UNK FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
ALUMNI HOUSE
Thursday, April 24, 2003
7:00 p.m.

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

II. Present: Barton, Barua, Bridges, Buckner, Cook-Fong, Damon, Darveau, Davis, Exstrom,
Fredrickson, Fronczak, Hartman, Hodge, Hof, Kelley, Kruse, Lewis, Lightner, Lilly, Luscher, Markussen,
Miller, Moore, Moorman, Nelson, Obermier, Seshadri, Terry, Unruh, Wozniak, Young.
Absent: Brown, Korb, Tracy.
Guests: Prof. David Tidwell, 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, Student Affairs Committee Member Davin Jones.

III. Bridges/Wozniak moved approval of the minutes for the Faculty Senate meeting of 4/3. Minutes
were approved with emendations.

IV. A motion by Bridges/Hodge to suspend the order of business to consider the changes to the UNK
Student Code of Conduct in response to an analysis by Legal Counsel passed.
Vice Chancellor Schlake clarified the changes. Davis/Bridges moved that discussion cease. Motion
passed. Miller/Young moved passage of the revised Code of Conduct. Motion passed.

V. Electronic Packets/ Minutes Sen. Obermier, the newly elected Faculty Senate Secretary, raised the
issue of minutes being distributed electronically. Sen. Young pointed out that the distribution of minutes,
agenda, and packets of documents under consideration is mandated by the Constitution, and electronic
distribution would break the terms of that document, in particular l. 181 in which the term “packets” is
presumed to refer to paper documents, and Article II.H.2 on Meeting Minutes specifies l. 357 “print copy
minutes.” Miller/Fredrickson moved to strike the words “packets” and “print copy” from the Constitution
and By-laws.

Sen. Obermier discussed using the Faculty Senate website with link to pages in PDF format, a
process which would allow automatic archiving of each electronic “packet.” Sen. Miller suggested that
this would also facilitate requests for resolutions; he has archives if they need to be added to the website.
Sen. Wozniak asked when the electronic packets would be made available. Sen. Bridges noted that the
By-laws state that the agenda must arrive three days before the meeting. Sen. Davis raised the issue of the
library’s need for a printed copy of the packet; would the Secretary still do this? Sen. Damon mentioned
that the packet actually goes out to two lists, one being the 35 senators and the other being some 35 other
individuals and groups at UNK [Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Deans, Registrar, etc.], other branches of
the University of Nebraska [UNL and UNO Faculty Senates, Regent Schroeder, etc.], and news sources
[Hub, Antelope, etc.]. Would this second list also be expected to access the packets electronically or
would the Secretary send printed packets to this larger list? Sen. Darveau also asked if Sen. Obermier
would be willing and able to do all this. Sen. Obermier answered in the affirmative. Sen. Darveau
wondered if sending an email “packet” wouldn’t be better than expecting senators to access the website
on their own. Would the packet materials be accessible all in one place? Sen. Obermier again answered
in the affirmative. Motion passed.

VI. Reports from Academic Councils:
A. General Studies Council: Minutes of meeting 4/3 prompted a discussion of the problem of
assessment of General Studies in anticipation of the NCA campus visit in 2004. Sen. Wozniak stated that
the recent visit by NCA official Bob Appelson caused the issue of assessment of General Studies to be
moved upward to the top of the priority list. An assessment document now exists in draft form. The assessment would be centrally operational, with random selection of students who would be remunerated for their participation. The assessments would be in writing and in specific content subsets. The General Studies assessment would be carried out in conjunction with the five-year academic program review, with a full assessment of General Studies occurring on a five-year cycle.

Sen. Unruh asked what the goal of random selection was. Sen. Wozniak explained that it would be easier than assessing all students per class. There would be a two-tiered selection process, looking at freshmen and juniors. This system could be coordinated to reflect the student body as a whole. Sen. Unruh also questioned what would happen to those who refused to participate. They would not be forced; they would be rewarded fiscally and with esteem. Sen. Lilly asked if the results would be made available to the students. Sen. Wozniak said they would. Sen. Bridges asked about departments assessing their own general studies courses separately from the General Students Program process. Sen. Wozniak said the assessments could be the same but reported separately. Sen. Lilly stated that objectives had been created already. Sen. Wozniak explained that annual assessments have been covering major classes; academic program reviews occur every five years. Sen. Miller mentioned the Liberal Studies proposal, pointing out that it is still just a proposal and not yet ready for more general debate.

