I. President Bridges called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

II. Roll Call:

**Present:** Albrecht, Bridges, Brown, Buckner, Craig, Darveau, Davis, Exstrom, Fredrickson, Hartman, Jackowiak, Kelley, Kruse, Lewis (late), Lightner, Lilly, Miller, Moore, Nelson, Rieder, Scantling, Snider, Taylor, Unruh, Wozniak, Younes (late early),

**Absent:** Barton, Damon, Elder, Fronczak, Hodge, Obermier, Seshadri, Strawhecker, Young

**Guests:** Student Senate Vice President Scott Vincent, CA Jeanne Butler, Student Senate Speaker Tom Schlund

III. Davis / Snider moved approval of the minutes for the Faculty Senate meeting of March 3, 2005. *Minutes were approved with emendations.*

IV. Reports from Academic Councils:

A. **Graduate Council:** The minutes of the February 10, 2005 meeting were reviewed and accepted without comment.

B. **General Studies Council:** The minutes of the February 3, 2005 and February 15, 2005 meetings were reviewed and accepted. Senator Kelley referred to comments in the new business section of the February 3 minutes concerning the process leading to the formation of the General Studies (GS) Roundtable process. He stated that the General Studies program belongs to the collective faculty and therefore any process should collect as much input as possible. The Faculty Senate Executive committee is on the right track on the GS discussion and did not overstep their bounds in creating the process. Senator Craig countered that the GS Council was to be consulted, but that the Director of GS did not consult the council. Director of General Studies and Senator Wozniak responded that he had always worked in good faith in working with the Executive Committee in the creation process.

C. **Council on Undergraduate Education:** The minutes of the March 10, 2005 meeting were reviewed and accepted without comment.

V. **Reports of Senate Representatives to Non-Senate Committees:**

A. **Assessment Committee:** The minutes of the March 10, 2005 meeting were reviewed and accepted. Senator Brown inquired about the actual ranking of UNK by *U.S. News and World Report.* several responses confirmed that the ranking was in the 2nd tier. Senator
Miller stated that the new Data Analysis Committee was looking at the data and the ranking and that UNK was not in the top 30. Senator Albrecht, taking advantage of the new wireless capability in Ockinga, found that the actual ranking of UNK was 63rd in the Midwest Region.

**Kelley/ Davis moved that the discussion of the lengthy Assessment annual report be postponed until the April 28th meeting of the Senate. Motion passed.**

**Lilly/Taylor moved to suspend the agenda to hear from Student Senate Speaker Tom Schlund.**

Speaker Schlund introduced himself and spoke briefly about the new Student Assessment Committee whose purpose is to give the students a voice in the assessment process. He stated that the committee was conducting a survey to gather student feedback on the General Studies program, the results of which may be presented at the upcoming Assessment Conference at UNK. CA Butler noted that the committee was comprised of 2 students from each college and gave a plug to the Assessment Conference to be held at UNK on April 29th. She stated that faculty members are more than welcome to present and/or attend the conference at no charge.

Speaker Schlund presented an overview of the potential faculty evaluation website in the planning stages in the Student Senate. The student senate is studying the possibility of creating a site along the lines of the USC faculty evaluation website (senatecourseguide.com). The purpose of the UNK website would be to provide an online forum for the students to discuss faculty teaching styles. The Student Senate wants the website to be a positive site and that the senate will monitor the content of the postings. The USC site has both a numerical ranking and room for commentary and he feels that the commentary section seems most relevant. It would be likely that any numerical evaluation numbers at UNK could be skewed for some time until sufficient students had completed rankings. The Student Senate is also considering ways to use login features to limit access to current students which should limit tampering with the site.

Several points were raised by Senators concerning a potential evaluative website.

Senator Snider raised the concern that if the site was voluntary, as Speaker Schlund confirmed, that the responses would tend only to the most extreme positive and negative. Speaker Schlund stated that longer timescales should balance the overall numbers and the at the participation rate could be increased with proper publicity about the site.

Speaker Schlund responded to a question about the cost of the site by stating that the Student Senate was still investigating. The USC student senate may be willing to donate the code to create the site; alternatively, the senate could build its own site or buy the programming with Student Senate funds.

