UNK FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
for
Thursday, April 1, 2004

Approved at the April 29th Meeting

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

II. Roll Call:

Present: Anderson, Barton, Bridges, Brown, Cook-Fong, Damon, Darveau, Davis, Exstrom, Fredrickson, Hartman, Kelley, Korb, Kruse, Lightner, Lilly, Miller, Nelson, Obermier, Seshadri, Wozniak, Young,

Absent: Barua, Buckner, Fronczak, Hodge, Hof, Lewis, Luscher, Markussen, Moore, Moorman, Terry, Unruh

Guests: Glen Powell, Deb Schroeder & Spouse, Jeannie Butler, Kathy Smith, John Kundel, L.Dennis Smith

III. Young / Bridges moved approval of the minutes for the Faculty Senate meeting of March 3, 2004. Minutes were approved as submitted.

IV. Fredrickson / Young moved to suspend the agenda to act upon the proposed Smith Resolution scheduled to be addressed in New Business. Motion Carried. The Smith Resolution was brought to the table as a seconded resolution from the Executive Committee. It will be presented to President Smith following his remarks later in the session.
RESOLUTION

Whereas, Dr. L. Dennis Smith has served as President of the University of Nebraska since 1994,

Whereas, President Smith has been a tireless campaigner for maintaining and improving the quality of higher education in Nebraska in the face of budget cuts and contrary political agendas,

Whereas, President Smith has recognized that competitive faculty salaries and working conditions are an essential ingredient for excellence in higher education,

Whereas, President Smith has been a well-prepared and persuasive representative of the University to its varied constituencies,

Whereas, he has been a patron and defender of academic freedom, especially with regard to scientific research at the University,

Therefore, Be it Resolved that, The Faculty Senate of the University of Nebraska at Kearney acknowledges his outstanding contributions to the University of Nebraska through his untiring service, his institutional vision, and his distinguished accomplishments. We express our gratitude to him and wish him well in his new endeavors.

____________________________
Richard L. Miller, President             Deb Bridges, President-Elect

Motion Carried.

V. Reports from Academic Councils:

A. Graduate Council: President Miller indicated the Graduate Council fully endorsed the summer commencement proposal passed by the Faculty Senate during the March meeting. The proposal has now been forwarded to the administration.

B. General Studies Council: President Miller called upon Senator Wozniak, Director of the General Studies Program, to provide a brief report from the General Studies Council. Senator Wozniak indicated he will be presenting student outcome data at the next General Studies Council meeting. Wozniak also reported that the General Studies Council upon the recommendation of the Council of Chairs changed the guidelines for writing intensive courses. Rather than requiring exams be 50% essay, it is now only a
recommendation. Wozniak also indicated the Council will be reviewing governance issues related to Capstone Courses. A request from the assembly was directed to Senator Wozniak to send out an announcement to faculty regarding the change in writing intensive requirements.

C. Council on Undergraduate Education: Glen Powell indicated that over the past four weeks. The Council has been visiting with the admissions department to determine how they may be able to assist with various new student orientations on campus.

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

A. Strategic Planning Committee: No report
B. Honors Council: At the request of Gary Davis, Director of the UNK Honors Program, The Faculty Senate Executive Committee made recommendations for an ad hoc advisory group. Member selected include, Kenya Taylor, Beverly Frickel, Jim Roark, and Sherry Harms. In addition to these members, Senator Brown will also be asked to serve. A more formal process will be created later to establish a more formal advisory group.
C. Center for Teaching Excellence Advisory Committee: President Miller introduced the new director of the Center for Teaching Excellence, Jeannie Butler. Glen Powell quickly pointed out Jeannie wears the dual hat of Assessment Coordinator.
D. Gender Equity Committee: No report
E. Parking Advisory Committee: No report
F: Safety Committee: No report

VII. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees:

A. Oversight Committee: Senator Young indicated college Senator elections will conclude on Monday, April 5 at noon. Following conclusion of the college elections, the Oversight Committee will be meeting to determine a slate of officers for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
B. Executive Committee: The Information Technology Committee projected future expenses report was included in the packet. Deb Schroeder, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Information Technology Services was in attendance to answer questions about the report. A question from the assembly asked for clarification as to which expenditures in the report represented new expenditures beyond the year 2004 that has not been funded before. Deb Schroeder reported there are no new expenditures in the report. The spreadsheet sent to the Faculty Senate was Deb's method of tracking reoccurring expenses in order to determine what extra money may exist in the student technology fee fund. At this point President L. Dennis Smith entered the room.

