



UNIVERSITY OF  
**CENTRAL  
ARKANSAS™**

**FACULTY  
SENATE**

**Minutes**  
**Tuesday, 8 Sept 2026**  
**12:45 pm**  
**Wingo 315**

**Present:**

President Davis  
Provost Hargis  
FS President Thomas

**Senators:**

**At Large:** Rowley, Rosenow (excused absence)  
**CAHSS:** Craun, Spivey, Burley (excused absence)  
**CHBS:** Downey, Jamerson, Jenkins  
**COB:** Fang, Britton, Horpendahl  
**COE:** McClellan, Buchanan, Couture (excused absence)  
**COSE:** Johnson, Yarberry, Naumiec  
**Honors:** Franks  
**Library:** Lebeau-Ford

**I. Call to order:** FS President Thomas: 12:47 PM

**II. Notification of Approval of Minutes**

**Electronic Vote results:** 12 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstentions. Minutes Approved

**III. Comments**

**A. President Davis**

Thanks for a few minutes, I wanted to give a bit of an update regarding analysis and conversations about our UCA Health Care Plan.

- 1) First, I want to remind you all that our plan is a self-funded plan as opposed to a fully insured plan. What that means is that we pay (out of line 11 of the budget) the actual healthcare claims incurred by our employees and dependents. Those claims are not paid from some external corporate account here or in some other state. We also pay - out of our line 11 for administrative costs and services such as protections like stop-loss coverage. This means that an individual's copay and UCA's portion cover the costs of all health care services.

I know that you all follow the news and see and hear the conversations nationally about healthcare costs and sustainability. We are all hearing tough stories about program insolvency and cost increases of 20% and above, but we want to do everything that we can to mitigate cost increases to employees while maintaining a program that is sustainable and keeps the quality of coverage that we require.

UCA chose to be self-insured as a means to mitigate price escalation and have some say over the quality and coverage of our plans, and we've worked to hold down employee costs by having the goal to cover 75% of costs (leaving 25% for the

employee) from the university budget. Self-Funding is substantially less expensive than outsourced fully-insured plans and allows us to control coverage options and benefits and do things like work toward pharmacy benefit savings for the university and individuals.

As I've already said, UCA continually strives to control costs while maintaining the maximum amount of coverage for our employees who enroll in our plan. However, here are some key numbers to begin understanding where we are in the current 2026 program:

Total budget for UCA health plan: \$14.8 million

Of that, \$11.1 million is UCA's contribution/share (from Line 11-Benefits)

And \$3.7 million is our employees' share (premiums)

At this point, our claims in 2026 are running \$2.7 million ahead of the budgeted \$14.8 million and will likely result in that \$11.1 million of university contribution being \$13.8 million total. This of course makes the university's portion significantly larger than the 75% target but - more importantly - is another sign of a trend of healthcare costs being an unsustainable portion of our salary and benefits budget. For scale, it is telling that the \$2.7 million additional funds is only \$1 million short of the entire revenue from employee contributions to the plan.

We are approaching a point where the currently constructed health plan is on an unsustainable trajectory and the uncontrolled cost will directly affect our ability to add any additional funds to line 10 for general salary increases. As a side note, the additional \$2.7 million being moved from reserves to cover the additional costs is the equivalent of a 2.8 percent pay increase. All of these funds are directly related to our total compensation strategies and abilities.

Now it is important to note that while we are concerned about what this means for future years, we are working to only make incremental adjustments to the plan for 2027 but will start much earlier this fiscal year doing the analysis for more substantive reforms in 2028 and beyond. We work with Stephen's to monitor the health of the plan and consider adjustments. During the next few weeks, we will be applying another series of adjustments to co-pay and out of pocket tiers that are in line with similar recommendations last year. Those changes are estimated to control overall program cost escalation for one more year with incremental adjustments. Current estimates show that employee premiums will likely increase by 12% this next year bringing total employee from \$3.7m to \$4.1m. The university's portion will increase by \$1.3m to move from \$11.1m budgeted to \$12.4m.

The Board of Trustees meeting on Oct. 2 is where those changes will be finalized for 2027. The likely increase for employee share is below what other plans are doing for 2027 both locally and nationally, however, this 12% will only suffice as a short-term fix to cover current expenditure assumptions. It will be important that immediately after the Oct. 2nd decisions, we begin the deeper analysis to see what is necessary for UCA's health plan to remain both competitive and sustainable in 2028 and beyond.

**Question: Are these increases caused by a larger number of claims or increased medical costs?**

Answer: The number of claims is not out of line with prior years, but the increased cost of procedures and drugs is driving overall costs. We certainly know that our number of high-dollar claims have increased. While seven claims over \$1 million were mitigated by our purchased reinsurance, we are seeing an increase in claims that are above \$100,000 but below the first level of reinsurance that picks up at \$250,000 for stop loss prevention. .

**Question: Have we considered going to external plans?**

Answer: If by that you mean “fully insured plans,” yes, but they are substantially more costly (20-30% more than forecast increased for next year). Blue Cross/Blue Shield refused to quote it officially saying it would be prohibitively expensive compared to our self-insured strategy. We have the best situation. Currently, Blue-Cross/Blue Shield processes claims for us and uses our plan guidelines to decide what is covered. Then we pay that amount. UCA pays BC/BS a fee for their administrative supervision and the administrative and operational ease as you move through the coverage network.

One final note related to a question about pay increases and health care premium increases. UCA will likely need to move towards a total-compensation model for future discussions of all things COLAs, raises, retirement benefits, health care coverage, etc. All of those things involve decisions about how to best use available funds to compensate employees and ensure the financial health of the university in the future.

**B. Provost Hargis**

**Thank you for the opportunity to share a few important items.**

I want to recognize Brian Massey and the Art Department for their partnership with the Mid-South Sculpture Alliance. Through that partnership, several sculpture installations will be placed in the courtyard and walkway behind the Windgate Building during the year, including both permanent and rotating works. I appreciate the department’s work to bring additional public art and creative activity to the UCA campus.

I also want to note that campus communications related to UCA’s HLC review will begin this week. Faculty and other members of the campus community will receive invitations to participate in the review of portions of the HLC assurance argument and related materials. I encourage faculty to participate in that process. Broad campus engagement will help ensure that the materials accurately reflect the university’s work and will provide an opportunity to identify areas that may need additional clarification or context.

Finally, implementation work related to UCA 2035 is beginning to take shape. Our immediate focus is on identifying a manageable set of Year 1 priorities within the four strategic imperatives and determining how work already underway across the university aligns with those priorities. As the implementation structure develops, there will be opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to participate and help move the plan from strategy to implementation.

