I. The meeting was called to order at 2 p.m.

II. The November 3, 2010, minutes were approved as submitted.

III. Officers’ Reports

A. President’s Report: Senator Laquer reported

1. Executive Committee and Administration (EC&Admin.) met November 17, 2010.

   ACE Fellow Dave Schnase, a special guest, attended at the request of the NU President's Office and Chancellor Christensen. The Chancellor asked the Senate Executive Committee to talk to Dave about the role of the Faculty Senate, how the senate operates, who serves on the senate and some examples of issues/achievements/expectations, etc. of the Senate.

   Dr. Schnase was also interested in how part time faculty’s issues are heard, and was told that there is no formal representation for part time faculty at UNO, or on the Senate, and it is very hard for part time faculty to be heard.

   He was also interested in shared governance. One of the biggest hurdles in shared governance, Senator Benjamin-Alvarado noted, is that Faculty Senators might not be clear that one of their charges is to bring information, from monthly Faculty Senate meetings, back to their units, in order to serve as a channel of communication. Chancellor Christensen replied that shared governance is very important to him, and he feels that people here at UNO are very supportive of each other. Senator Mitchell asked the group to define “shared governance,” but the topic was lost in the discussion of difference and changes. SVC Hynes replied that faculty owns the curriculum, but it is important and useful to have continuing discussions on the definition.

   a. Resolutions Passed at the November 17, 2010, Faculty Senate Meeting, & Accepted by Administration:

      i. RESOLUTION 3065, 11/10/10: Proposed B.S. degree in Public Health

      ii. RESOLUTION 3066, 10/13/10: Proposed Ph.D. Degree in Exercise Science

      iii. RESOLUTION 3067, 10/13/10: Conflict of Interest (COI) Committee Member

   b. Other Items also discussed:

      i. The question, “What are UNO’s academic strengths?” was turned back on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to go back to faculty and see what they considered as UNO’s academic strengths. One strength is collaboration amongst colleagues even across departments and colleges.
Another strength is the people at UNO. The ability of community, faculty, staff, and students to work together is another of UNO’s strengths. Chancellor Christensen noted that he was not going to give a list of programs. Academic strength should be advertised more.

ii. What are the academic opportunities available that UNO should be pursuing? Chancellor Christensen and SVC Hynes replied the PhD in Exercise Science is an example of academic opportunities that should be pursued, as should be the B.S. in Public Health. Other opportunities evolve because of passion, interest, needing no new resources, etc.

iii. In the event of possible layoffs to faculty and staff due to budget cuts, what efforts are being implemented to make this process as humane as possible? Chancellor Christensen replied that on the faculty side, that is handled beginning at the department level. On the staff side HR has been incredibly helpful. He has been here 32 years and we have had to reduce faculty and staff before and it has always been done humanely. SVC Hynes suggested that HR Director, Mollie Anderson, be invited to speak to the Senate on this subject. VC Conley pointed out that there are terminations on this campus every week for a variety of reasons, and the HR department has handled them in a way that impresses him and involves a lot of respect with the person involved. Over the past few years there have been tremendous improvements in UNO’s HR department.

iv. UNO Marketing Communications process: Chancellor John Christensen has asked Dean Gail Baker to develop a comprehensive communications strategy for UNO. She will have a report and recommendations to the Chancellor in January. UNO's Center for Collaboration Science is working with Dean Baker to develop sessions that gather existing opinions regarding UNO's image, position, strengths, and opportunities. There will be a limited number of sessions--essentially focus groups—for chairs/directors/deans, staff, faculty, and students. F.S. President Laquer recently attended one of those sessions and thinks it is good process and will be helpful in the long run.

v. Faculty's place in the strategic plan: The Strategic Planning Steering Committee is still debating Goal 2 (Academic Excellence), and how to add more references to the faculty. That process will continue within the Strategic Planning Committee then go to all constituent groups.

vi. Resolutions 3033 and 3013 inclusion in the catalog: Resolutions 3013 (Plagiarism Policy) & 3033 (Ethics) were discussed. Nora Bacon will combine them and get that combination to Dr. Rita Henry so it can be put in the undergraduate catalog. That has a deadline of December 1, 2010.

vii. Status on the re-posting of the annual great teacher and great researcher award recipients’ photos and listing (formerly in MBSC): VC Conley replied that he has remembered the problem, but he and SVC Hynes have been out of the country at different times and haven’t had a chance to deal with it yet.

viii. The December Senate Guest Speaker will be President Milliken.