Special Presentation by University of Nebraska President L. Dennis Smith

Young/ Bridges moved to suspend the agenda to welcome and listen to the comments of University of Nebraska President L. Dennis Smith. Motion carried. President Miller introduced Dr. Smith, and gave him the floor. What follows is a transcript of Dr. Smith's remarks.
Thank you very much Rick, it is a delight to be here again, I always look forward to it. And I’ve actually been here since this afternoon this is my third presentation. In return, I did have a free dinner. I want to summarize the budget situation very quickly. As many of you may have been reading or are well aware the Legislature as far as we can predict now is going to pass a budget, which would cut the University .5%. That in itself is somewhat of a misnomer. It would be .5% less than the increase we were projected to get. We currently have about $392 million. We were projected to go up to 400 million with the half percent increase we will end up at about 398 plus some additional dollars. So overall, it’s not nearly as bad as it could have been. And my staff and myself have worked quite hard to keep it as low as we could possibly get it. There is an already approved tuition increase of 12 point something percent. So the bottom line is we won’t take as far as we can determine any cuts for the coming fiscal year. That’s the good news, there are three pieces of bad news. One is with the budget, we have in place. As you all well know, salary increases will not be huge. I think they’re targeted at 1.75%. Secondly, I think what the Legislature has done, I don’t think I know, is simply defer the whole problem. They have decided not to tackle anything during this session. Which means going into the next biennium there is a projected shortfall of somewhere between 200 and $400 million. Part of that is the 151 million for the low level nuclear waste facility that still is up in the air. There have been a number of proposals on the floor to set aside money for that, each one has about 15 votes in favor. Not enough to get the 25 required to get it out, and certainly not enough to override a veto. So I don’t look for anything to happen of substance between now and the end of the Legislature. I think it’s all going to be deferred. I don’t think that bodes well for the biennial budget. There are those who think, because we are getting a minimal cut this time, and we took major cuts the last two years that we’re done and now we are over the hump and everything is fine. I don’t want to be the bearer of bad tidings, but I think we should be prepared, not only to lobby strongly during the coming year for the biennial budget, but we have a certain risk that I can’t convince myself that we are not totally out of the woods yet. I’d be happy to answer questions on that or come back to it. But what I really want to do today is spend just a little time talking about some additional things. I think all of you are well aware I’m stepping down as President officially July 1. That’s 91 days from now. In case you are following. The search committee is not doing a spectacular job as far as I can see. They have narrowed the list to 15 potential candidates. They hopefully will start inviting people, at least interviewing them, by mid to late April. I think you can well imagine I can’t visualize anybody being here July 1. To be candid, I’ve offered to stay on an additional 90 days. I have not offered to stay on an additional six months, and my wife would say bad things to me if I were to even contemplate that. So I think we are moving and someone said to me, how does it feel to be a lame duck? I said a lame duck implies that you know who is coming in and somebody is going to replace you and I’m not in that position yet. So I’m really at a lame duck. And I’ve never in my life been one anyway. So as long as I’m President I will continue to make decisions. It’s been a great 10 years, and I can’t help but look back on it from time to time. And I thought I’d spend a few minutes with your indulgence and tell you about some of the things that I think have been good. And some places we’ve been and some things we still need to do. And I really want to talk about four areas. One is student recruitment, the second is the growth in
external research funding, the third is private donor support, and the fourth is diversity among the faculty, staff and students. In terms of student recruitment, when I came here in March of 1994, I was sitting in the living room one day reading the World Herald, I think it was the Sunday edition. And they had a list of all of the top scholars in the state of Nebraska; you have all seen it. And I started going through and just mentally adding up who had committed to one of the campuses of the University of Nebraska. At that time it was less than 5%. And I said at the time to my wife, wow. None of the top students, here are going to the University, they are all going somewhere else. Last year, I am delighted to tell you that of that same list of students, greater than 50 almost 60% had picked one of the campuses of the University. And since these were high school graduates, they had picked UNK, UNL, and UNO. I think that is a tremendous improvement. UNL last year had four perfect ACT scholars. UNO had two. The ACT average of the entering class on every campus, including UNK, has gone up dramatically. In some cases over a full point. In short, I think we’ve done an outstanding job recruiting students. I think we still have a ways to go, but I think the success has been in large part due to the expertise and the aggressiveness of the faculty, and I congratulate all of you. I think things need to get better, but we’ve already turned the corner. We sent out a statewide survey last year to ask about impressions of the University. I know your Chancellor has talked to you about it of and on. 77% of the people interviewed thought the University of Nebraska did an outstanding job of educating students in the state. And point of fact, almost 85% ranked us as one of the top public universities in the Midwest. I’m sure Doug has told you that a fair number of people claimed they didn’t know who are what Kearney was. And I’m pleased at the ads that I’ve seen recently, in national magazines, really I think are quite spectacular. And I think of as a result of that kind of the campaign, UNK is going to come to the forefront very rapidly.

