I. Call to Order.
The meeting was called to order by President Zikmund at 7:00 p.m.

II. Roll Call.

Absent: Clark, Emal, German, Mena-Werth, Powell

Guests: Jen Osborn (press), Vice-President of Student Senate Alex Straatmann, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (ASVCAA) David Anderson, Director of General Studies (DoGS) Allan Jenkins, Associate Director of the Office of Residence and Greek Life Daniel Benge, Charlie Pickens

III. Minutes of the meeting of April 2, 1998.
Zikmund D (Fredrickson) moved approval. Senator Terry admitted that he was absent from the April 2 meeting, even though he was listed as present. Motion to approve amended minutes passed unanimously by voice vote.

Zikmund D (Young B) moved to suspend the agenda in order to move item VII-C to the first position on the agenda. Motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

VII.
-C. Report from the Writing Center Committee.

Dr. Charles Peek, Chair of the ad hoc Committee on the Writing Center presented a summary of the report of the committee. Dr. Peek commended the members of the ad hoc committee for bringing no personal agendas to the meetings. The committee was able to address writing as a campus-wide issue and to make a number of general recommendations. However, two more specific recommendations should be pointed out; the recommendation concerning the Writing Center's current space and a recommended survey of the faculty, which should be conducted as soon as possible. Peek also pointed out that the recommendations should not be considered a referendum on the previous or current operations of the Writing Center. He then proceeded to review the highlights of the report.

The Writing Center Director should be directly accountable to the Office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The budget for the Writing Center should come from that Office.
The Director should hold a faculty position and be eligible for tenure and promotion in accord with current guidelines for advancement. However, the criteria for this person's advancement should include a consideration of their responsibilities as Writing Center Director. The criteria should be written conjointly by the Department in which the Director has faculty status and the SVCAA.

There should be a Writing Center Advisory Committee comprised mostly of faculty.

The recommendation concerning the changes to the current space are short-term fixes and the committee acknowledges that the Library has a need for more space. Long-term plans for space reallocation would include moving the Writing Center closer to the Learning Skills Center.

Citing the greater availability of computers on campus and the reduced need to teach word processing, the committee recommended reducing the number of computers in the Center. As a matter of fact, the committee recommended that the Writing Center get out of the word-processing-instruction business.

The recommendations concerning the qualifications of the Director were written to be generic, even though the expectation is that the Director will have faculty status in the English Department. The proposal also described a set of qualifications/expectations for faculty, tutors, and students. The committee recommended that all students earn at least a "C" in ENG 101 before attempting a WI course, and that students earn at least a "C" in ENG 102 before their junior year. Senator Fredrickson asked if a minimum grade of "C" in ENG 101 and 102 was high enough to ensure competent writing in students. He suggested a higher required grade. Senator Miller responded by saying that the proposal already is suggested an elevated criterion. Senator Peck favored requiring average or "C" performance for the students. Senator Young A asked if UNK could establish a requirement like that. Several Senators responded "yes."

The Writing Center should offer services that include both the mechanics of writing and clarification of content.

The recommended budget is $60,000 including the Director's salary, student tutors' salaries, and support for development and Writing workshops.

The long-range recommendations include a unified University Writing Program that would include the management of the WI courses and complete support from the Office of the SVCAA. Senator Miller commended the committee for its fine work. Miller (Zikmund D) moved that the Senate endorse the report of the ad hoc committee on the Writing Center. Senator Umland then presented a number of concerns concerning the recommendations. She was concerned that faculty status for the Director may compromise his or her effectiveness. She favored designating
the position as a non-faculty professional. She was concerned that requiring tutors to take graduate courses in English may discourage non-English majors from serving as tutors. She also asked if the WI courses would migrate to the Writing Center Advisory Committee, then to where would the CD courses migrate? Dr. Peek responded that the WCAC could only be concerned with WI courses and that the status of the CD courses was beyond the purview of the committee. Peek also felt that the faculty status would not be a compromise because the criteria for promotion and tenure would be written to include the Writing Center operations. Senator Fredrickson pointed out that the starting salary of $33 - 36 K seemed low and pointed out that salary estimates should include benefits which inflate the projected cost. Senator Miller asked for confirmation of his understanding of the proposal. His understanding was that the Director would have the requirements for promotion and tenure composed by the Department and the SVCAA in a manner that ensured inclusion of the Writing Center responsibilities. Another Senator asked why should English (or any other department) be expected to house a person whose responsibilities are largely outside of the department? Senator Young B asked if it is possible for a person to get tenure without teaching responsibilities? Senator Anderson and others responded "yes." Senator Emrys asked about the likelihood of finding an appropriate person given the small pool of applicants that the department had in a recent search. Senator Smith asked what the norm was for such positions. She also pointed out that UNL has staff positions devoted to similar duties. ASVCAA Anderson reported that there is no normative approach to defining such a position. Senator Zikmund pointed out that the Senate is only making a recommendation to the administration and thus these definitions are not permanent. Senator Umland disagreed by saying that the definition of the position of Director is crucial to the proposal. The motion passed by a voice vote.

