I. Call to order

II. Roll Call: **Senator [Past-President] T. Moore at 7:05pm**

At Large Senators:  **Present:** Ellis, Wozniak;  
  **Absent:** Frickel;  

CBT Senators:  **Present:** Barry, Amundson, Agrawal, Messersmith, Moore, T., Taylor, Trewin;  
  **Absent:** (none);  

COE Senators:  **Present:** Kritzer, Lewis, Mollenkopf, Moore, J.;  
  **Absent:** Fredrickson, Kracl, Montgomery;  

CFAH Senators:  **Present:** Beard, Beissel-Heath, Burbal, Flood, Fronczak, White;  
  **Absent:** Chavez, Dimock;  

CNSS Senators:  **Present:** Carlson, Campbell, Darveau, Ericson, Lilly, Trantham, Wadkins;  
  **Absent:** Biggs, Forrest;  

Library Senator:  **Present:** Mueller

III. Approval of Agenda:

  **Wozniak (Messersmith) move approval.**  
  Agenda Approved.

IV. Action on Faculty Senate Minutes  **01MAR2012**

  **Carlson (Lewis) move approval.**  
  **Comments:** It was noted by Senator Wozniak that AIT was also to report on the progress made toward the frequency in which passwords were changed.  
  Minutes Approved.

V. Special Presentation

  A. Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance, Barbara Johnson.  

  VCBF Johnson presented a 2011-12 budget overview. Information presented followed that published in the 05 April Faculty Senate packet. Other notes of interest: Tuition and fees paid by students to UNK are retained by UNK, as opposed to being redistributed by central administration. General funds and cash funds are what comprise the state aided budget. VC Johnson spoke to various initiatives; priorities as identified by Founders Hall. Noted that over 80% of UNK’s operating budget is salaries. Hopeful for a pool for increase staff compensation. Personnel to support people soft. New university signage. Issues related to “deferred maintenance”, now referred to as “Capital Renewal”, fund at 1% of depreciated value of facilities
to be reinvested in the buildings. Debt to asset ratio is required to be 1.15 [or greater]; central would like to see 1.50, UNK is at 1.99. UNK has room in debt service to fund projects such as “South Campus”. First building to be replacement of University Heights (for nontraditional housing). There will be noticeable increase in renovation/building projects across campus over the next 4-6 years.

Faculty comments/questions

What has been determine with physical location of the BHS? New BHS addition for UNMC nursing program located east of BHS: with 44k ft² gross, 30k ft² assignable. Bicak and counterpart at UNMC responsible for developing program. Program as input on final design. Building owned by UNK. Will there be a conversation engaging UNK faculty input on general design? Yes, nominally through Deans council. It was pointed out that it would be important to have [UNK] faculty input on the design.

There was a question regarding the entrance to UNK and traffic flow around 25th street. Just learned $4\times10^6$ state funding for a roundabout at the 25th street/9th ave intersection construction beginning year 2015. Opportunity to redesign entry to UNK. Once renovate Towers East and West; Close Martin Hall and Conrad. Demolish Conrad. Martin renovated to house academic and administrative space, such as admissions.

West Center space after nursing moves to be determined.

VI. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees

A. Oversight Committee:

Oversight Committee Chair Trewin noted that Senators Burbal and Lilly have exceeded their constitutional absence limit. Trewin (Amundson) move to nominate Senators Burbal and Lilly to replace their own respective seats. Motion Passes.

B. Executive Committee:

C. President’s Report: 5April2012

Senator Wozniak noted that item 1 of the report indicates that Faculty Welfare Committee is working with the senate. However this committee has not submitted minutes in recent memory. Senator Carlson noted that she is on this committee. She reported that the committee has recently met and Dave Palmer took minutes. Further, Senator Carlson indicated that at the meeting they discussed faculty mentoring best-practices on campus. Since the faculty handbook mentions the need for mentoring, a denied promotion request or tenure application may be grievable.

D. Academic Affairs: 15March2012

Accepted without comment

E. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee:

F. Academic Information and Technology Committee: 10Feb2012

Senator Wozniak noted that minutes should not be cryptic since it is a historical document of the proceedings. It was suggested that executive committee request that the minutes contain less jargon and complete sentences.

