UNK FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
February 4, 2016
Ockinga Conference Room
Faculty Senate Website: http://www.unk.edu/committees/faculty_senate/index.php

I. Call to order

II. Roll Call: 4FEB2016

At Large Senators: Present: Kelley, Trantham

CBT Senators: Present: Konecny (proxy: Palmer), Porter, Taylor, Tenkorang, Trewin
Absent: Tami Moore

COE Senators: Present: Brown, Gaskill, Hoehner, Mims
Absent: Jan Moore

CFAH Senators: Present: May, Rogoff
Absent: Chavez, Jiang, Van Renen

CNSS Senators: Present: Davis, Harms (proxy: Alavi), Weiss, Pattabiraman, Reichart, Powell, Sogar, Strain, Dillon
Absent: Louishomme, Wulf-Ludden

Library Senator: Present: Mueller

III. Approval of Agenda
President Kelley asked that one item be added to the agenda at X.:F. Best Practices for Annual Review. Agenda approved with addition.

IV. Action on the Faculty Senate Minutes: 1OCT2015
Senator Trantham (May) moved to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved.

V. Special Presentations - None

VI. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees

B. Executive Committee: – There were no written minutes for the most recent meeting, Jan. 22, 2016, as the secretary and the president-elect were unable to attend. Senator Taylor did take a few notes and provided them here. He reported that the Director of Assessment position will be searched and hopefully filled by Spring break. This position will also deal with dual enrollment. The professor of practice final draft should be out by spring break as well. The position of Vice Chancellor of Business and Finance will be filled by the end of May. The first meeting of the
search committee should have been on Feb. 1. Pres. Kelley is on the search committee and it did meet on Feb. 1. He reported that candidates will be on campus shortly after graduation. It isn’t the best time he reported, but it’s how it worked out on schedule. They want this person on board before the next fiscal year.

C. President’s Report: **22JAN16** - Pres. Kelley passed around a handout from the Board of Regents meeting that provided statistics that President Bounds used in reporting the state of the university. It is called the **NU Economic Impact Report – Key Conclusions**. At the BoR meeting Fauneil Meier was given KUDOs award. VC Bicak will provide an academic issues forum in the Nebraska Union room 312, at 3:30 pm on March 17, 2016. He would like to encourage senators to attend. He did meet with Jane Sheldon and asked for an update on the projects to be given for the whole campus rather than just to the Faculty Senate. Suggested time would be after spring break. The Chancellor did provide two forums on the budget situation. Pres. Kelley reported that most people expressed appreciation for them, but it was not unanimous. If there are issues you would like him to address, please contact him with those concerns.

D. Academic Affairs: **19NOV15, 21JAN16** – no comments

F. **Academic Information Technology Committee: 4DEC16** – Pres. Kelley encouraged anyone who had problems with the IRS please contact Mary Chinnock Petroski. There was a question from Sen. Mims about how many were affected by this. Sens. Trewin and Powell both replied that it was a large number on the West campus as well as Pres. Kelley and maybe someone in Administration. No specific connections between all those effected were found.

G. **Artists and Lecturers Committee: 22JUNE15, 24NOV15, 11JAN16** – Sen. Trantham reported that he remembers that several years ago this committee was asked to report funds spent and by whom. Isn’t that still a request? Sen. Rogoff reported that VC Bicak will hold funds until a report is made of the distribution of the funds. Sen. May reported that he is on the committee and they are concerned that some requests are time sensitive and that if they waited for permission it may be too late for some requests. Sen. Taylor and Sen. May have reassured them that it is unlikely that any permission would be revoked, but there does need to be a report of the activities and dollars spent. Sen. Trantham stated that he really doesn’t need to approve them, he just wants a listing or report on what was spent on what. Sen. Taylor stated that the Executive committee has discussed this and that committee could approve expenditures if the need arises before the next Faculty Senate meeting.

I. **E-campus Committee: 10DEC15** – Sen. Davis reported that eCampus funds are distributed based on their ability to pay. He thinks there is some lack of clarity about that so that is why it is in the minutes. The second item here is about student evaluations. It was decided that Sen. Davis
should come to the senate and make a proposal that an Ad Hoc committee be formed to look at student evaluations. The Ad Hoc committee should have members from the eCampus committee and the Academic Affairs committee. They would set their own agenda and decide what the focus should be. Some things they could do would be a snapshot of what is available now; how do they function, what response rate do we get, what formats are they in, what is online what is in paper; other models, at UNO they are having all their evaluations done online. We need to survey the terrain; are we happy with what we have, not happy with it. Maybe new technology steps to take us to the next level. This report would then come back to the senate and we could look at it then and take the next steps. Pres. Kelley pointed out that this item is on the agenda at a later time, but we could go ahead and address it now that it is being discussed. Sen. Davis agreed.

