I. Call to order: President Miller called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Present:
At-Large Senators: Davis, Wozniak, Hansen
CBT Senators: Agrawal, Frickel, Hughes, Trewin, Hall, Smith
COE Senators: Fredrickson, McCarty, Young, Mollenkopf,
CFAH Senators: Wethington, Hartman, Nuss, White, Dimock, Smith, Snider
CNSS Senators: Aviles, Miller, Darveau, Lilly, Thompson, Kelley, Rohrer, Benz
Ryan Library Senator: Heidenreich
Absent: Eshelman, Lewis, Summar, Unruh, Brown, Younes, Kelley
Guests: Grant Campbell, UNK Student Senate Vice President; Travis Checketts, UNK Student Senate Speaker; Barbara Johnson, UNK Vice Chancellor for Business & Finance; Kim Schipporeit, UNK Registrar

III. Approval of Agenda

Senator Snider (Hartman) moved for the approval of the amended agenda. Motion Passed.

IV. Action on Faculty Senate Minutes of November 1, 2007

Senator Fredrickson (Dimock) move for the approval of the November, 2007 minutes. Motion passed.

V. Special Presentations

Representatives from the consultants working on the new SIS couldn’t make it, President Miller said two campus forums will occur next Monday to provide information on the development process and answer questions. He also introduced Registrar Kim Schipporeit, who was present to answer questions. She said that consultants have been hired to develop a new SIS system for the University. They will hold two campus forums—focusing on process not necessarily the end product. A follow-up e-mail will be sent to ask for input concerning content of a SIS system—it should be a brief questionnaire, relative to other versions. Senator Fredrickson asked if it would be appropriate to inquire about funding, since he had heard about the cost. Miller said that the University will submit a request to the Legislature for deficit funding. The State Colleges are also interested in being included.

Dr. Barbara Johnson was next to comment on and answer questions about parking and other matters. Highlights of her presentation included:

- Last spring a group of students had made a set of recommendations to Parking Advisory Committee. It was more a reshuffling of parking spots rather than looking at the bigger picture. A long-term parking plan would address what happens not only when we open Antelope Hall, but also open Nester Hall and begin the BHS renovation. She also described existing traffic flow problems, including some of the problems on Ninth Avenue. The city would like to assist, so a traffic study is being conducted. A consultant will make some
recommendations—they might have some meetings with concerned parties. West side of
campus is less densely populated which makes it a candidate for more parking. However,
even when the idea of parking at west campus and walking to east campus was presented as a
wellness program, the reaction was less than enthusiastic. So it seems we would need to
acquire a large parcel of property on the east side of campus for parking. Dr. Johnson is
investigating some options in consultation with the city, the UN Foundation, Varner Hall and
others. A long-term plan may emerge within 6 months. However, with BHS lot closed in
January, it will be interesting to see how the vehicles redistribute themselves into other lots.
She will wait to see if there needs to be more immediate actions.

- Questions
  - Senator Rohrer asked if it would be possible to build a parking garage? A parking
garage would be far more expensive than a surface lot, not likely in the present
environment--3 to 4 times more costly than a surface lot. Even so it will be
investigated
  - Senator White said it would be more convenient to have a garage closer than a
surface lot further away, which might justify the extra cost.
  - Senator Benz asked if faculty members are more willing to pay much more for
parking fees?
  - Senator Davis said that faculty would like to see the data including increasing the
parking fees. We need to get into the details rather than dismiss some of the ideas like
a parking garage. Dr Johnson said the garage has not been dismissed and will be
considered.
  - Senator K Smith asked about funding and the availability of funds for the project.
The funds available are surplus funds. The consultant will address total cost then
taking on additional debt will be reviewed. At present UNK will not take on
additional debt.
  - Senator P Smith asked if it is more cost effective to build garages below the new
buildings. The expense is still greater than surface lots. No new additional dorms are
planned in the near future. We cannot change the plans of the current construction
given that the plans have been approved and the process has moved too far along to
change. As a matter of fact, we just received approval from the Coordinating
Commission for the final plans for BHS and the central utilities project. Senator
Darveau wept for joy.

