

Academic Senate Council

January 31, 2018

Attending: Compadre, Frett, Hendrickson, Huitt, Karim, Lefler, MacMillan-Crow, Post, Rosenbaum, Smith-Olinde, Willett

Guests: Boysen, Gardner, Hayar, Mahadevan, Palade, Prather

Absent: Bercher, Ferguson, James, Matthews, McCain, Renard, Rosenbaum, Voth, Whited

Called to order at 2:00 PM

1. UA Board of Trustees Policy 405.1 status and next steps
 - a. Lefler and all other academic senate leaders, except UA-Pine Bluff and UA-Fort Smith were at a meeting with UA System counsel, Dr. Bobbitt and Dr. Moore on Dec. 18, 2017; faculty provided significant input and suggestions for changes; as of today, no new draft has been released
 - b. On some issues Counsel were amenable to change, others highlighted issues would be considered for change
 - c. The process, i.e., beginning again with the current text, will not be done; some advocated boycotting, but Lefler stated that talking is better than not talking
 - d. Kevin Hall – President at Fayetteville, indicated there would be a Chancellor’s meeting on February 1; however, the UAMS Chancellor does not usually attend this particular meeting, as it is about issues more relevant to traditional 2- and 4-year schools
 - e. Lefler received a reply 1-30-18, from JoAnn Maxey (senior Counsel) – “we are still working on the draft”
 - f. All schools in the System except UAPB and UAFS (neither of which has a tenure system) spoke concerns with one voice
 - g. Any other suggestions?
 - i. Opinion: in present form, we think it would have a negative impact on recruiting and retention; Lefler: the tone and language are punitive and negative, the wrong tone for an important policy such as this one
 - ii. Lefler: We made a good case that a 1-year deadline for dismissal is too short and that piece may be deleted or at least modified
 - iii. Question: What has happened to the committee of peers? That was taken out of the first draft but may be replaced in this second draft.
 - iv. Comment: There are two possibilities
 1. Faculty get a revised draft, and if so, what do we do?
 - a. Lefler: we were promised a draft but were not promised that we will be allowed to have any additional input; what constitutes our agreement? Will the draft be handed to us and that’s it?
 - b. Should Senates and faculties have a chance to weigh in? March 28-29 Board of Trustees meeting in Monticello
 2. Let’s assume no draft is sent to faculty, only directly to the Board of Trustees; what’s our plan B?
 - a. Lefler: Seems like the only path is to show up at Board of Trustees and get on their agenda
 - b. Comment: UA System and vagaries of the document leave open lots of wiggle room at the institutional level, so we our plan B is to work with our local administration to make things clear how they work on this campus

2. Are there any new financial developments or forecasts for new layoffs
 - a. Comment: I've been hearing there will be a second round of layoffs; Dr. Gardner: there is no 2nd round planned, but, there is ongoing evaluation of are we the right size, etc.
 - b. Question: Is there a policy to not overspend? Dr. Gardner: there was a \$39M deficit at the end of October, and we are not hitting target of a 6% profit margin; the goal is to get back to no more than the \$39M deficit with changes occurring that carry into the next fiscal year
 - c. Dr. Gardner: We will use a 2% margin instead of 6%; however, we don't want to be overly conservative and layoff unnecessarily; we will know the impact attrition is having at the end of January that won't be related to the reduction-in-force, but with no out-of-cycle reclassifications or raises and a hiring freeze in place
 - i. Depreciation is \$65M; we are putting \$40M back into the physical plant every year; however, even if depreciation is not actual "money", the possible impact is that we will have trouble getting loans
 - d. Comment: The atmosphere on campus is fairly "doom and gloom"
 - i. One person presented an example of perceived non-transparency by the administration and that their personal research agenda has been affected, although they believe the outcome may be fine
 - ii. There are concerns about the cost of hiring the Huron Group; discussion occurred regarding the presentation to the Senate Council, that Huron was hired to restructure clinical trials to recoup millions; some positions may be lost through restructure of clinical trials, but not a huge number; Comment: there is a seeming dichotomy of "no planned layoffs" vs. restructuring with the knowledge of possible jobs lost, "but not many"
3. Report of Committees
 - a. Communications, Hayar: not many are joining the committee, with Hayar and some colleagues performing the tasks; Comment: the website is getting more hits than formerly; Lefler will review then submit her notes from the System meeting office to be posted on the website.
 - b. Faculty Affairs, Compadre: send another email for all faculty to respond to survey; close to 200 responses but need a few more
 - c. Research, Prather: have scheduled the first meeting for Feb. 14, 1 p.m.; 19 people are on the committee email list; he has received 5-6 responses that people will be at the meeting, and none that they won't serve again
 - d. Boysen, UAMS Administrative Network Representative: Centralized printing is a big money saver; suggestion to get rid of all individual office printers
4. Nominations for 2018-2019 Academic Senate Officers
 - a. Lefler: What is the process? Now is the time to solicit nominations; Executive committee (past-, current-, -elect chairs) usually gets nominations; Compadre: must have 2 candidates for each office
 - b. LSO will gather information on office terms and send them to Lefler
5. Report of Christmas Service Event (family sponsorship) – LSO gave report

Adjourned at 3:05 PM