G. Artists and Lecturers Committee:

H. Athletic Committee:

I. e-campus Committee:
J. Faculty Welfare Committee:

K. Grievance Committee: 17Feb2012

Senator Carlson, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Representative, noted that an informal resolution for grievance mentioned in previous minutes has not been found, thus the grievance has evolved into a formal grievance.

L. Library Committee:

M. Professional Conduct Committee:

N. Student Affairs Committee: 08March2012

Accepted without comment.

VII. Reports of Senate Representatives to Non-Senate Committees

A. Assessment Committee: 05March2012

Senator J. Moore, a member of the General Studies committee, distributed written comments authored by General Studies Director Snider addressing portions of the Assessment Committee minutes (attached at the end of this document).

There were questions regarding levying fees for Taskstream. The Taskstream fee proposal was not approved. Senator Carlson indicated that this was not approved because the present of the University thought this would make the student fees increase by too much this year.

Also some discussion regarding the assessment of the distribution categories. Senator Moore indicated that GS would be considering these in the Fall of 2012. Senator Darveau noted that as GS develops the assessment plan/rubrics that individual faculty and departments be consulted both before and during the process.

B. Affirmative Action Commission:

C. Center for Teaching Excellence Advisory Committee:

D. Council of Chairs:

E. Ethnic Studies Advisory Committee:

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:

Senator T. Moore presented updated progress on the student success council. She presented four major categories: I. Academic Advising, II. First Year Transition, III. Engagement, IV. Student Services. Within category I, initiative #1: *Develop a total intake model for academic advising* was discussed at length.

There was considerable discussion by some senators regarding the perceived lack of dissemination of this information and input into the plan. There is a perception expressed that this plan has not been sufficiently communicated or vetted through the senate, departments and/or the faculty community in general.

There was input provided expressing the desire for departments to continue to have access to the freshmen, to be able to build a relationship with the new students.

Senator Darveau noted that when the first year program was initially created, it was intended to handle the advising on the student affairs side, as well as some academic issues which are now handled in the GS portals. He questions the wisdom of filling this position, and spending the salary dollars, since the original mission(s) of the first year are now covered elsewhere.

M. Safety Committee:

N. Strategic Planning:

O. Student Support Services Advisory Committee:

P. Technology Advisory Committee:

Q. Women’s Studies Advisory Committee: 14March2012

Accepted without comment

R. WI/CD Committee: 14Feb2012, 13March2012

Accepted without comment

S. Writing Center Advisory Committee:

VIII. Reports from Academic Councils

A. Graduate Council

B. General Studies Council: 1March2012, 8March2012

Accepted without comment

C. Council on Undergraduate Education:

IX. Unfinished Business

A. Report from ad hoc WI committee.

Senator Amundson indicated that he currently organizing a meeting with appropriate representatives.

B.

X. New Business

A. Senator Carlson presented a proposal to bring back the old telephone book (proposal attached at the end of this document). Carlson (Wozniac) move to endorse the proposal as presented. Motion passes.
B.

XI. General Faculty Comments

A. Senator White noted that music programs are having difficulty trimming its programs to the mandated 120crhr limit and, at the same time, maintain academic standards required for accreditation. He inquired as to how many other programs where having difficulty. It was noted that that most programs on campus have been able to comply with the rule, although many had to downsize; such as education programs only requiring one endorsement to graduate rather than two. Senator White inquired as to why general studies was not on the table to be cut in addition to major program hours.

**White (Taylor) move to request Dr. Bicak to present to the faculty at a forum of his choosing as to why General Studies hours was not under consideration to be cut.** Discussion: Senator Lilly speculated that possibly, considering the time involved in developing the GS program in the first place, we simply didn’t have time to consider cuts to GS. Senator Carlson noted that this very question has already been discussed by Dr. Bicak at a CTE event earlier in the academic year. Senator Wozniak, chair of Academic Affairs, noted that many programs, similarly constrained by accreditation issues, have been able to conform to the new 120 crhr rule and it would simply be unfair to these programs that have complied to change the rules now. **By a vote of 16 yea- 6 nay, motion passes.**

