I. Call to order

II. Roll Call  5SEPT2013

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

CBT Senators:  Present: Agrawal, Barry, Messersmith, Taylor,
                        Absent: Amundson, Moore (Crosswhite), Trewin

COE Senators:  Present: Brown, Gaskill, Hoehner, McKelvey, Mollenkopf,
                  Siegal
                        Absent: Kritzer

CFAH Senators:  Present: Alber, Burbal, Flood, Kruse, Rogoff, Van Renen, White
                        Absent: Chavez

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

Library Senator:  Present: Mueller

III. Approval of the Agenda

Senator Darveau (Messersmith) moved to approve the agenda.
The agenda was approved.

Senator Darveau (Kelley) moved to suspend the rules to deal with Oversight business.
Motion passed.

A. Oversight – Senator Darveau presented the slate for the open Senator positions. The following nominations came forwarded and seconded from the FS Oversight Committee. Jennifer Crosswhite to temporarily take position of Tami Moore for CBT, and Brian Alber (Music) and Martha Kruse (English) to fill open positions in CFAH.
   Senator Miller (McKelvey) moved to adopt the slate.
   Slate was approved.
   Still need a temporary replacement for Senator-At-Large Wozniak, and a permanent replacement for Senator Neal who left the University.

IV. Consent Agenda

A. Action on the Faculty Senate Minutes 25APR2013
   The following committee minutes were accepted without discussion as part of the consent agenda.

B. Graduate Council: 24JULY2013
C. General Studies Council: 25APR2013
D. World Affairs Committee: 30MAY2013
E. Women & Gender Studies Advisory Committee: 17APR2013

There was no discussion on any of these minutes.

V. Active Agenda
   A. Executive Committee: 22MAY2013
   B. President’s Report: 17JUL2013
   C. Grievance Committee: 29AUG2013
   D. Faculty Senate Retreat Minutes
      i. Code of Ethics (Wozniak)
         1. At the last EC/Admin meeting there was a discussion about formulating the Code of
            Ethics. President Trantham disseminated an email from Dean Taylor updating the
            Senate on the status of the COI policy team. Senator Kelley asked if there was faculty
            input to the document and President Trantham stated that from the email it does not
            appear so. Senator Miller reminded the Senate of what the Union has stated, in that
            we should not sign any Code of Ethics document since we do not want one
            perspective governing a policy and faculty input is paramount. The faculty need input
            so that it does not cause uproar. President Trantham will bring the issue to the next
            EC/Admin meeting. Senator Darveau stated that the website may be a central
            location for all documents. Senator Freeman stated that there is a conflict of interest
            page that has been active since he was hired at UNK. Senator Miller stated that it is
            his impression that this new COI is a University wide initiative. He stated it has gone
            by the Dean’s Council, but has not made its way to the faculty.

