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: Frickel, Eshlemen, Hall, Hughes
COE Senators: Fredrickson, Lewis, Young, Mollenkopf, Unruh, Summar
CFAH Senators: Brown, Dimock, Hartman, Snider, Wethington
CNSS Senators: Aviles, Darveau, Thompson, Kelley, Lilly, Rohrer
Library: Heidenreich
Absent: Agrawal, Miller, McCarty, Trewin, Smith, White, Brodene Smith, Younes, Benz

Guests: Grant Campbell VP Student Senate; Representing Leadership UNK: Andrea McClintic, Don Wellensiek, Linda Clark, Dee Ellingson, Rakesh Srivastava, Rochelle Kruger, Michelle Widger, Diane Holcomb, Bryce Abbey, Roz Sheldon, Stacey Darveau, and Julie Klahn; Peter Longo, Interim Dean of Students; and Cheryl Bressington Director AA/EO

III. Approval of Agenda
Senator Davis (Lewis) moved for the approval of the agenda with the addition of considering an honorary degree candidate. Motion Passed.

IV. Action on Faculty Senate Minutes of October 4, 2007
Darveau requested that grammar or typo corrections be sent to the secretary and asked for any content changes that needed to be made. Fredrickson (Davis) moved for the approval of the October 4, 2007 minutes. Motion passed.

V. Special Presentation
A. Peter Longo, Interim Dean of Students, Retention efforts

- Retention rate is pretty good and we do follow many best practices as indicated by Noel-Levitz.
- Student Services have many best practices.
- There are many blank spaces in the handout provided for faculty need to get involved in the retention process. It is not the place of the Dean of Students to tell faculty what they need to do. But I do challenge the faculty to create innovative ways in which we can take our retention efforts to the next level.
- We should work on top 15-20 so that can really leave our mark. For example, we could build on the concept of the Blue and Gold. The initial moment is critical in connecting students with faculty. For example, Creighton, like many other universities connects with students before the semester begins. Creighton breaks the incoming students into groups of 18 and tries to make students very comfortable. By the end of the day there is a connection with one faculty, two upper level students, and 17 fellow students. It is important to also include staff. We need to greet our students in a new fashion. Establish expectations at the offset. This is not innovative; many campuses that are successful currently engage in this practice. There would need to be a moratorium on other campus activities.
• We need to work together and we will be able to fill out the last page. We need to catch up with universities that do a better job of connecting with students. This needs to be done by faculty. President Miller has agreed to serve as a conduit between faculty and the ad hoc committee.

Q&A
1. Can you tell us a little bit about Novel-Levitz (Wozniak)?
   It is a corporation that provides example of best practices.
2. How would you characterize the points in your handout?
   These are not recommendations but discussion points; especially at the end. How we fill in will be up to the faculty. My plea is that we attempt to do something more innovative that will connect the students to campus.
3. Unruh asked what our current retention rates are?
   There was some disagreement as to what the current rates are. After the meeting, Dean Longo sent the following:
   **Percentage of undergraduate students who returned, reentered, or graduated**
   (Cohort each year includes first-time, full-time degree seeking freshmen)
   After After After After After After After After
   Cohort 1 Year 2 Years 3 Years 4 Years 5 Years 6 Years 7 Years 8 Years
   1983-84 70.8% 56.3% 48.2% 48.5% 48.4% 48.2% 47.9% 48.0%
   1984-85 69.1% 54.4% 49.7% 48.5% 46.5% 46.6% 46.0% 46.5%
   1985-86 69.4% 55.9% 51.7% 47.7% 47.1% 46.4% 46.8% 47.2%
   1986-87 72.1% 58.6% 49.7% 50.6% 48.4% 47.7% 48.0% 48.5%
   1987-88 70.6% 54.7% 48.3% 45.5% 44.6% 44.2% 43.8% 44.0%
   1988-89 71.9% 56.3% 50.4% 48.0% 45.9% 45.5% 45.6% 45.7%
   1989-90 70.4% 58.0% 53.4% 49.7% 47.0% 46.0% 45.9% 45.7%
   1990-91 72.5% 59.7% 54.7% 50.6% 49.1% 50.2% 48.1% 48.7%
   1991-92 75.0% 61.3% 53.0% 48.7% 47.5% 45.5% 45.3% 45.5%
   1992-93 71.4% 59.5% 52.2% 49.1% 46.2% 46.1% 46.2% 48.8%
   1993-94 69.8% 56.5% 51.7% 48.7% 46.0% 46.2% 48.1% 48.7%
   1994-95 73.6% 60.8% 46.8% 52.4% 50.6% 54.8% 54.8% 55.1%
   1995-96 70.8% 58.1% 53.3% 48.7% 54.5% 53.8% 53.0% 53.8%
   1996-97 73.1% 59.3% 54.2% 58.3% 56.7% 55.3% 56.1% 56.2%
   1997-98 74.7% 60.2% 63.2% 60.0% 57.0% 56.1% 55.6% 57.0%
   1998-99 77.4% 70.8% 68.8% 65.1% 63.3% 62.5% 62.6% 63.0%
   1999-00 80.4% 71.4% 67.4% 62.5% 59.7% 60.1% 60.1%
   2000-01 79.5% 68.7% 65.1% 57.5% 56.7% 57.6%
   2001-02 82.4% 72.0% 67.9% 63.9% 63.0%
   2002-03 85.0% 73.6% 68.8% 66.2%
   2003-04 82.2% 72.3% 68.5%
   2004-05 83.7% 72.7%
   2005-06 79.6%
   2006-07

