



UNIVERSITY OF
CENTRAL
ARKANSAS™

FACULTY
SENATE

Minutes

Chris Craun, Secretary

Tuesday, March 10, 2026

12:45 pm

Wingo 315

I. Call to order: FS President Dunlap at 12:46 PM

Present:

President Davis & Provost Hargis

FS President Dunlap & VP Thomas

Senators:

At Large: Mukherjee, Spivey, Rosenow

CAHSS: Burley, Craun, Mayhew

CHBS: Rose, Downey, Jamerson

COB: Appiah-Otto, McCalman, Britton (Excused Absence)

COE: Couture, Buchannan, McClellan

COSE: Yarberry, Naumiec, Johnson

Honors: Frank

Library: Lebeau-Ford (Excused Absence)

II. Notification of Approval of Minutes from Faculty Senate meeting 2/24/2026

16 Ayes & 1 Abstention: Minutes are approved.

III. Comments

A. President Davis

Just a point of clarification relative to our future planning for the new multipurpose arena: This evening, the Conway City Council will take up the permit for a future closure of Bruce street between Western and Farris, but the actual closure would take place at *an appropriate time in the future*. Tonight's decision is for the benefit of our architectural firm so that they can design the new Farris Center with this matter clearly settled.

Bruce Street will not close for quite some time (Winter 2027 or later). Related to the Bruce Street closure, the future Connect Conway trail system funded through the federal RAISE grant program will run through the Bruce Street corridor and therefore impact that part of campus. A second spur will come across Stone Dam Creek and through campus. The Bruce Street closure will enable both the trail extension and the arena planning to be done in coordination and cooperation with the city.

Question from a Senator: Will the changes taking place at the prior AR PBS building impact UCA?

- a) No, nothing will change on our end. The space is being managed in line with the last decade or so. This includes our university space which is distinct from theirs but operated in a cooperative manner..

B. Provost Hargis

Provost Hargis indicated that there were no new updates to share at this time and expressed appreciation for the Faculty Senate's continued leadership and service in support of the university's academic mission.

C. FS President Dunlap

I have a task for us to discuss under New Business, but I yield my time to our guest speakers:

IV. Invited Guests: An Update on UCA's Migration to Brightspace LMS

Amy Hawkins, Assistant Provost of Teaching and Academic Leadership

Trevor Seifert, Vice President of Information Technology

Tonya McKinney, Instructional Technology Manager

- Logging in: go to learn.uca.edu and use SSO (single-sign on, purple button) to log into Brightspace; there will be a tile on the myUCA menu later in spring
- May Intersession may be taught in Blackboard or Brightspace; Summer I and following must be taught in Brightspace. This includes courses that begin in May but extend past May Intersession.
- **Blackboard access ends on June 30, 2026, no exceptions.**

- Past summer (2025) content migrated from Blackboard to Brightspace by March 20, 2026
Past fall (2025) content migrated from Blackboard to Brightspace by April 10, 2026
- There are 60ish two-hour Introduction to Brightspace training sessions (Feb. 23-March 20, 2026) with over 400 faculty registered plus additional Zoom sessions for remote and adjunct instructors
- 20+ one-hour Navigating Migration Issues in Brightspace training sessions are being offered March 30-April 17, 2026
- Intro and Migration trainings offered again May 4-15, 2026
- 19 faculty trainers (at least three per college) have office hours available to work with individuals and small groups. Contact your Chair or Dean if you don't know who these are in your college.
- Reminder: CETAL staff work year-round and are available for consultation throughout the summer.
- There will be Advanced functionality training offered during Academic Year 2026-27 (Accessibility+, Lumi AI, Capture+ for video, H5P/Creator+ for interactives)
- Respondus and Kaltura are still available in Brightspace; we are working on a solution to replace Safeassign.

Information arising from the Senators' questions:

Faculty who are concerned about grade appeals for Spring 2026 should download their course grade-book and the relevant assignments. Archiving these in Blackboard won't give you the accessibility you need once Blackboard becomes unavailable.

New Students will be given some opening week training in Brightspace (on Brightspace). There will also be additional training available through Student Success & in the Living Learning Communities.

There will be short student-facing videos on the Student Success website which are pitched toward student attention spans and give short, practical responses to frequently asked questions. This will

be good material for faculty to link within their classes and a place to direct students with questions.

There is a Brightspace app (called Pulse). It must be downloaded through Brightspace. Brightspace is very mobile-friendly and will maintain its standard appearance on both phone and web-based platforms.

The faculty will have a “View as Learner” tab which looks exactly like what the students see. It remains to be seen if faculty will be able to actively take exams or assignments as a student.

To sign up for training: uca.edu/cetal/brightspace

V. Constituent Concerns

- 1) We recently had a situation where serious, violent threats were made against specific faculty. Due to the nature of the threats, it was recommended that faculty lock their doors to ensure classroom and office safety.

My concern is this: the classrooms in Irby Hall have no ability to be locked down. Most doors to classrooms have large windows, several of which were easily broken by someone wielding a trashcan last semester. These windows offer a clear view of the classrooms and most often, the professor is teaching facing away from the doors. Furthermore, once the window is broken, the door knobs allow someone to reach in and open the door with ease. The doors open outwards, so barricading is not an entirely effective option. It also takes time, which is unfortunately not in our favor in active shooter situations. Previously, we were given window shades to cover the classroom doors, but this is not sufficient to truly protect students and faculty.

Faculty office suites are similar. While they are by no means as vulnerable as classrooms, they also have large windows that would allow anyone to break the window, turn the knob, and enter.

I know any change would be expensive, but my only thought was that we would be sitting ducks if anyone decides to follow through on those threats. I would have no effective way to protect myself or my students.

Perhaps a safety study needs to be conducted with factors such as fire, active shooters/violence, weather, etc. in mind on Irby and other (older) buildings. Irby is old and some upgrades are surely needed to accommodate the risks of today's world.

