I. Call to order: Past President Darveau called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Present:
At Large Senators: Davis, Wozniak, Hansen
CBT Senators: Agrawal, Frickel, Eshleman, Trewin, Hall, Smith
COE Senators: Lewis, Summar, Young, Mollenkopf, Unruh
CFAH Senators: Brown, Hartman, Craig, Nuss, Dimock, Smith, Snider
CNSS Senators: Aviles, Younes, Darveau, Lilly, Thompson,
Kelley, Rohrer, Benz
Library Senator: Heidenreich
Absent: Miller, McCarty, White, Hughes, Fredrickson
Guests: Debbie Bridges, John Lillis, George Lawson, and Chuck Peek

III. Approval of Agenda
Senator Brown (Davis) moved for the approval of the amended agenda. Motion Passed.

IV. Action on Faculty Senate Minutes of December 6, 2007
Senator Wozniak (Davis) moved for the approval of the December 6, 2007 minutes. Motion Passed.

V. Special Presentation
A. Lee McQueen—Director of Facilities Management and Planning
   BHS Project
   - BHS architecture and construction firm hired
   - Taking down MMLH and will redevelop the parking spaces
   - Develop animal spaces and storage spaces in first floor
   - Second classrooms including one with divider
   - Third floor was laid out well in the 1960s so not as much work as others
   - Demolition bids by the end of the month and construction in early in April
   - December 2008 phase 1 will be substantially done
   - Addition substantially complete 10/2009
   - See link for further details:
     http://www.unk.edu/offices/facilities/index.php?id=20520&eklist=bhs

   Central Utility Plant
   - Take down old power house
   - Greater space will be occupied with new building
   - Develop and be done by mid-May by NPPD
   - And we will simultaneously build utility plant
   - Boiler plant hope to start late June

   Tunnel and Pipe Work
   - Tunnel work to be done on east campus
   - Different areas will be fenced off during the spring and summer
Various work needs to be completed: tunnels need to be replaced, steam or chill piping needs replaced.

The digging will require the loss of some trees. Planning attempted to minimize tree loss. Smaller trees will be moved.


Other projects
- Residence Nester north south is on time
- BHS renovation is on time
- Otto Olsen has been submitted. It was a priority 1 now 1b due to student information system
- Residential renewal is hoped for this summer

Q&A
Benz asked if the parking lot be reopened due to bad weather. McQueen did not think it was likely because reopening and closing would create more problems than it would solve.

VI. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees
A. Oversight Committee: no report submitted
B. Executive Committee Minutes January 16 and Kristensen submission
   Davis found it interesting that even though opponents out-spent the Ward Connerly amendment by 3:1 margin it has been approved by a comfortable margin. Something to keep in mind.
C. President’s report: No report.
D. Academic Affairs: Minutes November 15, 2007. Received without comment.
E. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: no report submitted
F. Academic Information and Technology Committee: no report submitted
G. Artists and Lecturers Committee: No report
H. Athletic Committee: no report submitted
I. Continuing Education (e-campus) Committee: Minutes December 4. Received without comment.
J. Faculty Welfare Committee: Minutes November 29. Received without comment.
K. Grievance Committee: No report submitted
L. Library Committee: December 10, 2007
   Davis asked if activities for the four day fall orientation had been provided. No details were available.
M. Professional Conduct Committee: no report submitted
N. Student Affairs Committee: no report submitted

VII. Reports of Senate Representatives to Non-Senate Committees
A. Assessment Committee: Minutes January 17
   Davis asked about the CAAP update. Anticipating question Senator Darveau received further information from Dr. Butler, Director of Assessment. The following is taken from a follow-up email from Dr. Butler:
B. Affirmative Action Commission: no report submitted
C. Center for Teaching Excellence Advisory Committee: Minutes December 10. Received without comment.
D. Council of Chairs: no report submitted
E. Ethnic Studies Advisory Committee: Minutes November 14. Received without comment.
F. Fees Committee: no report submitted
G. First Year Experience Committee: no report submitted
H. Gender Equity Committee: no report submitted
I. Honors Council: no report submitted
J. International Education: no report submitted
K. Parking: no report submitted
L. Student Retention Committee: no report submitted
M. Safety Committee: no report submitted
N. Strategic Planning: no report submitted
O. Student Support Services Advisory Committee: no report submitted
P. Technology Advisory Committee: no report submitted
Q. Women’s Studies Advisory Committee: Minutes November 14 and December 12. Received without comment.
R. WI/CD Committee: Minutes November 14. Received without comment.
S. Writing Center Advisory Committee: No report submitted

VIII. Reports from Academic Councils
A. Graduate Council: Minutes December 13. Received without comment.
B. General Studies Council: Minutes November 1. Received without comment.
C. Council on Undergraduate Education: no report submitted

IX. Unfinished Business
A. Changes to the Constitution
The changes submitted by the Oversight Committee to clean up the Constitution of inaccuracies and the name change for the FS Continuing Education Committee was presented for the second time. There was some concern over whether FS Continuing Ed Advisory Committee should be...
renamed the FS e-Campus Committee, so it was removed from the motion. Motion to make changes recommended by the Oversight Committee (Motion Passed).