When I came here in 1994 total peer-reviewed external research support on all campuses was $66 million. Right now, it’s about $150 million. And I think by the end of June, it will hit $175 million; almost a threefold increase. That’s peer reviewed research! you add total contracts and grants from federal agencies and state agencies, we are going to be approaching $400 million in external support. That is responsible for creating almost six thousand new jobs. It’s been a tremendous benefit to the state and to the future of this state, as well as to the University. That again is due to the excellence of the faculty, and it’s not restricted to UNL, and UNMC. UNO has done a spectacular job, particularly with the Peter Kiewit Institute, and UNK I think has done a remarkable job in bringing in external support for teaching, student support for the research programs you have with undergraduate students, and a variety of other areas. So I think things are looking quite well.

Third point, private support. You know, when I was at the University of California, Irvine, and I was thinking about leaving, I had advice from my supervisor at that time, the president of the University of California, his name was Jack Pelcits. Jack said to me, Dennis, don’t ever take a job at a university that is starting a capital campaign. About a week after I accepted the position as President, Terry Fairfield, and then Vice President Chuck Schroeder visited me on the Irvine campus and described a capital campaign, that was about to be initiated. In 1994, the goal was $250 million, and there was a great deal
of worry at the time that might be overly ambitious. We concluded the capital campaign in December of 2000. We raised a total of $737 million, that in a state with 1.7 million. The University of Nebraska Foundation now ranks with total assets of over a billion among the top 17 public universities in the country. And it’s in the top 40 to 45 of all universities in the US of A. That money allowed us to spend, in point of fact, $75 million on faculty support, a $125 million on student support, $240 million to new and improved facilities, and $245 million on program support; things such as cancer research, organ transplantation, and a whole variety of other programs. We established as a university 95 new endowed chairs, and 918 new fellowships and scholarships. I might add with LB 1100, which was the major renovation program, that we sort of snuck through and convinced the state that they could go into debt, which had never happened before. We have invested almost $350 to $360 million in either new facilities or renovated facilities, and were still going strong. So I think that’s been a remarkable success. It again has been due in large part to the expertise and the reputations of the faculty and the need, and you’ve demonstrated that need for new space. The education building is the most recent example on the Kearney campus, but we’ve still got several on the books, which we are pushing quite hard. And for your information we are moving rapidly towards convincing the senators to undertake and support LB 1102 dash 2, which would be another approximately $100 million bond issue to complete the renovation approaches.