**Question: An article from the Chronicle of Higher Education indicated that criminals are using AI-Bots to create (and maintain) fraudulent student accounts in order to take advantage of student aid programs. Is this true?**

Answer: Yes, it is happening throughout the country. It is happening here and probably even as you were asking your question. It is a constant battle to monitor and defend against it. Faculty attendance verification (of a student as a real person) is a fundamentally important part of this process. Logging onto the LMS does not constitute attendance. Students should perform a task or assignment to be counted as attending a course. It is my understanding that FS is taking up this subject at a later spot in your meeting. It is very important for us to take verification seriously.

**Question: I just learned that UCA has reached a legal settlement with the Department of Education regarding scholarships based on Gender or Race. Is that true?**

Yes, we have been working on this since the Biden Administration. At issue are privately established scholarships administered by the UCA Foundation that date back multiple decades. Many times the next-of-kin has to be found to help resolve the criteria as the original donor has long since passed away. The complaint in question concerns 10 privately funded scholarships that in May of 2025 were the last unresolved scholarships. It is important to note that they were not actively being awarded due to the on-going review. There were others that were resolved in 2023 and 2024 that were re-activated with changes prior to the 2025 complaint. Of those ten remaining, eight of them were resolved with the donor or their next of kin with a successful change in the scholarship criteria that are within the scope of current law (or legal interpretation). We have two scholarships remaining where the donor's representatives have not yet found a resolution of how they wish to revise the scholarships. In keeping with our process since 2023, we are not awarding those until they are resolved. The "news" was that OCR (somewhat surprisingly) sent us a letter of settlement (resolution) on August 24th that certified that our changes and plans for the remaining two scholarships are in line with their expectations and that we will monitor compliance going forward. We were glad to get that letter as we expected to just hang out there with an unclosed loop for potentially years to come.

### **C. FS President Thomas**

President Thomas emphasized the importance of faculty taking roll and reporting attendance as a primary defense against fraudulent student enrollment. He is drafting a white paper detailing how other universities manage attendance reporting to meet federal regulations while minimizing the administrative burden on faculty.

He also characterized the recent retreat as a successful and productive event, but noted that the Senate Committees need to select Chairs as soon as possible and identify them before the next meeting.

Finally, President Thomas introduced T.J. McDonald from the UCA Bookstore to present information on the Day One Access program.

## **IV. Invited Guests**

### **A. T.J. McDonald, UCA Bookstore regarding the Day One Access Program.**

See **Minutes Appendix C** for Mr. McDonald's slide-show presentation.

Summary of program:

- 1) Students get materials on the first day of class. Mostly digital, but some print items.
- 2) Materials are provided to students at below retail costs
- 3) Student accounts are billed at a later date set by the Office of Student Accounts.
- 4) Professors (or Departments if they have Department-wide curriculum) must opt-in for their course-texts to be added to the program.
- 5) Students in those courses may still opt out of the program.

**Discussion Note:** Student Veterans need to refuse their Professor's Day One Access class invitation because it will show up as a fee (which confuses the VA). However, they can personally speak to the bookstore and request Day One Access as a textbook cost (which the VA will recognize and pay).

### **B. Chief of Staff, Amy Whitehead, regarding the BeWell Program**

To reiterate President Davis' comments: UCA will continue working closely with the Employee Benefits Advisory Committee (EBAC) and Stephen's Consulting to develop our long-term response to rising health care costs.

I also wanted to update you regarding the BeWell program. We are continuing BeWell, but starting in the 2028 plan year (which employees can begin qualifying for on Nov. 1, 2026), employees can earn a \$25/mo premium discount (current discount is \$20/month). Employees may earn this 2028 premium discount by completing a required biometric screening between November 1, 2026 and October 31, 2027. Wellness challenges/points will no longer be a part of the plan for the 2028 plan year.

For the 2027 plan year, wellness challenges and the monthly discount incentive can still be earned through October 31, 2026.

### **V. Treasury Report:**

We are currently working on a summary break-down of each FS account, their balances, and their individual guidelines governing expenditures. I should have a report ready for our next meeting and will provide an update at each further meeting.

**VI. Constituent Concerns: See Minutes Appendix A** at the end of these Minutes.

**VII. Faculty Senate governance extract for senatorial review before next meeting:**

#### **A. Item: Faculty Senate By-Laws**

#### **ARTICLE I. PROCEDURES FOR THE REGULAR ELECTION OF SENATORS**

Section 1. Faculty Senate elections will take place according to the following schedule: College and Unaffiliated representatives during the last full work week in March; At-Large representatives during the second full week of April; Part-Time representatives at the beginning of the academic year.

Section 2. The Faculty Senate President is responsible for notifying the faculty in writing seven days prior to the election, for notifying candidates of the results, and for announcing the results to the faculty.

Section 3. The Faculty Senate Secretary is responsible for conducting elections via online ballot sent via UCA email or other method requiring a login, password, pin, or other security measures as deemed appropriate by the Secretary.

**B. Discussion:** None at this time

**C. Proposed issues/changes:** should be sent to the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee)

## **VIII. Senate Committee Reports**

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

Chair Sen. McClellan: We are meeting Thursday, Sept. 10 to review the vitality and need for our standing committees.

### **B. Faculty Affairs Committee**

Nothing to report, but meeting soon and electing a Chair.

### **C. Academic Affairs Committee**

Chair Sen. Buchannan: Nothing to report, but meeting soon. We need Committee member emails in order to add members to the necessary shared documents.

### **D. Advocacy and Engagement Committee**

Acting Chair: Sen. Lebeau-Ford

We are collecting items for distribution, but we need a list of the new faculty—preferably by college. Hope to have bags ready for Senators to deliver to their new colleagues in roughly a week.

We are also considering hosting Faculty Friday Lunches in the President's Dining Room at Christian Cafeteria.

## **IX. New Business**

President Thomas distributed a proposal to update FS bylaws regarding the review of minutes with the goal of making the process faster and easier.

The DRAFT proposal can be found at **Minutes Appendix B** at the end of these minutes.

Senator McClellan informed the senate that she has spoken with the two vendors regarding official FS button-down shirts. She brought a sample for consideration

Senator Craun motioned that we approve of the button down shirt design and get two official estimates to consider at the next FS meeting. Senator Yarberry seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously. Senator McClellan agreed to secure the estimates. Treasurer Craun agreed to provide current balances for our FS accounts at the next meeting so senators can see the impact of any potential shirt purchase.

## **X. For the Good of the Faculty**

Open Enrollment Vendor Fair + Flu Vaccine Clinic: Oct. 19, 10am-2pm, Student Center Ballroom.

SGA has asked faculty to announce/promote events for UCA Homecoming (Oct. 31). An SGA representative will provide a summary of all events at our next FS meeting.

## **XI. 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, 29 Sept 2026 12:45pm
- C. Faculty Senate has been invited to use the BookStore's suite for the Homecoming Game, Oct. 31, at 4pm. More information to come.

