UNK FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
APPROVED AT THE MARCH, 4 2003 MEETING
Ockinga Conference Room
Thursday, February 5, 2004
7:00 p.m.

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

II. Roll Call:

Present: Barton, Barua, Brown, Buckner, Cook-Fong, Darveau, Davis, Exstrom, Fronczak, Hartman, Hodge, Hof, Kelley, Kruse, Lewis, Lightner, Luscher, Markussen, Miller, Moore, Moorman, Nelson, Obermier, Terry, TracyUnruh, Wozniak, Young

Absent: Anderson, Bridges, Buckner, Damon, Fredrickson, Korb, Lilly, Seshadri

Guests: Glen Powell

III. Senator at Large Election: President Miller suspended the agenda to allow Senator Young, Chair of the Oversight Committee, to conduct an election for a Senator at Large seat which was vacated by Senator Hodge due to absences. The Oversight Committee upon Hodge’s consent selected Hodge to receive the nomination for the vacated seat. Senator Young asked for nominations from the floor, none were received. Davis/Kelley moved that nomination cease and a unanimous ballot be cast for Hodge. Motion carried.

IV. Hodge/Davis moved approval of the minutes for the Faculty Senate meeting of December 4, 2003. Minutes were approved as submitted.

V. Brown/Davis moved approval of the minutes for the Special Faculty Senate meeting of January 22, 2004. Minutes were approved with emendations.

VI. Reports from Academic Councils:

A. Graduate Council: Minutes of December 11, 2003 were accepted and reviewed by the assembly without discussion.

B. General Studies Council: Minutes of December 4, 2003 were accepted and reviewed by the assembly. Senator Wozniak speaking as the General Studies Director, indicated the General Studies Council met on February 5, 2004 and conducted the third reading of the proposal for Capstone courses. The Faculty Senate will be provided the proposal during the March meeting. He also indicated the Bachelor of Science proposal is waiting for input from the educational policy committees of all colleges. Senator Brown inquired about the Peek proposal for changing the General Studies program. Senator Wozniak replied, the council is discussing the proposal.

C. Council on Undergraduate Education: Minutes of December 3, 2003 and January 28, 2004 were accepted and reviewed by the assembly. Senator Davis sought definition of a “Faculty Assistant” as outlined in item 2 g on the minutes of January 28th. Glen Powell provided insight as to the status of the search for the Director of the Center of Teaching Excellence/Coordinator of Assessment. Davis sought further clarification as to if the
Faculty Assistant position as noted in item 2 g was an assistant for the Director. Glen Powell indicated that was a typographical error. The minutes of the Council of Undergraduate Education contained a report from the Faculty Assistant to the committee, creating the confusion. There will not be a faculty assistant to the Director of Teaching Excellence/Coordinator of Assessment.

VII. Reports of Senate Representatives to Non-Senate Committees:

A. Strategic Planning Committee: No report
B. Honors Council: No report
C. Center for Teaching Excellence Advisory Committee: No report
D. Gender Equity Committee: No report
E. Parking Advisory Committee: No report
F. Safety Committee: No report

VIII. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees:

A. Oversight Committee: Minutes of January 30, 2004 were accepted and reviewed by the assembly. Senator Young, Chair of the Oversight Committee provided an overview of the Faculty Senate Senator elections to begin next week with the Senator at Large elections. These will conclude in March. The election of College Senators will occur immediately following the Senator at Large elections. Young also pointed out the apportionment of Senators to each College. See the minutes for the Oversight Committee’s results of tabulating apportionment.

Academic Affairs Committee election: The Oversight Committee submitted Bob Walden as the nominee to fill a vacated seat on the Academic Affairs Committee. Nominations were requested from the assembly. None were received. Davis/Kelley moved nominations cease and cast unanimous ballot for Bob Walden. Motion Carried.

Continuing Education Committee election: The Oversight Committee submitted Wendy McCarty as the nominee to fill the seat vacated by Barb Clark on the Continuing Education Committee. Nominations were requested from the assembly. Moorman/Terry nominated Donna Montgomery. No other nominations were received. President Miller asked for background information on each candidate for the benefit of the assembly. Donna Montgomery was elected.