**Sen. Davis moved that the Faculty Senate create an Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluations comprised of at least one member from the following bodies: eCampus Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, Student Affairs Committee, and Faculty Senate.**

Sen. Rogoff asked if all members will be faculty. Sen. Davis responded that yes, they would be. Sen. Trewin seconded the motion. Pres. Kelley asked for discussion.

Sen. Trantham stated that he thought this was a good thing. He doesn’t want to be on the committee, but he knows there is a lot of research on this. Pres. Kelley responded that he talked with the president of the UNO faculty senate about this in anticipation of this meeting. He reported that they had some issues along the way and he would encourage the committee to talk with her before going too far into the research, so as to avoid them. Sen. Mims asked if this is primarily about online evaluations. Sen. Davis responded that the discussion was initially about online evaluation because it was in the eCampus committee, but further discussion pointed out the need to look at all evaluations. Sen. Mims suggested that there be a representative from each of the colleges because each college does their evaluations so differently. Sen. Davis responded that with their currently being 4 members on the committee, the colleges could be represented among these four groups as well. Sen. Pattabiraman asked: what is the need for this committee right now? Is it to improve evaluations or is it to understand the nature and use of evaluations? Sen. Davis responded, neither. He went on to say that the first step is to see if we know what we are doing before having a conversation about improving it. The idea is to end with a report that tells us what we are currently doing, breaking it down by colleges, response rates we get, etc. Then bring it back to senate to report on this. Sen. Palmer said he was on the eCampus committee as well and this started with conversations about response rates, online response rates so low that the results weren’t reliable. Then there was discussion across colleges and since it was so diverse it was suggested there be a committee to find out what everyone was doing and perhaps
eventually come up with a document on best practices. Sen. Porter asked about whether the
evaluations or surveys really get what we want. Some of the questions are really not on target to
put it mildly. He feels that we need to determine what the end goal of these surveys are and what
are we asking the student to tell us. Sen. Strain thought it odd that students are expected to
evaluate what she as an instructor knows. How do they know? Sen. Trantham offered to provide a
variety of books on the topic. Sen. Powell responded that there is a vast number of approaches to
how these are administered. Some places do not allow faculty to administer their own
evaluations. Someone else always administers them. Sen. May questions the validity of
evaluations all together. He believes they really don’t evaluate anything. They are often skewed
and they are often skewed against women. Why are we even doing it? Is it a standard? Why is it a
standard at UNK? Sen. Taylor mentioned that it is easy for administration to look at it. Sen. May
asked: if that is the case what are they seeing? Sen. Mims reported that the College of Education’s
promotion and tenure rules dictate the exact number on evaluations to be reached before someone
is promoted. Sen. May expressed concern that an exacting teacher may get lower evaluations and
a less exacting teacher may get high evaluations. What information do you really get out of that?
Sen. Trantham asked Sen. May to cite his sources. Sen. May responded that the Chronicle, the
Chronicle of Higher Ed, just had an article. Sen. Taylor said that he had also seen an article about
bias against women. Sen. Trantham concluded his statement by saying that the Board in Kansas
required that a uniform evaluation form be used and that this form was written to correct for some
of this bias. He expressed his opinion that this campus should follow suit. Sen. Taylor responded
that he did not think student evaluations were worthless. His opinion was that they were good to
identify problems in teaching. They are like the canary in the coal mines. They don’t necessarily
tell you what the problem is, but they do tell you there is a problem. Sen. Pattabiraman expressed
concern about the need for evaluations. He knows administrators want them, but if his students
earn good grades, doesn’t that show how well he is doing.

Pres. Kelley called the question. The ayes have it, Sen. May abstained. The motion passed.
Sen. Davis said he is willing to be on the committee since he is on the eCampus committee. Sen.
Palmer and Sen. Pattabiraman both asked to serve. There was a motion from Sen. Porter
(Davis) to allow both to serve on the committee. The motion passed.

There was a call for someone to represent the College of Education. Sen. Gaskill said she was
member of the Academic Affairs committee. Sen. Gaskill went on to relate her experience with
how she delivered her evaluations and how that made a real difference in response rate. Sen.
Davis then looked for an additional committee member from Student Affairs. Sen. Rogoff asked
if that would also be someone who represents Fine Arts and Humanities. If so, that would be him.
He said he would happily join. Sen. Mims suggested that since Scott Unruh led the last review that it would be a good idea to talk with him about the research that committee did. Sen. Sogar related her experience with the timing of the evaluations to get comments back.