VI. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees
A. Oversight Committee: Minutes of November 29 and a handout — This information is
attached at the end of the minutes. Senator Frickel said that the committee reviewed the UNK
Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws and are prosoing changes to some sections. A draft of
those portions of the documents with the changes marked was distributed. As per the Bylaws, this
is the first presentation of the changes—we will vote at the next meeting.
Senator Fredrickson asked if all references to “Continuing Education” should be changed to “E-
campus” (for example, line 757.) The change is not yet decided—may be up for a vote tonight.
Miller suggested consideration of another change addressing inconsistency between Regent
Bylaws concerning grievance committee and the operating procedures for the grievance
committee—there is a difference in the number of committee members. This probably will not
involve a change in the Senate Bylaws, but a change in the operating procedures of the
committee.

B. Executive Committee: Minutes of November 22, 2007. Received without comment.
C. President's Report: **Report of the meeting on December 3, 2007.** President Miller noted that SVC Murray used the term “Distance Education” and not “E-Campus.” Distance education includes the off-campus classes. SVC Murray feels that a viable distance education is important for UNK, but there is no coherent administrative oversight. That may be developed down the road. In addition to the items in written report, President Miller reported that SVC Murray has decided to create a committee to look at a new first year experience designed for all students, not just a subset, which is presently the case—300 students are in the first-year program. President Miller asked for 2 Senators to sit on the committee. Senator Kelley has already volunteered. Senator Davis asked if first year advisory committee is different from this committee. President Miller said that this committee has a different mandate but includes some of the members of the first-year advisory committee. Senator Davis expressed concern that “creating a new committee”—need to address the proliferation of committees as a problem solving technique. Senator Darveau suggested using the first year advisory council as the committee to do the task but with some additional members. President Miller responded that that, in effect, might be what this proposal will end up as. Creating another committee is the problem. Senator Wozniak asked what the intended composition of the committee is. President Miller said it is a work in progress. Senator Snider said that the new committee is actually a task force, more of an *ad hoc* committee with one task to do. Senator Darveau also mentioned that Academic Affairs and Student Affairs have mandates that overlap with this committee. Senator Davis reiterated his concern about the proliferation of committees. President Miller will relay the suggestion of using the first year advisory committee with additional members. **Davis (Benz, with a subsequent friendly amendment added by Senator White) moved that the Senate recommend to the SVC that he consider assigning the specific task to an existing committee: the first year program advisory committee, that committee plus some additional members, or a Faculty Senate standing committee. Motion passed.**

Other items.

- Administrative evaluation—President Miller has had an inquiry concerning Dean evaluation. He reported that Deans are evaluated annually by SVC—via questionnaire by 25% of the faculty. Every 5 years, a more formal evaluation is conducted with a written evaluation of the Dean by 100% of the faculty. Department chairs are evaluated annually with faculty input—evaluation done by the Dean. If that is not being done, please let the executive committee know. There were a few reports from the Senators that they had no chance to assess their department chair.
- President Miller asked for a volunteer to serve a search committee for the ethnic studies director—Senator Davis volunteered.
- President Miller reported that UNO Faculty Senate (as well as the UNMC Faculty Senate) would like to reverse the ban on bake sales. UNK currently has no such ban. Student Senator Checketts reported that the concern was based on fear of pranking the food, such as baking cookies with Ex-Lax.
- Senator Miller is chairing the committee that will make suggestions concerning improving the freshman orientation. He requested that if a faculty member would like to provide him with input, contact him. He would like to have a set of interested faculty off whom President Miller could bounce ideas, i.e., an advisory committee.

D. Academic Affairs: no report submitted
E. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: **Minutes of November 14, 2007. Received without comment.**
F. Academic Information and Technology Committee: no report submitted
G. Artists and Lecturers Committee: no report submitted
H. Athletic Committee: **Minutes of November 2, 2007. Received without comment.**
I. Continuing Education Committee: **Minutes of November 6, 2007. Received with comment.**
Senator Darveau pointed out that this committee is the Faculty Senate Continuing Education Committee NOT the Continuing Education Faculty Senate Committee. Senator Fredrickson pointed out that the help desk open 24/7 now, including Christmas and New Years.
J. Faculty Welfare Committee: no report submitted
K. Grievance Committee: no report submitted
L. Library Committee: **Minutes of October 15 2007. Received without comment.**
M. Professional Conduct Committee: no report submitted
N. Student Affairs Committee: no report submitted

VIII. Reports of Senate Representatives to Non-Senate Committees
A. Assessment Committee: **Minutes of November 8, 2007. Received without comment.**
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 of October 10, 2007. 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: **Minutes of September 19, October 17, and November 11, 2007. Received without comment.**
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 of September 9, and October 10, 2007. Received without comment.**
R. Writing Center Advisory Committee: no report submitted
S. WI/CD Committee: **Minutes of October 17, 2007.** Senator Darveau expressed confusion concerning the committee’s desire to do writing assessment. President Miller said that the WI/CD committee wants it back. However, writing assessment will be done by the assessment office until after the NCA visit this spring. At that point, if they want it back, the issue will be renegotiated.

