UNK FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
March 7, 2013
Ockinga
Faculty Senate Website: http://www.unk.edu/committees/facultysenate/

I. Call to order

II. Roll Call    07MAR2013

At Large Senators:  Present: Frickel, Wozniak
Absent: Davis

CBT Senators: Present: Agrawal, Barry, Messersmith, Moore, T., Taylor, Trewin
Absent: Amundson

COE Senators: Present: Kracl, Kritzer, Lewis, McKelvey, Mollenkopf
Absent: Brown, Moore

CFAH Senators: Present: Dimock, Flood, Hartman, Rogoff, White
Absent: Chavez, Fronczak, Kruse

CNSS Senators: Present: Campbell, Carlson, Darveau, Ericson, Freeman, Miller
Neal, Trantham
Absent: Biggs

Library Senator: Present: Mueller

III. Approval of Agenda

Senator Miller (Mueller) move to approve the agenda.
The agenda is approved.

IV. Action on Faculty Senate Minutes: 07FEB2013

Senator White (Moore, T.) move to approve the minutes with the following corrections:

- Change in Senator White’s comments regarding pre-semester camps to read that he would like to see the “…Executive Committee take a tougher stance regarding this issue.”
- Blackboard issue was sent to Student Affairs for discussion and review.
- Senator Hartman was absent at the February meeting.

Minutes approved as amended.

V. Special Presentation

- Introduction of Beth Hinga as the new Director of Assessment. Dr. Hinga introduced herself and discussed her background and goals for the assessment initiatives at UNK.
Charlie Bicak addressed the Senate regarding initiatives associated with improving graduation rates and the upcoming NCA accreditation visit. Dr. Bicak noted that UNK’s 6 year graduation rate (60.6%) is quite strong, but noted that improvement is expected in the 4 year graduation rate (22.5%). Dr. Bicak discussed the presentation that he gave to the Board of Regents including a review of who our students are and the population that we are serving. His presentation also discussed the ongoing initiatives that have been undertaken to attempt to improve campus life and graduation rates. The Graduation Strategies Task Force has been developed with 21 members from across campus. Dr. Bicak shared the charge that he gave this task force to assess ways to improve graduation rates at UNK. The group is divided into subgroups, with each group working toward a particular goal related to the charge.

Dr. Bicak also discussed the NCA planning process. He noted that a steering committee of 14 people are managing the process. He discussed the various criteria for the self-study – mission, integrity and responsible conduct, teaching and learning, and resource planning and institutional effectiveness. The committee is on track with their targeted goals, which would have the self-study completed well in advance of the necessary due date. Some of the focus areas have been in assessment, strategic planning, curricular issues pertaining to the General Studies program and an assessment of distance learning, improvements to physical facilities, graduate assistant stipends, staff salary levels, etc.

Senator Miller inquired as to when will the self-study be made available to faculty?

Dr. Bicak noted that the study should be delivered to faculty within the next two – three weeks and definitely in advance of summer.

Barbara Johnson provided an update on budget planning for the next biennial and UNK facility projects. The budget for the current academic year is $135 million with an operating budget of $95 million. This is a $4 million dollar increase over last year, which was achieved through an increase in tuition and greater credit hour production. VCBF Johnson also mentioned the upcoming budget, which is still being discussed as the legislature elected to shelve Governor Heineman’s plan for a 4.2% increase in state appropriations in exchange for a guarantee not to raise tuition. VCBF Johnson’s office is working to create budget templates assuming different funding scenarios.

VCBF Johnson noted that new construction will begin on campus after spring break, with the addition of a new 19,000 sq. foot, two-story wellness center that is being built northeast of Cushing. VCBF discussed plans to add new parking lots over the summer to make-up for the spots that will be eliminated with the development of the new center and noted that construction efforts continue on CTW with a plan to bring it back online for the fall when CTE will then be taken offline to be refurnished.

VCBF Johnson also noted a number of other building projects taking place on campus and discussed the plans for the South campus development. The first two projects that will begin on South Campus will be a new residential facility to replace University Heights and a new Child Development Center. Planning is also underway to begin the development of the new Health Education Complex, which will be a $19 million dollar, 45,000 square foot facility with plans to be open by the Fall of 2015. Additional plans are being developed in conjunction with the city of Kearney. Discussions are also taking place to improve the intersection southeast of Founders Hall and to potentially provide some type of transportation system for the campus.
VI. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees (Date included in bold for each committee that submitted minutes)

A. Oversight Committee: **01MAR2013**

    Senator Darveau reviewed the proposed apportionment for the upcoming academic year as a seconded motion from the Oversight Committee.