B. Executive Committee: Minutes of January 21, 2004 were accepted and reviewed by the assembly. President Miller provided an update on Item seven regarding the Faculty Senate Constitution review by University General Council. It was reported that the review will be completed soon. Senator Davis brought attention to item three in the minutes regarding dual credit. President Miller emphasized there is no way to determine from an incoming student’s transcript if the courses taken were delivered by a college faculty member or a high-school teacher in a high-school setting. Senator Davis encouraged the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to maintain vigilance on this high profile issue.
The purpose of the UNK Go for the Gold receptions was questioned by the assembly. Concern was expressed that students attending the receptions are already accepted to attend UNK. Additional concern was expressed regarding the use of faculty time and funds to host the event. Some of the trips require very late nights for faculty already committed to several service activities in addition to quality teaching. Multiple Senators encouraged opening of a dialogue with admissions regarding the issue of time spent on this event before faculty become dispirited.

The Executive Committee was reminded by the Assembly that the issue of recruitment was brought before the Administration. President Miller acknowledged that was indeed the case and the Executive Committee did ask for a coherent sense of recruiting activities at UNK so that activities at the College level can be more effectively articulated with the Administrative level. While information has been provided, nothing has been provided that outlines an overall plan for recruitment. President Miller reminded the Assembly about a proposal to bring John Kundel to a Faculty Senate meeting to provide an overview of recruiting activities. Concern was expressed that the Administration provide a critical view of recruiting rather than simply all the activities currently underway and their success. President Miller indicated that in his perception, no one in Administration is prepared to do that at this time. A request was made from the Assembly that John Kundel is asked to provide survey data as to the reason why potential students decide not to come to UNK. The rationale is that departments don’t know why potential students decide not to attend UNK and departments may continue to perpetuate a problem without recognition. President Miller indicated he would ask John Kundel to address three items; the purpose of the Go for the Gold receptions and what they are trying to accomplish, secondly a review of the recruiting targets and thirdly the survey data on why students don’t attend UNK. Further concern was expressed about the dedication of the faculty and the overuse of faculty resources on time-consuming outside recruiting efforts, and eventually faculty will be less willing to contribute their time. Additional concern was expressed about the lack of a marketing and an admissions plan that UNK follows regarding the types and timing of mailings sent out to potential students. What assessment is accomplished following recruiting activities? Further concern was expressed that UNK has a problem understanding the difference between public relations and recruiting.

C. President’s Report: No report

D. Academic Affairs: Minutes of December 18, 2003 and January 22, 2004 were accepted and reviewed by the assembly.

Minutes of December 18, 2003: Senator Wozniak indicated the committee discussed a proposal to officially describe a category in the catalog called “supporting courses for the bachelor of science degree.” The definition of a science course has not yet been defined. In addition clarification of supporting courses that distinguish the BS from the BA degree has not been accomplished. Only two college educational policy committees have responded due to confusion about the proposal. Wozniak
emphasized the proposal is not an effort to encourage languages and encourage the BA degree.

A question arose from the Assembly regarding the status of the proposal for students to receive cultural diversity credit for international experiences. President Miller indicated input has been received from the Undergraduate Council and the General Studies Council and the proposal is currently on his desk awaiting revision before review by the Faculty Senate.

Further discussion surrounded the proposed BS course category proposed for the catalog. The question arose if the courses, once identified, will meet General Studies electives, to which Wozinak responded in the affirmative. Miller emphasized there is no University mandate to require additional BS courses. Concern was expressed about the lack of recognition of the computer sciences in the proposal. President Miller indicated that at least in the Psychology department, BS optional courses include computer science. Wozniak indicated there is a debate regarding the difference between science courses and technology courses.

Minutes of January 22, 2004: President Miller provided a brief review of the minutes indicating a proposal is going forth for a bachelor of arts in philosophy. Inquiry came from the assembly regarding the process to seek approval of the proposed degree. Administrative support exists on campus. The proposal goes to the Board of Regents, and then to the Coordinating Commission for approval. For the benefit of the “youngens” as it was stated, President Miller was asked to review the reasons why the proposal was not successful in the past. According to Miller the proposal was not approved previously due to a perceived lack of need and demand and a perception of duplication of other programs in the area. A comment was provided that a University with a liberal arts education core should have a philosophy degree. Additionally a comment was raised regarding budget implications to which Miller responded there are none.

E. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: No report
F. Academic Information and Technology Committee: Minutes of October 7, 2003 were accepted and reviewed by the assembly. A comment was raised regarding decision making process for the future use of Blackboard. The executive committee was asked to inquire about the status of Blackboard due to a rumor Blackboard is being considered for replacement by another product. Responding to the issue, the suggestion was made to use expertise on campus to develop a product even better than Blackboard to disseminate distance education courses.

G. Artists and Lecturers Committee: No report
H. Athletic Committee: No report
I. Continuing Education Committee: No report
J. Faculty Welfare Committee: No report
K. Grievance Committee: No report
L. Library Committee: Minutes of November 5, 2003 were accepted and reviewed by the assembly. President Miller made inquiry to Senator Barton regarding the $25,000
priority program grant fund by which programs could purchase library materials. Miller indicated not all of the funds were spent and asked what was to happen to the remaining funds. Senator Barton responded the remaining amount will go to support the interlibrary loan system.

M. Professional Conduct Committee: No report

N. Student Affairs Committee: Minutes of December 5, 2003 were accepted and reviewed by the assembly without comment.

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

A. First Year Experience Committee: No report

B. Assessment Committee: Minutes of December 11, 2003 and January 15, 2004 were accepted and reviewed by the assembly. Senator Davis asked if Glen Powell could comment on the proposal for the future of the Assessment program at UNK found in item IV of the minutes of January 15, 2004. Powell responded with a review of the plans to make the Assessment committee permanent following the North Central Association review. The proposal is a draft by Powell to begin discussion on developing process and responsibilities for the permanent committee.

X. Unfinished Business: None

XI. New Business:

1) Senate Resolution 0204-1:

The Student Affairs Committee proposes the following resolution to the Faculty Senate. The resolution has been moved and seconded by the Student Affairs Committee.

"The Faculty Senate highly recommends that all faculty include in their syllabi a statement informing students of the UNK Student Code of Conduct and encourage their students to become familiar with said code. This statement should also include the address of the website for the Student Code of Conduct."

Discussion: A suggestion was offered to include the address of the website with the resolution. Another suggestion was offered to draft a statement that is less complex. As a member of the Student Affairs Committee, Senator Lightner offered insight as to the intent of the resolution and the student code of content. Emphasis was placed upon the word “recommends” so that academic freedom would not be compromised. One finding of the committee is the lack of a standard requirement for course syllabi. Another reason for the statement and the student code of conduct is to protect both the faculty and the student and provide due process for the student.

Motion carried.
2) **Senate Resolution 0204-2:**

Moved by Davis/Miller:

Whereas the National Center for Education Statistics concludes in its “Projections of Education Statistics to 2012” that the number of public high school graduates in Nebraska will fall by 9.5% over the coming eight years. And,

Whereas the National Center for Education Statistics also concludes in this study that for all of the states contiguous to Nebraska, except for Colorado, the number of public high school graduates will also decline over this time, by an average of 13%. And,

Whereas the National Center for Education Statistics finds that over this same time there will be an increase of 15% in the traditional college-age population of 18 to 24 year olds, and that college enrollments overall are expected to rise by at least 15% nationally, and that full-time equivalent enrollment is expected to increase by 17%. And,

Whereas the National Center for Education Statistics also finds specifically that enrollment in public 4-year institutions is expected to rise to 7.2 million from 6.1 million students, reflecting a 19% increase from the year 2000. And,

Whereas it is clear that the majority of the market of college-bound students over the coming eight years will not be graduating seniors from Nebraska and its contiguous area, but will be a population from “out-of-state” regions, And

Whereas, it is clear that the campuses of the University of Nebraska are currently operating below their optimal capacity due to the significant decreases in student enrollments over the last years, And,

Whereas, “the financial gain from public universities admitting an additional out-of-state student is higher than the financial gain from admitting an additional in-state student who is in the lowest ability region, regardless of the ability level of the out-of-state student.” And that, “states gain in future tax revenues…when additional out-of-state students rather than in-state students attend, regardless of ability level.” (Groen and White, “In-State verses Out-of-State Students: The Divergence of Interest between Public Universities and State Governments.” National Bureau of Economic Research Paper No. 9603, And,

