I. Call to order

II. Roll Call

At Large Senators: Present: Wozniak, Hansen, Davis;

CBT Senators: Present: Moore, Trewin, Amundson, Meznarich; Absent: Agrawal, Smith, Hall;

COE Senators: Present: Mollenkopf, Lewis, Summar, Kritzer, Unruh, Fredrickson, Bostic-Frederick;

CFAH Senators: Present: Nuss, Dimock, Kruse, Flood, Snider, Hartman, White; Absent: Wethington;

CNSS Senators: Lilly, Miller, Stevens, Biggs, Benz, Darveau, Kelley, Combs, Rohrer;

Library Senator:

III.a. Approval of Agenda

Motion approval. White (Davis)

Oversight action between items 3 and 4

Approved as amended.

III.b. Oversight Action

Motion: Nuss (White) Reinstate Rohor. Passed.

Motion: Lewis (Kelley) Reinstate Bostic-Fredrick. Passed.

IV. Action on Faculty Senate Minutes of March 4, 2010

Motion: Unruh (Davis) to approve the minutes.

Wozniak: Executive Committee minutes Item B – comment re dual credit – “who approves” not improves (amended)

Passed as amended.

V. Special Presentation

A. President J.B. Milliken

The president gave a presentation on the budget and other issues, summarized below, then answered questions.

Budget:

Some of the good news regarding the state of the NU system:

- Highest enrollment since 1996 – providing more opportunity, and meeting goal to increase enrollment every year for the past five years.
- Highest average ACT (across NU system)
• Set a goal to attract ½ top 25% of NE HS graduates and are keeping over 40% of them.
• We reached the highest level of sponsored research in NU history last year.
• We are ½ through largest capital campaign in NU history (somewhere between 15th and 20th for the largest endowment of any public institution)
• The NE economy has fared better than most neighboring states.
• NU has not yet had to cut (decrease) the budget
• NU has received major acknowledgements: NU press – won Nobel Prize in Literature, the Bancroft Award, and a CASE professor of the year.

Bad news:
• Lost increase in appropriation in special session last year
• Went back to “ground zero” – not lower due to the stimulus money (could reallocate form other areas of the budget). Have been able to maintain that.
• In the next biennium we are facing about 640 million dollar shortfall.
  o assumes a 7.2% revenue growth
  o likely to be closer to a billion dollar shortfall over the biennium.
  o looking at 15% cuts overall in state government – some cuts are discretionary and some are not.
• The next full legislative session has a lot of work to do that impacts the university.
• There has been concerns with the approximately $35 million (NU wide) reductions this year due to shortfall and reductions in the special sessions. We haven’t had reductions in the base state funding. The next biennium will be very, very difficult.
• Compensating for reductions:
  o Apart from the designated funds (e.g. federal funds, private funds, etc.) we have state aid, general fund, and tuition.
  o We can’t make up for state funds with tuition.

Other news:
• College Bound NE – still a successful program.
  o need to get to students early and let them know college is affordable
  o writing to 8th graders – we’ll help you but you have to prepare
• P-16 Initiative.
  o want a 98% graduation rate in every high school in NE.
  o want in the top 10 in college going students in the nation.
  o want to eliminate the achievement gap for different ethnic groups.
• Goals for state of NE.
  o UNK leading – online learning. Generated more online hours than UNL, UNO, or the Medical Center.
  o UNK leading – Considerably more international enrollment (by percent) of international students than other campuses. This creates good opportunities for our students and communities.

Questions:

Fredrickson: Re: Online Worldwide. UNK is doing well and we have strong programs. Online Worldwide is jeopardizing that. They increased tuition. We are more expensive than Ft. Hayes and it is the same for out of state students. They are increasing tuition to pay for Online Worldwide and that money is duplicating services we already provide.

Milliken: The increase in tuition and enrollments has made up for losses from funding Online Worldwide required. As a general rule tuition revenue has increased. The NU
system, including UNK, doesn’t compete on price with state colleges. Consultants said we could raise tuition. We did and are still getting the increases. We need to compete with institutions worldwide. Undergraduate business degree was not possible due to low tuition. We have been able to grow enrollment and revenue. There are serious issues we will have to work through: tuition differential and course and program duplication. That’s why we have some of the most committed people working on the steering committee.

Summer: With the Capital Campaign’s $1.2 billion goal, how much of that is for us?