ix. The Chancellor wanted to know how the Faculty Senate is surveying the faculty so it can bring the “pulse of the faculty” to him. If we don’t know what the faculty wants at the top of the agenda, then we have missed the opportunity for faculty to have a real voice and shared governance.
2. **Budget Forum** was held November 18, 2010. The slides presented are available [http://www.unomaha.edu/plan/sbac/inside/campusforum11182010.pdf](http://www.unomaha.edu/plan/sbac/inside/campusforum11182010.pdf)

   Chris Kabourek presented an overview similar to that presented to the senate earlier this term. The October $1.4 billion report of the state shortfall for the next biennium has eased slightly with a report on Nov 17 of only a projected shortfall of $986 million. This is equivalent to 15% of the state budget, and given the state appropriation of ~$500 million the potential impact is $75 million NU-wide. For comparison UNO receives $58 million from the state. Tuition would need to be increased 38% in order to raise $75 M. Over the past 10 years there have been $68 million in internal allocations NU-wide. Slides were presented showing the impact of budget cuts in the past decade at all four campuses. UNO’s are listed here (slide 23):

   **Academic Restructuring**
   - Eliminated College of Continuing Studies
   - Eliminated Dean and Associate Dean positions
   - Vacated leased space in Peter Kiewit Conference Center
   - Integrated Fine Arts, Communication and Radio/TV under one college
   - Eliminated Learning Center
   - Eliminated Office of Faculty Development
   - Merged Distance Education with Academic Computing
   - Eliminated Bachelor’s Degree program in Public Administration
   - Eliminated the Education Specialist degree and related faculty position and staff support
   - Combined three academic programs (IT Innovation, Information Assurance, and Bioinformatics) into a School of Interdisciplinary Informatics, which resulted in administrative savings
   - Integrated some satellite operations (e.g. NBDC) into new College of Business Administration Building, Mammel Hall, and eliminated related rental costs

   **Administrative Restructuring**
   - Eliminated two Vice Chancellor positions
   - Merged Academic Affairs and Student Affairs
   - Eliminated Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Services
   - Eliminated Purchasing Office
   - Eliminated Audio Visual Department
   - Outsourced Carpentry, Painting, Printing, and Physical Cable Plant Maintenance services
   - Merged New Student Orientation and Recruitment Services
   - Merged Telecommunication Services with Information Technology Services

   **Other Efficiency Achievements**
   - Aggregated campus computer and related technology purchases through Information Services division to leverage cost savings
   - Eliminated or reallocated over 200 faculty and staff positions

   The budget timeline for the near term was presented (slide 56):
   - Dec 2010 – LR 542 Committee recommendations
   - Jan 2011 – Governor budget recommendations
   - Feb & Apr 2011 – Forecasting board revenue revisions
• May 2011 – Legislature enacts 2011-13 budget
• June 2011 – Board of Regents enact NU 2011-12 budget

Ron Withem, Associate Vice President & Director of Governmental Relations asked for help contacting the legislators at critical times and solicited prospective “University Ambassadors”. [The registration may be found here http://nebraska.edu/legislative-information/grassroots-ambassadors.html ] His presentation was similar to that made to the senate this fall. We are reminded that any contacts with legislators should be made from personal resources and not University email or stationary. [You can find your Nebraska state senator here http://nebraskalegislature.gov/senators/senator_find.php ]

VC Bill Conley began by thanking two students who were assisting with the collection of questions, Ankit Agrawal & Diana Petersen [the two student members of the Strategic Budget Advisory Committee]. Conley also pointed out another item on their website which provides some more specifics on the UNO budget “The Color of Money” (October 2010) http://www.unomaha.edu/plan/sbac/inside/colorofmoney102010.pdf. He then briefly reviewed the U-wide committees that had been created by President Milliken and which met in August and September [slide 61]. Their work will be presented to Regent’s committees by VP Lechner and Provost Pratt. Conley noted that the Strategic Budget Advisory Committee had met once and would be meeting again soon. He presented a slide listing the membership [http://www.unomaha.edu/plan/sbac/inside/members.php].

SVC Hynes noted this is part of a broader process that has been going on for two years. They have keep an eye on national news impacting university budgets. They have benefitted from research on other campuses where a consulting firm (Battelle) has been hired to find efficiencies and the universities (UC Berkeley, U North Carolina) had posted their report on their web site. Hynes noted that the budget is a moving target, and in such cases it is important to be flexible. She noted that when they receive the budget reduction number, it will be necessary to be as ready as they can be to move forward as quickly as they need to move forward at that stage. Hynes noted the Focused Program Reviews parallel what is done by all academic programs every six years similar and have gone forward to Deans or the associate vice chancellor. They will come to her office where they will be an important base for our understanding of our programmatic strengths as we go forward [slide 64 quoted following].