Senator Yarberry moved to end the meeting at 2:51 pm. Meeting Adjourned at 2:52 pm.

---

## **Minutes Appendix A: Faculty Concerns**

### **1. Associate Dean Evaluations**

#### **Summarized Concern:**

Faculty can no longer formally evaluate Associate Deans, creating a gap in shared governance and accountability.

#### **Detailed Submission:**

*In previous academic years, faculty at UCA had the opportunity to formally evaluate Associate Deans in addition to their Dean and Department Chair. This evaluation opportunity no longer appears to be part of the current administrative review process. My concern is that removing this layer of evaluation creates a gap in faculty voice and administrative accountability. Associate Deans hold significant influence over faculty matters, including program decisions, resource distribution, and day-to-day operational support. Without a formal mechanism for faculty feedback, there is no structured avenue for identifying areas where Associate Dean performance may need improvement or where faculty needs are not being adequately addressed. I respectfully ask that the Faculty Senate investigate why this evaluation was discontinued and consider advocating for its reinstatement in order to uphold the principles of shared governance and ensure that all academic administrators who directly impact faculty are subject to meaningful, structured review.*

#### **Response:**

The Faculty Senate has submitted an inquiry to the Provost's Office to request a clear explanation

regarding the administrative rationale behind discontinuing formal Associate Dean evaluations. Shared governance relies on mutual feedback across all administrative levels that directly impact faculty work.

**Response from Provost Hargis:**

Thank you for sharing the constituent concern. I appreciate the question because the change was not intended to diminish faculty voice or reduce accountability for associate deans.

As we reviewed the administrative evaluation process, one of the issues we considered was whether the existing college-wide faculty survey was producing information that was useful for evaluating the annual performance of associate deans. Associate dean portfolios vary considerably across colleges, and much of their administrative work is carried out directly with the dean, department chairs, staff, students, and particular faculty members rather than with the faculty of the college as a whole. As a result, many faculty may have limited direct interaction with an associate dean or limited opportunity to observe significant portions of the work for which that individual is responsible.

The Council of Deans also discussed how the existing survey results were actually being used during the annual performance review process. Deans indicated that the data provided through the previous process generally were not informing their annual evaluations or personnel decisions. The combination of significantly different associate dean responsibilities across colleges, limited faculty interaction with some associate deans, and a standardized survey instrument meant that the results often were not well aligned with the responsibilities of an individual associate dean or particularly useful in assessing performance. Given the staff time required to administer and compile the surveys, the Council concluded that continuing a process that was not yielding information being used meaningfully was not a good use of institutional resources.

Our intent was therefore to align the annual evaluation more closely with the work being evaluated and with those who are positioned to observe that work. The dean, as the associate dean's direct supervisor, has primary responsibility for evaluating administrative performance. Because associate dean assignments vary significantly by college, the dean is expected to determine the appropriate sources of feedback based on the specific responsibilities of the associate dean. Depending on the portfolio, that may include chairs, faculty, staff, students, or others who interact directly with the associate dean and are positioned to assess the work being performed. Discontinuing the standardized college-wide survey was not intended to eliminate faculty feedback; rather, it places greater responsibility on the dean to gather relevant input that reflects the associate dean's actual task assignments.

We also recognized that associate deans generally retain faculty responsibilities. Those responsibilities continue to be evaluated through the appropriate faculty and departmental processes, including input from the department chair where applicable. Their administrative appointment does not remove those aspects of their faculty role from meaningful review.

That said, I understand the broader concern reflected in the constituent's question. There is a distinction between an annual supervisory evaluation and providing faculty with a meaningful opportunity, at appropriate intervals, to offer broader feedback regarding administrators whose decisions affect their work. I would be open to discussing with the Faculty Senate and the Council of Deans whether a periodic stakeholder-feedback process would add value, particularly if it is designed around the responsibilities of the position and produces information that can meaningfully inform administrative professional development and performance.

The goal of the change was not to insulate associate deans from faculty feedback. It was to discontinue a standardized process that was not producing information that was being used

effectively and to replace it with an approach in which the dean gathers feedback from those best positioned to assess the specific work assigned to the associate dean.

---

## **2. "Day One Access" Textbook Billing Workflow**

### **Summarized Concern:**

Students are automatically enrolled in "Day One Access" for online textbook rentals and are burdened with having to manually opt out every single semester to avoid charges.

### **Detailed Submission:**

*Student Concern: I learned some classes will automatically be enrolled in One Day Access for books, an online rental for the semester. I have opted out (with much difficulty; I needed the bookstore's help as the original opt-out form wasn't working).*

*I was told I have to opt out every semester or I'll be charged. This is just one additional inconvenience while balancing many other life responsibilities. Is there a way I can elevate my request to permanently opt out or request this only be an opt-in? I don't think it's ethical to add other financial burdens to students and make them remember to opt out when it was never agreed on.*

### **Response:**

This concern, submitted on behalf of the student body, has been forwarded to Academic Affairs for a response.

---

**3. A constituent fears that UCA will partner with a big AI company and pressure or require faculty to utilize AI within their classes. The constituent requests that Faculty be involved in any such considerations and that all decisions on these matters should be public.**

**Answer from Provost Hargis:** I am unaware of any specific partnerships being proposed with AI companies. However, we do have AI services as part of our current Google-suite. There are also some specific colleges that are engaged with using AI for some of their operational matters, but those smaller initiatives are not intended to be University-wide. Additionally, Dean Addison (COSE) has put together a working-group of faculty who utilize AI in their teaching to promote sharing experiences and strategies, but that is not driven by any anticipated university agreements.

---

**4. Faculty would like clarification on the 9-mo contract rules and required work during off-contract times.**

*If I'm off contract, what summer responsibilities do I have?*

*If I am on contract, is that related to teaching only or service (i.e.--advising)?*

**Answer from Provost Hargis:** For faculty on nine-month appointments, required responsibilities should generally correspond to the period and scope of the appointment. If a faculty member does not have a summer appointment or other compensated summer assignment, activities outside the appointment period would not ordinarily be required, although faculty may certainly choose to participate voluntarily.

Summer appointments are separate, and the expectations associated with them should be clear. Those assignments may involve teaching, but they can also include other responsibilities when those expectations are part of the appointment.

Reassigned time is a little different. It is provided in support of specific work, so the scope, deliverables, and expected timeline should be clear when the reassignment is approved. In some cases, that work may extend beyond the traditional academic year, but if so, those expectations should be understood and agreed upon in advance by the faculty member, chair, and dean.