IV. Reports from Academic Councils

A. Graduate Council.
Senator Miller reported that the Graduate Council met earlier today. The Council voted: to discontinue the MA program in Speech; to approve a program that allows the first 12 graduate hours in the UNK English MA program to be earned at Wayne State College; to approve a limit of 16 hours of special topic hours (including hours from the Outreach program) that can be applied to a graduate degree; and to direct the Chair of the Policy and Planning Committee of the Grad Council to work with the Director of the Outreach Programs in order to define more clearly what constitutes appropriate graduate credit.

B. General Studies Council.
Minutes of 4/2/98 were received without comment

V. Reports of Senate Representatives to Non-Senate Committees

A. Strategic Planning Committee.
Senators Miller and Young B reported that the Strategic Planning
Committee approved a document which defines what a scholarly teaching institution is. The document had been included in the Senate packet and was approved with one change: The item referring to Teachers and reading "maintain focused individual research interests throughout their careers" was changed to read "maintain focused research interests, which result in quality peer-reviewed products, throughout their careers." Senators Miller and Young B further reported that the SVCAA said that he and his staff would, over the summer, work on changing these statements into objectives. Senator Young B said that he abstained from the vote for approval of the statement because he did receive the document in time to carefully review it in light of the Mission Statement previously created by the committee. Senator Benz asked how detailed will the objectives be, especially with regard to peer-reviewed products? Senator Miller said the level of detail was not discussed, but he assumed they would be quite general. Senator Kelley asked what the purpose of the document was? Senator Young A said that it was simply a definition of what we claim to be. Senator Katsiyannis said that we have been talking about this question for some time and that this document expresses the common threads from the discussions. Senator Young A agreed by saying that the SVCAA asked for input from the campus and that this document best expressed the definition. Senator Davis expressed concern about the SVCAA developing objectives. He wished that there be broader dissemination of the definition before the next step. Senator Davis (Kelley moved that the document be distributed to all faculty for review before the SVCAA proceeds with the development of objectives. Motion passed by a voice vote. Senator Terry asked why the phrase concerning peer review was added. Senator Miller said that Dean Hadley was particularly in favor of the amendment. Senator Terry suggested that peer-review may then be appropriate for all of the criteria. Senator Miller said that peer review was not intended to include an external reviewer.

B. Budget Committee.
   No report.
C. Honors Council.
   No report.
D. Marketing Plan Committee.
   No report.
E. Pew Roundtable.
   The College of Education has met this past week.
F. University Calendar Committee.
   ASVCAA Anderson and Senator Wozniak were both surprised by the Hub article reporting that the calendar changes won't be implemented until 2001. Their recollection is that committee recommended that the calendar changes be implemented as soon as possible.
G. Gender Equity Committee.
   No report.
H. Other.
   Senator Fredrickson reported that the Student Technology Fee Committee is
gearing up for the change in technology money available that will occur because of the change in the technology fee from $1 to $5. He reported that off-campus students do not pay the fee. The committee will review whether that exception is appropriate. Senator Fredrickson speculated that the process for allocation may change from being a request-based process to permanent allocations for the Library and each College. Senator Wozniak asked if the Committee has a Chair and keeps minutes. Senator Fredrickson responded that minutes are kept but not made public because the Chancellor approves the final allocations and then announces them publicly. Senator Wozniak (Benz) moved that the Technology Fee Committee establish some regular formalized communication of their activities to the Senate. Motion passed by a voice vote.

VI. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees

A. Election Committee.
Senator Young B reported that a restatement clarifying the Faculty Senate Constitution will be ready for initial discussion on the Senate floor by the September meeting. A draft of the revision should be available for Senators before summer. Senator Young B reminded the Senate that the approval process will begin at the September meeting leading to a formal vote at the October meeting.

