



UNIVERSITY OF
CENTRAL
ARKANSAS™

FACULTY
SENATE

Minutes

Thursday, October 30, 2025

12:45 pm

Wingo 315

Chris Craun, Secretary

I. Call to order 12:45: FS President Dunlap

Members Present:

President Davis & Provost Hargis

Senate President Dunlap & Vice-President Thomas

At Large Senators: Mukherjee, Spivey, Rosenow

CAHSS Senators: Mayhew, Burley, Craun

CHBS Senators: Rose, Jamerson, Downey

COB Senators: Appiah Otto, Britton

COE Senators: Couture, Buchannan, McClellan

COSE Senators: Yarberry, Johnson, Naumiec

Honors Senator: Frank

II. Notification of Approval of Minutes from Faculty Senate meeting 10/14/2025
15 Aye 4 Abstentions

III. Comments

President Davis:

The Equal Protection Project has supposedly filed a complaint with the Office of Civil Rights against UCA about privately funded Foundation Scholarships that are dedicated to serving selective demographics. These scholarship criteria were set up by the original donors (often decades ago). Separate from anything related to that action, we have been working since 2022 to contact donors (or their survivors) and gain the required approval to update these types of criteria. The

outside group is claiming that there are approximately ten non-compliant scholarships, and the complaint is aimed at those. As it relates to our work to strengthen and clarify scholarship criteria, UCA will continue the task with those ten, and the complaint is no reason for concern because the work is already underway.

Provost Hargis:

I'll keep my remarks focused on four key areas of progress and collaboration.

1. Strategic Planning

We continue to make steady and meaningful progress with our strategic planning process. Over the past several weeks, our Working Groups have shared their draft goal structures, all aligned with the four strategic imperatives. We are currently in the middle of our campus Feedback Labs, which have been well attended and have provided valuable insights as we move towards having a final plan. The final set of sessions will take place next week.

Once those are complete, all feedback will be shared with the Working Groups for one final round of revisions before we move into drafting the full strategic plan.

We expect to present the final version to the Board of Trustees early in the spring semester. At that time, the Board will consider and approve the imperatives and goals that will guide us forward. This process has been collaborative, thoughtful, and forward-looking—exactly what we hoped it would be.

2. Priority and Advance Registration

Our priority and advance registration period for Spring 2026 began on October 29 and will continue through November 11, 2025, following the standard classification schedule.

After this period, regular registration will remain open through the last day to add or register for classes. I appreciate the work of our advising centers, department offices, and the Registrar's team in keeping this process running smoothly for our students.

3. Common Course Numbering

I also want to acknowledge the significant work being done to move UCA to

Common Course Numbering for the State. This is a major undertaking, and I want to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Kurt Boniecki, Amber Hall, Vicky Summers, and to all of our Department Chairs, School Directors, and Program Coordinators who are working together to ensure we meet our implementation timeline.

The collaboration and attention to detail across campus have been impressive, and we are on track and making strong progress.

4. Course and Curriculum Review

Finally, our course and curriculum review process is ongoing, working to ensure our courses and course content are aligned with current state law, is well underway.

Departments and Deans are working collaboratively to ensure we remain both compliant and true to our academic mission.

As we've said from the beginning, this is hard work, but it's also necessary work. It requires open dialogue, careful consideration, and a shared commitment to working together.

I'm grateful for the professionalism and thoughtfulness that our faculty and administrators have shown as we navigate this process together

FS President Dunlap:

New Senator Benjamin Britton is joining us as a COB senator to replace VP Thomas. Welcome, Senator Britton!

IV. Constituent Concerns

1. Access Bill Procedural Concern from Oct 14. Meeting–

- a. The Faculty Senate declines to release any interpretive statement regarding State Legislation because we are neither equipped or empowered to do so.
- b. There are now procedures that direct Faculty concerns and questions regarding the legality of their course-materials to Department Chairs, Deans, and UCA's General Counsel.
- c. During discussion, it was suggested that the Administration should develop an informational release to inform the Faculty of these processes. Such a document would need to be updated regularly.