Diversity among our faculty, staff, and students; when I came here, the proportion of the student body, who was minority was less than 5%. It’s now 7 1/2 percent. We have boosted the percentage of the minority faculty on all of the campuses, as well as the percentage of women faculty. We still have a long ways to go. That remains one of the top priorities of my administration, and I’m sure if you talk to your Chancellors and the Chancellors on the other campuses, it remains one of their top priorities. It seems to me irresponsible to bring students to our campuses, educate them, turn them out four five or six years later, and let them go into a world in which they will see a level of diversity that we haven’t been able to come close to on our own campuses. This is a global economy, everything were doing economically involves interacting with the rest of the world. And I think we have not only an obligation but a responsibility to increasingly diversify our campuses, to make our students aware of what the world is like and where we’re going in the future. Let me simply closed in saying it’s been a delight to have been President for 10 years. I told someone the other day, I am stepping down voluntarily. One of my staff asked me, should we have a going away and what did we do the last time, and I said as far as I’m aware, the last President who resigned voluntarily was Woody Varner. So we don’t have a record of being in that position. And Rick and I were talking earlier about the Board of Regents, I think that’s one of the reasons. It’s been a good run. I’m looking forward to going back to the faculty. I will be teaching on the Lincoln campus after some time off, developmental biology and probably a course in bioethics, and working on bringing more industry into the state in biotechnology. With that, thank you for allowing me to speak, I’d be happy to answer questions. And I’ll still come back from time to time as the President Emeritus.
President Smith’s response: The regents’ bless their souls, had a retreat maybe five years ago now. We brought in an outside facilitator, and we spent some time talking about the priorities of the University, what our strategic plans were, and how we were going to get there. One of the regents suggested that what was missing was a prioritization of our best academic programs. What did we feel was good, what did we feel needed help, and what did we feel was beyond help. That regent wanted us to rank order every program at the University. And take the bottom 25%, and throw them away. My compromise to be blunt, was to develop a protocol by which we could prioritize academic programs. And we in turn promised the board that we would prioritize the top quartile. I firmly believe by the way that that should be done, should’ve been done and was long overdue. I steadfastly refused and have publicly at several meetings to do anything beyond the top quartile. Because my feeling was that I didn’t want to target what anybody felt was on the bottom half, or the bottom 25%, and I certainly wasn’t about to go about trying to eliminate programs. But I think it is important, particularly when you have budget problems not to cut across the board. Because that wounds everybody, your best and your worst, and the best are what really ultimately establish initially the reputation of the institution. If you have among the top programs in the country in a small number of areas, they help bring everything else along. And as a matter of fact, they guarantee a certain immunity for everyone else. Because if you don’t rank order them nobody’s quite sure what they are. So that’s the way we set about doing it. Step number one was to develop a protocol for how to prioritize. That took what, Rick a year, a year and a half? And we put in place a protocol, which we took to the Board of Regents, and they approved it lock stock and barrel. Point number two was then to implement that approach, that process. And I asked the chancellors at the time to now go back to their campuses, and determine what the top quartile were, and let me and the board eventually know. The chancellors all did that. I can’t guarantee they all did it on each campus in such a way that everybody was totally pleased, and I’m sure that the reaction on the campuses was different. Ultimately, I received from each of the chancellors a prioritized list of the top quartile of the programs. We then developed something called the programs of excellence, and we decided to start setting aside a certain amount of money, particularly in hard budget times, to make sure that those programs came out as unscathed as possible. I’m not dumb I understand full well that if extra money goes to the best programs, somebody else isn’t going to get what they think they need. And that is the difference between across-the-board cuts, and what some people called vertical cutting. So that’s approximately the position we find ourselves today.

(The second question was asked from the assembly: Looking five years down the road, what do you see is the single largest problem in the University?)