Whereas, the Nebraska State Legislature Higher Education LR 174 Task Force recommends that, “The state’s postsecondary education system must more actively recruit non-Nebraska high school graduates to increase the number of such students who pursue postsecondary education in Nebraska,” And

Whereas a significant number of out-of-state students (\text{UNK} = 15\%, \text{UNL} = 35\%, \text{UNK-UNO} 50\%) who attend school in Nebraska decide to stay in the state after graduation
thus adding to the overall social, financial and occupational well-being of the state,

Therefore,

Be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate of the University of Nebraska at Kearney endorses
the position that the Regents should take this opportunity to offer in-state tuition to all
out-of-state students who choose to attend the University of Nebraska whose composite
ACT score is 22 or above.

Discussion: The discussion began with the question as to how in-state taxpayers will feel
when their children are allowed to attend UNK for the same price as out of state students.
Secondly the question was posed as to if this is an offensive or defensive move? If UNK
makes this change, will other schools in other states do the same so ultimately no one
gains in the end. President Miller responded the answer to these questions is not simple
and will depend upon the state involved. Due to the changing demographics in Colorado,
for example, the number of collegiate age students currently exceeds the capacity of
colleges and universities in Colorado. Since they will have difficulty servicing their own
population, it is unlikely Colorado will retaliate with a similar proposal. Other states
bordering Nebraska may be a different situation. Another question was posed as to
current reciprocity agreements between Nebraska and other states in regards to
undergraduate tuition. President Miller indicated the proposal would open in-state tuition
to ALL states and not just selected situations or special program agreements between
states.

The assembly questioned the requisite ACT score of 22, and asked President Miller as the
sponsor of the resolution why the limit was selected. Miller responded that an ACT score
of 22 represents the 64th percentile which will only allow students in the upper third of
ACT scores to receive in-state tuition. The observation was made that a score of 22 was
already higher than our current median score of students at UNK. The suggestion was
made that we at least set the ACT score at the average score of incoming students. Miller
indicated he is open to a friendly amendment stating that the incoming ACT score for
out-of-state students be set at the average of all UNK students. The amendment was not
acted upon. Concern was expressed with using the average due to the possibility the
minimum score would change each year making the process very difficult to manage.
President Miller responded that we should simply set a minimum score.

The conversation was directed by the assembly towards the issue of economic impact
upon campuses in Nebraska and specifically to UNK. Miller responded that the Board of
Regents has conducted an economic impact study. A mistake was noted in the ninth
paragraph of the proposed resolution. In the parenthesis the third percentage of 50% is
attributed to UNO rather than UNK and will be changed for accuracy.

The debate was directed back to the issue of educating out-of-state students with in-state
tax dollars creating an unfair burden to taxpayers. President Miller acknowledged the
issue and provided clarification by discussing the issue of capacity. Currently UNK has
excess capacity for which the taxpayer is already paying; therefore additional out-of-state
students will not create an unfair burden to the Nebraska taxpayer unless that capacity is
exceeded. Another point was made that approximately 32% of students end up staying in the area creating a positive addition to the economy.

The question was posed as to if the proposal would apply to graduate tuition as well as undergraduate. Miller responded it is directed to undergraduate tuition only. The point was made that graduate students may be attracted to a degree program by allowing them to take their first course at the in-state tuition level. It could be a marketing tool for graduate programs.

The point was made that with this proposal we may be providing a larger discount on tuition than what is necessary. For example, it was pointed out that UNK’s out-of-state tuition is already cheaper than in-state tuition for other states, so why discount the tuition even more and what are we really gaining? Miller didn’t have a response for the situation, but pointed out that the important issue is that we have a declining population base from the areas that send students to UNK, so we have to develop initiatives to find students from other areas. Regent Schroeder is looking at the proposal as a tool to maintain the current size and capacity of UNK and provide an influx of out-of-state students that will stay and become Nebraskan’s contributing to the local economy.

Another question was posed as to if a substantial reduction in out-of-state tuition rather than offering in-state tuition accomplishes the same goal. Miller indicated that it very will might, however, Regent Schroeder was interested in this proposal because it is simple to communicate to potential students. Glen Powell indicated that other institutions, for example, Wyoming and Chadron State College offer in-state tuition and are not very shy about recruiting students with this lucrative offer.

Miller pointed out the issue of a declining population base is a bigger issue to UNK than it is to either UNL or UNO. The observation was made from Regent Schroeder’s article in the Kearney Daily Hub that in-state students will pay $4,839 for 30 credit hours whereas out-of-state students will pay $12,422 for the same credit. Further observation was made that we would need two additional students for every one in Nebraska just to break even. It was further noted that UNL and UNO have a lot more to lose with this proposal than UNK and the suggestion was made the proposal be implemented for UNK only. President Miller responded the proposal is a University of Nebraska initiative for all campuses and not just UNK. The point was made, the UNK only possibility could be forwarded as an alternative proposal.

President Miller indicated the Board of Regents is not in opposition to the proposal. Additionally he noted that any initial loss in tuition revenue will not be lost by any one campus; rather, administrative offices at Varner Hall will have to deal with the issue. The observation was made that a proposal that offers a process where we initially lose money makes no sense, unless with time a gain is realized. So what data suggests that a gain will be ultimately realized? An example was provided that a company wouldn’t invest in capital construction unless a market was untapped and gains were possible. Senator Davis, sponsor of the resolution, in response, directed the Senators attention to the text of the resolution which contains data to support the resolution. Davis further
explained the taxpayer will not lose under this proposal unless a Nebraska student is not allowed access due to an excess of out-of-state students. Davis explained we could add 5,000 students to the system easily without adding a classroom or additional faculty. Using the example of a taxpayer investing a dime to support current activities at UNK, when the facilities are not being used to capacity, the taxpayer is not returned a portion of their dime. Excess capacity exists to handle out-of-state students in the system without additional burden to the Nebraska taxpayer.

The debate took an abrupt turn when the question was raised as to why the Faculty Senate was being asked to endorse the proposal. If the Regents want to implement this idea, then just let them do it. They don't ask for faculty input on tuition rates, dorm room rates, etc. Another point was made that a few years ago we were concerned about the 'brain drain' where Nebraska students were leaving the state for better opportunities, so it is difficult to reconcile the research that says out-of-state students will stay in Nebraska in good jobs when just a few years ago there were no ‘good jobs” for Nebraska graduates to accept. The feeling expressed by at least one individual is the proposal is much too complex to be considered by the Faculty Senate. Yet another Senator questioned the proposal and the argument that the proposal could be implemented with no cost to UNK or ultimately the taxpayer. Additional students will mean additional faculty.

A question was raised if the proposal will apply to international students to which Miller responded it does not. Discussion moved to the issue of residency and the fact that some out-of-state students establish residency after one year. The point was made that some states surrounding Nebraska are already doing what we are currently proposing, and it is working well for them. Concern was expressed that hard data doesn’t exist to indicate the proposal will work. President Miller indicated that hard data is not attainable before implementing the proposal. He emphasized we are not building new facilities rather we are only cutting our rate to increase the number of customers. One Senator asked for hard numbers as to how many out-of-state students will be necessary to offset the loss absorbed through lower tuition costs. Davis replied the proposal will have to be implemented to acquire actual data to determine if it is working. President Miller indicated we should be able to get data from Fort Hays University in Kansas; however, the Regents are going to discuss the proposal at their next meeting and need input from the Faculty Senate. The question was posed if the Faculty Senate at UNO and UNL were asked to endorse the proposal; Miller was unaware if they are reviewing the proposal.

The next question was in regards to student enrollments in the UN system, to which Senator Davis replied, UNL, UNO and UNK are all well below the enrollment levels of four years ago. The observation was made that UNK stands to gain more from the proposal than does UNL or UNO. The concern was expressed that UNO with proportionally more out-of-state students could possibly lose more in tuition dollars and Varner hall would have to make up a larger deficit with UNO requiring the gains at UNK to be much larger to make up for the losses at UNO.

Discussion turned to the requisite minimum ACT score identified in the proposal and whether that becomes a scholarship program rather than simply offering in-state tuition to
all those who qualify. Davis made the comment that he does not support the ACT score concept. President Miller indicated that he put the ACT requirement in the proposal because why should we accept the bottom tier of students from other states? The ACT requirement was in favor of the faculty working with students with capability and not with the financial issue. Concern was expressed that basing the entrance requirement for out-of-state students on one score is troublesome and sets a standard for scholarship criteria. We have the right to set an entrance score; however, concern was expressed that the most people that could benefit from this proposal are those students that do not have the resources to achieve a score of 22 or above on the ACT. The proposal becomes elitist when structured as a scholarship program. The suggestion was made to simply base admission on the current admission requirements. Senator Davis asked if that was a friendly amendment to which President Miller indicated it is not friendly and will have to be an actual amendment. Miller indicated it is important to make a distinction between scholarship programs where the institution is actually giving people money. This proposal is not structured to give out-of-state students funding for tuition. The question was posed as to the necessary ACT score for a Dean’s Scholarship. President Miller indicated the Regent’s proposal originally sought an ACT score of 24, but that would be a form of scholarship. A question was posed regarding Fort Hay’s admission requirements and if they require a minimum ACT score. Miller responded, he didn’t think they had an ACT requirement for admission. Concern was expressed as to the reaction of the Nebraska Legislature to this proposal. Miller indicated a Legislative directive was to increase out-of-state student enrollment in the University of Nebraska system.

Nelson/Hof moved to do away with the minimum ACT score and change the last paragraph of the resolution to read:

“Be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate of the University of Nebraska at Kearney endorses the position that the Regents should take this opportunity to offer in-state tuition to all out-of-state students who meet admission standards and choose to attend the University of Nebraska, whose composite ACT score is 22 or above. “

Discussion: The question was raised as to if the out-of-state students could be included in the 25% of students that can be admitted below admission standards and enter the University on a provisional basis. President Miller noted the new phrasing of the resolution states the out-of-state students would have to meet admission standards and therefore could not be admitted on a provisional basis. Clarification was sought as to the current admission standards. Senator Hartman asked to go on the record indicating art students are not dumb, referring to previous potentially derogatory statements regarding art students. The question was called on the amendment. Motion Carried.

The resolution as amended was brought to a vote. Division was called. The vote was 15 in favor, 9 against, and 2 abstentions. Motion Carried.
3) **Don’t Forget Kearney Marketing Campaign:**

President Miller brought to the Faculty Senate the results of the marketing firm Stamats that recently visited campus and is organizing an advertising campaign for UNK. There are two parts to the campaign. The first is to influence opinion leaders in the Lincoln and Omaha area. The second part is to influence students. There will be full page ads placed in Newsweek, Sports Illustrated, and Time magazines that are distributed in Western Iowa and Eastern Nebraska. They will run three times; in March, August and October. Faculty will be asked to assist with this campaign by providing anecdotes in the form of success stories from our graduates. Ann Tillery will be asking faculty for these success stories in the next month. The first observation from the Assembly noted that any school in the country could be associated with the ad campaign. Nothing about the campaign was unique to UNK. President Miller responded that Stamats indicated they worked hard to make the ad unique to UNK without using the word “unique.” Further commentary from the Assembly stressed frustration that UNK doesn't utilize expertise readily available on campus that know how to design advertising campaigns; people that have majored in advertising, marketing, and journalism, in favor of spending thousands of dollars with advertising firms when resources are so scarce. The comment was duly noted by President Miller. The comment was made that the proposed campaign is no different than our last ad campaign “A tradition of excellence” in that it could apply to any school, not just UNK.

4) **Honors Council:**

Gary Davis, as Honors Program Director is planning on implementing an Honors Council. President Miller indicated names were yet needed from the College of Education and the College of Fine Arts and Humanities. Concern was expressed about the lack of representation from the Library. Miller will point this out to Gary. Names were to be sent to President Miller by Friday, February 6th. The question was raised as to if the council was to be an appointed council to which President Miller responded in the affirmative. Additional concern was brought up regarding the need for a Faculty Senator to be a member of the Honors Council.