Milliken: Each campus sets a goal. They determine the figures based on campus giving (averaged over 5 years) and increase that to 150%. That sets the campus goals. The economy was down; we’re still striving. Extended the campaign timeline. We spend less to raise money than most other campaigns. Working to spread out to those smaller donations. UNK’s goal is $50 Million. That’s the UNK goal and we’re close to ½ way there. Donor contributions are (mostly) restricted to specific programs – so we can’t put it just anywhere. Those donations that are unrestricted are distributed across the system.

Lewis: Re: Online tuition and campus funding. If we have pricing equity, will we get salary equity?

Milliken: Pricing equity with regard to Online Worldwide does two things: 1) it eliminates competition on this platform – which doesn’t treat the campuses differently, and 2) it generates more revenue for the campus. UNK’s increase in revenue has helped offset the budget cuts.

Lewis: If our students can go to other campuses, it is losing its advantage for UNK.

Milliken: The consultants are telling us that colleges are not our competition. We are under priced, so this is a place to increase revenue.

Lewis: The money, the tuition differential, has helped grow programs. Now we’re losing that because we can’t save money across the biennium.

Milliken: Historically, differential was revolving. Now it’s part of the money that is tuition, but there is no reason that we can’t carry it forward. There has to be a reward in order to provide the incentive to grow programs. I want to create more incentives. This money will be reinvested in the programs.

Davis: Re: Midwest CREST program. Where are we as a university on this? Will information be coming forward?

Milliken: My representative on that board is in Vietnam right now. Not sure where MHEC is on this. Linda Pratt is our representative. Contact her.

Milliken: Genesis of Online Worldwide. A few years ago, the university wide distance education coordinating commission asked to create a website a gateway for NU. I said, I’ll invest, but I need proof that this will be to our benefit. I hired EMG (out of Denver) and they recommended the integrated academic enterprise model. I hired Gary Miller who developed the business plan (also developed the plan for Penn State – World Campus). We are building the online program on the NU brand which is strong. This was a response to the demand for a stronger online campus. 70% of online credits are on-campus students. That 30% off campus and the population in NE that has college credit but no degree is who we’re after.

Fredrickson: There are problems with the online worldwide site. Some courses are hybrid; that needs to be designated. The Library Media program in UNO (a good
program), but people have to show up for a couple days during the semester which is a real problem for out of state students.

Milliken: Fair point. There are issues, but these are things that we will have to work out. The opportunities for collaboration among the campus are an important side benefit of this.

Miller: What principles will you use in allocating the budget out to the campuses?

Milliken: We start with the base, then adjust based on several things. I changed the allocation model based on revenue. This makes people responsible on both ends. It encourages faculty and staff to increase enrollment and minimize remissions. There have generally been across the board allocations on Health Insurance, Utilities, Programs of Excellence, Diversity Programs, not O and M. Not sure what will happen this year. I’ll allocate in June. Tuition will be set in June. I did not distribute the Programs of Excellence money this year, so when the budget was cut in November, we had 3 million in reserve. We have averaged 5% tuition increase over the last five years.

B. Deborah Bridges – First Year Experience

(Handout and other relevant items from the presentation are posted on the Senate website under Additional Documents)

Bridges reviewed the history of the program and its goals as they have led to the present proposal. The program was integrated into parts of the curriculum and had the goal of providing a transition from high school to college. The APR questioned the sustainability of the program.

In 2008, VC Murry tasked Bridges with taking the current program and find a way to extend its reach and economic viability. A taskforce studied the program and recommended putting the program on hiatus and investigating what models we could use. The task force worked on developing a model based on input from the campus community. Bryant visited all the colleges, met with departments, and talked to other campus services. Recommendations were made to VC Bicak in Fall 2009 and the task force was directed to work on implementation. The charge was to look at the logistics of the implementation and needed to be consistent with existing programs and the UNK strategic plan.

Curriculum needed to be common and focused on the first year program goals, needed peer mentoring, and needed to bridge academics and student affairs. Assessment needed to be built into the program. The program needed to be faculty driven in the sense that it was guided by faculty input, but without increasing the load. The GS revision did not include a first year component, so it was not designed as part of the general studies program.

Proposed Pilot – consistent with everything we were asked to follow.