4. Dimock asked if other universities have called a moratorium on campus activities. Actually others bring students in a week before classes without other activities, but I don’t believe we could do it for a week but we should be able to pull it off for one day. It would require a decree from the Chancellor.
5. Lilly asked how many students?
   Roughly about 1,000.
6. Rohrer commented that threshold sounds like what the First Program is currently doing and we would just universalize the FY program. Possibly. I like that conversation but I do not want to comment on the program for it is up to the faculty to decide what should be done.
7. Thompson asked do you have any data on why students didn’t return? It would be helpful for planning if we knew why students didn’t return.
   I didn’t bring but I could provide. I know there isn’t a systematic collection of data.
8. Mark Nuss asked is there a key window where you lose the most? We could target retention effort?
   Good question. We lose them early in the year. That is why we need to connect right away.
9. Lewis suggested that Dr. Murray be contacted to share his powerpoint presentation which is highly informative. We can move beyond the data if we find a better way to connect with students.

10. Fredrickson suggested that we think about the size. You may have some who want to work with two or three rather than 17.
I agree there can be different models.

11. Dimock asked if we list first year students so that teachers could pay extra attention. Yes. It could be done.

12. What’s the next step and who do we talk to?
His office will move forward with a report to VC Murray. President Miller will serve as the conduit to the committee.

13. Davis asked if there was a timeline. A change in orientation would need to be announced very soon. If faculty are not willing to implement a new program in the fall, then they could slow down. A new orientation plan should begin planning next month.

Snider noted that the RSSET committee is scheduled to present a report to Chancellor Kristensen by February 1.

14. Summar stated that he had trouble putting orientation and retention in the same sentence. To give students so much information before the semester would result in getting lost. They are already excited. Efforts would be better used later in the semester.

Longo responded that the aggregate data suggests otherwise. Darveau noted that Murray’s data indicated that students need to be engaged in the first two weeks or retention takes a sharp drop.

B. Cheryl Bressington, Director AA/EO, Diversity Study
Ms. Bressington first reminded faculty that Disability Awareness Week (Nov. 12-15) was coming.

Important points about Diversity Study included:
- Peter Vogel of Culture Prep was brought to campus.
- Two day visit gathered data and examined documents. Evening meeting for a town hall meeting. Tried to get a feel for diversity on campus.
- He noted our strengths, namely that we are working toward goals
- Highlights from the report
  - We need to define what diversity is for this campus.
  - Orientation and community building needs work.
  - Enrollment management recommendations have already begun with training for admissions counselors and the CORE program which faculty have woefully not attended.
  - Recommendations on how to acclimate neighbors to diverse population at UNK.
  - Recommendations on what we can be doing in classroom to increase diversity awareness.
  - Recommendations on how we can continue to assess diversity issues on campus; such as, more town hall meetings.

Q&A
1. Wozniak asked what is it that faculty woefully do not attend.
CORE-- creating opportunities for respect and equity which is UNK’s diversity program to make people more sensitive to diversity issues. Darveau noted that the program was half-day and wondered if faculty were able to fit the session into their schedule. Ms. Bressington did not know.
2. Lilly asked if this is the first time the document had been distributed. No. It has been sent out as an email.
3. Lewis asked who filled out the survey. The members at the town hall meeting used clickers to answer the questions. They were invited and an attempt was made to obtain a cross section of campus.
4. Mollenkopf noted that she had been contacted by her dean.
5. Lilly asked what was next. The study has been given to the Diversity Strategic Planning Sub-committee to set priorities so that we can move forward.