**Davis/Barton** moved: “There should be a formal position on the Honors Council for a Faculty Senator.”

President Miller pointed out that all we can do is to make a recommendation and the Faculty Senate cannot specifically require Gary Davis to include a Senator on the Council. **Motion Carried.**

Ruth Brown will be submitted as the Faculty Senate representative on the Honors Council, should Gary Davis choose to include a Senate representative.

**XII. General Faculty Comments:**
1) Senator Young:

An email from Senator Lightner to President Miller contained a discussion between Senator Lightner and Senator Obermier regarding a proposal to implement a rule in the Senate to introduce a resolution in one meeting and vote on it the next. Senator Young expressed favor for the idea and used the resolution introduced during this evening session as an example. The resolution introduced regarding elimination of out-of-state tuition was very complex and required significant review and discussion prior to consideration by the Senate. The very process of introducing a resolution the same day it is to be voted upon provides an advantage to the sponsors. Senator Young expressed the same concern about being asked to vote on candidates for Honorary Doctorates. He proposed the Senate consider a process to consider a resolution at one meeting and vote on it the next. President Miller indicated that he could envision times in which the requirement to wait a month could be problematic; however, at a minimum resolutions should be in the packet for the requisite three day advance before the regular Faculty Senate meeting. President Miller indicated he would like to see a Faculty Senate policy requiring resolutions to be included in the packet before they can be considered at the meeting, recognizing there may be exceptions in emergency situations. Senator Davis expressed that he thought the Senate already had that rule. President Miller indicated the rule only existed for meeting minutes and he would like to see the rule for minutes extended to resolutions.

**Barton/Young** moved: Resolutions must be included in the packet before they may be considered at the regular meeting, with the exception of emergency situations.

**Discussion:** Senator Wozniak requested that when resolutions are presented, the presenter be clearly identified. In addition a standard template for the format of resolutions needs to be determined. Young asked if that could be a friendly amendment, to which President Miller was in the affirmative. Senator Davis indicated we shouldn’t act on this motion tonight. It should be brought to the next Senate meeting. Much laughter ensued. On more serious note, Senator Davis expressed concern that the Faculty Senate not constrain itself to the detriment of emergency situations that need to be acted upon quickly. Senator Young responded that in that situation we could vote on an exception to the rule. President Miller indicated the default action has been to bring resolutions to the table or even draft wording for resolutions at the table. He would rather make the default for the resolution to arrive in the packet. But he doesn’t want to see the Senate tied to that requirement should an emergency arise.

Senator Luscher expressed disagreement with Senator Davis and his comment that we could have indeed abstained on the resolution regarding undergraduate tuition. The timeliness of the issue required action during the meeting or the Faculty Senate would have no voice on the issue. President Miller indicated the tuition resolution considered this evening is an example of an issue that would receive emergency consideration by the Senate.
Senator Nelson pointed out that most state institutions and K-12 systems require that agenda items cannot be added within 24 hours of the meeting unless it is an emergency item. Senator Lightner pointed out that most municipalities have a reading requirement and also an emergency clause.

The suggestion was made that the proposed rule become part of the Faculty Senate constitution to which Senator Young nearly fainted. President Miller indicated it would be easier to make this issue a procedural requirement rather than a constitutional change. Senator Darveau indicated we might be able to add the requirement to the bylaws and avoid review by University General Counsel, to which President Miller indicated that would not be possible.

Seeking clarification Senator Wozniak asked the way the current situation is, we vote on a resolution unless we decide to postpone the vote to a future meeting. The proposed motion is that if something is brought up at the meeting [without appearing in the packet] it is automatically postponed. President Miller added clarification that the Senate would have to vote to consider any resolutions brought up at the meeting [but not included in the packet.]

Wozniak/Darveau moved to postpone the motion under consideration.

Clarification was sought by Senator Barton. President Miller indicated a vote in the affirmative means the motion under consideration will be postponed until the next regular Faculty Senate meeting in March. Division was called. Motion Carried.

2) **Honorary Degree Candidate:**

Miller/Kruse moved to enter closed session to consider an Honorary Doctorate candidate. Motion Carried. Closed session was entered at 9:08 pm.

Cook-Fong/Lewis moved to return to open session at 9:14 pm.

Hodges/Young moved adjournment at 9:14 pm. Motion carried

Tim Obermier,
Faculty Senate Secretary