Focused Program Reports – Academic & Student Affairs
• Centrality to mission and strategic plan
• Need, demand and resources
• Quality and impact
• Other unique program dimensions

Essential Services – B&F
• Evaluation of tasks as “essential”, “desirable” or “optional”
• Criteria include: Supports mission, student experience, safety, legal/regulatory, other

Chancellor Christensen noted two additional slides [66 & 67] which were not new but have been used before during prior budget reduction periods.

• Strategies to achieve reduced expenses might include:
  • Maximizing workload productivity
  • Continued restraint in hiring
• Shifting from full-time to part-time staffing, where feasible
• Reducing part-time and/or temporary positions
• Voluntary reduction in hours worked
• Operating budget savings, such as travel
• Focus on essential services
• Organizational changes
• Energy conservation

Budget Guiding Principles
• Minimize impact on students
• Make every effort to retain people
• Decentralized decision-making (college/unit level)…if possible
• Management of class sizes and assigned time
• Continued sound fiscal management to conserve funds
• Continued focus on increasing revenue

The Chancellor stated that whether decentralized decision-making can continue may depend on the magnitude of the budget reduction number.

The floor was opened up to questions submitted in writing. Russ Smith, Associate Professor of Public Administration selected the questions and moderated.

If vertical cuts become part of the solution, will those decisions be made at the campus level, the systems level or by the Board of Regents? The Chancellor replied that depending on the size of the cut it could occur at any of those levels. We do not know now.

While the final budget reductions figures will not be known for quite awhile, won’t the senior decision makers have several reduction plans already on the shelf, and then pull the one that best fits when the time comes? SVC Hynes stated that she was not aware of any budget reduction plans on the shelf at this point, or any plan to do that. A month from now things may be different once we have a clearer picture. They are trying to look at the whole and the pieces within it. The chancellor asked Conley if he had any plans on the shelf and Conley answered no also. Conley continued that this campus has great momentum, we are doing some wonderful things here, a focus needed by the campus is on winning and succeeding, and one way we can minimize whatever the number is, is by growing tuition revenue since those dollars stay on this campus. Anything that we can do to grow the student population is good for this campus. The Chancellor reiterated that he had no back pocket or back drawer plans either. Stability in our enrollment is absolutely critical, and it is also not realistic to think that we can grow ourselves out of this situation either. He believes that the best plan will be that developed by the campus community. SVC Hynes reported that with some one-time funds they were investing in attracting new students to UNO. She further noted that in previous budget reductions, some capability of what helps attract students was lost in order to protect other areas of instruction.

How will you bolster staff morale given several years without raises? The Chancellor noted that it is not easy or possible, but whether or not we can afford not to have raises for staff becomes the question. The topic has been brought up in the President’s Council.

How is UNL funding the tenure buyout retirement option for faculty? What options are being considered to minimize expenses with regards early retirements or early outs? [Two related questions taken together by the moderator.]
Chancellor Christensen said that he did not know how UNL Chancellor Perlman was funding that pilot project other than it was coming from UNL funds. In conversations with the regents this is a program that could have merit, and agreed to use UNL as a pilot and would make a decision later on whether to open it up to other campuses. If it were open to UNO, then how do you fund it, clearly money would be needed to bridge the time until the savings were realized. SVH Hynes answered the second question by noting that what is available at UNO is a phased retirement process (half time appointment for three years with the costs of medical benefits split) which has worked well in her opinion. There are a dozen faculty currently in that process, as many as there have ever been. Each college manages the costs. The chancellor noted in conversations with these faculty that they had appreciated being able to phase out, and not be in one day and out the next.

How are decisions being made about hiring or not, faculty who are replacing faculty in high needs programs? SVC Hynes noted that they had slowed down hiring across every category of faculty and staff, and that there has to be an urgent need case made by the unit to the Dean, then by the Dean to her office, and then by her office to the cabinet. There is not a consistent template that applies in every situation, they are trying to honor the differences in colleges and programs and needs of the communities they serve.