M. Professional Conduct Committee: 5NOV15, 16DEC15 Pres. Kelley was asked a while back if we had a policy concerning parent child relations. He found that the Consensual Relationship policy included some language that covered parent child relationships but wasn’t really clear about some issues. He gave a charge to the Professional Conduct committee to review the policy with the ability to do nothing, make changes or create a new document. As a result we have this policy as a seconded motion from the committee in the minutes. Pres. Kelley asked if any of the members, Sen. Trantham, Sen. Rogoff or Sen. Mims wish to speak to the motion. Sen. Trantham said the committee chose to address this charge by rewriting it but keeping it rather general. It would be rather difficult to include all circumstances so they opted for a broader statement. Pres. Kelley stated that this is a seconded motion from a committee and asked for a second. Sen. Davis seconded it. The motion passed.

All reports distributed in VI. Reports from Faculty Senate Standing Committees were approved.

VII. Reports of Senate Representatives to Non-Senate Committees
A. International Studies Advisory Council: 14JAN16 – no comments
B. World Affairs Conference Committee: 21JAN15 – no comments

All reports distributed in VII. Reports of Senate Representatives to Non-Senate Committees were approved.

VIII. Reports from Academic Councils
A. Graduate Council: 10DEC15 – no comments
B. General Studies Council: 3DEC15 – no comments

All reports distributed in VIII. Reports from Academic Councils were approved.

IX. Unfinished Business

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) – 3 Drafts
Pres. Kelley gave a summary of the history of the MOU and explained the three drafts that are in the packet. He called for a motion on one of the documents. Sen. Davis moved to accept the Davis document. Then Sen. Trantham seconded it. Pres. Kelley called for discussion, reminding the senators that if they are in favor of another document that they then should oppose this document. Sen. Taylor then commented that he liked Sen. Davis introduction, but he spent a long period of time with Vice Chancellor Bicak working on the rest of it. Pres. Kelley expressed surprise that the Davis document didn’t include the changes Sen. Taylor made. Sen. Mims suggested it should really be a merger of the Davis preamble and Sen. Taylor’s document. Sen. Taylor further explained that he didn’t make a lot of changes, because he acknowledged the hard work that the Faculty Welfare committee did in creating the original document. He does like what Sen. Davis added by including the Board of Regents in the preamble. Pres. Kelley asked for any other comments. He made the
suggestion that if everyone likes the combined document that we vote down this motion and put up a motion for the merged document. **Sen. Brown suggested that we request a friendly amendment to the current motion.** Sen. Davis agreed to the friendly amendment that the preamble from the Davis document be added on to the Taylor/Bicak document *beginning at At the University of Nebraska at Kearney.* **Sen. Taylor wanted to emphasize again the hard work done by the Faculty Welfare group on this document.** Sen. Dillon suggested that in the future we have the changes highlighted in one document rather than looking for changes across three documents. Sen. Taylor commented that the changes were noted like that for the Executive committee, but it seemed more confusing than helpful. **Pres. Kelley asked for a vote and it passed.**

X. **New Business**

**A. Oversight Committee – Election – Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee –** Parliamentarian Trewin reported that we need a senator for this committee who represents the senate, not a college. A senator asked: What are the requirements? There was a discussion about whether the member must be tenured. Requirement listed a tenured associate or professor. **Sen. Weiss volunteered to serve. He said he is tenured and an associate. A vote was called and he was elected.**

**B. College Concerns –** Pres. Kelley wanted to address any concerns other than personnel within the colleges. Sen. Trantham said they didn’t have any money. Sen. Mims said they are struggling with getting any diverse faculty and keeping them. **Pres. Kelley mentioned that other programs in the past tried to address this.** He told Sen. Dillon that this is another issue for that committee. He asked for any other issues. Sen. Sogar expressed concern about her advising load. **Pres. Kelley said that this is another issue for Faculty Welfare, but he won’t send it to them right now as their plate is already full with the question of diversity.** Sen. Trantham said that advising really doesn’t get recognized like it should as service. **Pres. Kelley mentioned a white paper done by Bob Young about ten years ago on advising.** Sen. Gaskill suggested that we need professional advisors. **Sen. Trewin agreed that having a group of people whose job is only advising is the way to go.** Sen. Davis expressed his opinion that we should go in the other direction. The impression that UNK expresses to the public is that we are close to our students. This idea of a professional advisor is contrary to this impression. Instead we should be recognizing the role of the faculty member working with the student and advising them. Recognize how much time is committed to this activity. **Pres. Kelley suggested pulling out the white paper and putting it on the agenda for next time.** Sen. Davis suggested that it be on the Admin/Exec. Committee agenda since it will meet before the next senate meeting and let them know this is a concern of the faculty. **Sen. Sogar doesn’t want to not do advising rather she would like to be acknowledged for doing it.** Pres. Kelley summed it up by saying that the topic should go to the administration for discussion and that he will provide the white paper for the senate’s information. Sen. Mims said this topic is well timed because the Coordinating council suggested that they come back with ideas on how they could enhance advising. **Pres. Kelley asked if there are any more issues. Hearing none he went on.**