- d. Senators expressed several important views:
 - i. A desire for a clear understanding regarding the Faculty's role in Shared Governance. What input do we have and what is the venue for sharing it?
 - ii. A wish for written guidance from ADHE which would allow us to root our decisions upon a solid basis and avoid unnecessary changes based on hearsay.

President Davis assured us that there is constant communication between University Counsels and Legislative liaisons in an ongoing attempt to understand the will of the Legislature. However, it takes time to gather the information necessary to generate an interpretive document that would have any value. The Administration hopes to produce a meaningful document sometime in the Spring.

Both President Davis and Provost Hargis are both willing and available to meet and discuss this with faculty in a small group setting or one-on-one.

President Davis had to leave the meeting, 1:38 pm.

Provost Hargis elaborated further:

We are still waiting to hear the final details regarding the State's revision of the Academic Core. There are a couple of different models before the state review committee. We will move ahead with preparations once we know their decisions. We also plan to consider the feedback we received during last year's external review of our current UCA CORE in future planning.

There was a further question regarding students who began their academic careers under an Undergraduate Bulletin that included the Diversity column in their CORE

Provost Hargis: To be clear, at this time, the pillar formerly identified as Diversity has been renamed Global Learning. Absent a few specific changes to align with state law, a significant subset of the courses that were part of the Diversity pillar are included in the Global Learning Pillar. The course attribute in Banner that was used to identify courses in the Diversity pillar will carry forward to the Global Learning pillar.

2. My concern is that many of the support organizations on campus aren't fulfilling their role as supports. I'll give two examples. ORSP is a supporting organization whose mission is to find and help develop funding opportunities for UCA faculty and staff. However, many of the challenges faced in securing funding are developed by ORSP

themselves. Convolutioned paperwork, constant upgrades to systems that nobody seems to understand, and a lack of concise information plague many interactions with ORSP's otherwise friendly staff. Their job is to support the faculty, not make securing funding more difficult.

Another example I'd like to present is our academic advising. I constantly have students come to me and ask about academic advising. The information they claim to have been given is contrary to our mission to help them graduate on time. Their 'support' to the students often leaves them with more questions or a delayed graduation date.

We need to do more to focus our support auxiliaries on supporting the populations they were designed to help. Whether this is through simplifying complex systems, better communications, or just by doing the job they were hired to do, we need to address these problems to make sure a wedge isn't driven between the various populations on campus.

- A. From Kevin Thomas regarding Academic Advising: Thank you for sharing this feedback. It's helpful and appreciated. This faculty member is absolutely right that our support areas, including academic advising, exist to make the student experience clearer and more efficient, and we should always be evaluating how well we're meeting that goal.**

At the same time, I do want to acknowledge that during our advising transition, both retention and graduation rates have continued to rise, a reflection of the strong work happening across campus and the dedication of our advising professionals. That said, learning and improvement are ongoing. We know there's always room to refine communication, ensure consistency, and better equip our advisors to meet student needs.

If any faculty, staff, or students encounter specific advising concerns or recurring issues, please reach out directly to LeighAnn DenHartog or myself. That feedback allows us to address matters quickly and also informs our broader training and development efforts so we can continue to strengthen the advising experience for our students.

Again, I appreciate you taking the time to raise this, it's through conversations like this that we continue to improve.

- B. From Michael Mills regarding ORSP: I understand the frustration when systems meant to support faculty feel like obstacles instead, and I appreciate the opportunity to address these matters and share ORSP's processes and recent improvements. In the spirit of brevity, I could sum up**

my response by saying the ORSP has made significant process and form simplifications over the past year and is committed to ongoing improvement. The core process requires just a 13-question intake form, proposal development with budget, and a compliance review. I welcome specific feedback and am happy to meet directly to discuss any concerns. More information is at the very end of this document.