VII. Reports of Senate Representatives to Non-Senate Committees

C. Center for Teaching Excellence Advisory Committee: Minutes of meeting of 4/24 were accepted without discussion.

VIII. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees

A. Oversight Committee: Minutes of meeting of 4/8 were accepted. Actionable items were brought forward. A brief discussion preceded a vote on the motion of Darveau/Bridges to pass the Constitutional Amendments. Motion passed.

Next, the nominations for the positions of president-elect, Secretary, and Faculty Senate Representative to the Executive Committee were considered. The Oversight Committee nominated Sen. Deb Bridges of the Department of Economics in the College of Business and Technology to the position of president-elect (a three-year term comprising president-elect, president, and past-president). No further nominees were brought forward. Hodge/Moorman moved approval. Motion passed.

The Oversight Committee nominated Sen. Tim Obermier from the Department of Industrial Technology in the College of Business and Technology for the position of Secretary (a one-year term). No further nominees were brought forward. Hodge/Darveau moved approval. Motion passed.

The Oversight Committee nominated Sen. Martha Kruse of the Department of English in the College of Fine Arts and Humanities for the position of Faculty Senate Representative (a one-year term). No further nominees were brought forward. Hof/Fredrickson moved approval. Motion passed.

Sen. Fredrickson expressed concern that the Executive Committee again does not involve equal representation from all colleges. Sen. Young said that balanced representation had been a goal of the Oversight Committee as well, but that College of Education nominees declined.

Nominations for college representatives for the Faculty Senate Oversight Committee were presented for vote. The following action was taken:

For the College of Business and Technology: Leslie Korb, Department of Management/Marketing; Bridges/Terry moved closure of nominations: Sen. Korb was elected.

For the College of Education: Marta Moorman, Department of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Leisure Studies; Wozniak/Hof moved closure of nominations: Sen. Moorman was elected.

For the College of Fine Arts and Humanities: Nathan Buckner, Department of Music and Performing Arts; Luscher/Terry moved closure of nominations: Sen. Buckner was elected.

For the College of Natural and Social Sciences: Bill Wozniak, Department of Psychology; Hof/Terry moved closure of nominations: Sen. Wozniak was elected.

For the Library: Mary Ann Barton; Bridges/Terry moved closure of nominations: Sen. Barton was elected.
Election of Faculty Senate replacement for Sen. Jim Scott, who is leaving UNK, included both a nominee from the Oversight Committee and a nomination from the floor. Oversight nominated Vern Volpe of the Department of History, the runner-up in the recent college-wide election; Damon/Exstrom nominated John Anderson of the Department of Political Science, since Sen. Scott has been the sole representative of that department on Faculty Senate. Luscher/Young moved that nominations cease. **John Anderson was elected.**

Election of a replacements for Sen. Jim Scott and Sen. John Lillis on the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee involved a single nominee from the Oversight Committee for each position: Sen. Bill Wozniak of the Department of Psychology was nominated to replace Sen. Scott. Hodge/Terry moved that nominations cease. **Sen. Wozniak was elected.**

Marta Moorman, Department of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Leisure Studies was nominated to replace Sen. Lillis. Bridges/Terry moved that nominations cease. **Sen. Moorman was elected.**

The Oversight Committee solicited nominations for the 2003 Hampster Awards.