B. Executive Committee.
President Zikmund distributed the reports of the executive committee concerning their meetings with the Vice Chancellors and the Chancellor. Senator Fredrickson commented on the unavailability of the names of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee. He asked if this was consistent with "open-door" requirement for State institutions. He also pointed out that UNK would have an even larger percentage of faculty attending commencement if there were a summer commencement. Senator Hodge asked who has been invited to the Chancellor's Advisory Committee meetings. Senator Fredrickson said that he was asked to give a presentation. Hodge further asked if he was invited to stay after his presentation, Fredrickson said "no." Senator Davis said that he was concerned both as a State employee and as a taxpayer, that there existed secret committees which could influence decision making at UNK. He suggested that like any public office, there is a need to know about the working of State institutions. Senator Hyatte expressed agreement with Davis. Senator Ziebarth said that it is not necessarily the members of the committee who want their identities protected. Senator Miller agreed. He said that three members in particular did not want their participation publicized because they had resigned from other such committees and acknowledging this membership would prove to be embarrassing to them.

C. President's Report.
President Zikmund reported that at the last Board of Regents meeting, the Human Resources Classification System was reviewed, the Multimedia
programs from Journalism/MC, Art, and CSIS were approved, and that merit pay was extensively discussed.

A resolution concerning merit pay was passed by the Board of Regents:

WHEREAS, Section 3.0 of the Bylaws of the Board of Regents (the "Bylaws") provides that "merit" is the criterion by which qualifications for appointment, retention and promotion of University employees is judged; and

WHEREAS, Sections 4.5 and 4.6 of the Bylaws and Regents' Policy RP-4.2.8 clearly state that merit shall be the basis for salary adjustments, and require annual evaluation of the performance of both academic and administrative employees to be used in determining salary adjustments;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Regents that the Board strongly supports the concept of reward and recognition of University employees based upon the quality of job performance, and consistent with the Board's existing policies requiring annual evaluation of performance, it is the policy of the Board that to the maximum extent permitted by law increases in individual compensation for faculty, administrators and staff shall be based upon the evaluated quality of performance of duties of University employment.

President Zikmund reported that the some of the discussion at the meeting centered on UNK's lack of merit pay. After the meeting, Regent Wilson further commented to her that merit pay is part of the University culture that UNK has yet to acknowledge. President Zikmund reported that Regent O'Brien stated that the UNK faculty do not want merit pay because they feel they are all equal. Senator Wozniak said that Regent O'Brien misquoted him in the performance pay committee meetings. In that meeting, he asked Regent O'Brien if it would be OK for a Department to decide that each faculty gets an equal share of merit pay. The response was "no" because that would defeat the purpose of merit pay. Senator Peck reported that the performance pay committee meetings were marked by an administrative unwillingness to respond to what faculty saw as rational arguments against merit pay. Senator Davis pointed out, for the record, that there is a model for merit pay that sets up a merit pay system without touching the base pay. Senator Miller said that, whatever we think, merit pay is not the measure of maturity of an institution of higher education. Senator Hodge asked if central administration raises are based on merit and are merit-based raises successfully differentiating among the successful administrators? Senator Smith asked if we have indeed been threatened. She suggested that the UNKEA could direct their legal counsel to investigate whether these threats constitute unfair labor practice. Senator Miller suggested that there may be enough interpretative freedom of the data to project UNK as needed a fairly
small raise to keep up with the comparison group. Senator Benz asked if we
don't already have a merit system, which is tenure and promotion. Miller
responded by indicating that the Board interprets merit as merit pay only.
Senator Young A asked Senator Davis to restate the law concerning existing
conditions of the contract. Senator Davis stated that a special master would
not approve a fundamental change in existing conditions, thus a new system
would not be favored by a special master. Senator Wozniak reminded
faculty of the Union meeting Monday. Senator Young B asked if the Board
ever gave a clear written statement as to why they want merit pay. Senator
Peck said that all arguments for merit pay were made verbally. Senator
Wozniak added that those arguments largely consisted of testimonials and
vague references to what the public wants. Senator Young B said that this
situation is being played by certain Board members (and candidates)
through the press in such a way to make the faculty look bad and that
rational arguments against merit pay are being washed away by emotional
and/or political appeals with unfair references to "deadwood" who are
resistant to progress.