3. I'd like to ask for the final exam schedule to be re-considered. I don't know who handles this. As a general rule, I would think that a "morning class" ought to have a morning final exam. An "afternoon class" ought to have an afternoon final exam. Likewise for "evening classes" or "Saturday" classes. They ought to have final exams occur roughly in the same time of day as the class itself.

For the most part our published Final Exam schedule does this. Except for these classes:

FINAL EXAMINATIONS FALL 2025 SEMESTER						
TEST TIME	SATURDAY Dec 6 th	MONDAY Dec 8 th	TUESDAY Dec 9 th	WEDNESDAY Dec 10 th	THURSDAY Dec 11 th	FRIDAY Dec 12 th
8:00 – 10:00 A.M.		10:00 A.M. MWF	9:25 A.M. TTH	8:00 A.M. MWF	8:00 A.M. TTH	
11:00 – 1:00 P.M.		1:00 P.M. MW OR MWF	12:15 P.M. TTH	12:00 NOON MWF	10:50 A.M. TTH	
1:00 – 3:00 P.M.	ALL COMM 1300 SECTIONS *SEE NOTICE	backwards		backwards		
2:00 – 4:00 P.M.		11:00 A.M. MWF	2:00 P.M. MW or MWF	9:00 A.M. MWF	2:40 P.M. TTH	
4:00 – 6:00 P.M.		4:00 PM MW OR MWF AND 4:30 P.M. M OR W OR MW	4:05 P.M. T OR TH OR TTH AND 4:30 P.M. T OR TH OR TTH	3:00 P.M. MW or MWF		
6:00 – 8:00 P.M.				6:00 P.M. MW		
7:00 – 9:00 P.M.		7:30 P.M. MW	7:30 P.M. TTH			

This is duplicated in Spring 2026:

FINAL EXAMINATIONS SPRING 2026 SEMESTER						
TEST TIME	SATURDAY April 25 th	MONDAY April 27 th	TUESDAY April 28 th	WEDNESDAY April 29 th	THURSDAY April 30 st	FRIDAY May 1 st
8:00 – 10:00 A.M.		10:00 A.M. MWF	9:25 A.M. TTH	8:00 A.M. MWF	8:00 A.M. TTH	
11:00 – 1:00 P.M.		1:00 P.M. MW OR MWF	12:15 P.M. TTH	12:00 NOON MWF	10:50 A.M. TTH	
1:00 – 3:00 P.M.	ALL COMM 1300 SECTIONS *SEE NOTICE	backwards		backwards		
2:00 – 4:00 P.M.		11:00 A.M. MWF	2:00 P.M. MW or MWF	9:00 A.M. MWF	2:40 P.M. TTH	
4:00 – 6:00 P.M.		4:00 PM MW OR MWF AND 4:30 P.M. M OR W OR MW	4:05 P.M. T OR TH OR TTH AND 4:30 P.M. T OR TH OR TTH	3:00 P.M. MW or MWF		
6:00 – 8:00 P.M.				6:00 P.M. MW		
7:00 – 9:00 P.M.		7:30 P.M. MW	7:30 P.M. TTH			

I understand that it's hard to make a "perfect" schedule. But it seems like these two class times could be swapped without difficulty. If swapped, all classes would have a final exam on roughly the same time of day as the class itself.

From Amanda Palandino, Senior Associate Registrar of Records &

Registration: When we were revising the finals schedule, we noticed that the previous version intentionally allowed for some downtime between exams. We wanted to preserve that consideration in the new schedule as best we could.

Because the finals time is determined by class meeting times, we made a few strategic swaps between time slots to maintain those built-in breaks. Our goal was to support a more balanced and manageable finals week for students.

If we were to make the recommended adjustment, students with back-to-back MWF classes would have faced finals scheduled one right after the other, with little to no break in between. Our published version helps minimize those situations wherever possible.

Hope this helps explain our reasoning, but please let me know if you have any additional questions.