      ii. Teaching Evaluation (Freeman)
   VI. New Business
   A. Discussion on yearly peer review Faculty Evaluation System(s)
      i. President Trantham asked if there should be a faculty evaluation system that has elements
         common to all disciplines. We suggested that we start the discussion and find out what is
         currently done. This is an issue because of Promotion & Tenure decisions, as well as for
         the Grievance Committee. The question is: how does everyone do it?
         1. Senator Kelley stated he does not know how all other colleges do it. Can we make it
            comparable across colleges? President Trantham stated that criteria is not what we
            are discussing, but what defines a peer, how are they selected, and how the process
            goes. Senator Kelley says that in regards to the peers themselves, it has to be
            considered whether they are from inside or outside the department. President
            Trantham said that in Physics he encourages outside people. Senator Miller stated
            that there is a lot of material out there in terms of best practices and that we should not
            recreate the wheel. Also, whatever we do has to be flexible, at least in terms of the
            process. This initiative may be a good endeavor in that there may be departments that
            aren’t following “best practices”, but the bottom line is that the department knows
            “best”. With that being said, the Senators should look at “best practices”. President
            Trantham agreed and knows enough about the process to be dangerous. He called the
            question “Is this worth doing?” Senator White asked if this was a problem we needed
            to fix? President Trantham stated that “No, but could we make things easier and
            better for faculty.” Senator Miller stated that every year there are grievances and that
            may indicate that something does need to be fixed. In the past, the problem was that
            Departments did not have clear guidelines and there was confusion. Senator Rogoff
            stated that in Music they have gone to having all the student evaluations done on-line.
            Senator Freeman respectfully disagreed with this solution because response rates
when switching to on-line dropped 40%, at least because you only get those that “love you or hate you”. Senator Brown agreed with Senator Miller in that there are problems and grievances are filled. He noted that there is a consistency in peer evaluations from year to year that is a problem. Senator White stated that unifying the structure across the departments would not alleviate the problem. Senator Miller pointed out that you couldn’t grieve a decision; you can only grieve a problem with a process. Senator Darveau stated that some try to grieve in the hopes it will work out. President Trantham wants to unify the process to help Grievance committee, if they are unified the process can start the same. Senator Davis suggested a taskforce to pull together best practices, but the best to come out of this is the discussion across campus. Also that departments know that “somebody” is watching and we as faculty is all connected. There will be diversity, but there is a sense that all new faculty know there is a process that is not arbitrary and that the process is transparent This would give a way for departments to build a context. Senator Kruse said it is important to distinguish between P & T and Annual Faculty evaluations, because these are two different things. President Trantham agreed. Senator Flood said they have a committee not peers. Senator Mueller brought up Digital Measures. She said it was her perception that the information in this will be used for peer evaluation. She stated that it was not discussed amongst the faculty, only the department chairs. There was no faculty input. President Trantham stated that this was a repository of data and would not replace the process. Senator Taylor stated that they were using a different product and switched to Digital Measures. He agreed that faculty should have had input, but he loves Digital Measures. It is very easy to use and for administration to use and gets rid of the binders. Senator Darveau said that the principle driver of Digital Measures is for data mining. By putting all your data in there, all reports can be generated. B & T will be piloting a study on using this, but, there is no place to reflect on the data. Senator Mueller stated that there are spots for reflection and comments. Senator Kelley stated if an ad hoc committee is formed they have to go and get the data. President Trantham would like to form a taskforce.

Senator Carlson (Biggs) made a motion to form a taskforce to look at best practices and what the departments do by December.

Senator Darveau (Messersmith) made an amendment that there is one representative from the Library and 2 from each college on the committee. Amendment passes.

Motion passes.

B. Discussion on MOU shared governance

i. Put together an MOU. Senator Taylor initiated this. Senator Taylor talked to SVCASA Bicak about this informally and SVCASA Bicak is for this as well. The point of this is not to rehash things that have gone wrong or change decisions, but we need to know what our rights and responsibilities are as well as what the terms mean and that we are all on the same page. Senator Miller said that in order to write this page, we need to look at what the BOR has outlined. We need to include the BOR language and expand on it. Senator Taylor had handed out the Preamble from the 2013-2015 collective bargaining agreement. Senator Davis assumes that someone is going to “wordsmith” a document from the Senate and asked: Who is going to do it? President Trantham said at this point we are just gathering information. Should we pursue it? Who should it go to?

1. Senator Miller (Davis) suggested that the Faculty Senate Welfare and the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs committees jointly draft a document.
a. Senator Darveau wondered if this was the appropriate place due to the charges of the committees.
b. Senator Miller stated that no matter where it goes it will come back to the Senate for approval.
c. Motion passes and the document should be brought to the December meeting.

C. UNK Social Media Guidelines
   i. Kelly Bartling presented this to the EC. President Trantham explained that this was brought to us for Senate input. At this point we are gathering comments for her. She will be presenting at the October meeting. Senator Miller asked what the issue was. President Trantham said it was information gathering. Senator Darveau said that currently we have no guidelines for the use of Social Media and we are one of the few Universities that do not have a policy. He reiterated that Kelly did not want to make a policy, but to have guidelines in place for essentially “best practices”. President Trantham noted that we have stated that administration puts guidelines without faculty input and Kelly is asking for input.