- 2) This is a follow-up on a concern I previously submitted regarding classroom safety in light of violent threats against faculty and/or students. To maintain privacy, I will not be referencing specific incidents, but my faculty senator knows who I am and is available to connect anyone who wishes to follow up. This concern is solely focused on how the university investigates, responds to, and communicates information about specific threats and patterns of student misconduct.

On the investigation of student misconduct: There appears to be no centralized, systematic process for reporting student misbehavior and receiving an adequate, documented response. "Student of Concern" reports frequently go unanswered with little to no follow-up or resolution. When students display inappropriate behavior toward other students in class, faculty are often told that nothing can be done unless the affected student files a complaint themselves despite the well-documented reality that students are frequently reluctant to report. Students also cannot know whether a behavior is part of a broader pattern, and it would be inappropriate for faculty to discuss that with them. A single faculty report documenting multiple inappropriate or disruptive behaviors should be sufficient to trigger further investigation; apparently, it is not.

On how the university responds to students with documented patterns of misconduct: Students with multiple documented instances of inappropriate or disruptive behavior are currently permitted to begin each new class or semester with a clean slate, leaving faculty entirely unprepared. Knowing that a student has a history of disruptive behavior would allow faculty to make reasonable, proactive adjustments, such as reconsidering group work arrangements, establishing a clear classroom behavior policy for all students, and knowing from the outset that careful documentation and prompt escalation to the Dean of Students may be warranted. Without this information, faculty may reasonably but incorrectly assume that a situation is isolated, and may be less likely to report incidents promptly.

On notification of targeted threats: When individuals report threats to the university and identify specific faculty members as targets, those faculty must be notified promptly and offered appropriate safety measures. It is not acceptable for targeted faculty to learn of a threat through gossip or informal channels when the university already possesses that information. This is a basic institutional duty of care.

Do you have a recommendation or solution to address your concern? (from the submission form) First, the university should establish or better publicize a centralized system for logging Student of Concern reports, with clear timelines for response and documented follow-through. Faculty who submit reports should receive acknowledgment and, where appropriate, confirmation that the matter is being addressed even if specific outcomes cannot be disclosed.

Second, I would propose a faculty notification system for students with documented patterns of disruptive behavior, modeled on how academic accommodations are currently communicated. Faculty do not need the specifics of each situation, just as we receive accommodation letters rather than full diagnostic histories, but a notification at the start of the semester indicating suggested action steps and the appropriate contact for escalation would go a long way toward helping faculty support these students, protect others in the classroom, and document incidents appropriately if they arise.

Finally, the university should establish a clear, mandatory protocol for notifying faculty when they have been named or targeted in a reported threat. This notification should come directly from a university official, within a defined timeframe, and should include available safety resources and next steps.

a: Unfortunately, the threat of violence against faculty or staff is a reality on every campus. The Faculty Senate and the Administration are in agreement that safety is paramount. If you feel uncomfortable or threatened in a situation, call the UCA Police. You are under no obligation to prove or justify your concern first—with anyone. Call the Police and seek a safer environment.

The same is true regarding someone witnessing violence or suspected potential violence. Office doors are kept open during office hours for reasons other than the students' well-being. If you hear something concerning, there is no need to wait: Call the Police. We are all each other's Keepers. This is our community so don't let your fellow members suffer alone.

There is no easy answer for what takes place after the Police get involved. They are the professionals in these matters. There are also legal issues outside of our purview and expertise. You may or may not be contacted again. However, if you are involved in an incident involving the Police and you have questions: Call the Police for next steps. Any Police action automatically includes notifying the Dean of Students (who can take their own independent actions). While these offices will still obey legal issues of privacy, they are the ones who are best suited to provide you with appropriate (and accurate) post-report information.

Finally, it is completely justified to be angry, fearful, and frustrated after experiencing a situation like this. Please take advantage of the UCA Counseling Center in these situations, as well as the support of your colleagues. It sounds trite, but we have to care for our own. If you see someone struggling or fearful, speak with them.

We realize this reply is in many ways inadequate. It's an imperfect response within an imperfect system. Your concern did not go unnoticed and was discussed with both the President and the Provost. Safety is a high priority for everyone involved.

- 3) The constituent is asking why department funds are used for classroom technology and why there are no building or common funds for these expenditures.
- a) **Provost: Classroom technology improvements are supported through a combination of institutional, college, and departmental resources. Departments may also use their own funds to purchase specialized technology that supports discipline-specific teaching or instructional needs.**

The university continues to invest in shared classroom infrastructure through institutional technology and facilities budgets. Technology Services works with colleges and departments to prioritize upgrades and address classroom needs across campus while balancing centralized resources with local flexibility.

- 4) Gemini AI & Chat GTP—is Chat GTP being blocked on campus?
- a) **ChatGPT is not blocked on campus. The university currently maintains an institutional Google license that includes access to Gemini AI, which is the AI platform presently supported at the institutional level. Because the university already maintains this license, Gemini is the primary AI tool supported for campus use at this time. As the AI landscape continues to evolve, the Information Technology Division and I will work in partnership with Deans and Program Leads to evaluate emerging needs and determine whether additional AI tools should be considered as part of the university's technology infrastructure.**

- 5) Some constituents say there is a bottle-neck in the chair positions and wish for this position to rotate more frequently. However, Chairs are resistant to stepping down because those who return to faculty receive a pay-cut to regular faculty pay.

Other institutions give 75-80% of their previous administrative salary to chairs who return to the faculty. Can UCA implement something similar?

- a) **Provost Hargis: UCA is fortunate to have many dedicated department chairs who provide thoughtful leadership for their departments and play an important role in supporting faculty, students, and academic programs.**

Leadership development and succession planning are important considerations in maintaining strong academic programs. I also recognize that salary transitions can influence when individuals choose to move out of leadership roles, and practices vary across institutions. We will continue monitoring these approaches as part of broader conversations about leadership development and departmental continuity.

Department chairs may be identified through internal or external searches depending on the circumstances within the department and the recommendation of the dean. At the time of appointment, compensation and expectations (including the transition back to faculty status) are discussed so that all parties understand the terms of the role.