4. I would like to ask for refreshments/snacks for faculty and staff who attend graduation ceremonies. Most of us forgo breakfast etc to be there on time and robe etc. I think some beverages and snacks would be very much appreciated and would

encourage a lot of faculty members to show up for the ceremony knowing they will not be starving while they wait to be called.

5. The street running in front of Schichtl Hall (Niven Dr.) needs speed bumps or a stop sign. Pedestrians crossing the street have nearly been hit by cars speeding around the curve. It's an accident waiting to happen.

This concern has been forwarded to the University Safety Committee to determine the appropriate course of action.

6. Over the summer, a letter was distributed to faculty outlining the results of a compensation study comparing UCA faculty salaries to those at peer institutions. The data revealed some concerning discrepancies, with some faculty reportedly earning only 60 to 70 percent of the identified market range.

While the acknowledgment of these disparities was appreciated, it is deeply disappointing that no immediate corrective action has been taken to begin addressing the most severe inequities. To raise awareness of a serious underpayment issue, especially after investing in a comprehensive study to verify it, and then to take no tangible steps toward immediately remedying it sends a troubling message to faculty about the university's commitment to equity, morale, and retention.

Faculty are the foundation of this institution's mission and success. Recognizing significant salary inequities without providing a clear plan or complete timeline for resolution undermines both trust and motivation among our colleagues. I respectfully urge the Faculty Senate to revisit this issue with administration and advocate for immediate, transparent measures to begin correcting the most critical pay gaps identified in the study.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and for your continued advocacy on behalf of faculty welfare.

I wish that something would of been done with the funding that was already set aside for the academic year (2 percent COLA, could of been adjusted to 1 percent and the other percent would of easily been enough to bring all those inequitable salaries up to a better percentage) to address this, but since it wasn't, then a focus on rectifying this should be the priority right now.

7. Faculty Salary Review - I am on this committee and it feels like we are walking through mud. I would also like to see a plan for how they will get individuals to 90% of market value BUT before I see that plan, I want to know that they have included EVERYONE in their research and in that plan. Currently, I am still pushing for data to

be presented for, what they are calling, faculty + (10-12 month faculty). I will tell you from my department alone, my 11-12 month faculty are WAY under the 90 percentile. If we have a plan, we need to be sure everyone is included and moves together

Concerns #5-6 regarding Faculty Salaries are being tabled until the next meeting in order to discuss them when President Davis is present.

8. If a subcommittee of the FS is formed to address faculty advocacy and engagement, I hope that at least ONE of you is on this subcommittee. I would ask if this needs to be solely a subcommittee of FS or if this needs to extend out beyond FS. I would also look at what CETAL is doing with their "coaching series" to see if this would be redundant and if what FS needs is a report from CETAL about the progress of these programs.

This concern is from a CHBS constituent, so they are hoping that a CHBS senator is on the new FS committee. There will be a CHBS senator on the new committee for faculty advocacy and engagement as: 1. The Faculty Senate strives to have a representative from each college on each FS committee, and 2. The group of people working to form the new committee will become that new committee, and that group has a CHBS senator.

9. Regarding the Faculty Senate Resolution 2 concerning Part-Time Senators: as a constituent, I am in favor of a bigger voice from the part-time senator, however, I also believe that there should be a stipend included for the representative. The previous Provost shot this down but if you are serving in this capacity as a full-time faculty member, it counts toward your promotion and tenure as service to the university. For a part-time representative, there is no incentive. We pay them a "decent" wage to come and teach classes that cannot be covered by full-time faculty. They do not have the obligation of service or scholarly activity that a full-time person is responsible for. Why would I want to "volunteer" my time? Even a little stipend might incentivize part-time faculty to be involved.

10. A Faculty member did not see any resolution about Faculty Emeritus status in Faculty Senate minutes.

I'm assuming this refers to the concern received during our 8/18/25 meeting requesting a review of language around non-tenure faculty in the Faculty Handbook, specifically if language about Faculty Emeritus status could be rewritten to include non-tenure faculty. Faculty Senate agreed to send this concern to the Faculty Handbook Committee, and we have done so.