    **Apportionment is approved.**

B. Executive Committee: **20FEB2013**

    President Mollenkopf described the process being undertaken by the AIT committee to develop and conduct a survey of faculty. AIT did get the survey done and will include as a report in the next packet.

    Senator Darveau – what is the status of the academic dishonesty form and process?

    Dr. Bicak noted that the Deans agreed that the form should go forward, and that he is ready to accept it as is. He also noted that his office is prepared to be the repository, but is not prepared to be the judge of what will happen regarding student discipline once the forms are filed. This discussion still needs to move forward.

    Senator Frickel expressed confusion as what questions still need to be answered as the form was developed to bring alignment with what already exists in the student code of conduct.

    Dr. Bicak noted that the student code of conduct provides an avenue for action, but the fact that there is a clearinghouse suggests that there are new questions about how the repository is to be used.

C. President’s Report: No report

D. Academic Affairs:

E. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: **31JAN2013**

    President Mollenkopf noted that the committee is creating a document for guidelines regarding post tenure review that will be included in the April packet.

F. Academic Information and Technology Committee: **01FEB2013**

    Reviewed without comment.

G. Artists and Lecturers Committee:

H. Athletic Committee:

I. e-campus Committee: **26FEB2013**

    Reviewed without comment

J. Faculty Welfare Committee: **28FEB2013**

    Trantham (Miller) moves to endorse the suggestions relating to office hours as written in suggestions 1-4.
1. Each department must have a written office hour policy for all of its faculty, including on-campus, online education, and adjunct faculty.

2. Each policy must be approved by the department’s faculty, the chair, and the college dean.

3. Faculty can cancel or amend their individual office hours when circumstances (conferences, etc.) dictate but changes must be posted.

4. Any faculty request for long-term (semester or more) exceptions to or exemptions from the department’s policy must be made in writing and approved by the department chair and the college dean.

Motion passes.

Senator Darveau expressed his concern that this significant recommendation was passed with little discussion by the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Bicak noted that he will include these suggestions on the agenda for the next Dean’s Council.

K. Grievance Committee:

L. Library Committee:

M. Professional Conduct Committee:

N. Student Affairs Committee: **13FEB2013**

Reviewed without comment.

VII. Reports of Senate Representatives to Non-Senate Committees

A. Assessment Committee (Mueller, Wozniak): **04FEB2013**

Reviewed without comment.

B. Center for Teaching Excellence Advisory Committee:

C. Ethnic Studies Advisory Committee (Mollenkopf): **13FEB2013** – joint meeting with WGSAC, minutes recorded under WGSAC

Reviewed without comment

D. Fees Committee (Trantham): **07FEB2013**

Senator Mueller - do we have fewer requests because of the reorganization of the committee?

Senator Carlson – the deadline changed, which means that we didn’t get our requests in on time, which explains some of the drop in requests.

Senator Miller – most of the requests don’t come from members of the committee, so it’s unlikely that the reorganization of the committee contributed to fewer requests.

E. Gender Equity Committee:

F. Honors Council (Frickel):

G. International Studies Advisory Council (Amundson): **07FEB2013**

Reviewed without comment

H. Parking (Wozniak):
I. Safety Committee:

J. Women & Gender Studies Advisory Committee (Kracl, Campbell): **13FEB2013**
Reviewed without comment

VIII. Reports from Academic Councils

A. Graduate Council: **13DEC2012, 14FEB2013**
Reviewed without comment.

B. General Studies Council:

C. Council on Undergraduate Education:

D. Student Success Council (Moore, T.):

IX. Old Business

A. Office hours report: Faculty Senate Faculty Welfare committee
Reviewed during committee report.

D. Report on Post-tenure review policy: Academic Freedom and Tenure
Reviewed during committee report.

E. Report on technology use and needs of faculty related to bookstore procurement: AIT
Results will be available for the next Faculty Senate meeting.

X. New Business

A. Updates to the Faculty Senate Constitution were reviewed.

**Senator Darveau (Carlson) moves that the Oversight Committee be directed to create a proposal to change the Faculty Senate presidential term from one year to two years. The proposal will then be reviewed and voted upon by the full senate.**

Senator Freeman asked for input from past presidents as to whether or not they see this as a positive move, or if the workload makes a two year term untenable.

Senator Miller noted that it may take a bit of time to be comfortable in the job, but better mentoring and sharing of responsibilities can go a long way toward solving this issue, a two year term is not necessary.

Senator Moore agrees with Senator Miller.

Senator Trantham inquired as to whether or not Senator Miller would have been willing to be president if it were a two year term.

Senator Miller – maybe, but I wouldn’t recommend it.