There was some discussion by Senators about raising this question for the Faculty Salary Review Committee for future consideration. Others questioned whether this matter was within the Senate's purview. Senator Spivey moved to end the debate. Stephanie Rose seconded:

The vote was unanimous to end the debate and move on.

President Davis left the meeting at 2:06 PM

VI. Senate Committee Reports

Faculty Salary Review Committee Report:

The Senate acknowledges receiving this report and thanks the committee for their hard work in compiling it. The Faculty Senate, having reviewed the contents, will pass it forward to the Provost. It is our hope that the Provost and President will take this report into consideration as they develop the budget that will be presented to the Board of Trustees at their May meeting.

(Report attached to these minutes. It will also be available on the FS website)

Constituents with questions regarding the reports findings are encouraged to contact their college representative on the Faculty Salary Review Committee.

Faculty Advocacy and Engagement Committee:

We have been discussing the Teaching Excellence Award. Currently, we are investigating who has the authority to change the application criteria in order to inquire whether we can assist with periodic review.

We have also been talking with CETAL to design ways to engage with mid-late career faculty. We would like the Faculty Senate to host a celebration of those faculty sometime this April to let these faculty know we value their presence at UCA and to gather their input on ways we might serve them.

President Dunlap mentioned that the FS account has about \$1200 for this year and indicated her willingness to allocate some funds towards this event. She charged the committee to move forward with developing a plan and budget.

Academic Affairs:

We will have an April meeting to review the Application form for the Faculty Enrichment grants.

Faculty Affairs:

We spoke with Dr. John Toth (Sociology) regarding our survey. Here are his recommendations.

- 1) Begin with a short paragraph reminding readers of the past context: that the Faculty Senate asked for a Faculty Salary Review. This survey closes that loop by asking our constituents' opinions regarding the process.
- 2) Dr. Toth suggested fewer open-ended questions and more questions with a range of answers from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree.

The committee is currently working on these suggestions.

Committee on Committee:

Vice President Thomas has emailed all the Deans. Responses are trickling in, and he is updating the spreadsheet as they come. He hopes to streamline the process so that it is easier on future Faculty Senates. For instance, he is urging the Deans to provide their candidates to the Provost so that VP Thomas can gather the names from a central location.

VII. New Business

Faculty Senate Elections:

President Dunlap offered a couple of different suggestions on how to proceed with the election of next year's Faculty Senators in accordance with the Faculty Handbook.

Senator McCalman moved that the senate open elections on Wednesday during Spring Break (3/25) with the understanding that President Dunlap would extend the elections through the week *after* Spring Break and end the voting period on Friday 4/3. This power to extend is in Article I, Section 4 of the Bylaws.

Senator Yarberry seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

After discussion, Senator Yarberry moved to hold the vote for the proposed Constitutional Amendment at the same time. Voting Links and QR codes on our signage will take voters to a single page with links to both election ballots. This will simplify and accelerate the process.

Senator McClellan seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

Senator Frank volunteered to contact Physical Plant about putting our signage out over Springbreak.

VIII. For the Good of the Faculty

Congratulations to the UCA Lady Bear and Bear Basketball teams on their successful seasons!

IX. Reminders and Announcements:

- A. Dr. Stephanie Rose is being honored in May by Community Service, Inc. for her outstanding community work! See the announcement below if you would like to attend the event.
- B. Faculty Senate has been approached with questions regarding service animals in classes. VP Thomas has developed an information document to help answer these questions, and that document is appended below.
- C. Faculty Senate meetings are now held on the second and last Tuesday of each month.
- D. Next regular meeting on Tuesday, March 31, 2026 at 12:45pm

Senator Yarberry moved to end the meeting. McClellan seconded.

The meeting ended at 2:57 pm.

A. Honoring Dr. Stephanie Rose



UCA is a sponsor for this event and all proceeds go to Community Support Inc. They never send a bill to any clients and serve people throughout Arkansas. The event will be catered by Vincent's Barbeque and will be at the Willow's Event Center, which is important to me because that helps their daycare!

If anyone would like to attend, here is the information and link to tickets

[Click here to purchase tickets](#)

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ui=2&ik=aa90fefc23&attid=0.1&permmsgid=msg-f:1859306482239650039&th=19cd95650279b8f7&view=att&disp=safe&realattid=19cd955e6544d8406d12&zw>

B.

Service Animals & Service Dogs in Training (SDiT): Federal ADA & Arkansas Laws Faculty & Staff Guidance University of Central Arkansas

This document is intended to support University of Central Arkansas faculty and staff in understanding their legal obligations and best practices regarding service animals and service dogs in training (SDiT) on UCA property. Our goal is to foster an inclusive learning environment while ensuring compliance with federal ADA law, Arkansas state law, and UCA policy.

1. Legal Definitions and Scope

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Arkansas law define service animals similarly, but the ADA gives protections to more types of service animals, namely miniature horses (under a separate provision). Only dogs are recognized as service animals under titles II and III of ADA.

Service Animal:

- A dog individually trained to do work or perform tasks for an individual with a disability.

Service Dogs in Training (SDiT):

- Under Arkansas law, dogs actively being trained to become service animals are granted the same public access rights as fully trained service dogs when accompanied by a trainer and under control.

Not Service Animals Under ADA:

- Therapy Animals – Provide comfort or emotional benefit but are not trained for disability-related tasks.
- Emotional Support Animals (ESA) – Provide emotional support but do not have task-based training.

2. Documentation & Identification

Neither ADA law nor Arkansas law requires:

- Any specific ID card
- A vest, harness, or tag
- A registration or certificate for a service dog to be treated as such legally.

Note: Local dog licensing and vaccination are still required, like for any dog.

3. UCA Policy & Support

At UCA, the Office of Accessibility Resources & Services (OARS) serves as the primary point of contact for disability-related accommodations. Faculty Senate leadership encourages faculty to approach service animal questions with empathy, legal awareness, and collaboration.