President Smith’s response: I think the single largest problem lingering for us is the one facing public universities across this nation in virtually every state. There is an increasing move towards what many people now describe as a market approach to higher education.
If you study economics or are involved in that you understand full well what I am saying. And even as a research scientist, I’ve had to spend enough time looking about how we run the University and financing it that I think I understand it very well. Students are becoming increasingly scarce, we’re having to compete with lots of people for them, we can only compete if we offer outstanding programs and if we’re attractive, not only price wise, but academically, because students have a wide variety of choices. That’s what the market is all about. Our goal is to have them pick us because were good, and because they don’t want to leave the state, and because we can provide a superior education. On top of that I think we have to increasingly become attractive to some of the states surrounding us who really can’t accommodate the students they have either because their quality is going downhill or because they have such a large number of students to accommodate that they can’t possibly begin to do it. I don’t want to see Nebraska go the direction Colorado is going. Now many of you may not have paid much attention to that. I got a package recently from Betsy Hoffman, who is my counterpart there. Colorado passed three laws that are killing the University of Colorado. One was a taxpayer’s Bill of Rights called TOPRL which essentially set a limit on how much revenue the state of Colorado could spend. Sound familiar to anyone by the way? Do you remember prop 413? It passed in Colorado. They passed a second law stating that K-12 was entitled to a certain percentage of the state general fund. They passed a third law stating that property taxes would not increase above a certain limit. Boy, I’ve got to tell you we were so close to having all three laws on the books. The University of Colorado has gone from having a budget from the state of $670 million to about $200 million. And by the year 2010, they are projected to receive from the state of Colorado $83 million. Think about that for a minute. They can’t survive, and it’s a four campus system, on that kind of income. So they are becoming what people frequently call, privatized. So is the University of Virginia. And by privatization, what that means is tuition is going to go up to $8000-$9000. They’ll cap the number of students they can take. The rest will be out of luck. It will essentially eliminate the neediest students from access to the University. And ultimately their support from the state will total less than 8% of their total expenditures, which is exactly where Virginia and Michigan already are. Colorado on top of that is now proposing, supported by the Governor, for lack of a better term a voucher system. In which every student will get the equivalent of, I can’t remember the number, $4000 a year, $5,000 a year, to go to the institution of their choice. Whether it be the University, or private colleges, or what ever. It won’t apply out of state. Now, those students then will have a choice, do they want to go to the University and still spend a fair amount more on tuition, do they want to come to Kearney, and I would suggest you ought to be incredibly attractive to them. Or do they want to go to Wyoming, or wherever? So I think it’s a whole new ballgame. We can be highly competitive. The bad news is demographically, the number of high school graduates in the state of Nebraska are at best over the next 10 years, going to increase at a half percent per year. There aren’t enough high school students in our state to populate all of postsecondary education. So, some of our smaller schools, unless they figure out other ways around it, are going to disappear. I think the competition is going to be cutthroat and I think the way we come out ahead is to have outstanding people, outstanding programs, and be attractive academically, and that’s where all of you come in.
(Following the completion of President Smith’s remarks, president of the Faculty Senate Rick Miller presented President Smith’s with a resolution recognizing his exemplary performance at the University of Nebraska)

B. Executive Committee (continued following President Smith’s remarks):

A question was raised from the assembly regarding item 10 on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee report dated March 29, 2004. Elaboration of the issue regarding referral to the Faculty Senate Faculty Welfare Committee to develop a policy regarding removal of faculty members from the classroom mid semester was requested. President Miller indicated that in discussions with UNK administration, no policy exists that suggests either a process or the standards with regard to removing faculty from the classroom mid semester. A particular case is not at issue, rather, the Faculty Senate requests the committee determine situations in which this may be warranted because it’s never been addressed before. Both the faculty handbook and the university Nebraska Regents policies lack guidance on the issue. President Miller recommended the committee look at other campuses that may have policies on this matter.

A question was raised from the assembly regarding the Dean of Libraries search. President Miller indicated no new information could be shared at this time.

A question was raised from the assembly regarding the search for Dean of the College of Fine Arts and Humanities. President Miller indicated that he believed an interim dean would be appointed with a search to follow thereafter.

The question was raised regarding item 10 B. regarding the NSSE data. President Miller indicated a workshop was held last month to share this information with faculty. A summary of the discussion and the data will be provided to the Student Affairs Committee.

A question was raised regarding item three on the Executive Committee report. When determining the student tech fee expenditures, how does the committee prioritize and how is input a given to the Information Technology Committee. Senator Obermier, serving on Information Technology Committee responded, the committee is in the process of determining the future for the expenditure of student tech fees. Currently the student technology fee pays for numerous ongoing expenses. President Miller emphasized that we are tied up for the next couple of years in terms of ongoing expenses, few discretionary funds will be available.

A discussion followed regarding carryover money. Dean Smith indicated that carryover money has been returned to the colleges with the exception of a small percentage of funds that have been reserved for potential budget cuts. Dean Smith also emphasized that priority program funding has all been made available and none of that money is reserved for budget cuts.
Young / Korb moved to suspend the agenda to discuss recruiting at UNK with John Kundel as a guest speaker. Motion Carried.

John Kundel reports cautious optimism regarding enrollments at UNK as we move into fall. He reports positive indicators for Residential and Greek Life. Numbers are up for new students turning in housing contracts. He perceives that all of UNK has had a pretty successful recruitment season.

Regarding the role of the Admissions Office, John reports their number one mission is to get students to submit applications and number two is to get students to come on campus for a visit. For students visiting campus, John reports a 95% chance that they will attend UNK. John emphasized the importance of faculty involvement for on campus recruitment visits. He further emphasized the number of minority students that have expressed an interest in the UNK campus. In the recent recruiting report he indicated UNK currently has 110 Hispanic applications and of those applications, approximately 70 are admitted to the University. John indicated none of the other campuses are pursuing the Hispanic population like UNK is currently doing.

John addressed several questions from the assembly:

Is there a reason why no one from admissions is available over Spring break when several students come on campus for speech activities? John reported there are people available, but what doesn’t happen during activities such as these are campus tours, and they typically set up tables containing information about UNK. The potential problem was noted in that organizers of special events on campus may not be contacting the admissions office to provide information about recruiting.

Regarding the major events such as go for the gold campaign, exactly what is the focus with each contact they have during these events? What do you really want faculty to do? John responded that the main message they try to convey during these events is that UNK cares. John emphasized that even today approximately 60% of all new freshman are first generation college students. So during an organized recruiting event in many cases, this is the first time a family has seen a real live Professor. John emphasized that experience has a major impact upon the potential students.

To whom do the faculty speak to in the Admissions Office in order to ensure correct information is being shared during campus tours? Lee Ann Amm is the person to contact. If there is a glitch with information being shared, they certainly need to know about it so that it can be fixed for future tours.

What is currently being done to target the transfer students from community colleges? John indicated that while transfer numbers have been increasing, it is been an area of disappointment for the admissions office. Dusty Newton visits each community college in Nebraska at least twice. The majority of students comes from Central Community College and from Mid Plains Community College in North Platte. John indicated that closer relationships are developing when several community colleges.
Are there additional efforts to contact tribal governments. John indicated that Admissions has brought students from tribal areas, but was uncessful in building interest. Another effort will take place this fall with Pine Ridge.

Does the admissions office have a comparison between departments and a determination of best practices that work for recruiting for departments? John responded that yes, some departments are better than others at recruiting. President Miller emphasized that if there are departments are doing an outstanding job it would be useful for other departments to know what they are doing. Several senators indicated that enrollment data that correlated to the practice used to attract that student to UNK would be quite valuable to determine what works and what doesn't for recruiting. John indicated that the Admissions Office could provide to departments the number of students that visited campus and whether or not they enrolled.

John indicated it is the contact with a potential student that is absolutely essential to get them to come to UNK. He also indicated that numerous letters postcards and other items of communication that may duplicate what other offices are doing on campus is ok. Multiple contact is important.

What is the ideal time for a department to contact the student? John replied there are several stages in the process. The admissions office has a prioritization process for working with potential recruits to UNK for example. Students that have contacted UNK directly are considered a priority one. The Admissions Office has also invested in a statistical analysis program that will give a student rating. Students with an “A” rating have profiles with a more likelihood to enroll at UNK. This will allow the Admissions Office to better focus their efforts. The original question from the assembly was clarified by asking if earlier contact with potential students was beneficial. For example would it be possible for the students that travel the state conducting recruitment exercises to e-mail departments so that earlier contact could be made with potential recruits. John responded that some departments are already doing this. Emphasis was made that the admissions office should share with departments what recruiters can do to share information so that more departments can take advantage of earlier contact with students.