[A group of three.] Are there any protected areas when looking at cuts from the top administration on down? Which colleges are being considered for merger on campus or merger across campuses or a system college such as engineering? Previous cuts have hurt the different campuses differently, some may have more fat left, others are close to the bone; will the Board of Regents consider this in allocating percentage cuts to each of the four campuses? The Chancellor noted that it depends on the magnitude; the Board has the wherewithal to make decisions at that level about how they might allocate funds to the campuses. The mix might change, but only they can answer that question. The study process that Milliken initiated of the discussions within the system on efficiencies is not necessarily being done to say instead of having three colleges of business we will now have one. Instead it was to look at do three colleges of business that are fully subscribed, and cutting two of those results in what? And what are the savings? After that question the result is that it makes no sense. Regarding the first question, the Chancellor noted that there probably are protected areas, but that is what the review process is for. Do you need a general education program for the university – of course you do. Do you need the exact one that we have or are there some variations – yes there are. Nothing is off limits to being considered or altered in some way. AVP Withem noted that President Milliken is a strong believer in the Strategic Framework of the University; there are no protected areas, but the work being done is under that document. [http://nebraska.edu/docs/StrategicFramework.pdf] SVC Hynes noted that one of the benefits of the deans of different campuses having these discussions is that they have discovered areas for continued collaboration. She further noted that the libraries on the four campuses have collaborated for twenty years to further the goals of the university.

[ Two paired.] You showed a slide of UNO’s efforts to cut expenses, any strategies that UNO could do to increase revenues? Whatever happened to the trimester idea; would that help utilize faculty and increase tuition revenue? The
Chancellor noted that the trimester idea would have led to more efficient use of facilities and staff, but had died along the way. It could still become important. SVC Hynes reported that last summer there were 52 different sessions; it is hard to market that variation. She further noted the competitive environment for online education, where students can take a different course every eight weeks. VC pointed out that outside grants brings in additional revenue in the form of F&A.

In past forums, it has been said that the next biennium will be even worse. The addition of Mammel also added significant O&M, so why build a Community Engagement Center now which will only add more O&M? The Chancellor replied that he had addressed some of that at the Convocation. He believes that you can move forward with the agenda that makes a difference with your institution, or you can hunker down and hope it blows over. He thinks the community engagement center is well on its way to being funded and it would be an enormous mistake to hunker down at this point. The Community Engagement Center is less challenging since it will generate revenue, not to completely cover the cost of O&M but certainly to shrink that. Also while it may be said otherwise, the truth is that academic affairs dollars are not used to pay for buildings. Finally there have been discussions at the President’s Council, as to how you can grow your institution when you have a state that does not help you to fund the buildings that in reality they own.

Are there plans for more money to go into Recruitment’s budget, i.e. travel and more access to work with potential students? Recruitment and the admissions counselors are the initial contact for potential students; doesn’t it make sense that more dollars be put into that process? SVC Hynes answered yes. The Chancellor added that one-time money is being used for that purpose, and that a request was made of President Milliken and the board for additional one-time money for recruitment and retention of students.

Could you address thinking on assigned time? Will the faculty be responsible for buying out that fourth class? SVC Hynes answered in some cases yes, and in some cases no. There are some fields where external funding is really not a possibility. That tends to be in the traditional humanities and social sciences although that is not exclusively the case. What we are asking is that everybody look to see where there might be opportunities to help fund research or even teaching. For example the funding for the Thompson Learning Communities is in the teaching category.

What size dollar amount of budget reduction would prompt a declaration of financial exigency? The Chancellor stated that he did not know the answer to that and it would be a board decision. He then asked AVP Kabourek if he could find out and let him know so that it could be posted on the UNO web site. SVC Hynes asked if the question could be expanded as to whether it would be on a campus or a system basis.

The Chancellor closed with several comments. We need to keep talking to one another. We have a over 18,000 people in this community we call UNO with faculty, staff, and students. Universities are places where really smart creative people hang out. We need to ask that population to offer ideas and suggestions. He does not know how we cannot be concerned and take this threat very seriously. At the same time he thinks you can be consumed with worry or anxiety which serves no good purpose. We still do not know exactly what it is that we need to be reacting to. He repeated a statement he made at Convocation. After 10
years of reductions, everything we have left on this campus is something that we value. We are approaching a point where we need to make decisions on what is mission critical to the core of what we do, versus things that are really great to do, nice to do, or what we frankly cannot really afford to do. We do not want to be there, but that is the reality we have seen play out in many other states coast to coast. Given the legislative schedule, there will likely be two more of these forums, one earlier in the next term and one later in the spring. It is always unfortunate that by the time the regents make a call, often times many people are not on campus.

3. **Meeting with Chancellor** was held November 19, 2010.

4. **Enrollment Management Steering Committee** was held November 19, 2010.