OARS will email a faculty member when it is known that a student will be entering the classroom with a service animal. However, students with a service animal or SDiT are not required by law to coordinate with the UCA OARS office; though they should be encouraged to do so.

Questions or disputes should be referred to OARS or UCA legal counsel rather than handled independently.

4. Where Service Animals Are Allowed

Service animals and SDiT must be allowed in all areas where students, faculty, staff, and the public are normally permitted, including:

- Classrooms and laboratories
- Libraries and common areas
- Academic meetings and events

Faculty may NOT require documentation, proof of training, or disclosure of a disability. If the need for the service animal is not obvious, faculty may ask only two questions: *1. Is the dog required because of a disability?*

2. What work or task has the dog been trained to perform?

Faculty may contact OARS to assist with this process.

5. Where Service Animals Might Be Excluded (Limited Exceptions)

Service animals may be excluded only when their presence:

- Fundamentally alters the nature of the service or activity
 - Ex: sterile rooms like an operating room (but not patient rooms)
- Creates a legitimate safety or health risk
 - Ex: boiler rooms, wood/metal shops, or zoos where it's considered prey/predator
- Conflicts with public health regulations
 - Ex: Allowed in cafeterias and food courts, but not in the kitchen where food prep is done.
- Religious & Non-Profit: Churches, temples, mosques, synagogues, and some non-profits don't have to allow them.

Note: faculty and staff should consult with OARS or UCA legal counsel before denying a service animal access to a location unless immediate safety is a concern.

6. Removal of a Service Animal

A service animal may be asked to leave only if:

- It is out of control and the handler cannot regain control
- It is not housebroken
- It poses a direct safety risk

If removal is necessary, the individual must still be allowed to participate and receive appropriate accommodations.

7. Classroom Scenarios & Examples

Scenario A – A student attends a lecture with a service dog quietly positioned near

their desk. Faculty should proceed as normal.

Scenario B – Another student reports allergies or fear of dogs. Faculty should coordinate seating adjustments or classroom layout changes to accommodate both students without excluding the student with the service animal. Seek OARS assistance if necessary or desired.

Scenario C – A service dog begins barking repeatedly and disrupting instruction. If the handler cannot regain control, faculty may request removal of the animal, but the student must still be allowed to participate and receive accommodations.

8. Faculty Do's and Don'ts

DO:

- Welcome service animals and SDiT as part of UCA's inclusive campus culture.
- Contact OARS with questions or concerns.
- Maintain confidentiality and professionalism.

DON'T:

- Ask for medical documentation or certification.
- Pet, feed, or distract the animal.
- Treat service animals as pets.

9. Specific Location Guidance

A list of specific locations on UCA campus where service animals are or might be restricted is under development and will be added here in the future.

10. Faculty FAQs – Common Questions & Clarifications

Q: Can I require a student to register their service animal with me or provide documentation? **A: No.** Under the ADA, faculty may not require documentation, certification, or advance notice. Coordination occurs through OARS, not individual faculty.

Q: What if another student has allergies or a fear of dogs?

A: Allergies and fear are not valid reasons to exclude a service animal. Faculty should work with the students and OARS to make reasonable seating or environmental adjustments for all students.

Q: Are service dogs in training (SDiT) really allowed in class?

A: Yes. Arkansas state law grants SDiT the same public access rights as fully trained service dogs.

Q: Can I ask the student to leave if the animal disrupts class?

A: Yes. The animal may be asked to leave only if it is out of control and the handler cannot regain control. The student must still be allowed to participate and receive accommodations.

Q: What about labs, performances, or specialized classrooms?

A: Yes, Service animals and SDiT are generally permitted. Any safety concerns should be addressed collaboratively with OARS rather than through unilateral exclusion.

Q: What if I believe the animal is not a real service animal?

A: Faculty should not attempt to assess legitimacy. If concerns arise, contact OARS or UCA legal counsel for guidance.

11. Legal and Policy References

- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 28 CFR §35.136
<https://www.ada.gov/topics/service-animals/> • Arkansas Code Annotated §§ 20-14-304, 20-14-308 <https://dws.arkansas.gov/wp-content/uploads/service-animal-rights.doc>
- UCA Board Policy #414: <https://uca.edu/board/files/2010/11/414.pdf>
- UCA Office of Accessibility Resources & Services – Service Animals
<https://uca.edu/oars/faculty-resources/service-animals/>
- ADA Technical Assistance Manual <https://www.ada.gov/resources/>
- For additional information go to the ADA service animal FAQ page at
<https://www.ada.gov/resources/service-animals-faqs/>

For questions on this document contact Dr Joe Thomas, joethomas@uca.edu, 405-714-4693
UCA Office of Accessibility Resources and Services (OARS), oars@uca.edu, 501-450-3613
UCA General Counsel, <https://uca.edu/legal/>

Faculty Salary Review Committee
Annual Report
2025 – 2026



UNIVERSITY OF
CENTRAL
ARKANSAS™

Faculty Salary Review Committee

Charge

Examine and study faculty salary, merit, and equity on an ongoing basis. Make periodic adjustments to the Salary Adjustment Allocation Model. Engage in ongoing dialogue with faculty by making reports electronically available to all faculty, responding to faculty queries, and, if necessary, conducting open forums for the discussion of issues and concerns of individual faculty members.

