



UNIVERSITY OF
CENTRAL
ARKANSAS™

FACULTY
SENATE

Minutes

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

12:45 pm

Wingo 315

I. Call to order: FS President Dunlap: 12:48

Present:

Provost Hargis

FS President Dunlap & VP Thomas

Senators:

At Large: Mukherjee, Spivey, Rosenow

CAHSS: Burley, Craun, Mayhew

CHBS: Rose, Downey, Jamerson

COE: Buchannan, Couture

COB: Appiah-Otto, McCalman, Britton

COSE: Yarberry, Naumiec (excused absence) Johnson

Honors: Frank

Library: Lebeau-Ford

II. Approval of Minutes from Faculty Senate meeting 3/31/2026

Motion to approve: Yarberry. Second: Rosenow.

Ayes: 13 Abstentions: 2 (3 Senators arrived after the vote)

Minutes Approved

III. Comments

A. Provost Hargis

I have nothing specific except to thank the Faculty for continuing to do their best for our students during this last push of the semester.

B. FS President Dunlap

- 1) WE DID IT! We had 306 votes cast and all motions passed.

Amendment 1 passed with 96.5% approval

Amendment 2 passed with 84.4% approval

Amendment 3 passed with 99.4% approval.

- 2) Here are the results of the college senatorial elections:

CAHSS–Phillip Spivey

CHBS–Tisha Jenkins

COE–Michelle Buchanan

COSE–Faith Yarberry

COB–There will be a run-off election.

- 3) We are about to have At-Large elections. More information soon.

- 4) Finally, Thank you for continuing to do the work of the Faculty Senate, which can often feel unending, unimportant, and unseen. I want you to know that I appreciate each of you.

IV. Invited Guests

A. SGA Executive President Kylie McGraw was unable to attend, but asked the FS to promote SGA's continuing need for faculty advisors.

SGA desperately needs faculty advisors, particularly with specific skills—such as financial management. They usually have five Faculty Advisors at any given time. The Financial Advisor does not have to attend the regular (and frequent) meetings. The regular advisors attend meetings on a rotating basis, so not every meeting. Please spread the word among the Faculty.

B. UCAPD Chief John Merguie and Dean of Students Kelly Owens to discuss campus safety and processes for reporting unsafe behavior.

Highlights of Chief Merguie's presentation:

- 1) Anytime the Faculty have questions for the Police Department, please reach out. We are always happy to speak with you. After reading over the constituent

concern reported in the FS minutes, I prepared what I hope are some relevant comments:

- a) Every year we publish the Cleary Report which identifies any violent incident on campus. It is posted on our website (upper-right of page)
 - b) We also publish a Daily Crime Log on our Department website that lists every incident (even minor infractions/acts) that took place during a given day.
 - c) All police reports are available through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). You can also ask me directly, but there may be limits regarding the details that can be shared.
 - d) A police report HAS to be filed by the victim. It can not be reported by a third-party. However, if there is something going on that you feel should be investigated, call us (not your supervisor or administration) and we can start the process to see if a crime has occurred. This includes our consultation with the Dean of Students if the incident is not clearly a crime but deserves some type of action.
 - e) YOU DO NOT HAVE TO UNDERSTAND THE LAW OR KNOW THAT YOU ARE A VICTIM TO CALL THE POLICE. IF YOU FEEL UNCOMFORTABLE, CALL US!
-
- 2) Irby Hall classrooms are lockable. The glass in the doors is meshed safety glass, so it will take quite a while to break-in. It is a delaying tactic to allow escape through a window or contact with Police. Barricade in place and out of direct line of sight from the door if possible. It will take us under two minutes to arrive after contact. Officers are trained to engage with the threat immediately upon arrival—not wait for some number of officers to arrive.

 - 3) We are happy to offer training seminars for threat-response and active-shooter scenarios. We are also trained in de-escalation strategies.

Question: Could you provide the de-escalation training for faculty?

- A) Perhaps the Counseling Center would be better prepared for this, but we can get with them and look into some sort of joint training.

Question: Faculty are not trained at all to recognize the line between student misbehavior and criminal misbehavior. Could you speak a bit about recognizing that?

- A) A key identifier is an explosive or uncontrolled outbursts perhaps intended to

generate a response from another person (i.e.--intimidation). That level of uncertainty suggests that you should call us to ascertain the threat and help support your response.