11. Faculty Self-Service: We've lost access to some important tools.

We no longer have a button that allows us to email a class. This button was really helpful for adding students en masse to shared Google documents (you could hit the email button and then copy/paste from the email draft it generated) and for sending emails that lacked the Blackboard announcement prefix (using the same method as above). May we please have this button back? **(This is solved—there is a selectable roster and an email button).**

We could also view a detailed list that included major, minor, year, and advisor for each student in one great list for each class. Given that we have lost the alert system, having this advisor list in one place was really helpful.

We also apparently do not have easy access to students' contact information, meaning that we cannot call students in the rare cases when we need to initiate contact and email has failed. These were helpful tools. May we please have them back?

12. Students are complaining about mold and saying that they are too sick to come to class. Is this real? Parents are posting about this on Social Media. Should UCA address their posts/concerns?

Provost Hargis will direct this concern and issue to Dr. Robin Williamson. The UCA Physical Plant routinely responds to issues as they are reported through the established process. It is important to remember that our Housing and Physical Plant team can only address concerns that are brought to their attention. These issues range from routine maintenance to larger projects such as replacing building systems or making significant facility updates. Our Housing team also works closely with students to provide alternative living spaces if that is necessary. Additionally, Provost Hargis thanked the Faculty Senate for sharing the social media posts so that the University can monitor this channel, investigate where appropriate, and respond when possible.

13. Could someone look into UCA benefits and see about including pet insurance?

This was passed on to HR for consideration.

14. Phased retirement—Faculty Handbook says that you can apply for 1-5 years of phased retirement. The decision is made by Chairs & Deans. It seems like (perhaps

due to ROI) that the actual awarded terms are more like 1-2. Can we get clarity if the situation has changed?

Provost Hargis said nothing has changed in policy, and mentioned that the key component is whether a Chair says that they do not need that full-time position slot (and for how long). He further noted that once the faculty member leaves (no matter the length of Phased retirement) the administration will treat this like any other retirement/vacancy.

15. The time between the First and Second series of student alerts (graduation alert & grade-checks) was too small for there to be any measurable change—making the process unhelpful. Please spread these alerts further apart.

This concern will be passed on to Kevin Thomas.

V. Senate Committee Reports

Committee on Committee: We are going to examine the bylaws regarding Senate Committee reporting procedures. We hope to present an action plan at the next meeting.

Academic Affairs: We notified the Faculty Empowerment Grant recipients and they may now move forward with their projects.

Former DBIE Committee: The committee presented a resolution to establish the committee's new name and charge as an Action Item (Action Item A, below).

Faculty Affairs: Nothing outside of the Action Item (Action Item B) below.

VI. Action Items

- A. Resolution to create a new Faculty Senate Committee for Faculty Advocacy and Engagement (Resolution is at end of document, labeled ACTION ITEM A)
 - 1. Senator Spivey (a member of the committee) moved the resolution to be tabled for further development.
 - 2. The resolution was tabled and sent back to committee (9 Ayes 5 Nays)

B. Resolutions for constitutional amendments presented by the Faculty Affairs Committee (Resolutions are at end of document, labeled ACTION ITEM B)

1. Pres. Dunlap asked to delay submitting these proposed amendments for a Faculty Vote until the Faculty Affairs Committee has acquired yard-signs (to drive greater participation).
2. Senator Burley moved to table the resolution on these grounds. Senator McClellan seconded.
3. Vote was unanimous to table this motion.

VII. New Business

VIII. For the Good of the Faculty

IX. Reminders:

Next regular meeting on Tuesday, November 11, 2025 at 12:45 p.m.

Sen Rosenow moved to adjourn the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 2:33 p.m.

ACTION ITEM A

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 individual 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 workplace culture 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.

ACTION ITEM B

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.

1st 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.

2nd 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.

