaction with officials at a university and to encourage a non-judgmental approach.

To identify typical negative reactions in cross-cultural and pressure encounters and learn alternative ways of dealing with these “challenges.”

#### Summary of Activity

Invitation: Participants are invited to role-play in an experience that will acquaint them with some of the difficulties that students face in their efforts to study in the U.S.

The Exercise: For approximately one (1) hour the participants will attempt to complete all procedures and obtain all documents necessary for arriving at the U.S. institution. It includes making contact with and meeting all requirements of eight different offices and agencies, both in and out of the U.S. Participants will find themselves somewhat at a loss on how to proceed, standing in long lines, and approaching offices that are closed for lunch or for a week.

The Debriefing: By the end of the hour, everyone will have made it to the U.S. and to their selected college or university, where refreshments and friendly folk are awaiting them. During this time, participants have a chance to talk about what they experienced and learn about the 'actualities' of the procedures through comments from international students and written summaries for some steps in the process.