IX. Reports from Academic Councils
A. Graduate Council: **Minutes of July 18 and November 8, 2007. Received without comment.**
B. General Studies Council: **Minutes of October 4, 2007.** Senator Darveau asked if the capstone course development is mirroring what’s going on with the roundtables. Senator Snider responded there is quite a bit of cross-pollination so the proposals are very close. There will be pilot capstone courses offered in the fall of 08. The General Studies Council is seeking volunteer pilots.
C. Council on Undergraduate Education: Senator Snider reported that CUE is meeting on an as-needed basis.
X. Unfinished Business:

- Comments on Dean Longo’s written input into the strategic plan for retention
  Senator McCarty—What is a threshold activity? (Item 9) President Miller said it could take on a number of different forms, e.g., Fish Camp at Texas A&M—a week-long program on how to be an Aggie (Teaching traditions, songs, etc.) Experiences (possibly course) that every student would take at UNK that socializes them to College Life and better prepares them for success. These activities would have a more academic focus that Blue and Gold activities. They would need to different for transfer students, nontraditional students, on-line students, etc.
  Senator Frickel—How do these activities dovetail with the orientation task force? Miller’s task force is still generating ideas for orientation, nothing is finalized yet. They are looking at a variety of specific activities that might continue throughout the first year.
  Senator McCarty—Under point number 4, the section on counseling and health seems a little light on physical student health—HIV, drinking, hepatitis, blood-born pathogens
  Senator Rohrer—This seems to be another example of committees working cross purposes—why not have the first-year experience committee deal with all of these issues. There seem to be many committees working on similar issues. President Miller described the roles of each separate committee and said that historically the first-year advisory committee has been an academic group while the orientation committee has been a student affairs group. The purpose of the task force is to get something piloted this fall.
  Senator Lilly it is important that the separation not continue. What is told at orientation must apply in all their classes. President Miller echoed that sentiment—what students are told to expect must be what they experience. They cannot be told that College is much harder than high school and then get classes that are easier than high school.
- Senator Davis agreed that the first-year experience should be available to more students, more than the 300 who are enrolled presently.

- Diversity study comments:
  Senator Lilly—Why, in the preparation of the report, were there no meetings with the gender equity committee nor the women’s studies committee? It was shocking that those stakeholders were not consulted. It was suggested that perhaps there was overlap in the membership. President Miller wondered if possibly the focus of the report was on cross-cultural diversity. However, later in the report the recommendations include suggestions for gender diversity. Also Senator Lilly asked what did they have in mind for this survey. It was suggested that a strategic plan may be developed, which is good. Senator Darveau said that the implementation plans were presented to the Chancellor’s Strategic Planning Committee two weeks ago. Senator Lilly asked if there is a time frame for implementation. The plans are being modified and prioritized based on the the diversity study and other input they received. Senator Lilly was concerned about membership of the task force responsible for the implementation. The office tasked with this responsibility seems overburdened with other duties. President Miller will guide the senators to the web site so they can review the structure of the committee and the implementation plans.

Guidelines for Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure:

**Senator Darveau (Benz) moved to endorse the guidelines as presented.**

Senator White was concerned that there was frequent reference to appendix A which was missing. Also under number 6, the criteria for promotion and tenure—under scholarship—“Research leading to the advancement of knowledge resulting in publication in peer-reviewed
publications (or equivalent demonstrations) is an expectation of faculty.” creates a publish or perish environment in a school that professes to emphasize teaching. In the performing arts, given the isolated location of UNK it is very difficult to get peer review. To have a publish or perish environment is not appropriate for UNK because of the nature or location of the institution. Senator Darveau disagreed—the teaching load does include consideration of service and scholarship. The teacher/scholar model requires some degree of involvement in scholarship to keep current in your field. Don’t recitals provide evidence for scholarship?

Senator P Smith said that the music workload is much heavier in terms of contact hours. New repertoire with students and for students does not count as research. Given the amount of prep for teaching involved it is almost impossible to get the research done.

Senator Dimock—It doesn’t count to only do a performance locally. It must be reviewed by a peer to count.

Senator Rohrer—It may be possible to revise the statements to recognize that criteria for scholarship may be different for different areas.