- to be piloted Fall 2010, limited approval to be based on data from the pilot.
- need a first year program office and director.
- full implementation is a long term goal
- for Pilot, Bryant will be supervising as interim director (has been involved from the beginning).
- First year seminar: 1 credit freshman seminar; Common curriculum – transition for HS to college education; each student exposed to the same information; this allows assessment of the goals.
Student affairs personal will provide instruction on transitional skills – goal to be engaged academic/campus citizens. Skills in the sense of what resources are available to do that.

- Developed 2 sections for each of the academic colleges; 12 class periods are the same; 4 class periods are up to the colleges.
- Peer mentors will get pay and experience.
- Leaders will provide leadership training.
- Colleges get the fte credit.
- No increase in budget.

- So far this is a pilot – it is based on all the analysis of best practices and needs.
- Final decisions will need to be based on assessment data.
- Deans council approved December 2009.

Darveau: Preparation for college was a fundamental component of the Portal course in the GS program. What is the difference?

Bridges: The portal is about critical thinking. This has more to do with the (personal transition) life goals, engagement, importance of GPA, academic advising, financial literacy, time management (etc.). The content is not in any way related to the portals.

Wozniak: Was LNSK 117 approved by AA?

Bridges: Yes on the meeting of the 25th of March.

Wozniak: Offering credit for learning skills courses is a problem. I have concerns about the lack of transparency to faculty and the offering of credit by student services.

Bridges: LNSK is housed in COE and their Ed. Policy committee approved it. It has been through the Deans council. The goal was to provide a way to have similar courses – attaching sections to the different colleges. Credit hour production will be based on each of the sections (which are assigned to the colleges).

Lilly: How does a college and not a department get the fte?

Bridges: We had to work with the LNSK course designation. The Registrar’s office will give credit hour production to the college. Student Affairs has control of the LNSK scheduling. That seemed a better fit than trying to house the program in a specific department.

Lilly: Is this going to be required of every entering Freshman?

Bridges: Not as yet. Most reports indicate that it should be required. In this pilot, each of the 8 sections will have 25 students.

Lilly: Some students will be bored and offended by having to take this class. Will they have a choice?

Bridges: Students will have a choice. This is a starting point. The program covers things that the faculty has said they want students to know.

Miller: Has the question of receiving credit been asked?

Kruse: It was addressed in the AA subcommittee meeting. At the full committee meeting it was not discussed, but the issues in the subcommittee were reviewed.

Benz: How will students be funneled?
Bridges: They are limiting enrollment during summer advising – so it doesn’t fill all at once. The students will be given options.

Benz: Grades?

Bridges: Credit/No Credit.

Wozniak: This is the first we are hearing of it as a course taught by student services.

Davis: This was put forward as a “matter of information” not something that needed approval? Since this is a course for credit, it needs approval. There was a process of review and reporting, but not to the faculty.

Bridges: It was an informational item that we were coming to the Senate to discuss it. The course approval was according to traditional approval.

Miller: Are their guidelines for the colleges’ portions? Who will speak?

Bridges: Yes and no. There are some suggestions. As to who will speak, that will depend on schedules and solicit input from the Deans.

Miller: Is there a budget for the lecturers?

Bridges: No.

Kritzer: If you have data on at risk students, you should target those students.

Bridges: There are already services for those students. This program is designed to address a different population. The goal is to have a representative sample of students entering UNK.

Darveau: There are smart kids (ACT scores) who have no life skills.

**Motion Darveau (Davis): LNSK 117 should go to each college’s ed. policy committee for approval and discussion.**

Fredrickson: Can the other education policy committees disapprove of a course approved?

Darveau: Each college should have input.

Miller: They should be able to review and comment.

White: Who teaches these courses?

Bridges: People with Master’s degrees who have experience in these areas.

((out of order))

Darveau: **amend the motion:** That the Faculty Senate will not accept the AA approval of LNSK 117 until the course has been vetted by the other 3 colleges.

Unruh: We do not have the power to approve or disapprove.

Benz: We do have the authority to approve this because this is a Senate Committee.

Fredrickson: How many colleges have to approve?

Miller: The Education Policy Committees will provide feedback, not approval or disapproval.

**passed.**
Miller: The advantage of assessment of this program is that it will allow us to answer questions of who should be taking the class with data.

Bridges: This would hold up the approval until the fall when the next Faculty Senate meeting in the fall when we approve the last Spring meeting’s minutes.

Miller: We could approve those minutes electronically.

Fredrickson: Can the EC contact the ed policy committees and ask them to comment?