Senator Miller suggested that the Student Senate might consider posting the number of students out of the total number of students that actually filled out the rankings. He
was also concerned about the current lack of comments on student course evaluations and that this website might further reduce the amount of comments. Further, at the website ratemyprofessor.com, UNK students have posted some very negative comments. What would be done to prevent similar postings on the UNK site? Speaker Schlund stated that that particular website is a free-for-all and that the Student Senate could try to limit the types of responses posted on its site.

Senator Kruse asked about the specific purpose of the proposed site. Would it be intended to provide information about instructors or would it serve as an evaluation? These two possibilities are very different goals. The student senate could ask faculty about their styles if providing information is the real goal. Speaker Schlund stated that the USC site does allow professors to provide responses to the commentary and to post information, but not many had done so. Senator Wozniak stated that there is also a big difference between good information and bad information. Senator Kruse noted that perhaps we should be encouraging students to experience different teaching/learning styles rather than always choosing one particular method. She also stated a concern that responses and information from non-students could be posted.

Senator Lightner stated that, with the ratemyprofessor.com website, there is already a functioning site similar to what the Student Senate is seeking. It is apparent that the information will be skewed and that some information really doesn’t belong in a public forum.

Senator Lilly stated that we could not prevent the comments that some students may make, but why should UNK or the Student Senate pay for such a “rumor mill.” Speaker Schlund stated that the postings would not be unsupervised.

Senator Brown stated that even her own daughter had used a similar site at another university; however, there is a big difference between that university or USC and UNK in that there are very few choices of professors or sections within a specific course offering.

Senator Darveau stated that in order to ensure honesty in the responses and responsibility on the part of the students offering commentary that pure anonymity must be removed, even if the names are not posted and only available to the website administrators. Only then would offensive comments be traceable.

Senator Lightner noted that direct interaction between students carried a lot more information about the intent or emotions behind a comment, but that additional information is not available in an anonymous posting. Additionally, who would be responsible for choosing the administrator responsible for moderating the website?

Senator Snider noted that in many cases, websites like this one have led to divisiveness between the faculty and students. There is currently a closeness between faculty and students at UNK which could be lost. Speaker Schlund stated that if the Student Senate decided that the problems presented by this website were too numerous that they would scrap the idea.

Senator Albrecht offered the observation that there is already too much overlap in evaluative instruments and that the money used for this website could be better used elsewhere. Senator Schlund noted that the only expenditure would be coming from the Student Senate budget not UNK resources.
Senator Rieder suggested that if the purpose of the website was to provide a way to choose instructors, that only those courses with multiple sections and varied instructors should be posted. Otherwise the website would be providing only a space to vent. Speaker Schlund stated that it might be more acceptable if the Student Senate focused its energy on giving professors a chance to describe their courses. This approach would be more accurate, but still widely available to students. Senator Frederickson stated that he wasn’t concerned about the website and its contents as it would not be much different that what already happens informally. However, he is concerned about the censorship aspects in a moderated site, about how the USC site currently allows anyone to post ratings even if not attending a class, and how a website adds the air of “officiality”.

Senator Younes stated that responsibility requires students to attach their names to the postings. Senator Lightner encouraged faculty to post information about their classes and teaching styles on their own webpages. Senators Hartman and Bridges commended Speaker Schlund for his willingness to take the issue to the Faculty Senate and for his willingness to listen. Any person wanting to make additional comments should send them to the Student Senate.

B. Affirmative Action Commission: no report submitted
C. Center for Teaching Excellence Advisory Committee: The minutes of the March 21, 2005 meeting were reviewed and accepted without comment.
D. Council of Chairs: no report submitted
E. Ethnic Studies Advisory Committee: no report submitted
F. Gender Equity Committee: no report submitted
G. Fees Committee: no report submitted
H. Honors Council: The minutes of the March 9, 2005 meeting were reviewed and accepted without substantive comment.
I. International Education: no report submitted
J. Parking: no report submitted
K. Student Retention Committee: no report submitted
L. Safety Committee: no report submitted
M. Strategic Planning: no report submitted
N. Student Support Services Advisory Committee: no report submitted
O. Technology Advisory Committee: no report submitted
P. Women’s Studies Advisory Committee: no report submitted
Q. Writing Center Advisory Committee: no report submitted

VI. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees:

A. Oversight Committee: no report submitted
B. Executive Committee: The minutes of the March 30, 2005 meeting were reviewed. Senator Kelley inquired about Item 3 (Alcohol Policy). President Bridges stated that she received a request to ask the administration about a policy on alcohol consumption by students at UNK approved field trips. Senator Albrecht stated that he had asked
about the policy and felt that if one didn’t exist that the creation of a policy would be 
both needed and appropriate. It was established that while there are policies on 
appropriate behavior, there are none specific to alcohol consumption.