3rd 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.**~~

4th Alteration

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.~~

MORE INFORMATION REGARDING ORSP FROM MICHAEL MILLS:

Regarding external funding, ORSP's role is to collect the information necessary to ensure compliance and minimize issues when funds are awarded and expended. While some complexity is unavoidable due to state and federal regulatory requirements, my commitment is to ensure ORSP continually evaluates every form and process to simplify and streamline wherever possible without compromising what is required for regulatory compliance and successful post-award management.

The External Funding Submission Process

The ORSP process follows a straightforward pathway from opportunity identification to submission:

Step 1: Initial Notification. When faculty identify a funding opportunity, they complete a brief Intake Form (13 questions) to notify ORSP and initiate the process. This alerts the office of the need to assign a Grant Administrator and to initiate the collaboration needed to prepare the proposal for submission.

Step 2: Proposal Development. Faculty develop their proposal, which includes components required by virtually all funders:

- Project narrative/scope of work (the research plan)
- Budget using the UCA Budget Spreadsheet (ensures proper accounting codes for post-award setup)
- Budget justification (explanation of costs)

Step 3: Compliance Review. If the funder requires institutional cost-sharing, the Cost-Sharing Form secures departmental commitments and approvals.

Step 4: Submission. ORSP conducts final compliance review and submits the proposal on behalf of the institution.

Post-Award Process (only if funded): If the proposal is successful, two other forms may be needed:

- Pre-Award Spending Form: Only if spending must begin before the official award arrives (requires funder's written permission)
- No-Cost Extension Form: Only if the project timeline needs extension

In essence: Faculty notify ORSP of their intent, develop their proposal with required budget components, secure any necessary cost-share approvals, and ORSP ensures compliance before institutional submission.

Recent Improvements

Over the past year, ORSP has actively engaged with faculty, deans, and the ORSP Advisory Committee to streamline processes wherever possible while maintaining compliance. These collaborative efforts have resulted in substantial improvements:

- Streamlined Intake Form: Reduced from 22 inputs to 13 (and only 9 for multi-year renewals)
- Simplified Core Forms: The Cost-Sharing and Pre-Award Spending Forms, the two most commonly used forms, have been condensed from multi-page documents to one-half to one page
- New Faculty Guidebook: A faculty-friendly resource that walks researchers through the entire process from conceptualization to submission (living document, continually updated)
- Website Redesign: Reformatted to mirror the actual grant-seeking workflow for intuitive navigation
- Video Tutorials: Currently in development based on Advisory Committee feedback that faculty prefer video format; the office welcomes specific topics that would be most helpful
- Proactive Faculty Engagement: Based on conversations with the ORSP Advisory Board, the ORSP Director has reached out to each of the academic deans to schedule sessions where she and the Project Development Specialist can meet with faculty, particularly new faculty, to walk them through the process of submitting a proposal for external funding

These changes were developed in direct collaboration with faculty, administration, the ORSP Advisory Committee, and the Post-Awards office and benchmarked against neighboring institutions, showing strong alignment with sector standards.

Moving Forward

The ORSP is committed to continuous improvement and welcomes constructive feedback. To help target improvement efforts most effectively, specific examples of

forms or processes that faculty find challenging are especially helpful. This allows the office to prioritize improvements where they're needed most. If departments can share 2–3 concrete pain points (e.g., a confusing field, a page, a Cayuse step), ORSP will address quick wins promptly and bring larger items to the Advisory Committee for solutions.

I encourage faculty to contact ORSP directly when questions or concerns arise; the office is there to assist. I also emphasize the importance of communicating with the ORSP Advisory Committee as a feedback channel. Members include Reid Adams, Marsha Massey, and Tori Dunlap from COSE; Sunny Styles-Foster from COE; and Stephanie Rose from CHBS.

I will ensure that the ORSP Director continues to prioritize process improvements and remains responsive to faculty needs within the office's compliance obligations. I welcome the opportunity to meet with this constituent or any staff or faculty member to discuss specific concerns and identify additional areas for improvement.