**C. Changing Developmental Leave –** Pres. Kelley surmised that ¾ pay for a full year of developmental leave may reduce the number of leaves available. **He’s not sure of this, but this is his view.** Sen. Davis has looked into this and summarized that currently when you take one year off you receive half your pay and your college captures the other half. If paid ¾ then the college still gets ¼ . No money has to be generated. It is already in your contract. His impression is that very few people actually take year-long leaves. The administration may want to take a look at this because they make money on these leaves. **Sen. Palmer asked: Doesn’t that 25% cover the replacement faculty?** Sen. Davis responded that in many cases there is no replacement faculty. Sometimes it depends on what the department wants to do.
The department may not offer those courses the next semester or may have an adjunct who can cover those courses. He brought it up so that the administration can take a look at this. Sen. Reichart spoke up and thought this might have been a topic for college concerns, but she commented that we really don’t have a mechanism to attract adjuncts. She heard that adjuncts in biology could only be hired for three years in a row and then none after that. Pres. Kelley responded that he had not heard of that. Sen. Davis interjected that perhaps it has something to do with the contracts. He stated that lecturers get one year contracts only. They are not renewable. They are issued a new contract each year. They look amazingly like their old contract, but they receive a new contract each year. However, if you are talking about a visiting assistant professor you are talking about a completely different contract. Sen. Reichart asked if a visiting assistant professor get better paid than a lecturer. Sen. Davis responded yes. Sen Reichart responded by asking if that would be a way to get a temporary person a better salary. Sen. Davis further said that a visiting assistant professor may be hired to teach graduate courses because they have the Ph.D while a lecturer may not. Pres. Kelley asked Sen. Reichart if we should continue to look into it. She expressed that she wasn’t sure. Some institutions are no longer having tenure track and some Ph.Ds are working as adjuncts. Pres. Kelley responded that there is a concern here, but it is a complex situation. Sen. Reichart wondered if this is a concern with the developmental leave issue and what is done with the money. Sen. Rogoff stated that he was in favor of the 75% developmental leave. Pres. Kelley asked Sen. Davis if this is a motion he wants to go forward. Sen. Davis indicated he trusted the Executive committee to take it forward to the administration. Pres. Kelley asked for a show of hands of those wanting to see this go forward. With the large positive response he agreed that he will take it to the administration.

D. Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluations – Discussed under the eCampus committee report

E. Compliance Committee – Sen. Davis reported on this. He gave a brief history of this committee. It began with establishment of an Audit, Risk and Compliance Committee by the Board of Regents at the NU level. The charter for that committee dictates that each campus report to this committee concerning compliance issues. The Chancellor’s cabinet here decided that the best way to do that would be to establish a compliance committee on our campus. However, the compliance committee doesn’t have any jurisdiction over any policies, which continues as originally developed. The committee will make sure that all of UNK has ready access to all policies and that they are easily found, read and understood. All approved policies will be available on a well-organized web site with links to related guidelines. In March or the next meeting the committee will determine if established policies are easily found and if not, to find them and make them easily accessible on the web site. He went on to say that the senate has policies and we really don’t have them easily accessible. Pres. Kelley called for any questions. Sen. Rogoff apologized for not being as versed on this as he would like to be, but he expressed concern about a 30 day window for review. At the time this committee was formed there was also a policy about a tobacco free campus. Neither one of these have been reported on as to whether there was any comments on these. In addition, there is a 400 page document out of the Division of Business and Finance, which appears to be a policy, which came out Jan. 14, 2016. Where is the 30 day review period for it? Will it be open for review every time this is revised? Sen. Davis agreed that this is the kind of input the committee is hoping people will give us. As for the 30 day review window I will ask the committee to look into this as well.