Members

Kurt Boniecki (chair, provost designee, ex-officio, non-voting), Liz DiPrince (Torreyson Library), Kim Eskola (CHBS), Kaye McKinzie (COB), John Parrack (CAHSS), Erin Shaw (COE), Azida Walker (COSE), and Amber Hall (OIR, ex-officio, non-voting)

Meeting Dates

October 6, 2025; November 3, 2025; December 1, 2025; February 2, 2026; February 23, 2026 (see Appendix A for the minutes of each meeting)

Recommendations

The 2025-2026 Faculty Salary Review Committee recommends to the Faculty Senate that

- The salaries of all full-time continuing faculty members should be at least 90% of the target salary indicated by the current faculty pay structure.
- The university will pay a faculty member a faculty longevity bonus to those full-time continuing faculty members who are on the August 16 to August 31 payroll each year. The amount of the bonus will be determined by their continuous years in service as of August 16. The bonus will be paid on the September 15 payroll and the amount of the bonus will be determined by the following table:

Years in Service	Lower Ranks	Terminal Ranks
13 – 16	\$400	\$800
17 – 20	\$500	\$1,000
21 – 24	\$600	\$1,200
25 +	\$750	\$1,500

- A review of the faculty pay structure should occur no later than every five years.
- In cases where there are no reliable data sources for determining the target salary of a non-administrative standard plus (10-, 11-, or 12-month) faculty member, the target salary should be extrapolated from the current faculty pay structure by multiplying the 9-month target salary by the number of months of the appointment and then dividing by nine.
- The administration should fund the following in priority order:
 1. Equity adjustments to reach at least 90% of the identified target faculty salaries (Recommendation 1 above)
 2. A cost-of-living adjustment (COLA)
 3. A faculty longevity bonus that includes the lower ranks (Recommendation 2 above).

A summary of the committee's work and deliberations that led to the above recommendations follows.

Summary

During the 2025-2026 academic year, the Faculty Salary Review Committee set an agenda based on unresolved priorities from last year and new concerns brought to the committee. The committee considered the following issues.

1. Equity Adjustments Relative to Target Salaries

Last year, the FSRC recommended that “the UCA administration use the pay structures in [last year’s] report to make decisions on any market equity adjustments to faculty salaries for the coming fiscal year.” The current committee considered the administration’s stated goal to increase all faculty salaries below 90% of the target salary indicated by the pay structure to 90%.

A motion and second were made to recommend that the salaries of all full-time continuing faculty members should be at least 90% of the target salary indicated by the current faculty pay structure. Discussion followed about including 10-, 11-, and 12-month faculty (called “standard plus” faculty) given that the pay structure provides 9-month target salaries. The committee agreed that the motion includes standard plus faculty, and that their target salaries would be extrapolated according to the recommendation in Section 4 of this report. The motion carried, 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

2. Revision of the New Longevity Bonus

Last year, the FSRC recommended that “the UCA administration consider providing a career service award to Senior Lecturers/Senior Clinical Instructor and Professors who have been in the rank for more than six years consistent with promotion timelines.” The UCA administration responded by implementing an annual “longevity bonus” paid to faculty who have achieved the highest rank (Senior Lecturer, Senior Clinical Instructor, and Professor). The amount of the bonus depends on years in rank as follows: \$800 for 1 – 4 years, \$1,000 for 5 – 9 years, \$1,200 for 10 – 14 years, and \$1,500 for 15 or more years.

A concern was raised in this year’s committee that the longevity bonus disenfranchised long-serving faculty at the lower ranks. This issue was discussed by the committee last year and the committee decided to limit the recommendation to faculty in the highest rank because faculty in the lower ranks still have the opportunity to increase their salary through promotion. Last year’s committee was concerned that a bonus might decrease the incentive to apply for promotion. However, this year’s committee considered the argument that long-serving faculty at the lower-ranks still make positive contributions to UCA even though they may not meet their department’s or school’s criteria for promotion. For example, an Associate Professor may intentionally direct time away from scholarly activity

to excel at teaching or service, and as a result, fall short of their department’s benchmark for scholarship to be promoted to Professor. Their disqualification from a longevity bonus appears to devalue their contributions and might lead to lowered morale.

Therefore, the committee considered several models that included long-serving faculty at the lower ranks in the longevity bonus pool. Instead of basing the longevity bonus on years in rank, the committee considered basing the bonus on years in service. The minimum number of years required to achieve the highest faculty ranks is 12. Therefore, the committee discussed eligibility starting in the 13th year of continuous service with the amount increasing every four years: 13 – 16 years, 17 – 20, 21 – 24, and 25 or more years. To address the concern over disincentivizing promotion, the committee considered a bonus structure in which faculty in the lower ranks are paid half of what is paid to faculty in the terminal ranks. After much discussion, the following proposed revision to the longevity bonus was presented to the committee.

The university will pay a faculty member a faculty longevity bonus to those **full-time continuing** faculty members who are on the August 16 to August 31 payroll each year ~~and have achieved the highest rank: senior lecturer, senior clinical instructor, and professor.~~ The amount of the bonus will be determined by their **continuous** years in rank **of service** as of August 16. The bonus will be paid on the September 15 payroll and the amount of the bonus will be determined by the following table:

Years in Service	Lower Ranks	Terminal Ranks
13 – 16	\$400	\$800
17 – 20	\$500	\$1,000
21 – 24	\$600	\$1,200
25 +	\$750	\$1,500

The Office of Institutional Research analyzed the impact of the proposal. Based on currently available data¹, 74 additional faculty members would receive a bonus, and 5 faculty members who met the years-in-rank criteria but not the years-in-service criteria would not receive a bonus. The total cost of the proposed bonus structure is \$257,928, including benefits, compared to \$188,496 under the current model (an additional \$69,432).

A motion and a second were made to recommend the above revision to the faculty longevity bonus. Discussion followed and focused on whether faculty in the lower ranks

¹ At the time of the analysis, the years in service of 10 faculty members were not readily available and the data that was available would require additional validation.

deserve bonuses when they have a pathway to salary increases by promotion. The motion carried, 5 in favor, 1 opposed.

3. Review of the Faculty Pay Structure

Last year, the FSCR recommended that “the Office of Institutional Research work with the Faculty Salary Review Committee to review annually and appropriately update the faculty pay structures as needed, including the peer group and CIP code groupings, and communicate the revised faculty pay structures to the UCA administration.” A concern was raised that this task requires an extensive amount of work and is not feasible on an annual basis. Gallagher, the company that was hired to assist with the university salary study last year, recommended revising the pay structure every three to five years.

