I. Call to order

II. Roll Call  5DEC2013

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

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

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

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: Boken

Library Senator: Present: Mueller

III. Approval of Agenda

Senator Chavez (Biggs) moved to approve the agenda.  
The agenda was approved.

IV. Action on the Faculty Senate Minutes 7NOV2013

A. Dr. Taylor made useful comments related to potential changes for the CTE in section XVII.B. With Dr. Taylor’s permission, an addition indicating that there seems to be a culture developing on campus that is intolerant of failure (esp. with regard to student evaluations?), and intolerance of failure is not compatible with innovation (was general notion responding to the CTE – Center for Academic Innovation).

B. Senator Hoehner – Senator Miller had said the Dean Wilke had presented 3 requests to Risk Manager not the Dean’s Council.  
Senator Hoehner (Miller) moved to approve the Minutes with the modification/correction B above  
The minutes were approved.

V. Special Presentations

A. Vice Chancellor of Business and Finance – Barbara Johnson  
University Village Development – 104 acres of land south of West Center. Working since June 2012 with HDR Consultants (Omaha) to develop the site. This used to be referred to as South Campus, but University Village is the submitted name.

1. University Village – Plan to accommodate all the parking needs in this area. Will enhance student recruitment and campus and community life, economic
development, and engagement of the region. It is a “Millennium Project” similar to Aksarben campus at UNO. If land is acquired to the east, it could be 110 acres. Input was from a variety of sources. Analysis of the site was done and the consultant worked with a marketing firm to understand needs (housing, retail, etc.). The bottom line for us is that this will be a significant catalyst for UNK, Kearney, and Nebraska. There is a phased approach with a Grand Vista, a Buffer, Green Initiatives, Green Space, a Pedestrian Network, and Mobility. Meet next week to update the UN President, in January it will go public, and in the Spring there will be an open session for General Developers. The plan was presented. University Heights will be replaced in this area with University Heights 2, and the Child Development Center will be here also. There are potential sites for URN and URS. Along HWY30, there can be retail, business, and the NU Foundation wants to build on this site. Would like University Drive extend and become the center vein of the property. The east side is for future development properties for UNK. On the west side, developers can build housing (cottages, apartments, condos, etc). Lower South End will be where the Athletic venues are (Softball, Baseball, Outdoor Tennis Courts, Indoor Tennis Court and Track). Plenty of parking for all areas. Landscaping will be done in the center of HWY 30. Will discuss with Department of Roads about doing this, because if you have to cross HWY 30 you have a stopping point. The property to the east that is used as a practice field can be developed as an extension of this plan. Senator Kritzer asked if the new track will be used for track meets. VC Johnson said that this level of detail has not been addressed at this time. Senator Taylor asked where the parking is for the new Health Science Education Complex. VC Johnson pointed out on the plan where this parking is located. Showed a comparison of Downtown Kearney (The Bricks) and how this compares in size, as well as UNO Aksarben Village. Both of these would fit on our site. There are two parts of the land we don’t own 1. A driving range and 2. The Safety Center. Because we have to house the Safety Center, we would have to relocate or develop it. Showed the Grand Vista, which is an area for programming, outdoor concerts, and speakers. It is located near University Heights 2. There are 125 trees on this site. For other projects, we have had to delete trees, so this is a way to bring back some of the trees. The Buffer is where are the Athletic Venues are located. Called The Buffer is because it is located near the rail lines and we don’t want to put housing there. There will be many green spaces. Also, a Pedestrian Network for walking and bikes. There may need to be a people mover to help students get from one side of campus to the other. This project increases our footprint by 90%. University Drive will be rerouted and a traffic light might be there. The rerouting is due to traffic into The Buckle warehouse. City has a concern that the students will leave the new high school, cut through University Village, and get on Country Club Lane to get to the north side. They also are concerned that all the streets will be city streets and who will be responsible for snow removal. UNK would do it. Opportunities on this site are those previously listed. In addition there could be corporate headquarters and public meeting centers, a separate utility site, parking structures (2 of them), recreation complex, and the Health Science Education Complex that Segway’s to this area. For parking structures, we would start with surface parking and build up as needed. In Kearney, there is a shortage of rental properties, so we hope to help the city by having developers build rental properties. Showed a yield analysis – home many beds on site, venues, 3,884 parking spaces, and square footage. In the first quarter of next year will break ground for the Health Sciences Education Complex. Must be ready for occupation in August of 2015.
2. Campus Landscape Plan – Very deliberate in our managing how this campus looks. The surveyors have been looking at the campus. There is a specific landscape plan for the campus. Cope Fountain will develop beauty in the area 12 month out of the year. This will be one of the first projects of the Landscaping plan.