D. Discussion of Minor overlapping hours
   i. Senator Darveau explained the issue. In ~2007 he undertook an evaluation between the overlap between majors and minors. At the time it was 6 hours of overlap in a major and minor. It was felt that this penalized some students. A policy was drafted and approved that there would be no overlap rule for majors and minors outside of the same department. After this passed, the Registrars office came up with their own “rule of thumb”, in which they only agreed to 50% overlap, which means that only 12 hours can overlap. This became a huge problem. This “rule of thumb” was not vetted through the Senate. The Business Departments, Math, and one other department want to rescind the approved rule through fiat. Now, the Registrar’s office is no longer allowed to enforce the “rule of thumb”. Senator Darveau begged the question whether or not we want to re-discuss this. Senator Miller met with the Registrar. She would like it to be known that faculty did not know the rule limiting overlap to 6 hours had changed and those Senator Miller surveyed also did not. He also stated that some students have figured out how to “game the system”. Academic Affairs will reconsider this on Wednesday with exceptions to the rules. President Trantham reaffirmed that in is on the Agenda for Academic Affairs. Senator Darveau stated that the original rule did not apply to the Comprehensive Major and now it does. The 6 hour overlap rule should be “out the window” in terms of a Comprehensive Major with a minor in a different department. The 6-hour overlap could apply to a straight Major or Minor. Senator Miller is asking for Senate input. Senator Brown suggested that we speak with Peggy Abels in Health Sciences.

VII. General Faculty Comments
   A. Senator Miller concerns for the EC meeting. In 1998, the Senate appointed a committee called the Committee for the Encouragement and Enhancement of Teaching (CEET) that created the Center for Teaching Excellence. The Council of Dean’s have suggested that the CTE is not necessary or needed. What is the feel of the Senate about the need for a CTE? Senator Davis agreed that we need to take this on because the CTE provided resources and the focus on teaching. We need to have a conversation with the Administration. Dr. Bicak said he did have someone in mind to be the head of CTE. Should they be approved by Senate? Senator Freeman asked if the position is needed? What does the data show? From his experience, the topics were not interesting and not well attended. Lunch conversations were not useful. Senator Miller stated that the attendance did vary. Senator McKelvey stated
that when she first started she had someone from CTE evaluate her teaching and it was very valuable. Senator Darveau stated that we need to remember what this center did for us across the years – WI, Critical Thinking, etc. Up until Dr. Forrest resigned, it was one of the best programs on campus. What does it say about us an Institution when the one Center that we have devoted to teaching, does not have a director? There is not mentoring program anymore. We need the Center to be supported. This will be taken to the Administration.

B. Senator Miller stated that the ADA statement includes pregnancy but what about active service personnel. Senator Darveau said he believes there is a policy of which we may not be aware. We need to find the policy and make people aware. Senator Miller states we need to bring this to the Administration. Senator Biggs asked who passed it? Was it put together at a moments notice? Senator Taylor found it on the web (http://www.unk.edu/mobile/mobile.aspx?id=39458).

C. Senator Miller brought up the issues of the roles and responsibilities of Department Chairs. There was a retreat in 2006 that created a document outlining the responsibilities and setting the groundwork for release time for scholarship. The document was submitted to Sr. VCAA Murray and received his approval. This will be taken to the Administration.

D. Senator Carlson asked that we talk to the Administration about summer contracts. They came out 6 weeks after a class started or 2 weeks after a class had ended. In addition, faculty were not paid what they were told and the contracts were changed by the Administration. Senator Darveau explained salary discretion and pointed out that according to the Collective bargaining agreement, we are to be paid in the summer as we are in the school year in terms of contact hours. The administration paid the salary based on credit hours NOT contact hours, as is stated in the collective bargaining agreement and as is used during the school year. This will be taken to the Administration.

E. Senator Miller stated that we need to define and explain the terms of summer employment. There is inconsistency in this. Senator White stated that we are on 9-month contract, so summer is not an issue. Senator Miller stated that we are paid over 12 months; therefore the administration may believe that we are hired here and paid by UNK for those 3 summer months. Senator Biggs explained this further. It is on a case-by-case basis. This needs to be explained. This will be taken to the Administration.

VIII. Adjournment

Senator Darveau (Messersmith) moved to adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned.