I. President Kelley called the meeting to order at 7:00.

II. Present: Barua, Bridges, Brown, Buckner, Cook-Fong, Craig, Damon, Darveau, Davis, Hoehner, Hodge, Kelley, Korb, Kruse, Lewis, Lightner, Lillis, Lilly, Miller, Moore, Moorman, Terry, Tracy, Unruh, Wozniak, Young.


Guests: University of Nebraska President L. Dennis Smith, Dean of the College of Business and Technology Kathy Smith, Dean of the College of Natural and Social Science Frank Harrold, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Denise Schlake, Asst. to Sr. VCAA Glenn Powell, Center for Teaching Excellence Director Elizabeth Peck, Student Senate Vice President Elect Marcus Donner, UNK Registrar Kim Schipporeit, First Year Experience Committee Chair Kate Benzel, Student Affairs Committee Members Davin Jones and Ryan Downing, and others.

III. A motion to suspend the order of business for a special election to hold an election to fill out a vacancy in the representation of the College of Business & Technology on the Faculty Senate passed.

The Oversight Committee nominated Tami Moore. No further nominations being heard, Bridges/Terry moved that a unanimous ballot be cast for Tami Moore of Family Studies/Interior Design to fill out the vacancy in B&T until elections are held later in March. Motion passed.

Sen. Moore was seated as senator for B&T.

IV. It was moved that the normal order of business be suspended to hear an address by NU President. L. Dennis Smith. Motion passed.

Following Pres. Smith’s presentation of compliments on a list of recent UNK accomplishments, he discussed the current budget situation in detail. He first warned against the friction budget cuts are creating among departments and among campuses, specifically mentioning criticisms targeting Central Administration. He said that Central Admin. has taken cuts and will take more cuts. Among peer institutions, NU has the smallest administration, still at 40 FTE, and remains one of the smallest in the nation. He also reminded senators that much of the funding of Central Admin. goes straight to the member campuses. He then discussed specific budget areas, including salary increases, unfunded mandates, and fixed costs. He reiterated that he and the Board would be monitoring the cuts made to ensure that across the board cuts are not made. Even with changes to the Governor’s recommended cuts, there will still be a significant shortfall. He made an appeal to senators: Any way you can make your support known, please do so. He briefly summarized planned testimony before the Legislature on the 10th of March.

Pres. Smith then opened the floor to questions. Sen. Davis asked for more specifics on the testimony before the Legislature. Sen. Young asked about the status of funding for priority programs. Pres. Smith emphasized that the funding was intended to support core functions and upper quartile programs. Sen. Lightner spoke to the importance of technology to US military preparedness. Sen. Unruh asked about budget cuts in relation to across-campus duplications. Pres. Smith said he favors a statewide economic summit. Sen. Lilly asked whether priority programs are keyed to essential programs or excellent programs. Pres. Smith reiterated that the original plan included both, however it may have been implemented on individual campuses.


V. Hodge/Bridges moved approval of the minutes for the Faculty Senate meeting of 2/6. Minutes were approved with minor revisions.

VI. Reports from Academic Councils:

A. Graduate Council: Minutes of meeting 2/13 accepted without comment.

B. General Studies Council: Minutes of meeting 2/6 accepted without comment.
VII. Reports of Senate Representatives to Non-Senate Committees
   A. Center for Teaching Excellence Advisory Committee: Minutes of meeting 2/17 accepted. Sen. Davis asked if there were still openings for lunch with Mildred García. Center Dir. Peck said there were not.

VIII. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees
   A. Oversight Committee: Minutes of meeting 2/11 accepted. The Committee presented the following resolution, recommending that following the NCA visit in the spring of 2004, the Faculty Senate Assessment Committee would no longer be a committee of the Senate but would instead be under the SVCAA:

   Faculty Senate Oversight Committee Resolution

Whereas, the North Central Association has stated (in its Addendum to the Handbook of Accreditation – Second Edition) that “The CAO (Chief Academic Officer) has oversight responsibility for the ongoing operation of the assessment program and for promoting the use of assessment results to effect desired improvements in student learning, performance, development, and achievement.” (p. 22)

Whereas, the North Central Association has also stated “The assessment program is provided with a Coordinator/Director who reports directly to the CAO.” (p. 25)

Whereas, the North Central Association has also stated “The CEO (Chief Executive Officer) or CAO has established a standing Assessment Committee, typically comprised of faculty, academic administrators, and representatives of the OIR (Office of Institutional Research) and student government.” (p. 25)

Whereas, the Faculty Senate agrees that faculty must play an important role in the construction, development, and implementation of an assessment program,

Whereas, the ultimate responsibility for the assessment program rests with the Senior Vice-Chancellor for Academic affairs (SVCAA/CAO),

Be it resolved that Faculty Senate recommends that (a) the Faculty Senate ad hoc Assessment Committee be disbanded upon completion of the Spring 2004 NCA visit, (b) thereafter, a SVCAA’s Assessment Council be formed immediately, similar in function and structure to the disbanded Faculty Senate Assessment Committee, (c) the SVCAA’s Assessment Council be a permanent council (i.e., a standing committee), (d) the SVCAA’s Assessment Council be modeled after other administrative councils that have clearly defined governance rules and with majority of its members faculty, (e) if a faculty member is Chair of the SVCAA's Assessment Council, then he/she be granted released time from teaching, and (f) the SVCAA’s Assessment Council regularly report to the Faculty Senate for review and discussion of its activities.

Resolution passed.

B. Executive Committee: Minutes of meetings for February were accepted. Sen. Davis offered kudos to Chancellor Kristensen on his comments concerning priority programming.
C. President's Report for March elicited discussion. Sen. Davis stated that he concurred with the focus on the fiscal aspects of academic priority programs. Sen. Wozniak said that he read the Regents’ comments differently. Sen. Young questioned how the Chancellor’s Installation Ceremony could help in recruitment. According to Sen. Kelley, the event would serve multiple purposes. Sen. Young wondered how recruitment was possible given the audience targeted for the installation. Are we attempting to do too much in one event? Sen. Kelley replied that the picnic and open house, not the ceremony itself, targeted recruitment.

D. Academic Affairs: Minutes of the meeting 2/20 included a motion whereby students who receive an F in a repeatable course can replace the grade by retaking the course: Courses designated to be repeated, where additional hours may be earned, are not available for the re-registration option, EXCEPT WITH PERMISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR.

Sen. Wozniak noted that the chair, Kurt Borchard, initially voted against the motion thereby producing a tie, but chairs normally vote only in case of a tie. Without Borchard’s vote, the motion then passed. Concerns about the revision of the existing policy focused on whether chairs should be able to force an increased workload. Sen. Lilly supported the motion, especially in regard to Special Topics courses. Sen. Buckner suggested that chairs should ask the concerned faculty member(s) before deciding. After further discussion of the topic by Sens. Miller, Korb, Wozniak, and Darveau, an amendment was proposed:

Courses designated to be repeated, where additional hours may be earned, are not available for the re-registration option, EXCEPT WITH PERMISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR AND THE AGREEMENT OF APPROPRIATE FACULTY (addition to procedure in caps, amendment by Faculty Senate in bold caps).

The amendment was proposed as friendly but Sen. Young, speaking as Parliamentarian, ruled that it was not a friendly amendment. Lilly/Davis moved that the motion be amended. Amendment passed. Motion passed as amended.

A question was raised concerning what items from a committee must be voted on by the Senate and what items stand without Senate oversight. In the case of Academic Affairs, policy changes come to the Senate but class revisions or approvals do not.

E. Continuing Education Committee: Minutes of meeting 2/11 were accepted without discussion.

F. Library Committee: Minutes of meeting 2/12 were accepted. Sen. Davis offered kudos to Dean Herbison for his rethinking of the issues.

