I. Call to order

II. Roll Call 7NOV2013

At Large Senators: Present: Davis, Kelley, Hartman
Absent: None

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

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

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

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

Library Senator: Present: Mueller

Visitors: Registrar: Kimra Schipporeit
COE, Faculty Athletic Representative: Scott Unruh

III. Approval of Agenda

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

IV. Action on the Faculty Senate Minutes 3OCT2013

Senator Chavez (Miller) moved to approve the Minutes.
The minutes were approved.

V. Special Presentations

A. Athletic Director Paul Plinske

AD Plinske introduced himself and his vision for Athletics. He discussed the Athletic Budget and the MIAA conference. Scott Unruh added that one area they are trying to improve upon is the amount of time student athletes misses class. They have been devising ways to decrease the amount of time missed.

B. Director of Assessment & Center for Teaching Excellence Dr. Beth Hinga

Assessing some of the GS 100 level courses. In some classes, for example Speech 100, data is being collected via Qualtrix and the instructor of record is not the person doing the data collection. Data collection is done in “real-time” by a different instructor using the oral
communication rubric developed and approved by the General Studies Council (in the case of Speech 100). Portal courses will be assessed in the Spring (2014) and procedures are still being worked out. Distribution will be done next year (Fall 2014). Senator Kelly wanted to commend Dr. Hinga for being on the right track.

NSSE – do every three years (Spring 2013). Shared some “snapshot” data. Stated that we are really good at High-Impact Practices (Student Learning Communities, Experiential Learning, Study Abroad, Undergraduate Research, and Senior Culminating Experience). We are doing pretty well. A second document was a quick first-glance preliminary summary of indicators. Senator Darveau asked if there is enough data to break it out by College. Dr. Hinga said that this can only be done for some colleges at this point because you need at least 30 responses to do the analysis. Senator Davis requested a “key” or explanation for the categories and terminology. Dr. Hinga agreed and said that in the second document she tried to do some of this.

CTE – Hopes to start using the data. Dr. Hinga submitted a proposal to the Dean’s and Upper Administration that included a name change to the “Center for Academic Innovation”. This name may more accurately reflects the broad scope of the bold, inspired, collaborative work we must do to keep UNK on its upward trajectory over the next several years. Her vision includes focusing on some of the High Impact Practices listed in the NSEE report. What can we do to attract more students, keep them here, and make them employable? We can learn from each other, outside sources, and the data. Senator Boken asked if the name change encompasses research. Dr. Hinga said that it does not go that far and that should stay in the Office of Undergraduate Research. Senator Miller state that it looks like there were some good ideas, but asked the question “In the proposal process, you talked to the Deans and the Administration, but what about Faculty?” Dr. Hinga clarified that is why she is here with the proposal and is willing to work with the faculty and make changes. Senator Davis stated that there were some good ideas and points made, but since Teaching is so important, where do we want to put “teaching”? Dr. Hinga does plan to continue the teaching mission, as stated in the document. She will be happy to work with faculty, help with improving teaching, but wants to expand the mission of CTE, not throw out what was done in the past. Senator Davis once again stressed the importance of what Faculty Senate wants to do with “teaching”.

VI. Consent Agenda - The following committee minutes were accepted without discussion as part of the consent agenda.
A. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: 28OCT13
B. Academic Information and Technology Committee: 4OCT2013
C. Athletic Committee: 18OCT13
D. E-campus Committee: 25SEPT13
E. Women & Gender Studies Advisory Committee: 9SEPT2013, 9OCT2013
F. World Affairs Committee: 24OCT2013
G. Graduate Council: 10OCT2013
H. General Studies Council: 5SEPT2013, 3OCT2013

VII. Discussion Agenda
A. Executive Committee: 10OCT13

Senator Freeman - Clarification of service in the summer. If you teach in the summer or have a grant, you are not paid by UNK for full time, why do you have to do service. Senator Carlson – if you are on a committee that meets year around, you should serve on them. Also, if you teach or do research for UNK in any way, you technically work for UNK. Senator Darveau stated that meeting a few times a week or a month is an extension of professionalism.