A motion and a second were made to recommend a review of the faculty pay structure occur no later than every five years. Discussion followed and focused on whether a review should occur every three years instead of five. The committee agreed that the recommendation is for a review to occur *no later* than every five years, but the university could decide to review faculty and staff pay structures earlier. The motion carried, 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

4. Methodology for Determining Target Salaries for “Standard Plus” Faculty

Last year, the university salary study established a faculty pay structure based on market data for nine-month faculty according to rank, years in rank, and CIP code groupings. However, a methodology for determining the target salaries for non-administrative standard plus faculty members (i.e., faculty members on 10-, 11-, and 12-month non-administrative appointments) was not finalized. In some cases, the department, college, or university has extant market data to determine an appropriate target salary for certain standard plus faculty. For example, CUPA provides market data for various library roles that can be used to determine target salaries for faculty librarians. In cases where there are no reliable data sources for determining the target salary of a standard plus faculty member, the committee considered a proposal to extrapolate the appropriate target salary from the nine-month faculty pay structure by the number of months of the appointment. For example, a 10-month faculty member’s target salary would be the nine-month salary from the pay structure based on CIP code, rank, and years in rank multiplied by $10/9^{\text{th}}$.

A motion and a second were made to recommend that, in cases where there are no reliable data sources for determining the target salary of a non-administrative standard plus faculty member, the target salary should be extrapolated from the current faculty pay structure by multiplying the 9-month target salary by the number of months of the appointment and then dividing by nine. The motion carried, 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

5. Standard Methodology for Converting Salaries of Faculty Administrators

A concern was brought to the committee that there is no standard university policy for converting the salary of a nine-month faculty member when they are appointed to 12-month administrative positions. As a result, practices have varied over the years. Most recently, nine-month salaries have been multiplied by 1.25 plus a negotiated stipend to reach an agreed upon 12-month salary in the letter of appointment. The committee considered 1.25 to be too low because 12 divided by 9 is 1.33. After discussion, the following proposal was made:

- When existing nine-month faculty are appointed to 12-month administrative positions, the minimum 12-month administrative salary will be 1.33 times the nine-month salary. An additional stipend may be negotiated. The nine-month salary and any negotiated stipend must be stated in the letter of appointment.
- When hiring external candidates into 12-month administrative positions that include a faculty appointment, the initial nine-month salary must be clearly stated in the letter of appointment and will not be less than 90% of the target salary from the current faculty pay structure.
- Any changes to the nine-month salary due to cost-of-living adjustments, market-equity adjustments, promotion raises, or other university approved salary adjustments must be documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

A motion and a second were made to recommend the above proposal. Discussion followed. Several committee members expressed concern that we did not have time to research the policies of other institutions or ask the administration to justify the 1.25 multiplier over 1.33. A motion and a second were made to table the proposal until the next academic year. The motion carried, 4 in favor, 1 opposed (one committee member was absent from the vote).

6. Review of Promotion Increases

Increases in faculty salaries as a result of promotion to a higher rank have not changed in 12 years. Currently, the salary increases for promotion are set at \$2,500 for Lecturer I to Lecturer II, \$4,000 for Lecturer II to Senior Lecturer and for Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, and \$5,500 for Associate Professor to Professor. The committee did not have time to fully investigate the promotion increases of peer institutions. However, the committee noted that the faculty pay structure provides insight into the minimum and midpoint market salaries for each rank. Therefore, a proposal was made to recommend that promotion increases should be the greater of (1) the current fixed amounts, or (2) a percentage of the minimum market salary for the next highest rank equal to the faculty

member's percentage of their target salary at the current rank. For example, if a faculty member's current salary is 90% of the target salary based on the faculty pay structure, then their salary when promoted to the next rank would be 90% of the minimum salary for that rank in the faculty pay structure *if* that amount exceeds the current fixed promotion increases.

A motion and a second were made to recommend the above proposal. Discussion followed. Several committee members expressed concern that we did not have time to research the promotion increases of other institutions or the financial impact of the proposal. A motion and a second were made to table the proposal until the next academic year. The motion carried, 5 in favor, 0 opposed (one committee member was absent from the vote).

7. Peer Group Methodology

The committee recognized that standard criteria should be established for selecting institutions to include in the peer group used to establish market salaries and the faculty pay structure. However, the committee did not deem this task to be a priority for this year given the recommendation that the faculty pay structure be reviewed every five years. Therefore, no proposal was made by the committee.

8. Faculty Salary Funding Priorities

The FSCR recognizes that there is a limited amount of funds available to adjust faculty salaries and pay. A motion and a second was made to recommend that the administration fund the following in priority order:

1. Market equity adjustments to reach at least 90% of the identified target faculty salaries (see Section 1 above)
2. A cost-of-living adjustment (COLA)
3. A faculty longevity bonus that includes the lower ranks (see Section 2 above)

The motion carried, 5 in favor, 0 opposed (one committee member was absent from the vote).

Respectfully submitted,

Faculty Salary Review Committee

March 4, 2026

Appendix A

Minutes of the Faculty Salary Review Committee

Faculty Salary Review Committee

October 6, 2025 @ 2:00 pm

Wingo Hall 214

Present: Kurt Boniecki (Chair), Amber Hall, Kaye McKinzie, Kim Eskola, Liz DiPrince, Erin Shaw, John Parrack, and Azida Walker

1. Action Item:
 - a. K. Boniecki will serve as the committee chair by assent of the committee.

2. Discussion Items:
 - a. K. Boniecki presented the charge of the committee to produce a report on the agenda findings and recommendations to the Faculty Senate by March, 2026.
 - b. K. Boniecki presented potential agenda topics to address this year and asked for input. Discussion included:
 - i. What criteria will be used to select institutions for our Peer Group?
 - ii. Does the current faculty pay structure make sense with new data? Review of the pay structure should be an annual responsibility.
 - iii. Should we reconsider a Longevity Bonus for faculty who have not been promoted to a terminal rank?
 - iv. How do we determine the market salary for faculty in administrative leadership roles and for faculty in 10, 11, and 12-month positions?
 - v. How do our step increases for promotion compare to other peer institutions?
 - c. The committee considered that some agenda items will be easier and thus quicker to address than other items. The committee re-prioritized the agenda list due to the limited number of meetings and the Faculty Senate report deadline as follows: (1) Reconsider the Faculty Longevity Bonus (2) Review of Faculty Pay Structure (3) Administrative Leadership Faculty Salaries (4) Standard Plus (10, 11, 12-month) Faculty Salaries (5) Peer Group Methodology and (6) Promotion Step Increases.