3. These projects are worked on every week. As plan is rolled out and detailing occurs, this will occur on a monthly basis. We can’t replicate sites.

4. Q & A Senator Hoehner – What about renovation of current buildings? VC Johnson – we have a plan. UNK has $30 million of deferred maintenance, not including Otto Olsen ($65 million). We make progress on this every year, but we it will take time to make changes. This plan will not be in spite of, but in addition to, the buildings that need renovation on campus. The capital renewal budget is used to do this, but we don’t have the $30 million to do all the deferred maintenance. There is a 10-year plan to update each building. This summer it was Copeland. Senator Hoehner – Is that plan available for everyone to look at? VC Johnson said the building managers look at it every month. Therefore, ask the building managers for this information.

Senator Barry – Why would my child come here (while looking at Otto Olsen), which is in bad repair, temperature problems, etc? VC Johnson – Otto Olsen is our #1 priority project. On the capital renewal list. The President knows we need to fix Otto Olsen. Part of Otto Olsen will be moved to west campus (2015/2016).

Senator Amundson – Are we seeing Village University as private/public venture? VC Johnson – Yes. University Heights will be paid for on debt. The Child Development Center will be requested from state money due to limitations for debt money. The land will be leased for developers to build on. Have submitted to General Counsel to create a Governing Board to review developers that want to build.

Senator Burbal – What is the plan for the sculpture lab? VC Johnson – Will be moved also, but where is still unclear. It depends where the Health Science Education Complex wants to expand.

Senator White – Accrediting body for the music department has sited the music department with inadequate facilities. They can’t do anything about the facilities and have asked for a plan, but none has been forthcoming. Where is it? VC Johnson – Fine Arts is on the Capital List and elevated to the 3-priority projects list for UNK.

Senator Miller – With regard to the budget, the number one priority says Teaching and Undergraduate Research – What has been done to fund this priority? VC Johnson – It is always a priority, but Charlie has the details.

VI. Consent Agenda - The following committee minutes were accepted without discussion as part of the consent agenda.

A. President’s Report: 14NOV13
B. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: 22NOV13
C. Academic Information and Technology Committee: 1NOV2013
D. Faculty Welfare Committee: 11NOV2013
E. Library Committee: 31OCT13
F. World Affairs Committee: 20NOV2013
G. Graduate Council: 4NOV2013
H. General Studies Council: 7NOV2013

VII. Discussion Agenda
A. Executive Committee: 13NOV13
From BB: It isn’t clear from the transcript of the meeting who was answering the questions submitted previous to the meeting. I am especially interested in the responses about the library situation. Was there any discussion on these questions or were they just accepted as presented?

President Trantham – This was VC Johnson. Senator Mueller – Library Committee was concerned because this test was done without letting them know. They felt it was insulting that the study was done and released without consulting them. President Trantham has the report and can pass it on. Senator Mueller – Why do we have to go about this way? Why are librarians treated this way? Senator Miller asked: Why did the meeting only last 35 minutes? Another meeting conflicted. Why is there no concern with rainwater, only sewer water or sprinklers? Senator Rogoff – The insurance claim would only be relevant in the cases of sewer water or sprinklers. It is a concern, but it will not be considered by the insurance. Senator Miller pointed out that the concern from the library is from the mold spores. Senator Taylor – the Air quality says there is no mold. Senator Miller – When will the water damage ceiling tiles be replaced? Senator Carlson – VC Johnson said there will be a walk-through and a punch list done this week or next. The tiles will be replaced very soon. Senator Davis – The information should be shared in a reasonable way. Maybe a website with updates. Goes back to shared governance. People need to be in the loop. How do we become an agent of change for more responsiveness?