President Miller indicated that what really is needed is a coordinated timeline between the department, college, and Admissions Office so departments can interface at the most appropriate times in the recruitment process. President Miller also pointed out that while multiple contacts are a good thing, receiving three different letters from three different parties at the same school, all in the same day is probably not a good thing. John indicated they are currently investigating a recruitment software package that would help to resolve the situation.

What impact does the priority program status hold for recruitment? John responded, priority programs for the “road warriors” that actively go out and recruit makes recruiting easier. The admissions office actively uses priority program status for purposes of recruiting. The question was raised from the assembly about what the admissions office
tells potential recruits about non-priority programs. John responded the standard response by Admissions Office personnel is that we are not eliminating any major programs at UNK.

As a final point, it was emphasized that faculty are not trained in recruitment and a template is needed from the admissions office for faculty to review to better understand how to conduct effective recruitment. John emphasized that the single most important message to come out of a recruiting contact is that faculty care about students. He also pointed out that not every institution, especially the larger institutions, utilize faculty effectively for recruiting. He further emphasized that the ultimate in service to the institution is the process of recruiting students. He is willing to help faculty in whatever way he can be recognized for their contribution to service through recruitment.

C. President’s Report: President Miller reported, nothing of interest to the UNK Faculty Senate occurred at the recent Board of Regents meeting.
D. Academic Affairs: No report
E. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: No report
F. Academic Information and Technology Committee: The minutes of February 20, 2004 were received and reviewed by the assembly without comment.
G. Artists and Lecturers Committee: No report
H. Athletic Committee: No report
I. Continuing Education Committee: The minutes of February 23, 2004 were received and reviewed by the assembly without comment.
J. Faculty Welfare Committee: No report
K. Grievance Committee: No report
L. Library Committee: No report
M. Professional Conduct Committee: No report
N. Student Affairs Committee: The minutes of January 14, 2004 were received and reviewed. The question was posed by the assembly as to how the resolution passed by the Faculty Senate in the March meeting is being communicated across campus. For clarification, the resolution referred to faculty including the web site of the student code of conduct on course syllabi. President Miller indicated he will take the resolution to the Council of chairs meeting. In addition, he will send an e-mail to college deans, reminding them of the resolution.

IX. Reports of Faculty Senate Special (Ad Hoc) Committees
   A. First Year Experience Committee: No report
   B. Assessment Committee: The minutes of March 11, 2004 were received and reviewed by the assembly without comment.

X. Unfinished Business:
   1) Directive to Senator Young: Report to the Faculty Senate the difference between a resolution and a motion. Senator Young: ‘Resolutions submitted are longer motions
submitted in writing because of their high importance and complexity. They always should be preceded by a preamble, (that would be the word whereas), always in writing, because the length and importance of the document.” Senator Young proceeded to submit a sample resolution to explain the difference to the Senate to which Senator Wozniak indicated (quite humorously), the sample was not placed in the packet and therefore could not be submitted at this meeting. Senator Young proceeded to read his example anyway. Senator Obermier indicated the resolution was not submitted in writing and therefore not qualified to appear in the minutes. Senator Lilly offered a friendly amendment, which was lost to the Faculty Senate Secretary do to the immense amount of laughter. President Miller managed to bring the assembly back to a sense of decorum.

XI. New Business:

1) **Spam Sentinel**: Senator Lightner expressed concern that spam Sentinel has been blocking incoming e-mail that should not have been blocked. He expressed additional concern that it is his understanding that items 100% blocked are not brought to the attention of the user. President Miller indicated he would check on whether or not messages could be blocked without the knowledge of the user. Senator Lightner expressed the position that he is capable of discerning what e-mail he wants and what he does not want, and does not need someone else to do that function for him. President Miller expressed the observation that he thought individuals had the opportunity to opt out of spam Sentinel, which would allow Senator Lightner to bypass the use of spam Sentinel. Senator Lightner express for their concern that the process by which it was implemented was not clear. It was his perception that no previous input was sought in the decision to implement spam Sentinel. President Miller indicated that he utilizes the “rules” function and Lotus Notes to control his influx of spam e-mail however, he has also had messages blocked by spam Sentinel even those sent from on campus.