Monthly meetings will be extended to two hours. The next meeting is November 3, 2025, from 2:00 – 4:00 pm in Wingo Hall 214.

Faculty Salary Review Committee

November 3, 2025

2:00 – 4:00 pm

Wingo Hall 214

Present: Kurt Boniecki (Chair), Amber Hall, Kaye McKinzie, Kim Eskola, Erin Shaw, John Parrack, Azida Walker and Jessica Riedmueller as proxy for Liz DiPrince.

1. No action items.

- a. Minutes from the October 6, 2025, meeting were approved electronically on October 8, 2025. Kaye McKinzie made the motion, with a second by Erin Shaw. No changes or corrections were noted. Motion passed, all in favor.

2. Discussion Items:

a. Reconsideration of the Faculty Longevity Bonus

- i. The current faculty longevity bonus was paid out on September 15, 2025 to faculty who have achieved a terminal rank (Full Professor, Senior Clinical Instructor, Senior Lecturer).
- ii. The committee discussed alternative proposals to include faculty who hold lower ranks, including one that awarded differential bonuses based on years in service and rank.
- iii. The committee agreed that eligible faculty must have full-time, consecutive, continuing service to the university. Time worked as an visiting or adjunct should not count towards eligible service.
- iv. Amber Hall will present data on the number and cost of the draft proposals and discussion will continue at the next FSRC meeting in December.

b. Review Faculty Pay Structure

- i. The committee discussed how often to revise this data. How can the university address market equity if the targets are constantly changing?
- ii. The committee agreed to recommend that the pay structure be revised every five years.

c. Standard Plus Faculty Salaries

- i. There are currently 21 Standard Plus (10, 11, 12-month) faculty who do not have a determined market salary.
- ii. The committee discussed how to calculate a 9-month market salary for 10, 11, and 12-month faculty. The following formula was proposed: Standard Plus market salary = (9-month market salary / 9) x

number of contract months. Thus, a Standard Plus faculty salary can be converted to a 9-month standard salary by dividing the salary by the number of contract months and multiplying by 9.

iii. Discussion will continue.

d. Administrative Leadership Faculty Salaries

i. The salaries of faculty in academic leadership positions (chairs, school directors, associate deans, deans, etc.) depend on their negotiated contracts. For internal hires, salaries were often calculated by multiplying the 9-month salary by 1.25 plus a negotiated stipend. For external hires, their contract should include a “walk back” to a 9-month faculty salary plus and COLA and market increases since being hired.

ii. Amber Hall works with Lori Hudspeth to maintain a 9-month “walk back” for all faculty in academic leadership positions that is adjusted annually based on COLA and market.

iii. A proposal was made to recommend that academic leadership salaries use a standard conversion equal to the 9-month salary x 1.33 + a negotiated stipend because 12 months is 1.33 times more than 9 months. The committee wondered if 1.25 was used as the multiplier because academic leadership positions accrue leave, whereas faculty positions due not.

iv. Discussion will continue.

e. Promotion Step Increases

i. Amber Hall did some preliminary investigation of the promotion increases at other peer institutions and will present that information at a later date.

The next meeting is Monday, December 1, 2025, from 2:00-4:00 pm in Wingo Hall, room 214.

Faculty Salary Review Committee
December 1, 2025 @ 2:00 pm
Wingo Hall 214

Present: Kurt Boniecki (Chair), Kaye McKinzie, Kim Eskola, Erin Shaw, John Parrack, Azida Walker, Liz DiPrince

Absent: Amber Hall

1. No action items.
 - a. Minutes from the November 3, 2025, meeting were approved electronically on November 19, 2025. Kaye McKinzie made the motion, with a second from Kim Eskola. One change was made to the minutes. Motion passed, five in favor and one abstention. The approved minutes were sent to the Faculty Senate president.
2. Discussion Items:
 - a. Faculty Longevity Bonus
 - i. The committee examined revised drafts and data provided by Amber Hall.
 - ii. Amber will provide updated data including faculty at the Assistant Professor, Clinical Instructor I, and Lecturer I ranks who meet the years-in-service.
 - iii. The committee was asked to obtain feedback from their constituents.
 - iv. The committee will vote on a final recommendation at the conclusion of the committee's work this academic year.
 - b. Faculty Pay Structure
 - i. Completed. The recommendation is to reevaluate every five years.
 - c. Standard-Plus Faculty
 - i. The committee agreed on using the following formula to calculate a 9-month equivalence for market comparison: divide salary by the number of months worked x 9
 - ii. Any nine-month market adjustment would be proportionally adjusted by dividing by 9 and multiplying by the number of months worked.
 - iii. Librarians are not included as standard-plus faculty. They have their own pay structure based on data from CUPA.
 - d. Administrative Leadership Faculty Salaries

- i. The committee agreed on using the following formula to convert a 9-month faculty salary to a 12-month administrative leadership salary:
9-month salary x 1.33 + stipend
 - ii. Should there be a minimum stipend?
 - iii. The calculation will only apply to internal hires. External hires must have an initial 9-month walk-back salary stipulated in their offer letter.
 - iv. The 9-month salary should be adjusted annually based on COLA and market.
 - v. The adjusted 9-month walk-back salary should be stated in a letter every year.
- e. Promotion Step Increases
 - i. Amber will provide information at the next meeting.
- f. Peer Group Methodology
 - i. The committee agree they will not examine the peer group methodology at this time, but it may be considered next academic year.