**Motion fails.**

**Senator Darveau (Miller) moves that the Oversight Committee be directed to create a proposal to codify the one course release for the Faculty Senate President in the constitution. The proposal will then be reviewed and voted upon by the full senate.**

Senator Darveau noted that this has been a tradition for most presidents, but it is not codified in the constitution. He also asked Dr. Bicak if this is even possible.
Dr. Bicak noted that he would not dismiss the idea, but it would require more discussion.

Several past presidents mentioned how their release was granted and the lack of uniformity in the nature of the release and also in the funding source for the release. Some level of consistency needs to be established.

Senator White added that finances should not play a part in somebody’s decision to serve as president and also that we should determine an appropriate number of credits of load hours to be released from, rather than a specific number of courses.

Senator Wozniak noted that we need to be careful to look at requirements to ensure that faculty, particularly department chairs also seeking leadership positions in the Faculty Senate, remain defined as full time faculty and that they do not become classified as administrators.

Motion passes

Senator White (Taylor) moves to direct the Oversight Committee to create a proposal to change the constitution to allow the president and/or the secretary to have the judgment to excuse absences that are work related. The proposal will then be reviewed and voted upon by the full senate.

Senator Wozniak – the reason excused absences have not been allowed is that doing so requires the president/secretary to make judgment calls, which we wanted to avoid. He noted his disfavor for this approach.

Senator Darveau noted that passing this would make it easier to fill open seats, because senators would not have to a) be reinstated to the senate after their 3rd absence as frequently and b) senators who are reinstated would not automatically have to stand for re-election the next year.

Senator White notes that it’s not always easy to know when conflicts will arise, particularly for performance faculty.

Senator Frickel noted that she appreciates the point, but absences do take away the faculty member’s ability to represent their constituents.

Senator Trewin noted that there are a lot of good reasons for why people have to miss a meeting, if we’re going to excuse somebody for work related reasons then we have to consider excusing for things completely outside of your control.

Senator Miller and others indicated that the reinstatement issue is a problem, but that allowing the president and/or the secretary to make judgment calls about what is and what is not an excused absence may not be the best approach.

Motion fails

Senator Miller (Mueller) proposes to direct the Oversight Committee to amend the constitution to simplify the process to reinstate a senator who has missed three meetings. The proposal will then be reviewed and voted upon by the full senate.

Senator Wozniak suggests that maybe an appeal should be made to the Oversight Committee rather than to the full Faculty Senate to reinstate a member.

Senator White notes that this doesn’t seem simpler.
Senator Darveau – It will simplify the process if we can reinstate the person for the remainder of the term, rather than just the remainder of the year.

Motion passes.

Senator Trewin (Hartman) move to propose that Oversight Committee put together a proposal to amend the constitution to require that the packet be distributed to the full Faculty Senate at least one week in advance of the meeting and that items not included in the packet cannot be included in the discussion. Minutes will also be due to the Faculty Senate Secretary at least 10 days in advance of the next meeting.

Senator Wozniak notes that tonight is a good example of why this change is necessary, as too much information is thrown out at the faculty with too little time to process it all.

Motion passes.

Senator Freeman (Miller) moves that Oversight Committee put together a proposal to amend the constitution to propose that write-ins not be allowed on election ballots.

Senator White inquires – why should write-ins not be allowed?

Senator Miller – because we want to make sure that nominees are willing to serve, which we cannot do with write-in candidates.

Motion passes.

Senator Dimock (Trewin) moves that the Oversight Committee put together a proposal to amend the constitution to allow the Oversight Committee chair or designee to conduct the nomination/election process for the Library.

Senator Darveau indicated that this is important because it allows the Oversight Committee to intervene if a conflict of interest arises.

Motion passes

Senator Frickel (Barry) moves that the Oversight Committee put together a proposal to amend the constitution to remove the requirement that a Faculty Senator must chair the Academic Affairs Committee.

Motion passes

Senator Trantham (Dimock) moves that we take a vote to see if we want to make a change in the membership composition of the Faculty Senate. If so, we would then take a straw poll to determine which Senate composition model the Oversight Committee should be instructed to propose.

Senator White – are we a shrinking university, why then should we be a shrinking senate? We are a growing university; therefore, reducing the size of the senate is incongruous.

Senator Darveau – As the Oversight Committee examined this issue we wanted to ask if there is something we can do to make the senate more efficient. We reviewed our peers and we are the largest body as a percentage of the faculty among our peers. The average would put this body at 25 based upon our peers. There are also models in which each department is represented on the senate, which may give better representation. We wanted to bring these subjects up as a discussion point for the senate at large. My perspective is that we get an unequal distribution of people from across campus, if that’s the case why do we need this many? Are there ways to get better representation? What can we do to get better representation?
Senator Dimock – getting a volunteer to serve on the senate can sometimes be trying and most elections are run unopposed. There are two ways to address this problem, 1) is to hold people accountable to their departments through a departmental representation model and 2) to maybe back off the number of people that need to serve and try to bring in more people to do committee work.