(Additional point from Dean Owens) A UCA PD response to any call regarding a student automatically generates a report that goes to the Dean of Student.

Question: If there is an issue and I call, where does it go—who do I ask for?

- A) If I call 911 from my cell phone—where does it go? And who should I ask for?
 - a) It will go to regular county 911 dispatch, so you should begin your call by saying that you are on UCA's campus. They will immediately push your call to us.
 - b) Calls to the regular UCA Police number (501-450-3111) will be treated as an emergency call, so you can call that number as well.

Dean Owens' Comments:

FYI—We DO have a centralized database to collect student issue reports called Maxient. Student Concern calls automatically create a file in Maxient. This includes any discipline issue. You can also use the anonymous text line and the Dean of Students Office will create a Maxient report for that as well.

My office does our best to investigate and evaluate student well-being and behavior concerns. However, no system can be 100% effective. Rest assured, we make every decision regarding student discipline with the best interest of UCA's broader community in mind.

I am happy to come speak with departments or individual Faculty, Students, and Staff.

We also need your help regarding Student Care Reports. The number of these means that we may not automatically get back to you with updates. If you have a question about a specific situation, please contact us. We will certainly discuss it with you and follow up on what has happened. If I'm not there, leave me a message. I will get back to you asap.

Question: Can we be notified regarding students who have documented behavioral issues/safety concerns?

- A) There may be legal concerns, and this may run the risk of prejudicing faculty views regarding particular students (who may be cleaning up their actions). Still, I can explore this issue with UCA's Legal Counsel.

Question: Do you know how many class-attendance related issues you've had this year?

- A) Many. We will notify a faculty member when a student is out. We just pass that on to the Faculty member—but the Faculty member has the decision regarding whether this violates a class-attendance policy or whether make-up work is allowed. We don't make that decision. We tell the student this.

Provost Hargis: Please make certain that your attendance policy is clearly articulated and that your Chair is fully involved in its application.

V. Constituent Concerns

- 1) An instructor suspects students were using AI during an in-class exam. Are there any recommendations regarding a response?**

- A) Faculty need to be aware that this is a possibility. Each instructor should decide how to police this within their classroom, but it is a serious issue—unfortunately one without a simple or universal solution.

2) The requirement that more than 50% of the total faculty association must vote on constitutional amendments creates an unnecessary bottleneck. Our current safeguards—advance notice and a two-thirds approval rating among voters—already ensure that only well-vetted, consensus-driven changes pass. Currently, vital updates to organizational structure or governance language frequently fail not due to opposition, but due to participation rates. This forces the Senate to expend redundant effort on non-controversial measures and prevents the body from being truly responsive to its members.

The UCA Staff Senate Constitution only requires a majority of participating voters. Amending the Faculty Senate Constitution to require 2/3 approval by participating voters for constitutional amendments would hopefully make it easier to update and reflect the level of concern required for each issue.

- A) Yes, the requirement that over half of the faculty association must vote on constitutional amendments for the vote to count appears burdensome. However, this is an important safeguard. The Faculty Senate represents the faculty association to the administration, helps to communicate from the administration to the faculty, and helps to shape university policy that affects

academics and faculty. The Faculty Senate Constitution serves as guidance and guardrails for these activities and should not be altered without due consideration and faculty input.

The $\frac{2}{3}$ approval requirement alone is not sufficient. It is possible that only a few people would vote, and the constitution would be altered with the approval of only a very small contingent. I know this leaves us with the argument that only those who care and are engaged will vote, but if faculty are not engaged with the work of Faculty Senate, then the answer is to figure out how to better engage them—not make control by the minority easier.

There is the possibility of changing the rules to ease the passage of non-substantive changes to the Constitution—such as grammar corrections or the elimination of terminology that is no longer applicable. These ideas may be debated in future senates.

3) Four faculty parking spots (yellow) by the cafeteria were commandeered by the Aramark GM over spring break. When questioned, the UCA police stated that the GM indicated the need due to staff often using personal vehicles for food transportation. The report also noted that these lost faculty parking spots were not replaced. The question is not whether or not the Aramark employees needed the space, but rather about the procedure for “claiming” parking from one type to another. For example, can a student organization put in a request, and have parking spots repainted without discussion or replacement?