Senator Benz—every dept can argue for an exception to the scholarship rule. The document relies heavily on departmentally-developed guidelines. The intent was to have each department develop their own guidelines. The committee only specifies procedure “in the absence of department guidelines.” Of course the department guidelines must be approved by the Dean and the SVC, but once they are in place, they are the rules in place. The only difference between this document and the previous rules is the insistence on each department developing guidelines.

Senator Hartman—There seems to be room for department interpretation. Equivalent demonstration could be offered by the department.

Senator K Smith—Can a department can establish their own standards? As long as not less stringent than overarching policies, according to Senator Darveau. President Miller said departments define the standards then they are approved up the administrative line. The term excellence was purposely used to avoid the implications of the old terms, outstanding, superior, good, which carry meaning after decades of use. Senator Smith continued, Who determines equity across departments? How do we determine fairness and prevent lawsuits? President Miller said that other institutions use the same general principles yet are not sued. At UNO, for example, each department sets standards consistent within the discipline. Fairness is in terms of process and the explication of the criteria are critical. When those aspects are not implemented, then the likelihood of a law suit increase. Senator Darveau said that equity is to a degree the responsibility of the Deans. Senator Smith recalled that a University-wide faculty committee is described by regents bylaws to ensure fairness, but has not been implemented for a long time. It would seem that the committee would at least monitor for fairness. Senator Darveau agreed that, as specified in Regents Bylaws, there should be a faculty committee that looks at the recommendations for promotion and tenure before the Chancellor makes the final decision.

**Senator K Smith (Lilly) to amend the guidelines to include reference to a University-wide faculty committee to review the tenure and promotion applications.** Senator Snider argued that we should not approve an amended document, rather, given its importance, we should review again after we suggest changes.

**Senator Snider (Hartman) indefinitely postpone amendment. Motion passed.**

**Senator K Smith (Trewin) indefinitely postpone the endorsement of the guidelines. Motion passed with one negative vote.**

Senator Thompson asked why not include all written department guidelines. President Miller suggested that developing the department guidelines may take years to complete. Senator Benz said that too many arguments at too many levels may prevent the document from ever being completed in that form.

Senator Fredrickson asked the rhetorical question of what is better than excellent, since that is the minimum? Since the Several tongue-in-cheek terms were suggested—fabulous, wonderific, magical, gorgeous, outwonderfulness, super special, supercalifragilisticexpialidocious.
Senator K Smith—The criteria for promotion—30 hours and terminal degree is that the same language as we have now? “Promotion to assistant professor normally requires…” Also promotion to professor “normally requires…” But promotion to associate professor requires… Why the exception in the use of the word “normally”? If the intention is to allow some individuals to go up for early promotion (i.e., the superstars), then what is the criterion for early promotion. The word “normally” begs the questions. There seems to be some “wiggle room” in the policy for associate professor, but the difference in the way it is worded might imply some different criteria for special circumstances.

Senator Lilly suggested that the document should be worded consistently. President Miller said we can suggest it.

Senator White asked how a person needs three years of teaching experience to be an assistant professor when most assistant professors are hired right out of graduate school. President Miller reminded him that the document only refers to promotion to assistant professor.

**Senator K Smith (Smith) moved that the document should include mention the University-wide committee which is consistent with Regents Bylaws.** Motion passed with one nay vote.

**Senator K Smith (Lilly) moved approval of a suggestion that the document add “normally” to VI-a-2 concerning promotion to associate professor to make it consistent across ranks.** Senator argued that the change in document wording is superfluous because the issue is usually addressed in the appointment letter. After a voice vote, Senator Benz asked for division. The motion failed 12-14.

**Senator White (Wethington) moved that we rethink the prescription that peer-reviewed publication be a requirement for scholarship.** Senator P Smith argued that peer-review would require that music faculty hire reviewers to assess their local performances. President Miller suggested that the departments need to define what constitutes peer-review. Departmentally-developed guidelines include clarification of the concept. Senator White argued that this document must be followed and is not preempted by Departmental policy. Senator Benz argued that this document was written to be “usably vague” to allow departmental interpretation. It is up to the department to develop guidelines that they can live with. Senator P Smith argued that the word “peer-reviewed” means that it cannot be less than that. Senator Dimock suggested that language should reinforce the fact that departmentally-approved equivalency—such as departmentally-approved demonstrations. Senator Fredrickson pointed out in Section I-C-2 that juried creative activity is listed as equivalent to peer-reviewed publication. Several suggestions for wording change were suggested. Senator White argued that non-juried work is completed negated as having value. He disagrees that someone has to see it in order for it to have value. Senator Hall asked how you establish scholarship with a jury of peers? Senator P White would like leave the establishment of what defines juried should be left to the department. President asked that the motion be put in general terms and leave the specific wording to others.

**Senator Dimock suggested that all of the document’s statements should be consistent with item I-c-2.** Senator White disagreed because there is no jury that exists for much of his work. Motion passed (2 nay votes)

Senator White argued that there are other things that are valuable that are not peer-reviewed and thus are discredited as scholarship and relegated to the service category. Faculty recitals are not service. Senator Lilly asked if a recital can be peer-reviewed by other members of the department? There are other activities that go into research, not peer-reviewed, yet still contribute to research and are kept in the research category. Senator Hartman stated that the argument concerning what constitutes scholarship in music should occur in the music department not the senate. Senator White said that the door is closed by the document. Senator Frickel as parliamentarian suggested that constructive debate has ceased.

From last meeting it was proposed that all references to continuing education be changed to E-campus. This motion is carried over from last meeting. Senator Wozniak asked if the SVC is
reviewing distance education. President Miller clarified his earlier statement in that the SVC also said there is no budget for continuing education so changes are not in the near future. However, distance education was used by the SVC. Senator Davis suggested that e-campus is a specific subset of what occurs in distance education. Is the change going to narrow the focus of the committee to only electronically offered courses? President Miller responded yes. Senator Fredrickson said the intent of the motion was to make the name of the committee consistent with whom they work. But was not meant to exclude distance education which still does occur on a small scale.

Senator Wozniak (Darveau) moved to postpone action on this amendment until the Senate addresses the other change to the constitution and bylaws. Motion passed.

XI. New Business:
Senator K Smith asked if there is any information on the search for Dean of Student Life. President Miller said there is no information about a search.

Academic Advancement Plan. Please review the document and we will discuss at the February Senate meeting. Dr. Murray will be reporting out this plan early next semester. E-mail comments directly to Dr Murray, because he is doing the briefing before the Senate meeting.

XII. General Faculty Comments

Senator Darveau the work of the Faculty Senate General Studies roundtable is nearly done. Please be prepared to read it beforehand and to rule on it at the February meeting. The report will be distributed before the packet is sent out.

XIII. Adjournment. Senator K Smith (Thompson) moved for adjournment. Motion Passed.

Respectfully submitted,
Bill Wozniak
Secretary pro tem
UNK Faculty Senate
Draft of Proposed Changes to the Faculty Senate Constitution and By-Laws are as in the gray shaded areas as follows where strikethroughs indicate deletions and additions are italicized within brackets[ ].

   **II.B.4. [Senator] Terms of Office**

   **II.B.4.a. Senator Terms:** Senators shall serve three-year terms, beginning at the last regular Faculty Senate meeting of the Spring and ending on the day before the last regular Faculty Senate meeting of the Spring Semester three years thereafter. The terms shall be arranged so that approximately one-third of the positions are filled by election each year.

   **II.B.4.b. Standing Committee Member (Faculty) Terms:** Unless stated otherwise in the Constitution and By-Laws and in accordance with the election schedule for Faculty Senate Standing Committees, faculty members serve two-year terms, beginning after the regular October Faculty Senate meeting following their election.

   **III.A.2. Officers’ Duties:**

   **PRESIDENT ELECT** – Records minutes of all Executive Committee Meetings. Serves on the Faculty Senate Professional Conduct Committee, and during October, requests appointment of members from administrative offices and student organizations to appropriate Faculty Senate committees.

3. Proposed Change to Constitution—Article V.A.
   **Article V.A. Standing Committee Member Elections and Terms:** Except for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate Oversight Committee whose members are elected at the last Faculty Senate Meeting in April to serve one year terms, other Standing Committee members shall be elected in September to serve for a term of two years, beginning on the first day following the regular October Faculty Senate meeting at which standing committee elections are completed. The two-year terms shall be arranged so that approximately one-half of the positions are filled by election each year. [Student members are selected as described in the By-Laws and will serve one year terms beginning on the first day following the regular October Faculty Senate meeting.]

   **VI.A.3. Elections:** Faculty members chosen to serve on Standing Committees will be elected, based on the composition of the committee, by the faculty of their college or the Library or by the members of the Faculty Senate, or elected/appointed by
the administration, and/or students, as appropriate. [Students will be selected/appointed by the Student Senate or by other Student bodies, as appropriate.]