Senator Taylor – does this need to be addressed tonight? The quality of discussion is not going to be the same, because the meeting is getting very long. If this issue is time sensitive then we need to do it, but if we have time maybe we should consider moving this discussion to the next meeting.

Senator Darveau – if we don’t want this to bleed into the next academic year, then we have to vote on it tonight.

Senator Freeman – how many FS reps are there on committees? Will this affect the size of existing committees.

President Mollenkopf – only a small number of committees require a faculty senator, so this should not be an issue.

Senator Darveau – Of the three options, I am moving to think that the best of these options is to most to a departmental base of representation, so that departments can elect their own representatives and we can potentially allow proxies.

Senator McKelvey – Some small departments would be overloaded with service requirements.

Senator Darveau – Small departments with <5 members could be combined if they wish, the proposal allows for that.

Senator Taylor – this is not the final proposal that we are voting on tonight, there would still be time to speak with representatives on the Oversight Committee to alter the proposal.

Senator Rogoff – how do we handle split appointments in the departmental representation model?

Senator Darveau – faculty members with such appointments must declare.

Senator White – we seem to have skipped over do we want to reduce the number and have moved to the discussion of the department approach. Given that, it’s not that everyone in a larger department is of the same mind, but this does create a system in which there might be a tyranny of the majority, where larger departments end up with more representation.

**Senator Kritzer (Frickel) moves that we postpone items 3-5 until next fall.**

Senator Trewin – at the last meeting in April we’ll have a lot of new people who aren’t familiar with what we’re doing, is that really a good time to make these changes? We should table this piece of the discussion.

President Mollenkopf calls the question on Senator Kritzer’s motion.

**Motion passes.**

**Senator Darveau (Freeman) moves that we move all changes to the constitution to next year.**
Senator White – we’ve already done a lot of work, do we really want to throw away that work?

Senator Darveau – yes.

Senator Freeman – amending the constitution is complicated, I can understand why members of the Oversight Committee would only want to go through this process one time.

Senator Darveau – with all due respect, we were doing what this body asked us to do. For us to now tell the Oversight Committee, no thanks – we’ll look at this next year, I find disgusting.

Senator Hartman – this body has the right to make changes and to direct the Oversight Committee as deemed appropriate. I understand that it’s a lot of work, but unless we want to suspend the rules this body has the right to direct the committee.

Senator Darveau – what is not being understood is that this takes an incredible amount of work and everything is related, so it does not make any sense to do this twice. That is why I proposed this motion.

Senator Miller – there’s two issues here. First, there’s agreeing what we want to do with the constitution and then there’s the actual writing of what we’ve already agreed to do. We can wait to do the writing until the fall once the changes are made, without having to invalidate all that has already been done.

Senator Darveau – I don’t want to do any writing at all, until we’ve determined all of the changes that we’re making.

Senator Dimock – If we’re uncomfortable with changing the composition of the senate, then why don’t we just kill the issues pertaining to senate composition and then move forward with the proposals to make the changes that we approved.

President Mollenkopf, Senator Taylor and Senator Miller expressed that this was in fact the original intent of Senator Trantham’s motion, which has since been postponed and called for a vote on Senator Darveau’s motion.

Motion fails

Senator McKelvey (Frickel) moves to revisit Senator Kritzer’s motion to postpone the discussion.

Motion passes.

Senator Dimock (Messersmith) calls the question on Senator Trantham’s original motion – do we want to direct the Oversight Committee to make any changes to the composition of the Senate? If yes, a straw poll will be conducted to determine which option to review.

Motion passes.

Senator Trantham’s original motion of directing the Oversight Committee to develop a proposal for changing the senate’s composition passes.

Per Senator Trantham’s motion a straw poll was conducted to indicate which proposal to direct the Faculty Senate Oversight Committee to pursue.

Option #1 – Reduce the number of Senators to 30
Option #2 – Reduce the number of Senators to 25

Option #3 – Propose a departmental representation model.

Senator Frickel – this is a major decision and university faculty should be able to provide feedback on this idea.

Senators Taylor and Darveau note that this is only a vote to form a proposal and that it is absolutely the responsibility of senators to seek feedback from their constituents on this important issue.

Option #3, receives the most votes in the straw. Therefore, the Oversight Committee has officially been tasked with forming a proposal for a departmental representation model.

XI. General Faculty Comments

None

XII. Adjournment –

Senator Trewin (Darveau) move to adjourn.

Motion passes.