F. Best Practices for Annual Review – Pres. Kelley acknowledged Sen. Trantham’s work to look into this when he was president a couple of years ago. Each of the chairs were supposed to have responded to him about this. However, since all the departments are represented here he would like each senator to briefly explain what their department does for annual reviews.
Pres. Kelley – in Sociology the chair is excluded in the process, non-tenured faculty have two peers who are in the department, no outside peers, in the third year we do a mini-tenure review where all members of the department, excluding the chair, serve on the peer review process, to alert to any problems at the time before actual tenure review comes up. For full tenured faculty they are only reviewed by one faculty member, but every three years they are reviewed by two.

Sen. Taylor – Marketing/MIS – 2 peers within the department

Sen. Brown – Kinesiology and Sports Sciences – 3 faculty on review committee, for assistant professors, associate or full professors do the evaluation, for full professors they are evaluated every three years and this evaluation goes to the chair

Sen. Porter – ITEC – you choose your own committee, one has to be a tenured professor, otherwise anyone

Sen. Davis – History – Each person gets to select three peers from the department, a written document is then sent to the chair. The chair is reviewed differently.

Sen. Gaskill – Teacher Education – We choose two members, and we do have a tenured member on the committee, but we get to choose who we have on the committee.

Sen. Dillon – Geography – We have no process, at the end of the year we receive a letter. In recent years we have been asked if we want to make any comments on our colleagues, but no guidelines are provided.

Sen. Pattabiraman – Chemistry – We have an annual evaluation and a third year evaluation composed of tenured faculty chaired by a full professor, though not the chair himself. A letter is given detailing any problems that need fixing. The next year we then go for promotion.

Sen. Tenkorang – Economics – There are 4 members on a committee and they review everyone.

Sen. Strain – Psychology – Pre tenure – We get to choose a chair and then the department chair chooses everyone else. Post tenure only gets reviewed every 3 years by a committee.

Sen. Powell – Physics – Annual review of all members, other than chair. A consistency member selected by the department is chosen to be on all committees. The member chooses one and the chair the third. The committee can be anyone, though they should be tenure track, but one should be associate. And one should be outside the department, usually the consistency member.

Sen. Mims – Counseling and School Psychology – A peer review committee that all non-tenured members sit on. Everyone is reviewed by this committee. Post tenure, we only have one or two.

Sen. Alavi – Computer Science – Everyone is on the committee and everyone is reviewed.

Sen. Reichart – Biology – Everyone is reviewed by a committee, who are full professors. They visit classrooms, get teaching evaluations and that is passed on to the chair for promotion and tenure. You can go up for promotion early. We are required to have three full professors.

Sen. Sogar – Social Work – All non-tenured faculty are reviewed every year by everyone. Classroom observations are made every year by the committee. The packet consists of Digital Measures, evaluations and the classroom observation.

Sen. May – Art – Reviewed by two faculty of equal or higher rank selected by the chair.

Sen. Weiss – Mathematics – The chair selects four tenure or tenure-track members and a lecturer for the committee and they review everyone. It’s a rotating committee.

Sen. Palmer – Management – Everyone is reviewed annually. Two peers review you. It can be from peers outside the department as well.

Sen. Trewin – Accounting/Finance – Everyone is evaluated. Each is evaluated by two faculty. An assistant would have an assistant and an associate, so one of them has experience with reviews. An associate would have associates and fulls and fulls would just have fulls. The chair selects the committees.
Sen. Mueller – Library – We have 1 peer reviewer selected by the dean. Each packet, after
the peer reviewer, goes to the equivalent of the chair, we call them coordinators, and then to
the dean.
Pres.-Elect Rogoff – Music – A committee of three, one reviewer selected by the member
must be ranked higher, one selected by the chair who must be ranked higher and one you
choose together. The committee reviews together and sends a report up to the chair. The
tenured and full are also reviewed each year.
Pres. Kelley – Thanked everyone and said this will help a project to know where reviews are
across campus.

XI. General Faculty Comments

Sen. Brown asked everyone if they have experienced having calls from athletics to meet
prospective football players on short notice or on holidays. A variety of senators agreed. Sen.
Brown had no problem assisting recruitment in this way, but would prefer more notice.
Others indicated that when asked they would check with others in the department, but would
make no commitment that there would be someone available.

Sen. Palmer made a clarification about the faculty evaluations. He said that if one faculty
member wrote a letter for a colleague in the department, there could not be a reciprocal letter
from the colleague in the same year.

Sen. Dillon also commented on his department’s evaluation process. He said that since they
are a very small department they avoid the three ring circus that would entail if everyone was
reviewing everyone.

XI. Adjournment

seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 8:38 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Mueller, Secretary