**B. Executive Committee:** Sen. Darveau raised questions about item #4 concerning budget reduction, especially in regard to the merger of academic departments. Members of the Executive Committee clarified that about 30 minutes were spent in discussing departmental mergers and reasons that they should be reconsidered. Concerns included the unique missions of the existing departments, accreditation issues, a blurring of mission and focus, and data from peer institutions. One example of the last of these issues is that the University of Central Arkansas is of a comparable size with UNK (365 faculty vs. just above 300 here) but has 44 departments compared to UNK’s 22. UNK lies at the low end in number of departments compared to its peer institutions. There are reasons for having small, focused departments. UNL has three different “biology” departments. Sen. Hof asked what the process would be in reconsideration of the mergers. No specific plan has been put in place, but position papers have been or are to be submitted. Sen. Lewis brought up the needs of Counseling and School Psychology. The specific problems faced by Chemistry and Physics also were discussed. Sen. Darveau described practices at Truman State and how their departmental divisions function. Sen. Exstrom questioned how much difference the changes would make. Sen. Fredrickson stated that mergers have not worked well in the past. There has been some increase in communication, but not much. The example of Sociology and Social Work was mentioned.

Sen. Wozniak reported that Aug. 18th had been suggested for the proposed administrative retreat. Sen. Lilly asked which departments would be invited to the retreat. Perhaps those who had recently undergone academic review?

Sen. Kruse suggested an emendation to item #3 in the meeting with the Chancellor: it should read, “The Chancellor suggested that we should [not] lead students to expect support that we cannot deliver.”

At this point a long discussion ensued concerning item #3 from the meeting with the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs: Workload Policies. Glen Powell, Asst. to the SVCAA, described the review he has been conducting of workload policies in place in our peer institutions. He has been contacting peer institutions, asking what their standard workload is and what policies are in place concerning workload. By July 10th, he will have gathered information about workload and how it is assigned for a report to the SVCAA. Based on his current research, it seems that a 12-hour load is typical of our peers. For example, Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas, has a 12-hour load for undergraduate faculty and a 9-hour load for graduate faculty. The University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point, recently established a 9-hr. load but suspended it due to budget constraints. Central Missouri State University has a normal 12-hr. load in all areas except the Business College, which has 9 in response to accreditation requirements. His method has been to contact Academic Affairs at each institution. Often specific workload for an individual is determined by negotiation with dean, department chair, and faculty member. Sen. Lilly asked how many of our peer institutions are universities, rather than state colleges. A good percentage are universities: University of Northern Iowa; University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point;
Moorhead State University; University of Northern Colorado; Central Missouri State University; Northern Michigan University; Sam Houston State University, etc. Sen. Miller suggested that expectations of scholarship should also be examined. A 9-hr. load would and should reflect scholarship guidelines. Powell stated that the responses so far are mostly negative, in terms of a 9-hr. load policy; only colleges of business seem to have a 9-hr. standard. Sen. Unruh reiterated that more things are needed to assess the actual policies in place in our peer institutions. What would our own institution say if contacted about a policy? Issues of accreditation, release time, etc. are needed.

Sen. Markussen stated that one point in the meeting with the Chancellor, Item #2 concerning the RIF Advisory Committee, is inaccurate: 2 + 2 dietetics is a UNK program.

C. President’s Report for April: President Kelley’s Summary of Budget Forum was accepted with discussion.

Sen. Unruh asked about staff cuts. How will these be decided? Sen. Miller indicated that those issues were discussed at the staff forum. One discussion point concerned movement to ¾ time but retention of full benefits. Delays in raises were also discussed. Sen. Unruh questioned whether this would include delays in cost of living increases. Advancement and promotion raises? Sen. Damon questioned the wisdom and fairness of faculty increases while staff faced cuts, as addressed in item #5 of the report. Could the faculty act to share the cuts, rather than leaving them in place only for the staff, who are often paid less then we are? Sen. Miller said that faculty pay is falling behind peer institutions, and the result is that UNK is becoming less and less competitive in the ability to attract quality faculty. The same is true of staff. Sen. Damon suggested that faculty waiving their salary increases would show our commitment to the community and send an appropriate message about our concern for the institution’s economic health. Sen. Darveau asked if we could delay implementation of the raises. Sen. Unruh asked if administrators were also taking raises. Sen. Damon said he understood that the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, and Deans have decided to forgo salary raises this year. Faculty would therefore be the only group obtaining raises.

Sen. Hartman asked about the status of merit pay. Sen. Davis said that the pool for merit pay has shrunk to practically nothing. There is a policy of merit pay, yes, but no money as a system actually to carry it out. There will be a trickle this year and none next year. Sen. Hodge asked what the regents will do since they mandated it. Sen. Davis suggested that they do not wish to put more money in.