-----  
*5. Faculty would like to see a comprehensive list of Graduate Faculty's research interests to better advise prospective Graduate Students.*

**Provost Haris will pass this on to the Dean of the Graduate School, Dr. Michael Mills.**

-----

*6. Faculty concern regarding faculty safety and student conduct received via email (Aug. 18).*

Dear Faculty Senate President Thomas, Vice President McClellan and CAHSS Senators,  
I am writing to follow up on a student safety matter that came before the Faculty Senate during the Spring 2026 semester. It appears in the constituent concerns recorded in the March 10, 2026 minutes and in the campus safety discussion recorded in the April 7, 2026 minutes. Having reviewed those minutes, I do not believe the Senate received the full context of what occurred. I write to provide that context, to share my concerns about how the situation was and is being handled, and to request a formal review along with several changes to our reporting and notification practices.

To protect the student's privacy, I refer to them throughout as DF. I have firsthand knowledge of much of what follows, and I can provide supporting documentation, including the relevant correspondence, upon request.

Executive summary

The letter documents the following:

- Over more than a year, a student (referred to as DF) showed a documented, escalating pattern of hostile conduct, including harassment of women, across multiple courses and instructors.
- In February 2026 the conduct escalated to statements, reported by a witness, of an intent to kill a named faculty colleague and others.
- The targeted colleague asked the Dean of Students in writing whether he had been threatened and received no reply, and other faculty were not warned because privacy barred warning them, even as they were instructed to lock their doors.
- The protective steps taken (locked suites, a circulated photograph, a colleague moved to online teaching) came from faculty, not the institution.
- DF reportedly remained in campus housing for days after the threats were reported, and a campus office where DF regularly volunteered was never told of the ban.
- Rather than use the disciplinary process, the university allowed DF to complete the degree online and graduate, with no conduct sanction.
- DF continues to contact faculty on campus after graduation, and in this correspondence, DF shows little awareness or acknowledgement of accountability for their actions.

The letter requests:

- A formal review of how the matter was handled.
- That the full context be made available to the entire Faculty Senate.
- An explanation of why the disciplinary process was bypassed, and how that aligns with the university's mission and conduct policy.
- Clear policies for threat notification, faculty notification of documented patterns of concern, and the Student of Concern process.

- That the administration contact DF and explain that they should not contact affected faculty unless explicitly invited to do so.

What occurred:

Over a period of more than a year, beginning Fall 2024, DF displayed a documented pattern of disruptive and, at times, hostile conduct across multiple courses and instructors. This included repeated interruptions, aggressive responses when corrected, and harassment and intimidation directed at female students and others perceived as female. Across two semesters, three female students brought concerns about DF's behavior in and out of class to Dr. Escamilla, although they declined to file reports of their own. The pattern was serious enough that, in Spring 2025, DF was removed from a course by Dr. Escamilla and, after meeting with Dr. Ty Hawkins (school director at that time), DF decided to transfer to the BGS program so as to avoid taking classes with Dr. Escamilla in the future. The removal was documented in a Student of Concern report, and Dean Owens reviewed that report in February 2025 and raised no concern about how it had been handled. DF's behavior continued into Fall 2025 in Dr. Burley's course.

In December 2025, after two students in my upcoming World Englishes course had told me they would not work with DF, I raised formal concerns with the interim director, Dr. Jellenik, and with Deans Williams and Owens. I asked the administration to consider either preventing DF's enrollment in this collaborative course, which is centered on group work and discussion, or establishing clear and enforceable behavioral conditions with immediate consequences. Importantly, this course was not required for DF to graduate. It is an elective in the BGS and DF was only taking a full course load to have access to the dorms. The responses I received emphasized due process and the need for faculty to give the student an opportunity to demonstrate that they could meet expectations. The responses also contained incomplete and incorrect information about DF's documented pattern of escalating unacceptable behavior. That being said, I understand and respect the importance of due process and so, in the end, I met with DF before the semester, set expectations for all students, and redesigned my course to remove group work. Around the same time, in December 2025, Dr. Escamilla wrote to the same administrators with specific written questions: how faculty should document a pattern of behavior, what due process requires when repeated efforts to redirect a student in class have not worked, and how to handle concerns from students who are reluctant to file their own reports. He received no response to any of them.

The situation escalated in February 2026. During an event sponsored by the university and held off campus (possibly out of state), an incident occurred involving DF. A student who was present sent urgent messages to faculty stating that DF should be kept out of an upcoming video presentation connected to a departmental event, warning faculty not to be alone with DF or to not leave their office doors open, and directing faculty to the Dean of Students, who the student indicated was already aware of the situation. When Dr. Burley and I contacted Dean Owens, we were told that an incident had occurred, that DF had damaged their own property in anger, and that reports had been filed.

That same evening, February 23, Dr. Escamilla wrote directly to Dean Owens. He explained that he had heard only fragments of what had happened, that the reporting student had urged him not to be alone with DF or to leave his office door open, and he asked plainly whether DF had made a specific threat against him that he needed to know about. He copied a colleague and our interim director. Our interim director had no information, and Dean Owens never replied.

The following morning, February 24, I contacted the UCA Police Department out of concern for the safety of faculty and students. The officer on duty told me that the police department had not been informed of anything related to DF. Later that same morning, Dean Owens met with DF with UCA PD present. DF was given the choice to withdraw from all courses taught in person

and complete the degree online, or to face disciplinary proceedings. DF chose to complete the degree online, and only after that meeting was DF removed from the residence halls and banned from campus. I want to be precise about the timing, because I believe it matters. To my understanding, DF returned from the event on or around February 22 and continued to live in the residence halls until the February 24 meeting. The reporting student's warnings were sent on February 23, and faculty were being told to lock their doors at about the same time. DF potentially remained in student housing after those warnings had gone out, and was removed only after the meeting on the 24th.

In the weeks that followed, the reporting student gave linguistics faculty a fuller and more alarming account. According to that account, DF had expressed a desire to kill Dr. Escamilla, and had said that killing him alone would not be enough, because DF would need to kill several people at once in order to, in DF's own words, get the respect DF felt owed. The position conveyed to us was that because DF was banned from campus, the threat had been removed. On February 26, Dr. Escamilla told the director in writing that he felt materially unsafe on campus, especially in Irby Hall, and asked to relocate his office and his classes for the remainder of the semester, and requested that the change not be posted on Banner or any searchable system so that DF could not find him. He also asked the director to inform SLL faculty of the situation and to circulate DF's photograph. Dr. Escamilla now teaches online only, because he does not feel safe.