G. Student Affairs Committee: Minutes of meetings 2/11 and 2/27 were accepted. Their major proposals were deferred to New Business.

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

A. First Year Experience Committee: Committee Chair Kate Benzel presented the report of 2/28. She directed senators in particular to the difference in satisfaction ratings between those students completing the First Year Experience program and the polling of general student satisfaction through the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) administered in 2002 on the UNK campus. Further comparisons will be made possible as the results of the College Students Expectations Questionnaire (CSXQ) and College Students Experience Questionnaire (CSEQ) become available. Sen. Cook-Fong asked if classes were being offered in spring semesters; Benzel said only fall courses are offered at this time. Sen. Craig commented on the grassroots growth of the program and wondered if it would be recommended for all freshmen. Benzel said yes, ideally. Sen. Barua asked if any academic growth improvement had yet been noted, but Benzel said not yet. Sen. Young commended the committee on its success, three years in the making, with substantial faculty involvement, time taken first to study the problem, then funds allocated for implementation. The process was undertaken in a methodical and scholarly fashion. Sen. Cook-Fong reported that parents attending summer advisement were very impressed by the First Year Experience program. Many more wanted it than could be accommodated by the available classes. Sen. Kelley
offered kudos to Vice Chancellor Schlake, the Center for Teaching Excellence, and the First Year Experience Committee for the video teleconference offered on the first year experience process. Benzel added that both the Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Committees should also be thanked.

B. Assessment Committee: Minutes of meeting 2/13 were accepted without comment.

X. Unfinished Business:

A. Scholarly Release Time and the Workload Documents

A motion to accept and forward to the SVCAA the Workload Report of Aug. 22, 2002, and to further recommend that the SVCAA take whatever steps necessary to make the 1995 and 2001 Workload Guidelines official policy had been tabled by the Faculty Senate at its meeting of Feb. 6 pending the location and attachment of the 1995 campus-wide and 2001 college-specific workload guidelines. Senators were to seek out copies of the policies from each of the colleges of the 1995 and 2001 documents for the Senate’s consideration at the March 6th meeting.

Following a successful motion (Bridges/Korb) to remove the old motion from the table, the motion itself failed.

Sen. Unruh asked why the colleges had three different policies. The policy for COE had not been distributed because it reflected a radically different model. Sen. Bridges stated that the change to the new standards reflected in these document occurred suddenly. Senators questioned the relationship between these reassigned time policies and guidelines for promotion and tenure, many agreeing that they were entirely separate. Sen. Lilly said that at first there was a 9-hour load instituted for scholarship without any specific requirements. Sen. Bridges stated that her dean (B&T) indicated that the scholarly release time requirements were also promotion and tenure guidelines. Sen. Craig stated that his dean (FAH) told the college that they were not promotion and tenure guidelines but only applicable to scholarly release time. Following a question by Sen. Young, Sen. Davis indicated that the UNKEA contract references but does not negotiate work load. It could be linked if we change it. Sen. Terry stated that the Department of Communications has had guidelines for reassigned time but it has not always been possible to give it due to student credit hour production levels in FAH. Sen. Unruh presented what seemed to be the majority opinion: that the 1995 and 2001 guidelines could not be forwarded to the SVCAA for approval since they do not reflect a common university-wide policy. Instead, the Faculty Senate considered a motion to return the Workload Report of Aug. 22, 2002, to the Welfare Committee for clarification. The motion charged the Welfare Committee to review the various documents and consider the following: 1) accreditation concerns; 2) scholarly reassigned time; 3) lab courses; 4) distance education/web-based courses; 5) writing intensive classes; 6) the relationship of promotion and tenure requirements and scholarly reassigned time; 7) First Year Experience courses; 8) departmental needs and concerns; 9) class size; 10) service; 11) advisement load, and to put forward policies to be brought back before the Faculty Senate. Motion passed.

XI. New Business:

A. Academic Integrity Policy

The Senate considered a UNK Academic Integrity Policy that had been drafted by the FS Student Affairs Committee. In drafting a new version of the Academic Integrity Policy, the Student Affairs Committee proposed a Judicial Committee and a Hearing Board to process grievances and hearings on misconduct. Sen. Craig asked why four students would serve on the boards, Sen. Lilly pointing out that they would thereby form a majority. VC Schlake clarified that students usually take a harder stance even than professors. Sen. Lightner concurred. Davis/Miller moved approval, but the Student Affairs Committee was asked to reconsider the composition of the committee to balance the faculty and student representation.

B. Resolution on C- Grading

A separate motion from the Student Affairs Committee was also considered:

WHEREAS the University of Nebraska at Kearney has implemented a plus/minus grading scale taking effect Fall 2001, and
WHEREAS the "C-" is a variant of the "C" usually awarded for work that falls in the low end of the "C" range, and

WHEREAS the conversion to plus/minus grading was not intended to jeopardize students' academic standing,

BE IT RESOLVED that the University of Nebraska at Kearney Undergraduate Catalog be revised to reflect the current grading system, where a grade of "C" should be replaced with "C-".

Sens. Moore, Lewis, and Bridges pointed out that their respective departments had already considered this issue and voted in favor of retaining the C- grading. Damon/Lightner moved approval.

Resolution failed.

C. Student Affairs Committee Resolution on Academic Dishonesty

One final recommendation by the Student Affairs Committee was introduced:
The Faculty Senate Student Affairs Committee recommends that records of academic integrity/dishonesty be kept in the Office of the Sr. VCAA. It further recommends that the SVCAA’s office should provide a summary report to the Faculty Senate Student Affairs Committee each semester with tracking information on academic integrity/dishonesty policy violations. Wozniak/Young moved approval.

Resolution passed.

D. Resolution on Budget Cuts

A resolution concerning the current budget crisis was considered:

A Resolution Presented
To the University of Nebraska at Kearney Faculty Senate
From the Faculty Senate Executive Committee
March 6, 2003

WHEREAS, the University system, in and of itself, contributes to the depth of intellectual life, the variety of cultural events, the social growth, and the economic health of Omaha, Lincoln, Kearney and the entire State of Nebraska.

WHEREAS, excellence in higher education is dependent on the contributions of every program in the system and cannot be compartmentalized to a few programs.

WHEREAS, budget cuts to the degree that have been proposed will result in substantial loss of essential programs in all of the branches of the University.

WHEREAS, a 10% budget cut for the UNK campus represents a cut of $2.6 million dollars. Given that this amount is equivalent to 81% of the entire non-personal services (non-salary) budget, which includes books and journals, phone service, building insurance, utilities; it seems inevitable that program and personnel cuts will be made. WHEREAS, budget cuts beginning in the next biennium will affect our current students and future students by the availability of fewer academic programs and increased tuition costs.

WHEREAS, students’ accessibility to higher education opportunities may be reduced by these changes.

WHEREAS, such changes may lead to a greater “brain drain” of both students and faculty from Nebraska to other regions of the country.

WHEREAS, the Faculty of the University of Nebraska at Kearney recognizes that it has been entrusted with education of the youth of Nebraska upon whose shoulders the future of our state and our country rests.
WHEREAS, the Faculty of the University of Nebraska have in the past and will continue in the future to make every effort to maintain and enhance quality education and research, so that the people of the State of Nebraska can be proud of the University.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate of the University of Nebraska at Kearney is deeply concerned that any continued erosion of state support for higher education may have disastrous effects on the educational aspirations of the citizens of Nebraska. The Faculty Senate appeals to the State Legislature and the Governor to use every means at their disposal to minimize the negative impact of the current budget crisis on the University of Nebraska by maintaining current funding levels for all programs in the University system.

Sen. Lightner proposed an amendment:
Whereas the military preparedness of the US is dependent in part on a readily available pool of educated potential recruits. Amendment failed for lack of a second.
Resolution passed.

Meeting adjourned at 9:53.

Respectfully submitted,

John Damon
Faculty Senate Secretary