President Zikmund continued her report. Mr. Ron Withem was on campus
recently to meet with representatives from the Student, Staff, and Faculty
Senates. Mr. Withem stated that communication between the University and
the Coordinating Commission needs to be improved. President Zikmund
also reported that there is concern about the proposals coming out the
Business Summit (AKA Nebraska Futures) and that political action from
this group will be important to watch. The Chancellor wanted the Senate to
discuss a proposal concerning the start-of-the-year faculty convocation as a
new campus tradition. It has been suggested that faculty wear their
academic robes, convene under the Carillon and march to the convocation
in the Fine Arts Building. President Zikmund also said that another formal
orientation meeting for students was also being considered. Senator Hodge
asked why wear the robes in August heat. Senator Kuskie said that more
formal tradition needs to be instituted at UNK, and the faculty must lead in
developing this tradition. He also quickly said that wearing robes in August
may not be the way to initiate tradition. Senator Young B asked why robes?
Senator Kelley said that wearing formal academic regalia may only serve to
increase the perceived distance between faculty and students. Senator
Wozniak said the orientation proposal was misinterpreted. He said that the
proposal for the orientation meeting was to hold a Sunday evening
ceremony (in academic regalia) to begin the new students' academic career.
The ceremony could include a short speech concerning the nature of
academia (perhaps by one of our own excellent teachers) and could
incorporate an academic fair, wherein each department displays information
about programs. Senator Young A suggested that if we wish to impress new
students, faculty could wear their robes to their first class meetings. Senator
Young B said that new ideas like these need to be tested (perhaps on a focus
group of freshman) before we invest time and resources in a ceremony that
could flop. (There will be no carnival this year.) He found it difficult to understand how these ideas will help us relate to 18 year olds. Perhaps we could survey some of them to see if they would go to it. Senator Umland asked if the gown would be compulsory. Senator Miller jokingly replied that the front seats would be reserved for those without gowns. Senator Peck stated that the idea of wearing academic regalia is ridiculous and that it would be better to focus on issues of substance rather than image. Senator Smith reported that Senator Benz suggested that, in order to reach more students, faculty should wear robes to the bars.

D. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee.
No report.

E. Grievance Committee.
No report.

F. Professional Conduct Committee.
No report.

G. Academic Computing Committee.
Senator Fredrickson apologized for the lack of minutes. He had served as acting secretary for the committee and simply did not have time to get them together. However, in summary, the committee felt that it needed more time to discuss the idea of redefining the position of Director of Computer Services. The committee therefore is unable to respond to the Senate directive concerning that issue.

H. Academic Affairs Committee.
The minutes of 3/18/98 and 4/15/98 were accepted without comment. Senator Wozniak asked if the committee had discussed the proposal concerning establishing a requirement that certain GS courses be completed by the junior year. President Zikmund reported that she had spoken to Chair Sluti about the topic and that it will be added to their agenda.

I. Artists and Lecturers Committee.
No report.

J. Athletic Committee.
The minutes of 3/10/98 and 4/1/98 were accepted without comment.

K. Library Committee.
No report.

L. Student Life Committee.
The minutes of 3/30/98 were discussed. Senator Kaye reported that the committee has subsequently met and is currently considering the residential college proposal. Senator Davis feared that the lack of action might allow the proposal to move forward over the summer without Senate input. Senator Kaye indicated that the committee could not make a recommendation at this time and needed to study the proposal further. He added that the committee wanted to see further development of the idea. Mr. Dan Benge reported that the committee had initially approved the proposal but that the approval was rescinded because of a procedural error. However, Mr. Benge asked that he needed direction from the committee as
to what portions of the proposal needed further development. Senator Kaye said that the committee could provide him with their questions. Senator Zikmund said that the original motion explicitly requested that the development of the residential college be initiated only after Senate approval. Senator Davis then said that the proposal is on hold until September. Senator Miller asked that the committee and Mr. Benge work out the concerns over this summer, then report to the Senate in the fall. Senator Benz asked how Benge can address problems that are undefined. Senator Kaye indicated that the committee can list the items that need to be addressed. Senator Wozniak reminded the Student Life Committee of the assignment that the Senate gave it at the last meeting (to discuss the possibility of requiring advising of all students,) and asked that it be added to the committee's agenda.