I also want to be clear about how faculty came to be informed. During this period, those of us who were aware of the threat were told that we could not warn other faculty, on the grounds that doing so would violate DF's privacy. The information was eventually circulated to faculty and to other chairs in the building by Dr. Jellenik, including a photograph of DF so that DF could be recognized, with instructions to contact campus police on sight. Faculty suites were kept locked because of the threat, and the notification itself acknowledged that it is impossible to predict the behavior of someone acting erratically. In other words, the situation was serious enough to justify locked doors, a circulated photograph, and a standing instruction to call the police, yet a privacy rationale had delayed telling faculty what they needed to know to protect themselves and their students. I would also underscore who took these steps. Locking the suites, circulating DF's photograph, and agreeing to call police on sight were decisions that faculty made among ourselves. They were not protective measures the university put in place. The institution's role was largely to permit us to protect ourselves, rather than to act on our behalf.

The gaps in notification reached beyond our department. DF remained an enrolled student, completing their degree online. I later learned through conversation with colleagues in the Office of Education Abroad that DF had been a frequent volunteer with their office and that no one there had been told of the ban. Staff who had worked closely with DF were left unaware of both the ban and the conduct that led to it. Because DF was still an enrolled student, there were no mechanisms in place to prevent them from volunteering or attending UCA functions. DF has now graduated and still maintains access to UCA Alumnae networks and has contacted faculty as recently as August 18, 2026.

I would like to return to one point in that December correspondence that bears emphasis. In it, I wrote that the concerns I was raising were not hypothetical but, in the words I used at the time, inevitable, and that continuing to warn and document was no longer sufficient given DF's history. What occurred in February was, in substance, the outcome I had described. It did not happen in my classroom, in part because I had already restructured the course and met with DF in advance, but the risk I identified did not disappear. It surfaced at a university event instead. The situation was flagged in writing, with a specific request for a stronger response, and that request was set aside in favor of giving DF another opportunity. That sequence should weigh heavily in any review of how this matter was handled.

#### Further context

The March 10 Faculty Senate minutes reflect that constituent concerns about classroom safety, threat notification, and the handling of documented patterns of student misconduct did reach the Senate, and I am grateful that they were raised. The administration's written response even acknowledged that it was, in its own words, inadequate. What the Senate did not receive was the specific context that gives those concerns their weight:

- that faculty were identified by name as the targets of threats of serious violence
  - that the Dean of Students did not respond to specific questions asked by a targeted faculty member
  - that a UCA PD sergeant had no knowledge of the matter on the morning of the intervention, despite a prior warning that pointed faculty to the Dean of Students as already informed
  - that faculty were initially told they could not warn others about the threat because of the student's privacy, even as they were being asked to keep their suites locked
  - that DF purportedly continued to live in the residence halls for several days after the incident and after those warnings, and was removed only following the February 24 meeting
  - and that a colleague has had to change where and how he teaches in order to feel safe.
- I do not believe the Senate can meaningfully weigh the reporting and safety questions already before it without this context.

#### My concerns about the handling

I want to state these concerns plainly, while acknowledging that the administration operates within real legal and privacy constraints, and that individual staff members have tried to act responsibly within them. My concerns are with the process and the outcomes, not with anyone's Intentions.

First, when named faculty are identified as the targets of a reported threat, they must be notified promptly and directly by a university official, and offered concrete safety measures. Here, the opposite happened. The targeted faculty member learned of the threats through a student, and when he asked Dean Owens directly and in writing whether a specific threat had been made against him, he received no answer. The same failure extended to the wider faculty, who were initially not warned at all because of the student's privacy, even while being asked to keep their doors locked. Privacy matters, but it cannot be the reason that the people most likely to encounter a threat are the last to learn of it, and it cannot be the reason that a person who asks in writing whether he is in danger is met with silence. Taken together, this is a failure of the university's basic duty of care.

Second, I want to address in advance the response that the university did not have specific information about the threats. The threat was characterized to faculty as not directed at anyone in particular. That is very difficult to reconcile with what was reported to us by a witness, which was a stated desire to kill a named colleague and a stated intention to kill others as well. If the Dean of Students did not have those specifics, the appropriate response, once faculty had disclosed the message instructing us to lock our doors, was to ask. A gap in what the university knew is not the same as an absence of anything to know, and the duty to inquire rests with the office that receives a report of this kind, not with the faculty who raised the alarm. Indeed, the person most directly at risk asked the question outright and was not answered.

Third, the position that a campus ban removes the threat is not a safety assessment. A person who is banned from campus is not thereby prevented from acting, and the fact that a targeted colleague has already changed to online-only teaching – and had to request to make this change – to protect himself shows that the risk is being managed by the person at risk rather than by the institution. A ban that is described as the reason a threat has been resolved should not be presented as if it settles the matter.

Fourth, the response during the most acute window was slow and poorly coordinated. As noted above, DF purportedly remained in student housing for several days after the incident and after the warnings had gone out. On the morning of February 24, when I contacted UCA PD, the sergeant on duty was unaware of the matter, even though the April 7 minutes describe systems that are meant to prevent exactly this kind of breakdown. If those systems functioned as described, a student who had melted down and made statements about killing should not have remained in student housing or on campus for days while the UCA PD knew nothing about it. That gap deserves examination.

Fifth, the burden of managing this pattern fell repeatedly on individual faculty, and the way the problem has been framed has too often placed the fault with us. Despite years of Student of Concern reports, each new semester began as though the record did not exist, and faculty were expected to rebuild the case from the beginning while continuing to protect their students. While the linguistics faculty knew of DF's behavior, we had no idea that they had had similar issues in other courses until after the February 2026 events. When we asked for help in advance after a year of escalating behavior and numerous reports, the response suggested that we had not given the student a fair chance to grow and were depriving them of due process. That characterization is completely incorrect, and therefore difficult to accept. We met with DF, set expectations, documented incidents, filed reports, and redesigned courses. The record is not one of faculty refusing to support a student. It is one of faculty supporting a student well past the point at which the institution should have stepped in. This extended even to the safety response: the protections that were eventually put in place were ours, not the institution's.

I would add one further observation. The university has been clear that student attendance is a privilege, not a right. If that is the standard, then the institution plainly had both the authority and the grounds to act on DF's documented and escalating conduct long before it reached the point of threats of lethal violence. Instead, DF was extended chance after chance, and the cost of that choice was absorbed by faculty and by other students. I do not raise this to argue that any student should be treated without care or without process. I raise it because the same principle that is invoked to remind us of the university's authority did not appear to guide the university's decisions here, and the inconsistency has left faculty carrying a risk that was never theirs to carry.

As I mentioned, DF has contacted faculty in Linguistics as recently as August 18, 2026. In this correspondence, DF asked for career advice, but also lamented their ban from campus and removal from courses. Their email very much indicates that DF still believes themselves to be an aggrieved party in this matter, and does not show any contrition surrounding the situation. I want to close this section by naming what is at stake when a university manages around a person rather than acting in the best interest of the university community. At Virginia Tech in 2007, a student's disturbing conduct was known in fragments across several departments. Faculty had already intervened. One professor had him removed from a class after he had been photographing female students during it, and women in that class stopped attending. Two other women had complained to police about him. That student, Seung Hui Cho, killed 32 people and wounded 17 others with two semi-automatic pistols on the Virginia Tech campus. The state panel that reviewed the case afterward found that the university never assembled these pieces into a

single picture and did not intervene effectively. Specifically, it found that a misreading of student privacy law had discouraged people from sharing what they knew, even though the law permits sharing when there is danger.