B. Senator Darveau reminded the senate that constitutionally required President’s report is due.

XII. Adjournment

**Lilly (Messersmith) move adjournment.**
The following provides clarification of some comments that appear in the 3/5/12 minutes of the Assessment Committee. These clarifications were prepared after consultation with SVC Bicak and Dr. Kenya Taylor on 4/5/12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>STATEMENT(S) from MINUTES</th>
<th>CLARIFICATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. TaskStream Implementation for Fall 2012</td>
<td>“Last fall, faculty teaching GS portal courses were not trained in TaskStream, but only received emails asking them to use it in their classes. Faculty need to be trained each semester to use TaskStream…”</td>
<td>Faculty orientations in GS assessment and TaskStream take place each semester, including during last semester. Participation by faculty is monitored and reported to chairs and deans. Beginning spring 2012, faculty orientations are delivered online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Infrastructure to support TaskStream</td>
<td>“The Office of Assessment…plans to hold training each semester for faculty scheduled to teach GS portal courses the following semester.”</td>
<td>The GSC has been providing faculty orientation in GS assessment since the new program began. Ancillary orientations would represent a duplication of efforts. The GSC does the orientations itself in order to maintain consistency of message and to ensure collection of valid, reliable data. Faculty have the “fundamental role in developing and sustaining…assessment of student learning” (Commission Statement on Assessment of Student Learning, 2003). As such, the GSC plays the lead role in designing and carrying out GS assessment practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“[Assessment] further plans to set up a website with useful information for both faculty and students by Fall 2012.”</td>
<td>There are currently three dedicated sites about GS assessment and TaskStream at UNK: 1) the GS assessment website since 2006, which includes a dedicated TaskStream page since fall 2011; 2) a faculty info section on TaskStream since fall 2011; 3) a student info section on TaskStream since fall 2011.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Correction of statement made by Daren about GS assessment

“Butler made a correction to the statement by GS Director Snider wherein he stated that “Current UNK GS assessments meet our obligations to North Central.” Both Senior VC Bicak and Butler have agreed that the current data being collected in portal, capstone, democracy and foundation courses are not sufficient and that assessment in distribution areas of GS will still need to be developed in Fall 2012 and implemented in spring 2013 before North Central accreditation team comes to campus again.”

In an 11/29/11 meeting with SVC Bicak, Debbie Bridges, Daren Snider, and Jeanne Butler, several points were covered (some of which Butler only partially agreed with):

1) Contrary to in the past -- during the implementation of the new GS program under deadline pressure from NCA -- there is currently more time for the GSC and general faculty to play their fundamental role in assessment and to discuss the extent, process, and timeline by which Distribution courses may be assessed.

2) Assessment practices in the foundation, portal, and capstone areas currently assess for the six GS program learning outcomes, and as such meet the “assumed practices” requirement of NCA. While the discussion of Distribution assessment will continue, it does not possess the same urgency for NCA purposes as assessment of the other GS areas did.

3) Discussions about GS assessment will include the use of samples, which the GSC has always envisioned employing in assessing the new GS program.

“Butler reminded the committee that in the past, every GS course, including distribution courses, were assessed and results reported by the departments to the Assessment Director.”

The 2008 NCA report cited the need to focus on sustainability in assessment, noting that “assessment fatigue” was a problem that would need to be addressed moving forward. A deliberate, considered approach to GS assessment as contemplated by the GSC stands in contrast to the former approach of assessing ‘every student, every course, every semester’.

Training for NCA reviewers instructs them to consider sustainability issues in relation to assessment practices.
Student Success Council
Up-date
As of April 3rd

Four Categories: Academic Advising, First Year Transition, Faculty/Student Engagement, and Student Service

ACADEMIC ADVISING

Initiative #1 Develop a total intake model for academic advising

- First year students
  - 25%+ come in undeclared
  - 70%+ file change of majors during first year
  - First point of contact with academic advisor (if major has been declared) is during registration for next Fall—during weeks 12-13 of the semester

- In-take Model
  - Staffed by staff advisors with academic faculty representatives
  - Developmental Advisement training for all
  - Summer advising by this unit
  - Week 4 mandatory engagement
  - Additional engagements as determined
  - Towards end of this first year, transitioned to a faculty advisor
    - They are reaching the completion of at least 24 credit hours
    - They have declared a major
    - They are in good academic standing
  - The “hand-off” will include completion of an academic plan towards graduation that has been created by the academic unit (Initiative #2)

Initiative #2 Develop advising plans in each academic unit that include advisor selection/assignment, advisor training, advisor acknowledgement and assessment of departmental advising.