Upon confirming that the office has changed its name to e-Campus, Senator Smith spoke for the motion to change the name. It may cause confusion if the Office is e-campus and the committee has a different name. Further discussion indicated that Continuing Education currently has no budget and off campus courses are electronic. Name change of FS Continuing Education Committee to FS e-campus committee. (Motion Failed 13 ayes, 14 nays)

Lily (Younes) proposed that the name be changed to “Faculty Senate e-campus and Continuing Education. Darveau stated that the motion will be put on next month’s agenda.

X. New Business
   A. VCA Murray—pandemic plan. Received without comment. Senator Darveau noted that any comments should be sent to VC Murray.

   B. Bill Wozniak—Emeritus Faculty
       Senator Wozniak stated that as we were to review the policy for emeriti faculty, it caused him to think about the role of emeriti on our campus. Senator Wozniak asked for advice as to who should receive the questions. Senator Craig noted that we don’t know who the emeriti faculty are. Darveau recommended that it be sent to the Executive Committee. Wozniak (Davis) recommended that the list of questions by sent to the Executive Committee. Motion passed

   C. General Studies
       Darveau set some ground rules. Discuss ideas and openess on both sides. To keep discussion fresh and new is to limit repeating. The members of the roundtables in the audience were invited to participate in the discussion. Scott Darveau provided an overview of the process and the work of the roundtables. (powerpoint sent to senators in separate document)

Q&A
   Brodine Smith
   With the present plan our graduates are not prepared for graduate school due to the General Studies Program. To get into a good graduate program they must be able to speak at least three foreign languages and the present program does not require any foreign language. This program makes even harder for students to complete, so we may as well get rid of performance program. I believe other programs are in the same situation.

   Frickel
   My comments represent many colleagues input.
   1. Process should be transparent and clear. What basis is the authority for 3 of 4 colleges? Where is it written?
   2. Do all the members of the proposal of the roundtable support and to what extent?
   3. If the present system is broken, why not fix instead of creating a radically new system.
   4. There are many questions about a multi-disciplinary approach. Who is qualified to teach the course? Where is the quality control? Who will exert control over multi-disciplinary courses?
   5. Proposal appears to be territorial.
   6. The Phase 1 guidelines were ignored. Phase 1 does not receive the attention throughout the document. The spirit of Phase 1 was dismissed. Roundtable 2 does not flow from Phase 1.
   7. Serious implementation issues are disregarded. We may not be able to attract transfer students and will also have a impact on foreign students. We will have difficulty attracting students being
fed by the community colleges. We are small part of the system that is fed by community colleges and it is unrealistic to expect the Community colleges to change their curriculum.

8. Where are the resources coming from to transition between the two programs? What impact will this have on retention and recruitment?

Snider
Many issues but the first was on the ratification of proposal. This was included in the General Studies governance document and we are a long way from ratifying any change. Senator Snider asked that questions be asked as well as comments.

Smith
Ratification is important to get clear right now. If 3 of 4 agree to new proposal and one does not is that what we really want. The Regents allow the faculty of each college to control the curriculum. Each College controls their individual curriculum. She thinks it is false that 3 of 4 must accept; all four must accept or we will have a different GS in one college.

Lilly
Issue is, it is time for a conversation. We cannot have a conversation if we cannot comment. This has been going on for 3 and a half years. People want to express their opinions as well.

Snider
Did not want to shut down conversation, but there is a lot to digest if people want to ask question.

Craig
Modes of Inquiry lists many different possibilities; is the list exhaustive or could it include other areas like cultural studies?

Darveau
Overall principle was as long as meet the guidelines you can submit a proposal.

Dimock
The list was not meant to be all inconclusive but provide some examples.

Bridges
1. Is this document finished or can it be changed?
There is room for change. Faculty Senate and others can amend as see fit.
2. I saw the structure portal course as a sophomore level course but could fundamentals be incorporated in the core in the first year?

Darveau
Some committee members saw the portal as a first semester and then as first year. Important to acquire skills early.

Roher
The document refers to the AACU list of 50 programs. I personally taught in cafeteria style and one similar to the document. In terms of learning outcomes I am not sure there is a great difference. But your document may be more appropriate for a small liberal arts college. Did the committee make any effort to contact the other state universities to gather data on their experience and see if we could find out any problems; especially, problems experienced by schools similarly structured to UNK?