I raise these concerns not to equate DF with Seung Hui Cho and not to predict any specific act. I raise them because the institutional pattern is the one I am describing in this letter: documented and repeated complaints about a person's conduct, faculty left to improvise their own protection, and an administration that hesitates to act while citing process, privacy, and legal risk. The hesitation itself was and is the danger in these circumstances.

There is a further point I do not want to lose. The Dean of Students is the office to which these reports are directed, and, as the April 7 minutes describe, it is where UCA PD responses and Student of Concern reports are gathered in Maxient. It is, by design, the one place positioned to see the whole pattern and to connect it. That vantage point carried a responsibility to act on the pattern, not to resolve it away. Instead, the matter was settled in a way that let DF avoid the conduct process and complete the degree online. This response still left DF in contact with UCA students and faculty, allows them access to UCA Alumnae networks, and presumably allows them to attend UCA events held off campus. The lack of documentation surrounding these threats also leaves targeted faculty with little recourse in ensuring their own protection in the Conway community. When the office best able to see the danger chooses accommodation over accountability and over the emotional and physical safety of other community members, the safeguard that office exists to provide is not there when it is needed.

I do not believe DF was the first and they certainly won't be the last student to test these systems. There will be another, and if what I have described is how the university responds, faculty and students will again be left to absorb a risk the institution was positioned to prevent. That is why I am asking not only for a review of this case, but for the changes that would keep it from happening again.

What I am requesting

In light of the above, I respectfully request the following.

1. A formal review of how this specific matter was handled, with particular attention to the failure to notify and support the targeted faculty member, the delay in notifying other faculty on privacy grounds, the length of time DF remained in student housing after the incident and the warnings, and the coordination gap between the Dean of Students and UCA PD.
2. That the full context described here be made available to the entire Faculty Senate, so that its ongoing discussion of campus safety and student conduct reporting is informed by the actual facts of the case that prompted it.
3. That the administration contact DF and explain that they are not to contact affected faculty unless explicitly invited to do so. This includes myself, Dr. Escamilla, and Dr. Burley.
4. That the administration explain to the faculty its reasoning for resolving this matter through an arrangement to complete the degree online rather than through the disciplinary process provided in the Standards of Student Conduct, especially without consulting targeted faculty members. This explanation should address why that process was judged too burdensome to pursue, the terms on which DF was permitted to complete the degree and graduate, and how that decision is consistent with the university's stated mission, its commitment to a safe environment, and its own conduct policy.

5. The adoption of clear, written policies and procedures, including:
- a. A mandatory protocol, with a defined timeframe, for notifying any faculty or staff member who has been named or targeted in a reported threat. Notification should come directly from a university official and should include available safety resources and next steps.
  - b. A faculty notification system for students with documented patterns of alarming behavior, modeled on the way academic accommodations are already communicated. Faculty do not need diagnostic detail; a notification of suggested precautions and the appropriate contact for escalation would allow us to support these students while protecting others.
  - c. A centralized and accountable Student of Concern process, with acknowledgment of reports, defined response timelines, and documented follow through, so that a single faculty report documenting multiple incidents is sufficient to prompt review without requiring an affected student to file a complaint personally.
  - d. Guidance on how threats are assessed and managed when the subject is banned from campus but not otherwise restrained.
  - e. A direct response to the specific written questions Dr. Escamilla raised in December about how to document a pattern of behavior, what due process requires when repeated efforts to redirect a student have not worked, and how to handle concerns from students who are unwilling to file their own reports. Those questions remain unanswered.

I want to be clear that I remain committed to the wellbeing and the due process rights of all students, including DF, and to a learning environment that is safe for everyone in it. Those commitments are not in tension. Protecting students and colleagues from credible threats and giving a struggling student a fair process are both obligations we can and should meet at the same time.

I am glad to provide the full documentation of this matter and to meet with any of you to discuss it. Thank you for your attention and for your continued work on behalf of the faculty.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Response from Vice President of Student Affairs, Dr. Robin Williams:**

Dear Dr. Thomas,

I received a copy of a letter addressed to you and other members of the UCA Faculty Senate regarding a student matter in Spring 2026. I wanted to take this opportunity to help faculty members better understand the Student of Concern (SOC) process.

As you know, the Dean of Students (DOS) Office receives many SOC reports throughout the year. If there is anything in a SOC report that indicates imminent danger to the student and/or our community, the UCA Police Department (UCAPD) is immediately notified. If there is no indication of immediate danger, but there may be a concern for potential danger or harm, we will convene a Behavioral Intervention Team (BIT) to review the situation as well as employ any appropriate and necessary interventions. Representatives of UCAPD are part of the BIT process. If the SOC report does not indicate any danger to the individual or community, the DOS staff will reach out to the

student to schedule an individual meeting.

During these meetings, the staff work with the students to determine what issues may be present and will connect them with the appropriate resources and services. Regarding the student incident mentioned in the letter, I am unable to share specific details with you due to FERPA. However, after reviewing the letter, Provost Hargis, Chief of Staff Whitehead, UCA Chief of Police Merguie, General Counsel Readnour, Dean of Students Owens, and I met to conduct a comprehensive review of the situation and the protocols employed. Since no UCAPD reports were filed in this matter, the DOS decision in this matter was based on a review of the SOC reports received. We are confident that all appropriate protocols and actions were taken in this specific matter.

I highly encourage any member of our community to contact the Dean of Students Office should they have any questions or concerns about a student. If they do not think it is worthy of a Student of Concern report, they should still reach out with a phone call or email. We are willing to discuss their concerns and find ways to best support the student and resolve the situation. If a member of our community witnesses any harmful behavior or receives any threats, please contact UCAPD immediately. Our community and our ability to care for one another begins with communication. While there may be limitations on what the DOS can or cannot share, please know that this team is fully committed to the wellbeing and safety of our entire community.

I look forward to our continued and ongoing work together to help our students be successful.  
Sincerely,  
Robin M. Williamson, Ph.D.  
Vice President for Student Affairs

---

## Minutes Appendix B: Proposal to change the FS By-Laws

UCA Faculty Senate — Bylaw Amendment Proposal & Operating Procedure

***PROPOSAL: Amend Article VI, Section 4 of the UCA Faculty Senate Bylaws to Transition Meeting Minutes Ratification from Asynchronous Online Balloting to Electronic Tacit Consent.***

### GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT METADATA

Organization: University of Central Arkansas (UCA) Faculty Senate  
Document Type: Bylaw Amendment Proposal & Standard Operating Procedure  
Target Bylaw: Article VI (Policy on Access to the Faculty Senate), Section 4  
Parliamentary Authority: Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised (12th ed.)  
Proposed Effective Date: Immediately upon adoption (Article VII, Section 2)

#### 1. Executive Summary & Purpose

The University of Central Arkansas Faculty Senate Bylaws authorize asynchronous online voting to ratify meeting minutes. While intended to speed up the approval process, this practice creates procedural conflicts under Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised (12th ed.) and operational vulnerabilities:

- **Misapplication of Motions:** Minutes are a factual record of actions taken, not a main motion to be voted up or down (§41:11).
- **The Quorum Paradox:** In an asynchronous vote, quorum is measured by voter participation (returned ballots). If fewer than a quorum of senators submit responses, the vote is legally void, trapping minutes in procedural limbo (§40:1).
- **Binary Deadlock:** Voting 'No' on a ballot indicates disapproval but provides no parliamentary mechanism to correct or amend the text (§41:11).
- **Administrative Overhead:** Requiring the collection of ballots, verifying voter eligibility, and tabulating a majority vote delays the release of minutes to constituents.

This proposal replaces asynchronous binary voting with a 2-business-day Electronic Tacit Consent review window, ensuring parliamentary alignment while allowing approved minutes to be finalized efficiently.

## 2. Formal Bylaw Amendment Proposal

To resolve these procedural defects, the following amendment to Article VI, Section 4 is submitted for consideration by the Faculty Senate pursuant to Article VII.

### Current Bylaw Text (Proposed Strikethrough):

#### ~~Section 4. Voting On and Dissemination of Minutes~~

~~Online voting is authorized for ratifying meeting minutes. Voting must be secure and include only those authorized to vote.~~  
~~Members must receive proper notice, no fewer than two business days, of the vote and any materials necessary to make an informed decision (like motions, reports, etc.).~~  
~~A quorum must be established for the vote to be valid. The motion passes based on a majority or required threshold of those voting, as specified in the bylaws or rules.~~  
~~Once the votes are certified by the Secretary, minutes can be shared with others.~~

### Proposed Bylaw Text:

#### Section 4. Review, Approval, and Dissemination of Minutes

- A. **Distribution:** Following a Senate meeting, the Secretary shall distribute draft meeting minutes to all Senators via official university email.
- B. **Tacit Review Period:** Senators shall have two (2) business days from distribution to review the draft minutes and submit proposed corrections or edits to the Secretary using the official online correction form.
- C. **Automatic Approval:** If no corrections or objections are submitted by the deadline, the minutes shall stand approved as distributed by unanimous consent.
- D. **Handling Corrections:**
  1. Non-substantive or clerical corrections accepted by the Secretary shall be incorporated into the draft, and the corrected minutes shall stand approved.
  2. If a substantive correction is contested or unresolved, the disputed portion

shall be placed on the agenda for disposition at the next regular Senate meeting, while undisputed portions stand approved.

## Minutes Appendix C: Day One Access Presentation



## WHAT IS DAY ONE ACCESS?

Day One Access ensures all students receive digital course materials on Day 1 at a lower cost, seamlessly integrated into Brightspace, with the option to opt out.

Day One Access does not change your required materials, it only changes the billing mechanism.

### FACULTY SELECTS COURSE MATERIAL

Instructors choose required materials, ensuring all students receive the same resources without needing to purchase separately.



### STUDENTS RECEIVE ACCESS

Students get Day 1 access to materials directly in Brightspace (\*\*mostly\*\*)



### CHARGE TO STUDENT ACCOUNTS

Students pay a discounted price through their student account, saving up to 50% compared to traditional textbooks.



### OPT OUT

Students can opt out before the deadline if they prefer to obtain materials elsewhere, maintaining freedom of choice for students.



## WHAT CHANGES

01

### Billing

Posted to the student account prior to term start.

02

### Price

A negotiated rate with publisher, usually below retail.

03

### When Students Access

Day one of class, not whenever they get around to it.

04

### Where Student Access

Linked directly in Brightspace

05

### How Many Have It

All students have access to the materials on day one

## WHAT DOESN'T CHANGE

### The Material Itself

Same title, same edition, same publisher. You choose!

### Duration

Set by the product and publisher you choose.

### Your Academic Freedom

You decide what to require and in what format.

### Students' Ability to Choose

Anyone can opt out for any reason.

### Your Book Order Workload

Same process, same deadlines, one extra checkbox..

# How To Add An Item – FacultyPortal



FacultyPortal

University of Central Arkansas (UCA)

SPRING 2027 (default)

Contact Your Bookstore

tradenak@textbookbrokers.com

Faculty Dashboard

School Dashboard

Store Dashboard

## DAY ONE ACCESS SAVES STUDENTS MONEY

THE NEW DAY ONE ACCESS PROGRAM GRANTS IMMEDIATE ACCESS TO COURSE MATERIALS, ALLOWING YOU TO START TEACHING WITH NO DELAYS, ALL WHILE SAVING STUDENTS MONEY.

[More information available here!](#)

To enroll your classes, select "Yes" to the question "Include this material in the Day One Access program" during the course material selection process.

To manage a course listed below, just click any part of the course. You can sort fields by clicking the header names. You can also find courses by using the search box below. Thanks for using Faculty Portal!

All Statuses

Any Start Date

All Instructors

Reset Sorting/Filters

| Dept Code | Course Name                   | Course Code | Section | CRN | Start Date | Status               | Course Material Wizard | Instructors                    | Approval | Actions      |                                  |
|-----------|-------------------------------|-------------|---------|-----|------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--------------|----------------------------------|
| GEOG      | HUMAN GEOGRAPHY               | 1320        | 34586   | N/A | 2027-01-07 | No Materials Entered |                        | Zhang, Ling(lizhang10@uca.edu) | NEW      | All Approved | <a href="#">Edit This Course</a> |
| GEOG      | GEOGRAPHY OF EUROPE & RUSSIA  | 3335        | 36651   | N/A | 2027-01-07 | No Materials Entered |                        | Zhang, Ling(lizhang10@uca.edu) | NEW      | All Approved | <a href="#">Edit This Course</a> |
| GEOG      | PRINCIPLES OF GEOGRAPHY       | 1305        | 36650   | N/A | 2027-01-07 | No Materials Entered |                        | Zhang, Ling(lizhang10@uca.edu) | NEW      | All Approved | <a href="#">Edit This Course</a> |
| GEOG      | SPECIAL PROBLEMS IN GEOGRAPHY | 4V60        | 29001   | N/A | 2027-01-07 | No Materials Entered |                        | Zhang, Ling(lizhang10@uca.edu) | NEW      | All Approved | <a href="#">Edit This Course</a> |
| GEOG      | HUMAN GEOGRAPHY               | 1320        | 28493   | N/A | 2027-01-07 | No Materials Entered |                        | Zhang, Ling(lizhang10@uca.edu) | NEW      | All Approved | <a href="#">Edit This Course</a> |