Senator Miller - Library committee has some continuing concerns - It appeared that the mold study has not been done. Continuing concern that the mold is an issue. The real concern is that the roof will get done in time. Dean of the Library has requested the report 3 times in Dean’s Council and been denied all three times. Senator Taylor asked if HR should be involved. This issue will be brought back to the Exec/Admin meeting.

Senator Davis - Mentions morale is low. Is it no wonder considering our conversations tonight. Senator Miller stated that support for faculty is declining. Work orders just sit there, amongst other items. Faculty have lost parking. Senator Flood – No funds to fix items. Commitments being made but not being honored (International Studies). Senator Amundson – spending a lot of money on orange paint to mark cracks, but did not fix them. Senator Davis – have a major academic change without asking faculty. Also think about Coursera. Faculty had no input. These issues will be brought back to the Exec/Admin meeting.

B. Faculty Welfare Committee: 18OCT13

President Trantham had Departments contact him about Senior Checks. Senator Carlson explained that when she gave the charge to the Faculty Welfare Committee, which was the shared-governance MOU, she had some misinformation that she shared with the committee. This misinformation dealt with the recent change to the overlap policy between majors and minors. This was reflected in the minutes and published in the November 7th FS packet. To clear up the confusion and misinformation, the following information details the misinformation and clarification.

This is what is in the minutes:
An example of administrative decision-making is the setting aside of the “no overlap” rule between majors and minors. The Registrar reverted to the old rule that specified that only six hours could overlap between major and minor. The faculty had gone through channels to drop this requirement.

The Registrar was informed by (Scott) Darveau that this could not be done without the reversion of the old rule being approved by Faculty Senate. Minutes had been approved for everything but changing overlap rule. However, the Registrar changed retroactively to the old rule.
Here is the clarification:

A meeting was held on November 1, 2013 with Kimra Schipporeit (Registrar), Charlie Bicak (SVCASA), Ken Trantham (President of Faculty Senate), Kim Carlson (Secretary of Faculty Senate), Peggy Abels (Director of the Health Sciences Programs), and Joe Springer (Chair of Biology) to discuss the overlap policy between majors and minors. In this meeting, Kimra Schipporeit clarified and corrected some of the misunderstandings that were submitted in the FS Welfare Committee Minutes. Senator Carlson presented the charge to the FS Welfare Committee and described the types of issues to be discussed in the shared-governance MOU. When discussing the overlap policy between majors and minors, it became evident that some of the information Senator Carlson was given and gave to the committee was not correct. In order to make sure the correct information is documented, the following is the account from Kimra Schipporeit on the overlap policy between majors and minors.

In Fall of 2010, the new overlap policy between majors and minors was put into place. UNK went from having only 6 hours of overlap between a major and a minor allowed to unlimited hours of overlap allowed, as long as the major and minor were from different departments. During this time, certain Departments did not know that a new rule had been put into effect and wanted the old rule to be reinstated. There were many reasons for this, not limited to the fact that some majors (International studies) only has a few courses required for the major and the rest of the hours come from a different department. Therefore, an International studies major could get a major and a minor from taking all the same Political Science courses (for example). In addition, The College of Business has problems with this due to the nature of their programs. They wanted to revert back to the old policy and make their requirements more stringent.

About 5 months ago, the confusion on the overlap policy between majors and minors became a problem in the Registrar’s Office. The overlap policy between majors and minors became hard to manage and was becoming problematic on the part of trying to keep straight what College and what Programs were following what reiteration of the overlap policy between majors and minors. In order to ease the confusion, the Registrar talked to Dr. Bicak about the confusion as to what was going on. He suggested that Kimra discuss the issue with the Dean’s Council. She did this on August 27 and the Dean’s voted to rescind the current overlap policy between majors and minors and go back to the 6-hour limit. Dr. Bicak approved the reversion back to the 6-hour limit.

At this time, the change was made and Senator Darveau had a meeting with a staff member in the Registrar’s Office about the reversion back to the old overlap policy between majors and minors. On August 29, it was recommended that the reversion back to the 6-hour overlap be sent to Academic Affairs for approval and approval from Faculty Senate. On Sept 5, Schipporeit met with Rick Miller, chair of Academic Affairs to inform him of the proposal and ask that the issue be put on the Sept agenda. It was approved at the level of Academic Affairs, but not Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate sent back an alternative proposal for the Academic Affairs committee to consider. At the last Academic Affairs meeting there was not a quorum, therefore no action could be taken on the overlap policy between majors and minors. Currently, the Registrar’s Office, the SVCASA, the Academic Affairs Committee, and the Faculty Senate are working on an overlap policy between majors and minors that will satisfy everyone.

At the conclusion of the meeting on November 1st, it was agreed, until Academic Affairs AND faculty senate considers and approves a new policy (whenever that may be) 1) that the old overlap rule will not be applied to students on the 2010 catalog or later, 2) that advisors and students (on the 2010 catalog or later) can ignore recent senior checks indicating an erroneous overlap warning, and 3) senior checks will not be issued in the interim.
We thank the Registrar and Dr. Bicak for the detailed explanations and history of the situation. We also apologize for creating any additional confusion and misconceptions that may have occurred.

Senator Trantham stated that he wished that 5 months ago, this issue be brought to Faculty Senate and not the Deans. He also stated that Dr. Bicak had been very helpful.

VIII. Old Business

A. Discussion on MOU shared governance

President Trantham said this is really important. Senator Miller – sent a draft to Faculty Welfare will tweak it, then it goes to Academic Affairs, and then to Faculty Senate. SVCASA Bicak has read this and made some comments. We want a document we will all sign off on. Senator Freeman asked if this was to include the policies at the level of the University. Senator Miller stated that he was very careful not to spell out Regent’s duties.

B. Discussion of Minor overlapping hours

President Trantham stated that he promised SVCASA that this will be done quickly and diligently by Academic Affairs. He attached Senator Darveau’s proposal.

PROPOSAL – Presented by Senator Darveau – Similar to the one in FS a month ago. He talked with the Registrar about the proposal. The Registrar took it back to her staff also. When the change was proposed, the logic was that Departments could not empire build, but allow students with a comprehensive major in one Department to get a minor in a different Department. Of course, problems do exist.

1. Students must complete a Degree Plan that consists of
   a. One major (30-36 hours) and one minor (18-24) hours. Duplication of coursework between the two is limited to two courses (including labs as applicable) or fewer.*
   b. One major (30-36 hours each) and a second major (30-36 hours) of which twenty-four hours is unduplicated.**
   c. One comprehensive major.

2. Additional minors beyond the Degree Plan described above will be allowed. If the additional minor is from a department in the Degree Plan, the minor may only have two courses (including labs as applicable) or fewer of duplicated coursework.* For minors from departments different from those in the Degree Plan, there is no limit on duplicated courses. For the purpose of this rule, all business departments will be considered a single department.

* Not to exceed 8 hours
**Students with multiple majors must select this option. Each additional major beyond the first two must have a minimum of twenty-four hours of unduplicated work. Students with multiple educational endorsements must meet the requirements of each endorsement without regard to duplication.

The Registrar stated that after speaking with her staff, the concern is the ability to explain this. They need to be able to clarify it in a sentence or two. College of Business sent her a mandate that they want their students to follow the more stringent 6-hour overlap major/minor rule. She also stated that in Academic Affairs and other faculty will meet to discuss this issue. Also, we need to think across the entire campus. President Trantham stated that CBT should also be invited to this meeting. He also stated that General Studies just changed and was complicated also. There may be growing pains. Senator Darveau said that we should have open forums to discuss the proposal or change that may result.
IX. New Business

A. Discussion of Attendance & Absence Policies for Military Students (see attached)

 President Trantham asks that Student Affairs draft a policy for this. Registrar stated that this is in the BOR policy. They can get a 100% refund or take an incomplete or finish all their courses. Senator Darveau asked if the incomplete can be extended past a year? Registrar stated that the incomplete is extended a year after they return. This is not automatic because they don’t know where they are. As long as they let them know, they can work with them.

 Senator Taylor – what if the faculty member states that an Incomplete does not work. Registrar said IF the student gets a grade of Incomplete, then it could mean that the student repeats the entire class at no cost. The student can even finish the class with a different instructor but all of this would require approval by the instructor of record. This is an informal arrangement with the faculty member. Senator Amundson – students can’t pick or choose to drop some and finish some. Senator Miller (Rogoff) made a motion to draft language on the faculty role.

B. Blended Courses (see attached)

 President Trantham wanted to start a dialogue. As we move forward, there is an opportunity to do blended classes. Senator Miller – can meet once a week face to face also. Senator Darveau – potential problems. If we have an instate student that chooses to take a blended course is there a differential? Yes. This will cost the student extra money because we don’t want to be in the classroom. If we start taking undergraduate courses normally offered face-to-face because we don’t want to be in a classroom, this is a huge problem. There need to be some principles laid out with the students in mind first and faculty second. The Registrar said that 2/3 of the class has to be online and 1/3 has to be face-to-face. Senator Miller – so if I do less than 2/3 online, then it is not considered blended. The Registrar clarified that it would be considered an on-campus course. Senator Mollenkopf explained that a blended course should be an online course enhanced with physical contact. Senator Kelley – Where did the document come from?

 Senator Freeman – Came for OWW. Senator Davis – A Long time ago when we first started online, everything was defined at the campus level. Then a decision by eCampus stated that 100% online was considered online. Now, as faculty wanted more leniency, eCampus developed the plan based upon campus need. Senator White – Doesn’t any course have to go through Ed Policy? Doesn’t there have to be a justification for method of delivery to be explained? Senator Miller – Once a course is approved, you don’t have to get approval again to change the teaching method. Senator Darveau urged us to be very careful. Senator White – How can a policy be made to cover this? Senator Carlson- CNSS Ed Policy is working on this. Senator Davis – This was discussed at the Dean’s council and the Council of Chairs. Now they are in the Department
level for discussion. The discussion is just getting started. Senator Amundson – Echos what Senator Darveau stated. There will be some scrutiny with the extra cost and that comes back to the department. It has to be for Student value and not investment for the Department. Senator Freeman – Largely due to wanting to have an asynchronous class. Senator Miller – Ed Policy committee going to look at office hours, etc. Senator Carlson – I do not know. President Trantham – Should we wait for the College Level Ed Policy committees to look at this or have Academic Affairs? Senator Miller stated that we should let the faculty working on it to continue working on it. eCampus is also working on this. Should try to work together. Senator Darveau – Do we think it appropriate for normally face-to-face classes to be changed to online? We have no mechanism to make decision or put in controls. We may be creating some unattended consequences. Senator Kruse – for these classes, they have to come to Kearney for 1/3 of the class. If they can come to campus, why not come for 100% of the time? Senator McKelvey – Isn’t this the responsibility at the Department level? Aren’t they responsible to make sure the classes are in a format that is beneficial for all the students? Senator Freeman – FS should not act until there is a cross-college issue. Senator Davis – It is a discussion right now. In regards to the students, we have students who say that they like technology and would like this type of course. Senator White – There may be an advantage to having certain courses online. Maybe it can be beneficial. Students like them. Serious problem for a course to go change teaching method should go through Ed Policy. Senator Mollenkopf – who would benefit. They have a subgroup of commuters, who try to arrange their schedules to be on campus as little as possible. A blended course would possibly benefit them. Senator Barry – Need to be careful about what we scrutinize. Agree it should be at the Department level. Senator Miller – Faculty are very skilled at presenting things in the best light. We need to discuss student learning outcomes. Senator Taylor – there needs to be quality control, but allow to innovate.

X. General Faculty Comments

This period is allotted for faculty members to bring matters of importance before the Senate. Speakers are asked to limit their remarks to five minutes or less. Senate meetings are open to all members of the academic community. All faculty members are specifically invited to attend Faculty Senate meetings.

A. Senator Carlson moved to adjourn, seconded by Senator Darveau, unanimous approval.

XI. Adjournment