A. I am unsure about the procedure here. I do know that both Physical Plant and UCAPD are involved in parking decisions. I can reach out to Kevin Carter, Associate VP of Facilities, and Katie Ray Pickett, UCAPD Parking and Traffic, to get more information about these procedures. We will also contact Amy Whitehead, Chief of Staff.

4) **A student shared their extreme frustration the other day regarding their health and safety in Carmichael. Below is their direct quote: “The dorm jeopardizes student safety with a floor finish that makes me slip in rugged rubber sole hiking boots (genuinely how does that work?) but don’t worry slip mats are on order eventually (couldn’t go out to Walmart on a company card?) What was the new floor supposed to fix? Why was it added in the first place? It’s ugly, it’s dangerous, and the entire bathroom is covered in a coat of loose paint particles which I’m curious is safe for bathrooms with so much steam. Do I involuntarily ingest these particles? Why isn’t that cleaned off?” This highlights serious concerns related to slipping hazards and potential health risks from environmental conditions. These issues warrant immediate review to ensure student safety.**

A) (From Kevin Carter, Associate Vice President for Facilities):

This was brought to my attention a few weeks ago. I investigated and found the flooring to be installed according to specification, with the correct anti-slip aggregate embedded in the paint. With my shoes on, the floor provided adequate traction. When wet, the floor did become slippery. However, this is the case with any hard surface bathroom floor, i.e., ceramic tile, polished concrete, vinyl, etc. If students don't dry their feet before exiting the shower, there is a potential that they could slip and fall. Students are also leaving the shower curtains open, allowing water to flood the bathrooms. We did order some commercial bathmats to try out. They are similar to the type around swimming pools. They are very expensive, so we ordered a few to try out before ordering enough for the entire building. They seem to be working great, so we just placed an order for the rest of the building. The cost of the mats is around \$6,000.

The new flooring surface was installed because the previous surface had worn very unevenly, causing it to be very difficult to clean. It had lots of cracks and crevices that made it unsanitary. As for the concerns with the aesthetics, I think it

looks much better than it did before. I did not notice any "loose particles" when I last inspected, but I will swing by again today to make sure something else hasn't happened in the past couple of weeks.

5) At the October 30, 2025 Faculty Senate meeting, the senators discussed a constituent concern that related to the ACCESS law. The minutes reflect that, while the Senate declined to offer faculty a good-faith reading of the actual prohibitions contained in the law, President Davis and Provost Hargis would consider producing a guidelines document sometime in the spring.

The November 11, 2025 Faculty Senate meeting minutes recorded an update from President Davis: "Provost Hargis and I are working with other leaders to create a 'status document' for our work toward compliance with the ACCESS legislation and any other related state laws and regulations. We expect that this will capture where we stand as we close the fall semester of 2025 and will be something that we can update and complement through the next couple of years as state and federal developments unfold."

Could we please get an update on this work? When can faculty expect to receive guidelines that reflect the university's interpretation of the ACCESS Act and relevant executive orders in relation to faculty expertise in their discipline and the university's stated commitment to the free pursuit of knowledge?

Since August 2025, syllabi have been censored, at least one book has been banned from a class reading list, and a university spokesperson declared to news media that one or more classes would never be taught again irrespective of the established curriculum review processes. These actions have been taken under the guise of complying with the ACCESS Act or an executive order, but no textual evidence from the laws has been provided to substantiate these actions when faculty have requested it.

Clearer guidance can help faculty better plan courses and choose reading lists that not only comply with state and federal laws but also conform to the university's interpretations of those laws.

A) FS President Dunlap: Thank you to this constituent for reminding me of this important matter, and on behalf of the Faculty Senate, I apologize for not

updating the faculty body on this issue. Provost Hargis presented an ACCESS compliance update to the Board of Trustees at their February 26 meeting. This update was given in the public forum of a Board meeting in part to be as transparent as possible. During this update Provost Hargis explained that the university's established curricular review process, which includes department to college to provost review, was utilized to provide curricular review for ACCESS compliance but was done at an accelerated pace.

I understand that many faculty would like detailed guidance and if/then statements to help with understanding of state law when most of us do not routinely read legal language. I am inclined to this myself, and agree that specific guidance might allow faculty to better plan courses. However, by utilizing our established review processes we can preserve our academic freedom while still being in compliance with the ACCESS bill because our review structure is multi-layered and calls for evaluation by several units so that curriculum can be assessed for both content as usual and ACCESS compliance.

Some syllabi and class content have been altered in response to the ACCESS bill, and some have been tabled pending further review and revision. With the early confusion regarding ACCESS compliance in Fall 2025, Faculty Senate received some concerns regarding immediate revision of course content. Individual senators or myself reviewed these to the best of our ability, and while the revisions were done quickly they were not done in isolation. Faculty Senate is happy to seek guidance on behalf of faculty regarding ACCESS compliance or any other topic, and while we understand the desire to remain anonymous in many situations, if a faculty member has a specific concern regarding a course change made due to legislative changes or other reasons, Faculty Senate is best able to intercede on behalf of the faculty if we have as much specific knowledge about the situation as possible.

Faculty Senate appreciates faculty engagement in our campus community, and especially in issues that involve how and what we teach and how that impacts our students' success in and out of our classrooms.

- A) **Provost Hargis:** Thank you to the constituent for raising this concern, and more broadly, thank you to our faculty, school directors and department chairs, and deans for the significant work that has gone into navigating ACCESS

implementation over the past several months. I recognize this has required thoughtful engagement under compressed timelines, and I appreciate the care and professionalism demonstrated across our academic units. This work has reflected coordination across departments, colleges, and shared governance structures, consistent with our shared commitment to thoughtful and collaborative review.

Status of ACCESS Guidance

I want to be direct on the question of guidance: a separate, centralized document interpreting the ACCESS Act is not planned. I recognize that is not the answer many faculty were hoping for, and I understand the frustration that comes with navigating unfamiliar legal language without more prescriptive institutional guidance.

This was a deliberate decision, not an oversight. A single, rule-heavy compliance document would have effectively removed curricular decision-making from the faculty, departments, chairs, deans, and colleges who are best positioned to evaluate how legal requirements intersect with disciplinary expertise and academic context. Shared governance is not simply a procedural formality; it is the appropriate mechanism for these judgments, and centralizing compliance into a prescriptive document would have undermined it.

With respect to the status documents and updates referenced in prior communications, my February presentation to the Board of Trustees was designed to serve that purpose. The status update was delivered in a public forum intentionally, in the interest of transparency, and reflects where the university stands as we move forward. That presentation also addresses both the ACCESS Act and relevant executive orders, both of which have informed our compliance work.

I also want to be candid about the nature of this environment: this is not purely a legal exercise with a fixed body of text to interpret and apply. It is also an evolving environment in which additional guidance from the state may or may not materialize.

Our goal has been to ensure that the university's footing is firm as that landscape continues to develop, while preserving the shared governance structures that protect academic integrity.

Questions regarding specific legal interpretation have been addressed through consultation with the Office of General Counsel and appropriate institutional channels. While not every determination has been reduced to a written, distributable interpretation, decisions have been grounded in legal review and institutional responsibility.

Clarification of Reported Actions

Several claims included in the concern do not fully reflect what occurred, and I want to address them directly. I also recognize that when faculty experience disruption to their courses and materials (whatever the process behind it) that experience is real and the concern it generates is understandable.

In some cases, syllabi and course materials were reviewed and, where necessary, revised through established academic processes to ensure alignment with state law. That is a standard function of academic oversight, particularly in a changing regulatory environment. Faculty whose courses were affected received communication through their deans and department chairs as part of that process.

Similarly, there has been no blanket prohibition on books. In limited cases, course materials were reviewed for compliance with state law, and where a particular text was determined not to meet those requirements, alternative materials were required. I recognize that, from a faculty perspective, this can feel restrictive, and I do not want to minimize that experience.

These decisions were not made in isolation, but through established departmental and college-level processes, with communication occurring through chairs and deans.

To my knowledge, no course has been permanently removed outside of established curricular processes. In some cases, courses were paused for further review at the department and college level, consistent with our governance model.

Scope of Compliance Efforts

I want to be explicit on this point: our compliance efforts have been scoped to curriculum and curricular review. We have made no effort to curtail or restrict faculty research, scholarship, or creative activity. The university remains fully committed to the free pursuit of knowledge in those domains, and nothing in our ACCESS compliance work has been intended to reach beyond the curricular context.

Academic Freedom and Institutional Responsibility

We remain committed to the principles of academic freedom. At the same time, as a public institution, we are required to operate within state law, Board policy, and coordinating board expectations.

Our approach has been to maintain the appropriate balance:

- Faculty retain primary responsibility for curriculum through shared governance
- The institution ensures compliance with applicable law and relevant executive orders
- Decisions are made through established, multi-level academic processes

This is consistent with the expectations outlined by the American Association of University Professors, which emphasize both faculty responsibility for curriculum and the role of the institution in governance and oversight.

Engagement, Support, and Clarity

I want to acknowledge that the desire for clearer guidance is understandable. State law, regulatory language, and executive orders are not always written in ways that are easily translated into day-to-day curricular decisions, and faculty are right to seek clarity as they plan courses and select materials.

Throughout this process, we have worked to provide support consistent with shared governance. Members of our leadership team (including the Office of General Counsel, our legislative liaison, deans, school directors and chairs, and Academic Affairs leadership) have remained available to meet with departments and colleges to discuss questions, challenges, and specific curricular considerations as they arise. Faculty with specific concerns should bring them forward through their department chairs and deans.

Our intent has been to create space for departments and colleges to engage thoughtfully in course and curriculum review, rather than replacing that work with centralized directives. That space is essential to ensuring that decisions remain grounded in disciplinary expertise while also aligned with institutional and legal expectations.

Moving Forward

Faculty should continue to work through the established curricular process:

Faculty → Department → Chair → College → Provost

We have also reinforced expectations that:

- Curriculum resides within departments and programs

- Regular review of course content is part of ongoing academic responsibility embedded in the annual review process
- Changes or concerns should be addressed through established governance structures

I want to close by again recognizing the significant effort that faculty, department chairs, deans, and academic leaders have invested in this work. Navigating new legal requirements and an evolving environment while upholding our commitments to academic quality and shared governance is not simple, and it has required careful judgment at every level of the institution.

I appreciate the continued engagement of the Faculty Senate and the broader faculty as we move forward, and I remain committed to ensuring this work reflects both our academic values and our institutional responsibilities.

(In addition to his comments, Provost Hargis provided the slides from his February presentation to the Board of Trustees. Because of their length, these are ITEM B at the bottom of these minutes)

Senator's Questions:

- 1) The law says nothing about specific texts, and I fear that when we preemptively remove or disqualify texts in a curriculum review we may be breaking the spirit of the ACCESS Law and perhaps needlessly censoring literature. Is there some appeal process for faculty to look to in response to a Chair's review?**

- a) I appreciate the concern embedded in your question, particularly around maintaining alignment with both the letter and the spirit of the law while also preserving the integrity of academic decision-making.

The primary venue for these discussions should remain at the department level. Faculty should proactively work with their department chair to present the academic rationale for specific materials, including their role in the course, connection to learning outcomes, associated assignments, and their place within the broader departmental curriculum.

Those conversations are important and should be grounded in disciplinary expertise.

If additional guidance is needed, department chairs are expected to bring those questions forward through their college-level chair council, including consultation with the dean. This ensures that decisions are not made in isolation and benefit from broader academic review. If, after that review, additional guidance is still needed, the dean is expected to bring the matter forward to the Provost for further review and a final decision.

More broadly, our expectation is that these matters are addressed through a shared governance process at the department and college levels whenever possible, with escalation used when necessary. The goal is not to preemptively remove materials, but to ensure that curricular decisions are both academically grounded and aligned with institutional and legal expectations.

- b) One Senator noted that a faculty member could appeal to the Academic Freedom Committee if they believe that a decision has not been handled appropriately at the Department, College, or University level. This committee convenes a panel of randomly selected faculty who review the matter and report to the President who is empowered to follow or disregard the committee's decision at his discretion.

2) Is UCA working with other State Universities regarding these issues?

- a) Yes, we continue to be in regular communication with other State universities.

VI. Senate Committee Reports

A. Committee on Committees: Filling of 2026 -2027 committees is ongoing
Nominations to FS Committees continue to come in from the Deans.

B. Faculty Affairs: Faculty salary review process questionnaire
Please see the revised questionnaire after the input of Dr. Toth. We
would like to get the document out as quickly as possible.

Senator Yarberry moved to approve the survey. Senator Mukherjee
seconded. Votes: Ayes--17 (1 Senator had to leave beforehand)

Motion Passes.

C. Academic Affairs:

Thank you for the constitutional amendments voting campaign!
Signage really helped--thank you to the Committee for getting them
created and placed around campus.

D. Faculty Advocacy and Engagement Committee:

- 1) We did meet with Dr. Fetterley regarding the Teaching Excellence
Award Criteria. A report with our recommendations will come later.

- 2) We propose to hold a celebration of Mid-Late Career Faculty (more
than 10 years continuous service) on April 23, in the skyboxes
overlooking The Stripes of Estes Field. This event will be cohosted by
CETAL. Invited Faculty will need to submit their response to a single
survey question in lieu of a ticket. We are designing the specific
question, but something akin to: "Aside from pay, how can we help you
feel more engaged and fulfilled at UCA?"

We have developed a tentative budget of \$1000 + plus additional
funds from the Foundation. May we move forward?

Senator Craun moved to give the remaining \$1050 of this year's FS budget
to this committee in order to support the event. Senator Rosenow
seconded.

Votes: Ayes 17. **Motion passed.**

VIII. New Business

Vote on Faculty Handbook changes submitted by the Faculty Handbook Committee at the 3/31/2026 meeting (ITEM A at the end of these minutes).

Sen. Yarberry moved to approve. Sen Rose Seconded. Vote: Ayes 16.

Motion passed.

IX. For the Good of the Faculty

X. Reminders and Announcements:

A. Faculty Senate meetings are now held on the second and last Tuesday of each month.

B. Next regular meeting on Tuesday, April 28, 2026 at 11 am

Sen. Craun moved to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 3:03.

ITEM A: **Faculty Handbook- Board Policy No. 300**

The UCA *Faculty Handbook* Committee recommends revisions to the opening pages, document, and chapters three and seven of the current *Faculty Handbook*. The following is a summary of the recommended revisions:

- Opening Pages:
 - o Cover page: modify date of the document
 - o Title page: modify date of Board approval (pg. i)
 - o Table of Contents: modify page numbers (pg. iv-vii)
- Document:
 - o Clerical revisions to handbook
- Chapter Three:
 - o II.B. Remove definition of “close relative” and reference Board Policy for clarification (pg. 12)
 - o III.B.: add language to specify offering years of credit for promotion of non-tenure track faculty (pg. 15)
 - o IV.A.4.: revise language to specify the promotion to professor timeline (pg. 20)
 - o IV.B.3.: revise language to specify the promotion to senior lecture/senior clinical instructor/senior laboratory instructor timeline (pg. 20)
 - o V.D.: revise language to specify the promotion to professor timeline (pg. 23)
 - o VII.: edit procedure and revise language to align with tenure-track guidelines (pg.29- 30)
- Chapter Seven:
 - o I.D.2.: add current president of the senate will record meeting minutes (pg. 65)
 - o II.F.: revise language to clarify committee initiative (pg. 68)
- Correction:
 - o Correct one error in the Faculty Handbook resolution submitted for approval to the Board of Trustees on May 21, 2024.
 - Chapter Seven: I.D.2.: Change the not affiliated designee to specify Honors College or Torreyson Library (pg. 65)

The recommendations of the *Faculty Handbook* Committee have been considered and endorsed by the Faculty Senate, and other appropriate administrators.

Therefore, the President recommends the following resolution to the Board of Trustees.

“BE IT RESOLVED: That the Board of Trustees hereby approves the above

revisions to the UCA *Faculty Handbook*.”

ITEM B: Provost Hargis' Presentation Slides



Institutional Alignment with ACCESS and Related Governance Expectations

- Public university governance responsibilities
 - Part of our ongoing institutional stewardship efforts
 - ADHE/AHECB implementation guidance
- Ongoing commitment to shared governance and academic integrity



Actions Taken as Part of This Work

- Curriculum and Courses
 - Renamed UCA core pillar: Global Learning
 - Course title and content review
 - Some courses paused for further review by Departments and Colleges
- Common Course Numbering
 - Across all institutions in Arkansas
 - Designed to help students transfer between institutions
- Committee Structures and Charge Review

- Across all reviews, we have worked to maintain a commitment to shared governance and academic integrity.

Actions Carrying Forward

- Regular Course and Curriculum Review Process
 - Solidified expectations that curriculum lives within Department, College, and/or University governing structures (e.g., UCA Core) and those units will regularly review course content and support materials
- Annual Review Expectations
 - Individual Faculty → Department → Chair → College → Provost
- Common Course Numbering
- State Common Application