5. Proposed Change to By-Laws—Article VI.B.

Article VI.B. Committee Vacancies: The process outlined for filling vacancies in the Faculty Senate will be used to fill committee vacancies. See By-Laws, Article IV.C, [IV.B1. and IV.B.2. regarding] Vacancies.

6. Proposed Change to By-Laws—Article VI.C.

Article VI.C. Committee Replacements: The process outlined to replace Faculty Senators will be used to replace committee members. See By-Laws, Article IV.C.e., [IV.B3. regarding] Replacements.

7. Proposed Change to By-Laws—Article VII.B.

Article VII.B. Academic Affairs Committee
Serves as a safeguard against needless curricular duplication of courses and programs by:
a) receiving notification of undergraduate courses and programs of study after they have been approved by the curriculum committee of the undergraduate college, (b) reviewing course proposals in intercollegiate and multidisciplinary areas within the University, and
(c) making specific policy proposals for curriculum development and coordination to educational policy committees of the undergraduate colleges. Proposes policy statements for University-wide academic issues. Maintains liaison with the Graduate College so as to coordinate undergraduate and graduate curricula and programs. Reviews actions taken by the General Studies Council. Considers any other academic question as directed by the Faculty Senate or the Senior Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

COMPOSITION: The Senior Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs [Chief Academic Affairs Officer], the Graduate Dean, the Registrar, (or their respective designees) two elected faculty members from different departments of each undergraduate college, one elected Library faculty member, and two students with majors in different fields selected by the Student Senate. Total: 14 members.

8. Proposed Change to By-Laws—Article VII.D.

Article VII.D. Academic Information Technology Committee
Serves as the UNK Teaching, Learning, and Technology Roundtable that advises administration and faculty, shares information, coordinates plans, and suggests means for using technology to improve teaching and learning.

COMPOSITION: One faculty member from and elected by each undergraduate college, one faculty member from and elected by the library faculty, and one faculty member from and selected by the Faculty Senate, the Assistant Vice-Chancellor of Information Technology [Chief Information Technology Officer], the Director [Dean] of Libraries, and one student selected by the Student Senate. Total: 9 members.
9. Proposed Change to By-Laws—Article VII.E.

**Article VII.E. Artists and Lecturers Committee**
Develops and supervises a program of events in support of the academic and cultural objectives of the University.

**COMPOSITION:** One faculty member from and elected by each undergraduate college, one faculty member elected by the Faculty Senate, one student selected by the Student Senate, and one student selected by the Student [Lopers Programming and Activities Council]. Total: 7 members.

10. Proposed Change to By-Laws—Article VII.G.

**Article VII.G. Continuing Education Advisory Committee**
Reviews and makes recommendations to the office in charge of Continuing Education on policies, programs, and practices to ensure that they are consistent with the educational mission of the University of Nebraska at Kearney and the client groups it serves.

**COMPOSITION:** One faculty representative from and elected by each undergraduate college, one graduate faculty representative chosen by the Graduate Council, one representative from each of the following: the Faculty Senate, Calvin T. Ryan Library, the Rural Health Education Distance Learning Research Center, and the Dean of Students [Student Life] Office[, and the office in charge of Continuing Education]. A representative from the office in charge of Continuing Education is an ex officio, non-voting member. Total: 10 [9] members.

11. Proposed Change to By-Laws—Article VII.J.

**Article VII.J. Library Committee**
Recommends the procedure by which funds are allocated to the colleges and advises the University administration on the formulation and implementation of Library policy.

**COMPOSITION:** One faculty member from and elected by each undergraduate college, the Director [Dean] of Libraries, the Director of Academic Computing, the Assistant Vice Chancellor of Information Technology [Chief Information Technology Officer or representative], one member selected by the Graduate Council, and one student selected by the Student Senate. Total: 8 members.

12. Proposed Change to By-Laws—Article VII.M.

**Article VII.M. Student Affairs Committee**
Acts with respect to matters of general concern relating to student affairs, especially with regard to areas of joint student/faculty concern.

**COMPOSITION:** Chief Student Affairs Officer [Dean of Student Life], one dean selected by the Dean’s Council, one faculty member from each undergraduate college and the Library, and five students with majors in different fields selected by the Student
Senate [to be one student from each of the four undergraduate colleges and one student from the Graduate College]. Total: 12 members.