Senator Lilly inquired about whether the climate survey would be delayed. The Executive 
Committee will make inquiries about the status of the survey.

C. President's Report: The report on the March 4-5, 2005 Board of Regents meetings were 
reviewed and accepted without comment.

D. Academic Affairs: The minutes of the March 24, 2005 meeting were reviewed and 
accepted without comment.

E. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: no report.

F. Academic Information and Technology Committee: no report

G. Artists and Lecturers Committee: no report

H. Athletic Committee: no report

I. Continuing Education Committee The minutes of the February 25, 2005 meeting were 
reviewed and accepted 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: no report

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

A. First Year Experience Committee: no report

B. Encouragement of Study of Modern Languages: no report submitted

C. Writing Intensive/Cultural Diversity Committee: no report

VIII. Unfinished Business:

A. Response to FS Resolution on SMS Server

A lively discussion on the topic resulted from the committees’ response to the charge 
from the senate to consider the topics addressed in the resolution (1004-2). The most 
important topics and conclusions resulting from the discussion were:

• The report doesn’t adequately address possible intentional or inadvertent 
access of student information on faculty computers.

• The senate endorses the idea of a common oversight (on policy matters only) 
of both university and college IT staff by the Assistant Vice Chancellor for 
Information Technology Services.

• While the report outlines existing policies, there is some question as to 
whether these policies are adhered to universally.

• Much of the anecdotal problems reported can be reduced to the need for 
“professional courtesy” in the notification of staff and faculty 
before/during/after (especially before) access of their computers.

• There may be a need to create a grievance/appeals/feedback process to handle 
policy violations by ITS or college IT staff.
IX. New Business:

A. Amendments to Constitution/Bylaws on Election Procedures:

The amendments to the constitution and bylaws will be discussed and voted upon at the Faculty Senate Meeting on April 28, 2005.

B. David Stevenson UNK Faculty Senate Hamster Wheel Award.

Senator Davis presented the background information on the award, the text of which is below. Nomination forms due at April 28, 2005 meeting of the Senate.

The Hamster Wheel award was begun, I believe, by an initiative by David Clark when he was a Senator, following the death of David Stevenson on Jan. 12, 1997. Stevenson wrote a satirical review following each senate meeting called the Hamster Wheel...where he reviewed the meeting but also lampooned the foibles of the Senate.

David was a loyal senate supporter and believed in shared governance and a strong senate to check the administration. However, he was also quick to keep the senators from making too much of themselves, and he enjoyed the self deprecating humor of poking fun at himself and the institution he cared for. The Stevenson Hamster Wheel was a welcome and anticipated read across the campus.

It was fitting for someone to suggest an award to recognize senators for their service and I know David would endorse that.

C. Response from Artists and Lectures Committee:

President Bridges commented on items included from the Artists and Lectures committee chair Gary Schaaf about the mandate from Senate to consider a mechanism to fund more functions earlier in the fall. Several possibilities were discussed; however no solid resolution was reached. Faculty members were encouraged to participate in the process by serving on the committee.

D. New Senators Elected to Senate

On behalf of Bob Young, the election or re-election of the following Senators were announced:

- Senator-at-Large: Roger Davis
- CBT: Larry Kuskie, Bev Frickel
- COE: Scott Frederickson, Joan Lewis
- CFAH: Ruth Brown, Herbert Craig, Mark Hartman
- CNSS: William Aviles, Rick Miller, Maha Younes

Congratulations and thanks were offered to those Senators completing their terms: Chris Exstrom, Kay Hodge, Sri Seshadri and Nathan Buckner.

X. General Faculty Comments

Senator Kelley congratulated Kenya Taylor on receiving the University of Nebraska Outstanding Teaching and Creative Instruction Award (OTICA).
Student Senate Vice President Scott Vincent introduced himself to the Senate and stated that he was looking forward to building a relationship between the Senates.

**Kelley/Rieder moved adjournment at 8:41 pm. Motion carried.**

Scott Darveau,  
Faculty Senate Secretary