Lewis (Lilly) moved that the Diversity study be place on next month’s agenda. **Motion Passed.** Wozniak (Rohrer) moved that the retention idea list also be placed on next month’s agenda. **Motion Passed.**

VI. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees

A. Oversight Committee: no report submitted
   Bev Frickel announced a senate vacancy in Business and Technology. Oversight recommended Larry Hughes from the Department of Management. There were no nominations from the floor, a vote was called for. **Motion Passed.** Senator Hughes was invited to the table.

B. Executive Committee **Minutes September 26 and October 24**
   No comment on September 26.
   October 24:
   1. Davis was pleased to see that the blackout is under conversation. Online education going on in the summer and advance notice would be greatly appreciated. Darveau responded that it may be three 1-day blackout or 1 three day blackout. All on-line classes will be essentially dead for the servers will be down. Incoming messages will be stored but you will not send anything out or receive. Administration reported that they will have a better idea as to what days to have the blackout as time gets closer.
   Senator Frickel noted that administration wants to hear what issues will need to be addressed, so they can solve problems that will be caused by the blackout.

C. President’s report. No report.

D. Academic Affairs: **Minutes October 18**
   1. Wozniak asked if Marc Albrecht agreed to chair the committee.
   
   As convener of the meeting, Snider reported that Professor Albrecht did, indeed, agree to serve as chair.

E. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: no report submitted.

F. Academic Information and Technology Committee: no report submitted.

G. Artists and Lecturers Committee **Minutes October 15**
   1. Wozniak asked why a list of awardees could not be included in minutes. Darveau noted that such a list was requested and hopefully will be forthcoming.

   2. Davis wondered about the range (the nature and type of requests). Darveau responded that such information would hopefully be included in the list.

   3. Lewis noted that there was a need for more advertising of programs. Darveau suggested that anyone who needs help; especially, getting information on the UNK sign should contact Kurt Carlson.
H. Athletic Committee: no report submitted

I. Continuing Education Committee Minutes October 25
   Darveau reported that the committee was requesting a change to the bylaws and tonight would constitute the first reading. The committee would like to change its name to “eCampus Advisory Committee” and update the composition of the committee in dropping the representative from the Rural Health Distance Learning Research Center as the Center no longer exists.
   Wozniak asked if there is an office of Continuing Education. The discussion indicated there was some uncertainty of the present administrative structure and the Executive Committee will investigate.

   Fredrickson suggested that if this change needed approval from the Regents, we should also include any other housekeeping items that we may have.
   Darveau suggested that all changes should be sent to Oversight.

J. Faculty Welfare Committee Minutes October 25
   No Comments on minutes, Darveau reported that Wozniak will be the UNKEA representative on the Faculty Welfare Comment.

K. Grievance Committee: No report submitted

L. Library Committee: No report submitted

M. Professional Conduct Committee: no report submitted

N. Student Affairs Committee Minutes October 16
   No comment.

VII. Reports of Senate Representatives to Non-Senate Committees

A. Assessment Committee Minutes October 11
   1. Davis noted that the number of responses had dwindled and he was curious as to the final count.
   Executive Committee will ask.

B. Affirmative Action Commission: no report submitted

C. Center for Teaching Excellence Advisory Committee: no report submitted

D. Council of Chairs: no report submitted

E. Ethnic Studies Advisory Committee Minutes September 5
   No comments

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: no report submitted

R. WI/CD Committee: no report submitted

S. Writing Center Advisory Committee: no report submitted
VIII. Reports from Academic Councils
   A. Graduate Council; Minutes July 18 September 20 and October 15
      Secretary Kelley apologized for omitting the July 18 minutes for a second time and
      promised to submit with the next packet.
      September 20—No comments
      October 15—No comments
   B. General Studies Council: Minutes September 6
      No Comment
   C. Council on Undergraduate Education: no report submitted
IX. Unfinished Business
X. New Business
Wozniak (Fredrickson) moved to go into a closed session to discuss the honorary degree
candidate. Motion Passed.
Fredrickson and Snider moved that the Senate move into open session. Motion Passed.
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.

1. Wozniak described the task of listing all of the committees that now exist and noted that
   committees do seem to be proliferating. He will ask for information on committees and proposed
   the following structure:
   Name of the committee and if it is a FS, Chancellor, College, etc. committee
   Who it reports to
   Who is ultimate authority
   How the membership is selected
   Charge, purpose or mission
   Current chair
   List of members

2. Snider reported that CAP assessment is completed. The goal was 800 and 756 completed. He
   wanted to thank everyone who was involved.

3. Lewis made a last plea for the United Way. Faculty should at least turn in information.
   Consider donating at least a small amount. UNK needs to supports local community.

Wozniak (Lewis) moved adjournment at 8:29 p.m. Motion Passed.