Initiative #3 Provide professional development for developmental academic advising including degree planning.

Initiative #4 Create a university culture which empowers students to take responsibility for their own degree planning.

FIRST YEAR TRANSITION

- Approximately 20% of freshmen do not return the next fall
- Another 10% disengage between second and third year

Initiative #1 Develop a common first year experience utilizing General Studies Portal Classes

Proposed to ask faculty of Portal Classes to volunteer to incorporate some additional elements and designate those sections as “First Year Transition Classes”. Peer leader and additional faculty training to meet needs of identified “at risk” first year students.

Initiative #2 Develop a common first year experience via the residence halls. Creation of “traditions” and a “celebration” event for the second year experience.

Initiative #3 Develop an informational program for parents of first year students.
Initiative #4 Develop a first year transitions program for students who have been historically at-risk.
- Noel-Levitz has identified several risk factors for UNK student persistence.
- Students identified as having a set number of these factors will receive additional support as deemed necessary.

ENGAGEMENT
- Data collected from UNK students indicate that they DO engage with faculty at UNK and that it is important to them
- Same data indicates that we can improve. Focus group data indicates that students are desiring a stronger level of engagement with faculty from the very beginning.

Initiative #1 Create an atmosphere where faculty/student engagement is a priority
- Create an expectation of such from the senior leadership of the institution
- Reward faculty who demonstrate engaged behavior

Orient new faculty and provide them with developmental opportunities (that are available to “seasoned” faculty, also)
- Explore incorporation of faculty engagement measurement into faculty performance evaluation systems.

Initiative #2 Develop content for new faculty orientation which focuses on quality student/faculty engagement with emphasis on teaching and learning.
Initiative #3 Increase the level of significant and relevant student-faculty interaction outside the classroom.
- Provide professional development opportunities to faculty
- Encourage faculty engagement and provide more timely and complete information about activities on campus.
- Increase participation in existing programs (Thompson, undergrad research) and identify new possibilities.

Initiative #4 Increase the level of significant and relevant academic challenge as measured by SSI and NSSE data.
- Include a measure of meaningful work assigned outside the classroom in course evaluations
- Ramp up CTE professional development offerings for faculty
- Develop an inter-campus conference on teaching

STUDENT SERVICES
Initiative #1 Develop a program to address the needs and interests of students who live off campus.
Initiative #2 Enhance student employment opportunities on campus.
Initiative #3 Develop and implement a second year student transition program.
A proposal to support the resumed production of the UNK Telephone Directory:

The UNK Telephone Directory was a great use to faculty and staff as they conducted daily business on campus. While there was a cost savings associated with not printing this document, we feel that the loss of productivity outweighs the printing costs. People are keeping their UNK Directories due to the easy access to phone numbers, departmental faculty names, building abbreviations, maps, and even emergency information. The phone number information is available online, but this is not as easy to use, and is only available when a computer is on, and at the correct web page. The recent publication of the “University of Nebraska at Kearney Emergency Plan Operation” on colored heavy cardstock indicates that some funds are available for publication of materials for faculty and staff. This proposal supports the resumption of UNK Telephone Directory as before with the inclusion of the Emergency Plan Operation material. The Directory has proven utility and acceptance and should be reinstated.

A couple more points:

1. The current situation of “printing the directory if you want it” just cost-shifts from the university to the departmental level – and costs more per page to print on departmental printers. So the university loses money if enough people eventually print this out. And the letter-size format is not as easy to use as the smaller form the UNK Directory was printed on.

2. A bit of a reiteration here, but to be clear: money was spent on the current Emergency Plan Operation (EPO) manual. That money could have been used to print the normal UNK phone directory.