# How To Add An Item – Prompt



FacultyPortal University of Central Arkansas (UCA) SPRING 2022 (default) Contact Your Bookstore theucabrokers.com

Faculty Dashboard School Dashboard Store Dashboard

Course Material Wizard - HLTH 2201 25399 [Back To Courses](#)

[Add Previously Used Materials](#) Search Course Materials Choose Courses Summary

Your Most Recent Materials Materials From Previous Terms Materials From HLTH Department

| EAN/ISBN/SKU  | Item Details                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Material Details                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Material Notes                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Course Details                                                                                                                                                                                          | Actions                  |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 9781264211427 |  <p><b>Title:</b> FIRST AID, CPR, and AED ADVANCED PB<br/><b>Description:</b><br/><b>Author:</b> JACOB<br/><b>Publisher:</b> JONES &amp; BART<br/><b>Edition:</b> 8TH-12</p>                            | <p><b>Requirement:</b> Optional<br/><b>Content Book?</b> No<br/><b>New Required?</b> No<br/><b>Access Code Required?</b> No<br/><b>Previous Editions Allowed?</b> No<br/><b>Update to newer edition if available?</b> No<br/><b>Include this material in the Day One Access program</b> (<a href="https://theucabookstore.com/pages/day-one-access-faq-for-faculty">https://theucabookstore.com/pages/day-one-access-faq-for-faculty</a>) Visit <a href="https://theucabookstore.com/pages/faculty-faq">https://theucabookstore.com/pages/faculty-faq</a> for more details.<br/><b>Yes</b><br/><b>Stack Digital Version?</b> Yes</p> | <p><b>Student Notes:</b> The required materials for this course are included into your fees and are available to you on the first day of class within your Brightspace. This is a print version and is optional if you feel you'll perform better with a print version.<br/><b>Bookstore Notes:</b></p> | <p><b>Term:</b> FALL 2026<br/><b>Department:</b> HLTH - Health Promotion<br/><b>Course Name:</b> FIRST AID<br/><b>Course Code:</b> 2201<br/><b>Course Section:</b> 11323<br/><b>Course CRN:</b> N/A</p> | <a href="#">Add This</a> |
| 9781264252545 |  <p><b>Title:</b> Advanced First Aid, CPR, and AED (Day One Access eBook)<br/><b>Description:</b><br/><b>Author:</b> JACOB<br/><b>Publisher:</b> Jones &amp; Bartlett IA<br/><b>Edition:</b> 8th-12</p> | <p><b>Requirement:</b> Required<br/><b>Content Book?</b> No<br/><b>New Required?</b> No<br/><b>Access Code Required?</b> No<br/><b>Previous Editions Allowed?</b> No<br/><b>Update to newer edition if available?</b> No<br/><b>Include this material in the Day One Access program</b> (<a href="https://theucabookstore.com/pages/day-one-access-faq-for-faculty">https://theucabookstore.com/pages/day-one-access-faq-for-faculty</a>) Visit <a href="https://theucabookstore.com/pages/faculty-faq">https://theucabookstore.com/pages/faculty-faq</a> for more details.<br/><b>Yes</b><br/><b>Stack Digital Version?</b> Yes</p> | <p><b>Student Notes:</b> To access this item, open your course in Brightspace and select "Day One Access" in the Brightspace menu bar.<br/><b>Bookstore Notes:</b></p>                                                                                                                                  | <p><b>Term:</b> FALL 2026<br/><b>Department:</b> HLTH - Health Promotion<br/><b>Course Name:</b> FIRST AID<br/><b>Course Code:</b> 2201<br/><b>Course Section:</b> 11323<br/><b>Course CRN:</b> N/A</p> | <a href="#">Add This</a> |

Include this material in the Day One Access program (<https://theucabookstore.com/pages/day-one-access-faq-for-faculty>) Visit <https://theucabookstore.com/pages/faculty-faq> for more details.

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

REQUIRED! Please answer Yes or No.

# How To Add An Item – Confirmation



Send emails to instructors/professors when they complete an adoption and answer "Yes" to the "Offer students discounted day-one access to their course materials?" question?



## Email Subject

Day One Access Confirmation

Plain text only. No HTML or images please.

If left blank, the default text "More information about the course material(s) you adopted." will be shown instead.

## Email Body

Thank you for submitting your book orders through FacultyPortal. This is an automated message to confirm your Day One Access preference.

Our records indicate you selected "yes" to add one or more items to the Day One Access program. The Day One Access program provides students with direct access to the course materials in Brightspace on the first day of class.

Our team will take care of setting everything up for the class within Brightspace. As we approach the start of the term, we will send you an email with more information, as well as sending students information on how to access.

If this was not intentional, please reach out to [tmcdonald@textbookbrokers.com](mailto:tmcdonald@textbookbrokers.com)

If there are any issues adding the materials to the program, we will reach out and let you know!

Thank you again,

The UCA Bookstore

Plain text only. No HTML or images please.

If left blank, the default text "Thank you for adopting course materials and choosing to include them in day-one access for the students." will be shown instead.

Total Savings

**\$421,531\***

With an average of \$54.93 saved per student

**8/10** 

81.7% of the UCA Student Body currently participating, with a 96.7% participation rate

Fall 2026 Snapshot

**960**

Number of  
Courses

**22,807**

Number of Items  
Distributed

**7,674**

Participating  
Students

\*Savings calculated compared to the publisher's / VitalSource's published retail price for the same digital product / duration.

# 60%

**of surveyed UCA students  
want more of their classes  
included in Day One  
Access**

**51% of students believed Day One Access improved  
their overall performance in the course.**

Cangelosi, J. (Ed.). (Spring 2026). UCA student course materials and Day One Access survey [unpublished survey report]. MKTG 4353 Course, College of Business, University of Central Arkansas



**I've had students who could have been successful, but couldn't complete assignments because they couldn't afford MyLabs. We had no issues with this in the Spring!**

Haley Hurley, Lecturer, Department of Mathematics



**Students are much more prepared and engaged for class. They are more confident with the material and are able to communicate the material with one another, which makes them even more confident.**

Dr. Steven Augustine, Assistant Professor, Department of Biology

# OPEN Q&A

**TJ MCDONALD**



Cell: 870-930-5421



[tmcdonald@textbookbrokers.com](mailto:tmcdonald@textbookbrokers.com)