Senator Mueller – In response to the kind of questions about the kind of water that came in, they are still questioning that. Handles the books that are coming back from restoration and there are pieces of tar and she has been told tar is a toxic substance. If this is true, how can this be clean water? They asked to see the insurance policy to see what is covered, but are not allowed. To them, it is coming down to a lack of respect and communication from the whole University. Just sitting down and talking to them could have handled this. The Chancellor said we would remove the carpet and replace the shelves; we will fix all of this. Unfortunately, this did not happen. The carpet is 30 years old, flooded twice and has not been replaced. A bathroom flooded and the carpet has never been replaced. Need the faculty senate needs to take hold of this and do something. Another lack of consideration for the individuals is that they are going to replace the windows in December. President Trantham – We should get together and see how we can approach this with Lee McQueen and the Building Manager. Completely understand your frustration. Senator White - Has close experience with toxic mold poisoning. If you do research, you can see that any number of diseases that are misdiagnosed are actually the effect of toxic mold. I encourage you who work in the library to monitor your health and tell your doctor that you are in an area that may have toxic mold. If you get sick, the University can be a possible target for lawsuit. Senator Mollenkopf – There is a lot of focus on mold and toxic mold and issues of being ill. For understanding air quality and how it affects different people consider an old book will have dust and old mold, you may sneeze, but this will not produce the black mold issues. When you look at the air quality study information, it is not showing the toxic mold issues, but this does not mean the library faculty and staff are facing issues. What may be happening is how people respond. People can get sick. People who are sensitive, they become hypersensitive. Regardless of what the report comes out, there needs to be attention to the sensitivity, whether or not it is mold. Senator Mueller – Is the testing valid? Whoever was doing the testing did not ask where the water was? Without help from the library staff, how do they know where to test? President Trantham – Will forward the information and the contact information is on there. Senator Taylor – Needs to be a meeting between Library and Administration. When we ask, it sounds good and prepared in advance. It is not efficient for us to bring questions, but these groups need to get together so the right questions are asked. Senator Mueller – Appreciate the help of the FS Executive committee. Senator
Amundson – There is a condescending nature in the replies we get from service entity. We do not have the service nature that we should have. Senator Carlson – FS Welfare is working on a Faculty Morale survey. Please put these comments on this. Senator Taylor – Facilities has been cut, budget looks good, may start hiring people. They could not hire until there was a budget. They are aware of the problem, but not enough money. Senator Miller – With regard to Charlie’s response to the changes in CTE that nothing has been finalized, but it is open for comments, where and how should this be done? Is there a process for a dialogue? Senator Trantham – none given, but that may be due to the shortness of the meeting.

B. E-campus Committee: 24OCT13
From BB: General comments without any real question. 1. Note that OWW estimates the cost of developing a MOOC at ~$50,000, if done in a high end way (which seems to be NU desire). 2. Statement by OWW’s Mary Niemiec that “If you (faculty member) feel the terms of the agreement are not palatable or you feel they do not protect what you want to do well enough, then there is no obligation to participate.” Simply supports the notion that faculty are not currently obligated to develop MOOCs; however, if a UNK faculty member desires to develop a MOOC there may be some significant obstacles. Senator Taylor – Anything on recent MOOC data? About effectiveness? Senator Davis – Midwest Higher Education Compact held a conference on MOOCS. It turned out to be a wider-ranging discussion. Started out as one thing, and in 48 months have change into something else. Will prepare a report on this. Coursera contract is in Union hands now. The University has a $25K package if there is interest in creating a massive online course.

C. Academic Affairs Committee: 21NOV13
Senator Taylor – Would like to move to table the ITECH 305 course proposal because his department was not notified. This course may/may not overlap his department, but would like some time to review it. They should have been notified, but were not. Senator Miller – This is a course that originated in your college. Did your College Ed Policy Committee not notify you? Senator Taylor – No. Motion by Senator Taylor (Agrawal) to table item 08, ITECH 305. It should go back to the COB Education Policy Committee. Unanimous. Senator Amundson – It was at Academic Affairs and all Colleges are represented and minutes and agenda are made available before. The discussion about duplicity has been addressed. But the point was that there is not a current course like this, but possibly a course may be created. Chair Obermeir has been made aware.

VIII. Old Business
A. Discussion on MOU shared governance
From Academic Affairs and moved here. Academic Affairs had a document. Faculty Welfare had a draft. Senator Miller – Draft from AA, went to Faculty Welfare, back to AA. What is in the packet is the final draft from AA. The major point of difference is the inclusion of Professional Staff with Faculty in Shared Governance. Faculty Welfare took out Professional Staff, and AA put it back in. AA put it back in due to a document called Shared Governance in Higher Education. Some of the things that are traditionally done are now done by none faculty. So the idea was to extend protection to those people. That was the thinking for putting Professional Staff in there. Senator Taylor – Our we defining professional staff as the Board of Regents? Senator Carlson – Faculty Welfare is concerned with the definition of “Professional Staff” and how the Board of Regents defines it. It needs to be clarified or explained because the Faculty is defined. Senator Darveau – Maybe we need to call it academic Staff? Senator Miller – That could work.
Senator Carlson - Maybe move #2 to number one for more clarification? Senator Miller – Take out professional staff and substitute academic staff. Strike “working directly with students” in #1. Senator Taylor – Should we consider all people professional staff? Senator Miller – the language is national language. Senator Carlson – I believe Faculty Welfare would be happy with that. Senator Taylor – Senator Freeman do you have a suggestion for wording from what was said on BB. Senator Freeman – It depends is this a “feel good” document or define what is to be done. Instead of saying, “should have”, maybe say “does have”. Understands though that it needs to get through the other components on campus. Senator Taylor – Should we go through and change the “should” in areas with documentation from the Board of Regents? Senator Miller – We can do that? Should it go through another cycle? That means it goes back to someone else. Senator Carlson – Can we work on this through email to maintain consistency before Senator Miller leaves. Yes. This will be worked on via email between AA and Faculty Welfare.