Miller: We should give the ed policy committees the opportunity to comment. If they don’t take that opportunity, then they don’t.

Wozniak: We are operating as though this will be approved. If it is to be reviewed, the review should be fair.

Wozniak: The report and the syllabus should be made accessible.

Bridges: Where?

Dimock: It can be put on the FS website.

Bridges: Can the documents be emailed to the ed. policy committees? CAP won’t let it be sent to other colleges. Answer: Email is fine.

White: Who are the teachers and what are their fields?

Bridges: Dr. Zeller would know. They all have Master’s level education or above and are credentialed for the subjects they will be teaching.

VI. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees

A. Oversight Committee:

B. Executive Committee:

C. President’s Report:

D. Academic Affairs: **Minutes of March 25, 2010**

Questions?

**Davis (Biggs) approve with the exception of #159.**

Miller: Was the ITEC 290 issue resolved?

Dimock: yes.

**Motion Passed.**

E. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee:

F. Academic Information and Technology Committee: **Minutes of February 5, 2010**

No comment.

G. Artists and Lecturers Committee:

H. Athletic Committee:

I. e-campus Committee: **Minutes of March 10, 2010**

No comment.

J. Faculty Welfare Committee:
K. Grievance Committee:
L. Library Committee:
M. Professional Conduct Committee:
N. Student Affairs Committee:

VII. Reports of Senate Representatives to Non-Senate Committees
A. Assessment Committee:
B. Affirmative Action Commission:
C. Center for Teaching Excellence Advisory Committee: 
   Minutes of February 17, 2010
   No comment.
D. Council of Chairs:
E. Ethnic Studies Advisory Committee: 
   Minutes of March 4, 2010
   No comment
F. Fees Committee:
G. First Year Advisory Council:
H. Gender Equity Committee:
I. Honors Council:
J. International Studies Advisory Council:
K. Parking:
L. Student Retention Committee:
M. Safety Committee:
N. Strategic Planning:
O. Student Support Services Advisory Committee:
P. Technology Advisory Committee:
Q. Women’s Studies Advisory Committee: 
   Minutes of March 3, 2010
   No comment.
R. WI/CD Committee:
S. Writing Center Advisory Committee:

VIII. Reports from Academic Councils
A. Graduate Council
B. General Studies Council:
   
   **Davis: Motion** for a vote of no confidence in the general studies process. (Amended)
   Davis: The process has been identified as “evolutionary”. The CNSS Council of Chairs /Directors correctly questioned apparent decisions regarding making structural changes.
   Members of the GS committee have indicated that they have been uncomfortable with the proceedings of the Council and unclear on how some decisions were arrived at. Minutes of the Council are minimal at best and voting records which would indicate college
support for issues are seldom present. Questions regarding Math requirements and course placement and discipline expertise have arisen to be dealt with in this evolutionary process. It is admirable that many opportunities for general faculty input have appeared via email, but questions have arisen with regard to such polling apparently replacing proper procedures for addressing structural change and course placement. The accumulation of these and other concerns are significant enough to determine that it is time to acknowledge such and question the process that is in place for the new general studies program. Consequently, the intent of this motion is to call for a vote of no confidence in the general studies process.

Miller: Only twice in the last 20 years has there been a vote of no confidence. It has created bad feelings and unforeseen negative consequences. Larry Theye resigned the chairmanship of the GS council. Let us not create the ill will. I’d move to eliminate the no confidence language and submit a different motion. Let the motion die for lack of a second.

Rohrer (second)

**Miller (Darveau): Amendment:** That the no confidence language be removed and the motion read that the “FS offer suggestions to the GSC, as follows:” (revised)

**Revised Motion:** That the Faculty Senate expresses its concern with the GS process. (passed)

Trewin: that is too vague for a motion.

**Motion.** Davis: Move that the GSC return to a Faculty Senate body and that an ad hoc transitional committee be established to address the concerns of the faculty regarding the General Studies program and process.

(there was no second to this motion)

Miller: This would slow down the process and create logistical problems.

Fredrickson: In order to vote on the amended motion, we need to know what we are voting on.

Miller: The motion is to remove the language “no confidence.” At that point we would not have a legible motion and we could then address the concerns.

Darveau: That is too vague for a motion.

Miller: We can replace the no confidence language with “concern.”