Darveau
Committee members gathered information from each of these colleges but doubt if any personal contact was made. There was a vast array of programs that were brought in. The document evolved through a lot of discussion. Told to us we were to design the best program for UNK without regard to implementation.
Lilly
How can you design ideal program for UNK without a discussion about implementation? When will that take place.

Darveau
There will need to be talk--here and beyond.

Lewis
We have invested many years as General Studies as disciplines, can we look at another approach? We don’t work in a single field. Asking what we have done in the past, we will never look at another way of educating students. My concern is with graduate students. Our students cannot work at a higher level. Will they have the capacity to work in a world that is rapidly changing? I do not yet have an opinion on the document, but we should keep an open mind. Is what we are doing now the best? Are we preparing them?

Dimock
1. Clarification. We(roundtable 2 members) sat down with goals of Phase 1, information on different studies, and information on the needs of our schools. We wrestled with if we could use the existing structure. We decided that it was not going to happen with the cafeteria and then we went between structures. We negotiated between cafeteria and a new structure. Question this body must ask is the change we need a structural one?
2. We knew that the document needs fleshing out. Others need to looking at it critically and solve the problems contained within it.

Darveau
The question we need to ask: does it have enough merit for it to be passed down the line?

Smith
What basis did the roundtable Phase 2 members use in deciding a structural change was needed? What data said our students were not prepared? If you are basing your decision on changing the whole format on assessment, it should be part of the document.

Snider
The NSSE data indicate that our students are mediocre to below in every category that is comparable for our General Studies objectives. Please see the website for the General Studies on assessment.

Smith
If our students are not up to par on writing, then why do we take down the number of courses that we offer?

Rohrer
There is broad agreement among faculty that something is not happening with our students that should be happening. But I am not seeing any clear evidence that convinces me that learning outcomes are tied to the structure of GS and that changing GS structure will magically improve performance. Best way to meet goals is discipline based curriculum. Western Washington was going through the same process and they changed process in two years. After looking at many different models, they decided to create a discipline based curriculum. I am not convinced that the structure is the problem. Are there other areas to look at before a radical surgery of program is conducted. There are demographic and economic issues that we should look at before we change.

Lilly
1. In writing section we were not lower than national.
2. Inter-disciplinary work is a positive experience, but I am concerned about the amount of it and the level. Must master the discipline before you engage in inter-disciplinary work. What worries
me is the amount of it and it comes in lower level. Before your are ready for inter-disciplinary you need grounding in the rigor of a discipline. If you start out with inter-disciplinary work you are teaching them mush.  
3. My suggestion would be to take the modes of learning first and then turn to capstone. So you would take your capstone in the area that you have your major.  

Peek  
There was no predisposition to get rid of the cafeteria approach. We found that we needed to start from scratch to teach our students that knowledge is integrated. After running into many problems we decided to start from scratch. We got to that point by pursing the ideas. A lot of good ideas were expressed tonight. The only one that surprised me was that we did not take Phase 1 into account. The first three meetings we attended the objectives of Phase 1 was on the board and we continued to discuss those goals throughout our discussion.  

Unruh  
Let’s look at things that happen on a day to day basis. Most of our students are concerned with how to meet the requirement. And that is a waste of time. We cannot think of practical for the goal is what do we need today? Things have changed a lot in 10 years. Today our country faces a whole plethora of issues. I am really concerned that we are afraid about bucking a system. I don’t care what community college thinks. We shouldn’t be concerned about bucking the system. We need to do what is best for our students.  

Lewis  
We may understand a discipline better if we understand how people think. This is a different approach and which is better is a matter of opinion. If students understand the thinking of the people teaching, then they may better understand the disciplines.  

Mollenkopf  
The people working on this--the ideas are very laudable. They are trying to integrate ideas and prepare our students. The concepts are very powerful. I do have concerns. I work across the state with students who face challenges. Success has been based on articulation and our ability to work with institutions and people to come up with flexibility. This may work but it needs to be thought out very, very carefully. Need a better understanding of how change can occur without throwing out the old. We cannot assume that transfer students will be able to stay. We want to make education accessible.  

Unruh  
Our charter is to address the needs of the state and it is important to think about in devising a GS program.  

XI. General Faculty Comments  
This period is allotted for faculty members to bring matters of importance before the Senate. Speakers are asked to limit their remarks to five minutes or less. Senate meetings are open to all members of the academic community. All faculty members are specifically invited to attend Faculty Senate meetings.  

Dimock (Smith) motion to adjourn 9:30 p.m.