XII. General Faculty Comments:

1) **UNK calling tree**: Senator Darveau was requested to make a comment regarding the mock tornado drill and the breakdown of the UNK emergency calling tree. When the problem was pointed out to the office of public safety, the response was to install Buffalo Watch on your computer. Senator Darveau pointed out that even if you were to install Buffalo Watch on your computer it doesn’t help much if you are in a classroom or at an event on campus. So, a better calling tree is needed. Senator Bridges noted that secretaries in the West Center were unable to hear the siren during the mock tornado drill. She has since forwarded this information to the UNK safety committee and suggested that Senator Darveau do the same regarding the breakdown of the calling tree. President Miller also indicated the Executive Committee will place it on the agenda for the meeting with administration.

2) **Priority programs statement and ethnic studies minor**: Senator Damon asked what we were to do with the two documents related to these subjects included in the packet.
President Miller indicated the purpose for including the two items were to prepare senators for discussion during the Faculty Senate meeting of April 29.

President Miller opened the floor for preliminary comments. Senator Andersen indicated that he applauds the statement on priority programs but does not necessarily agree with all the statements but it is important so that UNK may begin analyzing once again the concept of priority programs. Senator Kelley was asked to provide a summary of the statement. He expressed concern that as UNK was moving towards priority programs, we never really took time out of the process to explore what priority programs really mean to this particular campus given our history, institutional identity, and given who we are. By admission, even Senator Kelley does not agree with everything in the document. He emphasized that he sees tension between a community of scholars and a meritocracy and that numerous issues surround the topic of priority programs, including concern about junior faculty becoming individual scholars and not of the broader community of UNK. Senator Kruse indicated the statement is a method of getting discussion going in order to take a second look at how to go about accomplishing priority programs after a period of three years under the previous plan, and perhaps shift the focus to interdisciplinary programs to allow more programs to participate. President Miller indicated it is worth noting that in the original proposal departments were given a template to complete, which included methods to identify excellence within their program. While many departments participated not all did. Proposals went forward, and the process of review following submission was completely unknown to faculty. Senator Andersen pointed out that the perception exists that programs not achieving priority program status perceive programs that have priority program status as receiving more resources, which has not been entirely the case with some priority programs having lost positions. His perception is that priority program status is really not meant much, but may mean more to other priority programs. President Miller indicated the concern exists because some items of the regular funding have been transferred to funding from priority programs, which was never the intention. Senator Lightner indicated it would be a good idea if the Faculty Senate Secretary were to send out the link to the web site (to Senators) containing the initial information about how priority programs were established.

3) **Ethnic Studies Minor**: Senator Lilly asked the question, where the proposal goes once Faculty Senate has completed discussion. Senator Kelley indicated it will go to each of the College Academic Affairs Committee’s Educational Policy Committees at the same time it is being considered by Faculty Senate. Clarification was provided comment only is being sought at this time, not approval. Senator Seshadri asked in what college the program would be housed? The program will not be housed in any one particular college, but will be interdisciplinary. Senator Damon asked where additional comments can be forwarded? President Miller indicated to forward comments to the appropriate academic affairs committee or to the Faculty Senate on April 29.

4) **Assessment Committee Resolution**: Senator Young recommended the Faculty Senate endorse the resolution prepared by the Assessment Committee in regards to Liz Peck’s service on the committee. Senator Young emphasized Liz was a longtime Senator of the
Faculty Senate and had a tremendous challenge in working with the issue of assessment and in light of the North Central Accreditation visit.

Young / Korb moved the Senate commend Liz Peck for her efforts and recognize the spirit of the resolution made by the Assessment Committee. **Motion carried.**

5) **Last meeting for some Senators:** Senator Young expressed his appreciation for all those Senators whose term is ending.

**Bridges / Korb moved adjournment at 9:06 pm. Motion carried**

Tim Obermier,
Faculty Senate Secretary