Davis: There are a host of concerns. We are at a point where the best way to raise this to the seriousness it deserves is to state that we do not have confidence in the way the GS process is unfolding. This is meant to raise the discussion. We can vote it down.

Darveau: Accepted the motion to replace the no confidence language with concerns.

Hanson: The complaints that the process has been fatally rushed are overstated.

White: If the problem is with the hurtfulness of the language then concern is as hurtful.

Miller: We have had more problems with no confidence.

Hartman: There was a lot of hurt with the last no confidence vote.

**Motion** Fredrickson (Unruh): Move the previous question.

Passed.
Benz: on the motion to accept the amendment.

Passed

Motion on the floor:

That the Faculty Senate expresses its concern with the GS process. (failed)

Miller: I would like us to address the issues that are new that we can address.

Lilly: There are a variety of issues that we do not have time to resolve: The speech issue, GS online, portals online, transferring in and out, adjuncts teaching, quality control, as well as other questions.

Miller: What would you recommend?

Lilly: Moratorium on classes, GSC meet in the summer, retreat in the summer, and Bicak address the issues.

Miller: What advice can we offer to help that the GSC can’t do itself?

Snider: VCAA Bicak approved the program at the end of the summer to avoid the appearance of impropriety. The timeline we are on is controlled by external factors. We need courses, data, and experiences upon which to make decisions. A handout was passed around. It addresses the concerns that have been raised and the actions to address those concerns the GSC has taken. What would be most helpful would be concrete suggestions about what would be most effective. Anytime a faculty member has raised a concern with the members or the chair, they have been raised to the council’s attention.

Kelley: What concerns can we address?

Biggs: It appears as though GS is overburdened. Perhaps they could ask for help on a temporary basis. Could you be more productive with more faculty support?

Miller: That is a good idea that has precedent. This could address the issue of buy-in as well.

Hanson: I don’t see that more people would speed things up. The pace is slowed by extended debate.

Lilly: Perhaps the Senate could formulate a committee to address the issues and leave the GSC to approve courses.

Kelley: One issue that is coming up is the assessment. Given the expertise in methodology we have on the campus, perhaps we could rely on some faculty to help with that issue.

Dimock: I’d like to see Lilly’s statement as a motion.

Snider: What can we do now?

Miller: Could the council bring these issues to current senate committees? Online issues could be sent to the eCampus committee, for example.

Unruh (Fredrickson): Move to call the question.

Division: 17 (in favor) to 6 (opposed), Passed.

Vote on motion: voice vote. Failed.

Division: 7 (in favor) to 15 (opposed), Failed.

Snider: Send me your concerns.
Darveau: If you send these concerns to Senate Committees you are going to get a fragmented response. Should we develop a joint committee to address the big picture items?

Hanson: The committee has done well with the big picture items. We are almost ready with version 1. I don’t believe the system is broken.

Dimock: While I appreciate the amount of work the GSC has accomplished, Davis’s call highlights a problem with the faculty’s impression of the GSC and the GS process. Faculty members have concerns about the decisions being made and how those decisions are made. I believe we need a committee under the authority of the Senate to reconcile the general studies program and process to the faculty’s concerns. The concerns I have lead me to believe the program would fail if put to the vote of the colleges; it is losing, not gaining support. Those concerns include questions about assessment and faculty qualifications. We need some deliberative body who can address concerns that is representative of the general faculty and not appointed by the GSC.

Snider: Every meeting is public. What specifically can we do differently?

Wozniak: I was GS director. It was deadlocked and that is why it had to be moved out of Senate. We need to try to just let it work. So many people are trying to get this to work.

Lilly: The logistical issues have to be done quickly, but there are many issues GSC doesn’t have time to do and we could potentially use another body that is responsible to the Senate.

Stevens: There is a problem with General Studies that are matters of first principles. For instance, there are serious concerns with due process and assessment.

Snider: I was trained as a reviewer. What I have found is that the assessment office is following the guidelines of the NCA – they are asking for what NCA is asking for. None of us want to limit academic freedom.

Davis: This has been a very difficult process and many people working very hard to accomplish a great deal. We can do nothing or take action – what action can we take?

Davis: Move that the Faculty Senate endorse the VCAA and the GSC work with a reconciliation committee of the Faculty Senate to address the concerns of the faculty. (died for lack of a second)

Snider: Would it be helpful to have representatives of the Senate on the GSC?

Miller: I don’t think it is a do this or do nothing. Does the GSC need help and if you need help addressing the concerns, what do you need.

Rohrer: There are two issues: 1) GS is overwhelmed, 2) problem of lack of confidence. There is already hurt and division. There has to be some dealing with the hurt that has been occasioned by procedural failures. When I asked people to run for Senate, they say that Senate doesn’t do anything. I’m working to move forward, but there is a lack of faith in the process.

Miller: There has been hurt and there are problems. Part of my concern with the no confidence vote had to do with unforeseen problems. Most concerns are not with the process but with the outcomes. No one will be happy with every outcome and decision of the council.

Amundson: We have to understand the concerns that there is so much change and stress that it creates anxiety. We need to echo the offer for support. We are here to help and collaborate.

Darveau (Davis) Motion:

That the Faculty Senate work with the GSC to commission a joint committee of the Faculty Senate and the General Studies Council composed of 1 member of each college and the
library, elected by the Colleges and Library, and 1 member of each college appointed by the Faculty Senate. Said committee will be charged to make recommendations and hold discussion to include but not limited to structural and curricular aspects of the General Studies program. (as amended)

Discussion:

Snider: It takes a long time to get up to speed on the General Studies Committee. If you gave it to the standing committees would you have the same effect?

Darveau: The committee needs to be representative and they can get caught up. Relying on Senate committees will be too fragmented.

Miller: We should direct the EC to meet with the VCAA and Chair of GS to work out a process. The solution should include some substantive involvement from the Senate. Coming back with a thought out plan might be a better option.

Lilly: There is a concern with getting up to speed, but those are more to do with course decisions. The concerns that need to be addressed are larger scale curricular issues.

Biggs: We need something concrete from this body.

Fredrickson: If it is a joint committee, why would we elect members? Wouldn’t both bodies appoint members?

Darveau: The Faculty Senate and GSC could appoint, but the election part is important. Just electing could lead to an ill-informed committee. There is also precedent for FS controlling the composition of its committees.

Kritzer: This is being rushed.

Wozniak: The workload issue can be managed by the GSC and the EC if GSC needs help. If academic freedom is an issue, then the AFT committee can address the relationship between institutional assessment and academic freedom.

Hartman: This Committee, what are they going to do?

Darveau: Their charge is to consider the big issues, like the structure and process. They are a recommendatory body, not an authoritative. They could go to the SVC, Senate, and GSC.

White: Would the GSC then decide on a list of questions to be addressed?

Darveau: The body could address whatever concerns they felt relevant.

Benz: How will they work with the GSC?

Darveau: The motion allows that to be worked out. FS will work with the GSC in the commissioning to work these details out.

Lilly: They would work as a GS/FS committee and look at the questions, then report to GSC and FS. GSC and FS would make decisions based on that input.

Miller: Would this make things easier or harder in the GSC?

Snider: Conceptually it is a good idea to forge a link between the GSC and Faculty Senate, but not necessarily this structure.

Fredrickson: We could disband the committee if this structure will fail.

Benz: I would rather table this until next meeting.
Miller (Kritzer): move to postpone (division 11 (in favor) -12 (opposed) – failed)

Darveau: The motion doesn’t specify how, just what. The commissioning process will need to be worked out. If we do it tonight, we can have people in the positions before the summer starts. We don’t want to kill the summer again.

Snider: It would be easy enough to set up a summer retreat with the GSC and the Senate.

Lilly: Amend to make the appointed seats jointly appointed by the FS and GSC. (accepted as a friendly amendment).

GSC and Faculty Senate jointly choose faculty appointed to the committee.

Fredrickson. Amendment: EC and GSC commission. (dropped)

Snider: As director, I would not act independently in the commissioning.

Darveau: Commissioning means define the details of the committee: set the ground rules and organize the elections.

Final Wording:

That the Faculty Senate work with the General Studies Council to commission a joint committee of the Faculty Senate and the General Studies Council composed of 1 member of each college and the library, elected by the Colleges and Library, and 1 member of each college appointed by the Faculty Senate and the General Studies Council. Said committee will be charged to make recommendations and hold discussion to include but not limited to structural and curricular aspects of the General Studies program.

PASSED

C. Council on Undergraduate Education:

IX. Unfinished Business

X. New Business

XI. General Faculty Comments

XII. Adjournment

Darveau (Miller). Motion to Adjourn. Passed. 11:02 PM