The next FSRC meeting is scheduled for February 2, 2026 at 2:00 pm in Wingo Hall 214

Faculty Salary Review Committee
February 2, 2026 @ 2:30 pm
Wingo Hall 214

Present: Kurt Boniecki (Chair), Kaye McKinzie, Kim Eskola, Erin Shaw, John Parrack, Azida Walker, Liz DiPrince, Amber Hall

1. No action items.
 - a. Minutes from the December 1, 2025, meeting were approved electronically on January 8, 2026. Kaye McKinzie made the motion, with a second from Erin Shaw. Motion passed, all in favor. The approved minutes were sent to the Faculty Senate president.
2. Discussion items:
 - a. Reconsider Faculty Longevity Bonus
 - i. The committee reviewed updated data provided by Amber Hall. To include the additional faculty (12) with first ranks that meet the years-in-service criteria would currently cost an additional \$9,174. The committee will consider a longevity bonus model that includes all full-time continuing faculty based on continuous years-in-service.
 - ii. The committee considered other recommendations for no changes to the faculty longevity bonus and / or to do the same pay out as last year.
 - iii. The committee discussed the difference between “continuous service” and “continuing faculty”.
 - b. Standard-Plus Faculty Salaries
 - i. Kurt Boniecki clarified that the target salary for faculty in 10-, 11-, and 12-month positions who do not have a nine-month salary defined in their letter of appointment should be determined by either (1) extrapolating the appropriate 9-month salary from the faculty pay structure to the number of months required of the position, or (2) a justified recommendation from the department chair or school director approved by the dean and provost.
 - c. Administrative Leadership Faculty Salaries
 - i. The committee is considering recommending that a minimum salary for 12-month academic administrators with 9-month faculty appointments be equal to their 9-month salary x 1.33. An additional stipend may be negotiated.

- ii. The committee discussed whether they had enough data to recommend a range for administrative stipends at this time.
 - iii. This recommendation would be for new administrative leadership. Existing leadership would be held to their current letters of appointment but may request to renegotiate.
 - iv. Academic administrators' 9-month salaries should be adjusted annually based on COLA, market equity, or other approved salary adjustments and recorded in their personnel files.
- d. Promotion Step Increases
- i. The committee discussed if they have enough data to make an informed recommendation.
 - ii. The committee is considering recommending the greater of (1) current fixed amount or (2) same percentage of target salary for next rank.
 - iii. Amber will provide a budget analysis of this recommendation for the next meeting.
3. Kurt Boniecki will draft a final report on all the recommendations and distribute the information to the committee members before the next meeting. The committee will vote on their final recommendations and priority order at the meeting on March 2, 2026.

The next FSRC meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 2, 2026, at 2:30 pm in Wingo Hall 214.

Faculty Salary Review Committee
February 23, 2026 @ 2:30 pm
Wingo Hall 214

Present: Kurt Boniecki, Kaye McKinzie (via Zoom), Kim Eskola, Erin Shaw, John Parrack, Azida Walker, and Amber Hall (NV)

Absent: Liz DiPrince (comments and votes on action items submitted prior to the meeting)

The committee discussed the draft annual report and took action on the following items:

1. Equity Adjustments Relative to Target Salaries
 - a. John Parrack made the motion to recommend the administration's stated goal to increase all faculty salaries below 90% of the target salary indicated by the pay structure to 90%. Kim Eskola seconded the motion. Discussion ensued. "All faculty" should explicitly state "full-time continuing" and include "Standard-Plus" faculty as outlined in subsequent sections of the report. Motion passed, all in favor.
2. Revision of the New Longevity Bonus
 - a. Kim Eskola made the motion to recommend the revision as summarized in the draft report. John Parrack seconded the motion. Discussion ensued. The term "terminal rank" will be used instead of "higher rank". Motion passed, five in favor and one opposed.
3. Review of the Faculty Pay Structure
 - a. Kaye McKinzie made the motion to recommend a review of the faculty pay structure every five years. Kim Eskola seconded the motion. Discussion followed. Motion passed, all in favor.
4. Methodology for Determining Market Salaries for "Standard Plus" Faculty
 - a. Kim Eskola made the motion to recommend in cases where there are no reliable data sources for determining the market salary of a standard plus faculty member, to extrapolate the appropriate target salary from the nine-month faculty pay structure by the number of months of the appointment. Kaye McKinzie seconded the motion. Discussion followed. If data other than the pay structure are available, then a target salary will be determined in consultation with the Department Chair/School Director, Dean, and Provost. Standard Plus faculty do not include faculty administrators. Motion passed, all in favor.
5. Standard Methodology for Converting Salaries of Faculty Administrators

- a. Kim Eskola made the motion to recommend the proposal as outlined in the draft report. Kaye McKinzie seconded the motion. Discussion followed. Members expressed concern that there was not enough time to research and not enough data to support changing the 1.25 multiplier to 1.33. The committee would like to know what peer institutions are doing. John Parrack made the motion to table the proposal until next academic year. Kim Eskola seconded the motion. Motion passed to table the proposal until next year, with four in favor and one opposed.
6. Review of Promotion Increases
 - a. Kim Eskola made the motion to recommend that promotion increases should be the greater of (1) the current fixed amounts, or (2) a percentage of the minimum market salary for the next highest rank equal to the faculty member's percentage of their target salary at the current rank. Erin Shaw seconded the motion. Discussion ensued. Members expressed concern that there was not enough data to support the recommendation and would like to explore other models for promotion increases, especially since not everyone is at 90% of their target salary. Kim made the motion to table the proposal until next academic year. John Parrack seconded the motion. Motion passed, five in favor and none opposed.
7. Faculty Salary Funding Priorities
 - a. Kaye McKinzie made the motion to recommend that the administration fund the following in priority order:
 - i. Equity adjustments to reach at least 90% of the identified target faculty salaries.
 - ii. A cost-of-living adjustment (COLA)
 - iii. A faculty longevity bonus that includes lower ranks.Erin Shaw seconded the motion. The motion passed, five in favor and none opposed.

Kurt Boniecki will draft a second revision of the FSRC annual report for committee review before submitting the final report to the Faculty Senate.

This concludes the work of the Faculty Salary Review Committee for this academic year. No further meetings are scheduled.