B. Discussion of Minor overlapping hours
Senator Miller – This is the work of a large group of people, including the Registrar. Senator White – This is an expansion from 6 right? When I came here, I was told not to take a minor closely related to their major. The more I think about it, 8 is better than 6, but this limitation is absurd. We have things we set up for a major or minor and if students achieve this, why can’t they have this? It is still one degree what does it matter? It is not like we are giving them 2 degrees for the price of one. Talk about creating fiefdoms. What is the difference between a comprehensive major and a fiefdom? If you want to be a music educator and have an emphasis in performance, why should it matter? This would be advantageous for a certain position. If we are thinking of preparing students for a Master’s degree, if we can allow them to have a closely related minor or a second major, that is helping the student to begin to specialize. This may help them to better prepare for a Master’s degree. This may limit our effectiveness. Question the basic foundation for doing this in the first place. Senator Darveau – 6 years ago I would have agreed with you. I pushed the change for getting rid of the overlap rule. What this did was put in place a way for students to “game” the system. This new plan forces them to have a degree plan. Students were finding a way to pick up a minor without taking any extra courses. Within different disciplines, you can tack on as many minors in different departments. For teachers, rules and 1 and 2 don’t mean anything. What you need for an endorsement is up to the department. That is controlled by Department of Education and NCATE. This demonstrates fairness and equality. Senator White – I don’t see how it is unfair. Senator Taylor – I agree with you Senator White, but we lost the argument. Senator Miller – Part of the reason this changed was because there are interdisciplinary majors where in obtaining the major you also obtain a minor with no additional courses required. Another reason for the rule is to provide rigor. Senator White – So is there a problem with there not being enough credits? Senator Darveau – In part. Senator White – Make a limit on what you need of a degree. Senator Miller – We do, it is 120 hours. Senator Darveau – We are saying you need 42 hours to graduate. Senator White - If they have that and there is still overlap, what is the problem? Senator Darveau – 42 unique hours.

Motion to approve new overlap rule. Senator Miller (Davis). Unanimous.

IX. New Business
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
Senator White – Student evaluations that they were forced by the Dean to adopt. We came before the Senate and we agreed that you could use what you want, with some common core. The evaluations they are being forced to use have nothing to do with private lessons. The department worked out 3 student evaluations for different types of instructions. But these had to be abandoned. The issues are being sent off to be calculated and the demographic questions are being calculated. If a student thinks they are getting an “F” then that reflects you and your packet. Reiterate the opinion that this idea of unified student evaluations across all disciplines is absurd. Senator Rogoff – His evaluations do not contain the scoring anomalies. Senator Miller – To Trantham – you are working on this (Trantham: NO). BOR says we will evaluate students and courses, but not the same evaluations. I think Senator White is correct. If the point of student evaluations is to give us feedback to faculty, it can’t be uniform. Senate needs to look at this like we did 15 years ago. Senator McKelvey – COE has been wrestling with this for 2 years. In the process of looking at this and comparing the two instruments. So far the questions are not appropriate. Several faculty said they did not like the tool and it needs to be better. They had focus group meetings and a group was charged with coming up with this tool. Looked at the literature. Now the fear is how does it compare to the old tool. Senator Carlson – We undertook this in CNSS and there was little faculty feedback. Senator Darveau – I see an argument for a limited subset that can go across campus. Course management issues for example. Senator Carlson – We were giving the CFAH evals as our own. Ours does not work and it won’t work for everyone. Senator White – We did the same thing as COE and were told me could not use them. Senator Darveau – There was an issue in CNSS that the Chairs got together, wrote a letter, and sent it to Charlie laying out the argument. Should do this. Senator Freeman – Concern is that the student evaluation is being perverted into a faculty evaluation tool. Our annual evaluations must require student evaluations. Are student evaluations going to become our annual evaluations? Can we encourage the administration to use multiple tools? Senator Miller – The senate can set forth the idea to use multiple tools. We need to get away from the idea that you have to be 4.23 is absurd.

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

XI. Adjournment