Sen. Terry voiced support for Sen. Damon’s position. He asked if there was a process by which the faculty could vote on the issue. Sen. Kelley suggested that a union meeting would be the normal means. Sen. Davis said that a majority vote of UNKEA membership would be needed. Sen. Terry asked if this would have to be a contract vote. Could a poll not be conducted to determine the faculty’s sentiment on the issue? Sen. Davis stated that there is no means by which the faculty could designate their delayed salary increases for the relief of staff. There is not way to guarantee that A’s generosity will go to B. There is no such mechanism. Perhaps individual accounts could be set up whereby faculty could deposit their $900 of raise to an account for staff. Sen. Terry said he was not confident that the statement that we cannot do this really means that it is impossible. Sen. Buckner asked how much this money represented. Sen. Lilly wondered if we could not designate a group. Sen. Kelley said we cannot even designate that the funds stay at UNK. Sen. Unruh asked when we would know the specific cuts. Sen. Miller said that we will know the real numbers in June. Until then, we do not know what staff pay status will actually be. Beyond taking a poll of faculty sentiment, we cannot act until after June. Sen. Terry pointed out that money returned to Varner Hall can come back to UNK if the upper administration and UNK act together. Sen. Fredrickson wondered if the funds could go to the NU Foundation. If we give the money back to upper administration, he does not believe it will return. Members of the Executive Committee said they would examine the issue.

D. Academic Affairs: Minutes of meetings 3/27 and 4/17 were accepted with discussion.

Sen. Bridges expressed concern that not all items submitted to Academic Affairs made it to the agenda. The decision to proceed without all items on the agenda was a response to requests by Jeanne Cutler concerning catalog deadlines. An additional May meeting was suggested. Concerns were expressed
about the lack of a chair to convene the meeting and the lack of a procedure for calling a special meeting. Young/Miller made a motion to direct the Academic Affairs Committee to hold a special meeting on May 15th to resolve the backlog. In response to a question by Sen. Bridges, Sen. Lightner and Sen. Young confirmed that six voting members would be needed as a quorum. **Motion passed.**

**J. Faculty Welfare Committee:** Minutes of meeting 4/7 included an actionable item in the form of the following resolution:

**Resolution**

*We propose that the SVCAA appoint a SVCAA Workload Committee chaired by the Assistant Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs consisting of faculty representing UNKEA, Faculty Senate (perhaps from the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee), and the 4 Associate Deans. The first task of the committee is to draft a policy that covers the campus. The policy should address the following issues:*  
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,

Because the workload is an essential element of our quality of work life, we request that the final draft be submitted to the Faculty Senate for comment.

The SVCAA Workload Committee would annually review the implementation of the workload policies and produce an annual report for the SVCAA. The report should also be shared with the Dean’s Council and the Faculty Senate (perhaps through the Faculty Welfare Committee.)

Lilly/Bridges, Damon/Fredrickson, and Miller/Luscher proposed three amendments, each of which passed, resulting in the following amended resolution (with new language indicated in bold and eliminated material marked with a strikethrough):

**Resolution**

*We propose The Faculty Senate proposes that the SVCAA appoint a SVCAA Workload Committee chaired by the Assistant Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs consisting of faculty representing UNKEA, Faculty Senate (perhaps from the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee), and the 4 Associate Deans. The first task of the committee is to draft a policy that covers the campus. The policy should address the following issues, including, but not limited to:*  
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,

Because the workload is an essential element of our quality of work life, we request that the final draft be submitted to the Faculty Senate for comment. The Faculty Senate considers reassigned time for scholarship as essential to the mission of UNK.

The SVCAA Workload Committee would annually review the implementation of the workload policies and produce an annual report for the SVCAA. The report should also be shared with the Dean’s Council and the Faculty Senate (perhaps through the Faculty Welfare Committee.)

The resolution passed.

N. Student Affairs Committee: Minutes of meetings 4/10 and 4/17 were accepted without discussion, except for actionable items concerning recommendations on academic advising and on Academic Integrity Hearing Boards.

The first recommendation read as follows:

The Faculty Senate Student Affairs Committee makes the following recommendations:

I. The Director of Academic Advising should be asked to provide a guide of expectations for advising. The guide should include the expectations for faculty members and students. There should be inclusion of the role of career planning as well as academic course advising. Further, the expectations should be tailored to the classification of the students (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior).

II. The information on expectations should be published in the Undergraduate Catalog, the Class Schedule, on Web-EASI, the Antelope newspaper and its online edition, and included in e-mails to students regarding advising. All academic advisors would also receive a copy of the expectations.

III. Advising expectations should be thoroughly explained to students during their summer orientation.

IV. Advising expectations should be incorporated into the requirements for Y1@UNK courses.

Cook-Fong/Hof moved acceptance of the recommendations. Sen. Wozniak asserted that the recommendations cannot be accepted without Faculty Senate oversight of the guidelines. Sen. Obermier concurred, stating that they cannot be accepted without the guidelines. Davin Jones spoke for the recommendations, saying that they were planned to aid student understanding of the new policies. Sen. Kruse pointed out the guidelines themselves do not yet exist as a document. Sen. Miller expressed the opinion that these established a goal but were premature. Sen. Lilly suggested that these be used to get the ball rolling. Lilly/Wozniak moved that section #1 of the recommendation be amended to state “The Director of Academic Advising should be asked to provide a guide of expectations for advising to the Faculty Senate and to the Student Senate.” After some discussion, the amendment was withdrawn. Sen. Seshadri asked whether the remainder of section #1 should be eliminated, and Sen. Luscher pointed out that no vehicle is created in the recommendations for the discussion of the guidelines by the Senate.

Following an amendment by Darveau/Miller and a friendly amendment by Young Hartman, the motion passed as amended:

The Faculty Senate Student Affairs Committee makes the following recommendations:

I. The Director of Academic Advising should be asked to provide a guide of expectations for advising to the Faculty Senate and to the Student Senate. The guide should include the expectations for faculty members and students. There should be inclusion of the role of career planning as well as academic course advising. Further, the expectations should be tailored to the classification of the students (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior).
II. Following review and approval of the guidelines by the Faculty Senate and the Student Senate, the information on expectations should be published in the Undergraduate Catalog, the Class Schedule, on Web-EASI, the Antelope newspaper and its online edition, and also included in e-mails to students regarding advising. All academic advisors would also receive a copy of the expectations.

III. Advising expectations should be thoroughly explained to students during their summer orientation.

IV. Advising expectations should be incorporated into the requirements for Y1@UNK courses.

Sen. Terry pointed out that the cost to the Antelope for publication of the guidelines would have to be remunerated. This requirement was officially noted.

The second recommendation of the Student Affairs Committee concerned the establishment of Hearing Boards for violations of academic integrity:

The Student Affairs Committee recommends that the Judicial Board to review alleged violations of academic integrity shall consist of the following: Two appointed students, three appointed faculty members, and the Judicial Officer in an ex-officio capacity. One of the faculty members will serve as Chairperson. The chair will be a non-voting member except in cases of a tie; in such cases the Chair will cast the tie-breaking vote.

Following discussion and clarification of the language and intent, with issues raised by Sen. Luscher concerning the grammar of the initial clause, by Sen. Fredrickson concerning the meaning of “ex-officio,” and by Sen. Seshadri concerning who would appoint these members, Luscher/Bridges moved approval of the following amended form of the recommendation:

The Student Affairs Committee recommends that the Judicial Hearing Board designated to review alleged violations of academic integrity shall consist of the following: Two appointed students, three appointed faculty members, and the Judicial Officer in an ex-officio capacity. One of the faculty members will serve as Chairperson. The chair will be a non-voting member except in cases of a tie; in such cases the Chair will cast the tie-breaking vote.

Motion passed.

IX. Reports of Faculty Senate Special (Ad Hoc) Committees
A. Assessment Committee: Minutes of meetings 3/13 and 4/10 were accepted without discussion. The Committee Chair’s Report generated brief discussion. Prof. Peck explained that this represented the status of the committee’s progress as of 4/16. Work is ongoing. Sens. Miller and Young asked about the definition of programs and departments requiring assessment, especially whether mergers would alter the assessment profiles. Prof. Peck replied that all programs and departments are included but that mergers would affect the assessment picture. The status of certain departments under consideration for merger or elimination is uncertain. Young/Moore made a motion of commendation to Prof. Peck and the committee for their hard work. Motion carried.

X. New Business:
A. Student Technology Fee Projects 2002-2003

Sen. Fredrickson complained that student technology fees were instituted to benefit students directly. It is unfair to the students that 100% of many items go for uses that are institutional rather than directly benefiting students. Examples include Blackboard, the salary of the UNK webmaster, and SIS maintenance. Sen. Wozniak disagreed, since some of these items do help students directly. Sen. Fredrickson acknowledged that some do, but not 100%. Sens. Lewis and Kruse said that the Technology
Advisory Committee, on which they serve, has not been asked to advise but rather to rubber stamp decisions. Sen. Seshadri asked if the Executive Committee could look into this. Sen. Wozniak said that student fees also pay salaries. Sen. Fredrickson said this was different, because we requested these technology fees for students directly. Sen. Unruh said that approval should be sought for each item and that a rationale should be given. Sen. Miller questioned whether, if the Technology Advisory Committee should review requests, should they not also examine ongoing projects? Sen. Hodge expressed concern that many of those who serve on that committee have a conflict of interest. Sen. Darveau pointed out that some of the proposed budget asks for money from these funds. The Executive Committee will address the administration about these concerns.

B. Faculty Senate Action Plan

The Action Plan was accepted without discussion.

C. Summer Meeting

The question of whether a summer meeting should be called to respond to the budget news as it arrives was discussed in detail. The real budget information will not be available until mid-June, after the 17th at the earliest. Sen. Miller suggested that a meeting be called, if needed, later in the summer. Sen. Unruh stated that cuts or changes would go into effect July 1st since that is the beginning of the new fiscal year, that action should not be taken without review, and that numerous areas of concern would need to be determined over the summer for the new fiscal year: equipment, travel budgets, staff, lecturers and adjunct faculty. Sen. Barton said that a meeting before July 1st would be good, but decisions in the library could be delayed until August or September. Sen. Miller expressed that feeling that people not things will be what bother us most, and these should be dealt with expeditiously and with fair warning. Sen. Miller suggested that a call for a meeting be sent out one week after announcements. This met with general agreement.

XI. General Faculty Comments

Prof. David Tidwell of the Theatre Program approached the Senate with concerns about the elimination of the position of theatre technology director and the resultant increase in workload he would experience. He had been told by his program director that he would have to take on the full load in addition to his current duties. All of the duties of the current staff position would be reassigned to him as a faculty member. He expressed concern that he had been given no recourse to appeal the problem it was a situation of put up or shut up, do the increased work or leave. Sens. Hodge and Hartman requested clarification of Prof. Tidwell’s status and the scope of the position. Sen. Hodge wondered if this was punishment for Prof. Tidwell speaking out at the budget forum. He said it was not. He is in his third year of a tenure-track position with responsibility for scenery and lighting. Sen. Miller wondered how this differs from reassigned work in other departments. Sen. Buckner pointed out that the loss of a strings person has left him now responsible for that area as well as his previous responsibilities. Sen. Hodge said that the reassigned work is troubling, but that more troubling is the manner in which he was treated. Sen. Exstrom asked how peer institutions handle these duties within their theater programs and suggested that we need to find out. Sen. Fredrickson asked if this was a union issue. Sen. Davis said that was undeterminable. Sen. Miller questioned whether there are other examples of this kind of problem. Is this a general issue that should be addressed by the Faculty Welfare Committee? Sen. Hof suggested that the question of staff jobs should be examined more fully.

Sen. Wozniak asked that senators participate actively in Fall Orientation, including academic advising and feeding students.

The issue of alumni deaths and the lack of internal communication and coordination was raised. The Senate decided to express appreciation to Vice-Chancellor Schlake and to retiring faculty members.
Meeting adjourned at 10:20.

Respectfully submitted,
John Damon
Faculty Senate Secretary 2002-'03
Emended by Tim Obermier
Faculty Senate Secretary 2003-'04