M. Continuing Education Committee.
The minutes of 4/13/98 were accepted with no comment.

VII. Reports of Faculty Senate Special (Ad Hoc) Committees

A. Post-tenure Review Committee.
A complete copy of the proposed post-tenure policy was included in the packet. Senator Benz asked if the copy was correct because the sentence structure of item 2.-a.-1 was unclear or incomplete or ungrammatical. The executive committee promised to check if the copy was accurate.

B. Committee on the Evaluation and Encouragement of Teaching (CEET).
Senator Anderson reported that the committee has been formed and will meet tomorrow. The committee members are: Greg Anderson (representing the Library), Ken Nikels (representing the administration), Rick Miller (representing the Graduate College), Antonis Katsiyannis (representing the Faculty Senate), Barbara Clark (representing the College of Education), Jim Scott (representing the College of Natural and Social Sciences), Laurie Swinney (representing the College of Business and Technology), and Mike Benzel (representing the College of Fine Arts and Humanities).

C. Writing Center Committee. [presented earlier]

D. Committee on the General Studies Capstone Course.
Senator Miller reported that the committee has been formed and will have an orientation meeting next Wednesday.

VIII. Unfinished Business.

A. Proposed Constitutional Revisions.
Senator Young B reported that this work in progress is work and is in progress.

IX. New Business.
President Zikmund asked that faculty give some thought to the questions which are listed on the enclosed Reach-Up Faculty/Staff Forum Handout. Apparently no faculty or staff attended the forum on April 7. President Zikmund asked for comments concerning the Dual Career Program Proposal. Senator Emrys said that the program doesn't seem to offer anything substantive. Senator Hill said that it took much needed money away from the Colleges. Senator Luscher said that he had already seen a brochure concerning the program. Senator Miller agreed that the program was too modest and as it currently is structured may not make a significant difference. Senator Emrys asked if it ever could become a meaningful program. Senator Hill asked if it addresses the usual situation of trailing spouse, where both partners have a Ph.D. Senator Benz added that either the trailing spouse has a Ph.D. or is a professional person. In either case, it was difficult to see how the program would help recruiting. The Wellness program was discussed next. Senator Benz noted that $8K was needed for a dual career program, whereas $100K was needed for Wellness. Senator Miller asked where the bulk of the money was coming from. ASVCAA Anderson did not know. Senator Miller admitted that the SVCAA was asked only about his contribution to the program. Senator Young A asked if this program was related to externally-funded programs in exercise physiology. The executive committee promised to investigate. The Letter from President L. Dennis Smith was discussed next. Senator Hodge pointed out that besides the picture of gloom and doom, there is a call to become more streamlined and efficient. This seems to stand in contradiction to her perception that the number of administrative positions is growing. Senator Kaye asked about the publication entitled "Breaking the Social Contract: The Fiscal Crisis in Higher Education." He asked if it was a call for education to break the social contract or the converse. Since the letter refers to the article, it could change the meaning of the message. Senator Davis expressed dismay in that the central administrators, who should be teaching the Regents and the Legislatures about the nature of higher education, are caving in to the notion that higher education is just like a big corporation. They should know that higher education is not a corporation and that a liberal arts education is inconsistent with the corporate culture. Senator Fredrickson asked that administrative growth within each College as well as in Founders Hall be investigated. Senator Young B observed it would seem that during recent years the higher administrators on the NU campuses have been dedicated to increasing levels of external service activities as a major job focus. This provides them access to the politicians and the media, as would be expected, and also to selected professionals and selected socioeconomic groups. This investment of time, talent and money in external service activities should hopefully shore up support for our higher education mission and, hopefully at some point, better explain the valid differences between corporate operations and campus operations, faculty duties, rights, and so forth. So it is very disconcerting to be warned again and again that financial support is dwindling, that an already productive faculty needs to be even more productive for its average/mid-point (not above average) salaries, and that there is great public outcry for less tenure and for annual salary adjustments based only on a merit system for selected faculty only, despite extensive annual evaluation for all faculty, including the post-tenure review.
stigma policy adopted to ferret out non-meritorious faculty. At this point, Senator Wozniak wished to make a comment that he wanted Senator Young B to take in the most positive way. He reported that his brain had exploded and may be unable to report Senator Young's comments accurately. (Secretary's note: Since then Senator Young B helped Senator Wozniak to transcribe his comments accurately. Thanks to Senator Young B.)

X. General Faculty Comments.
Senator Zikmund (Hodge) moved for adjournment. Motion passed by a voice vote out of sympathy for the Secretary.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Wozniak, Faculty Senate
Secretary