   At the invitation of Thomas Wallace, Dr. Richard Mullendore\(^1\) met with a group consisting of mostly the Enrollment Management Steering. Some of his comments and others from that meeting (a formal report from him may be available later).

   The first six weeks on campus are critical for retention and ultimately graduation. Social and academic integration in important at the beginning. Orientation needs to balance the emotional and social support and not overload the student with the academic side. Timing is one issue with only 1 ½ days available. Better to spread out some information over the first year.

   To increase admission yield, a key point to convey during orientation are support services for the first year, and career counseling in the second year.

   UNO does some things right. Mullendore noted that at his meetings with students they were upbeat and candid. It is nice to see our student centered campus, exciting and refreshing versus an R1 institution.

   The best time for orientation is in June, shortly after high schools let out. Transfer student orientation can be in the spring. The students most at risk are those admitted August 1; but they too need a full orientation and should be provided the same material as those attending earlier in the summer.

   International students are different with visas allowing arrival when school begins. Some way needs to be found to do orientation once school begins.

   It was noted that at UNO, graduate student orientation is at the department level.

   Transfer students have orientation waived with sufficient credits. Is a 2 – 4 hour option viable or a required on-line option possible? Mullendore thought that both should be in place; face-to-face is better. On-line is not good for first time full time students.

---

\(^1\) From an email from Rita Henry. “Dr. Mullendore is a Professor of College Student Affairs Administration at the University of Georgia. Prior to moving to the faculty, Mullendore served as the chief student affairs officer at the University of Mississippi and the University of Georgia. He is also a Fellow of the National Resource Center for The First Year Experience and Students in Transition (FYE). Dr. Mullendore, a former president of the National Orientation Directors Association (NODA), is a frequent conference presenter, speaker and consultant on student learning, orientation, parent programs, and transfer students; and he is the author of numerous publications. He was co-editor of the 2005 NASPA book *Partnering with the Parents of Today’s College Students*, co-author of the 2007 booklet *Empowering the Parents of First-Year College Students: A Guide for Success*, and co-author of *Helping Your First-Year College Student Succeed: A Guide for Parents*. Mullendore edited the 1995 and 1998 editions of the Orientation Planning Manual, and was co-editor of the first volume of *Designing Successful Transitions: A Guide for Orienting Students to College*.\right)}
Wallace asked about community service activities in the first year. Beyond orientation, U Georgia has a variety of weekend camps. There is a service week which ties students to the community and to each other. U Utah has a strong service learning program.

Wallace asked about Freshman convocation; Mullendore replied that they were overrated. The time, energy and resources versus what the students get out of it, especially if there are not the resources available. It is better to spend the money on a strong welcome week. Plan activities for commuter students. Get the dorm students away from their video games. Provide food to pull in faculty and staff. Have campus wide picnics and invite students. Not a time for speeches.

Orientation advisory groups usually include faculty for the academics. There are national standards since 1979 for functional areas. The orientation advisory group should look at those standards to see that they are in compliance. AVC Rita Henry has the standards in her office. Need to involve faculty who teach first year students.

The key to retention is engaging the student within the institution. It is easy to focus on the residential student. But what about the other group typified by a 25 year old single mom. How do you keep life from stopping her? Meeting them where they are is a challenge.

Reorientation after 2-3 years in the department. A career center has value to help the student select a career using testing.

Honors reported that they have a 1st year recognition in March. Mullendore noted that the literature supports recognition of these students. They have grown up with ribbons for just showing up. They expect to be recognized.

Parent orientation is also important. Twenty percent of student parents have contacted the university on behalf of their child.

E-mail is not the best way to reach students, even though it is economical. Students see e-mail as old technology and instead are texting. However it is important that they know that the University will be communicating with them by email. The texting by the university is better saved for emergencies. The next wave will be smart phones.


6. **Written Acknowledgements of Resolutions (& Table)**:
On November 11, 2010, Nancy Castilow, Asst. to the Chancellor, wrote in an e-mail:

*The chancellor accepts all three resolutions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Res.#</th>
<th>Date Senate Passed</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Admin Accept</th>
<th>Sent for Senate Action</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Deferred</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Final Action/Resolved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3067</td>
<td>11/10/10</td>
<td>Conflict of Interest (COI) Committee</td>
<td>11/11/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chancellor Accepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3066</td>
<td>11/10/10</td>
<td>Proposed Ph.D. Degree in Exercise Science</td>
<td>11/11/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chancellor Accepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3065</td>
<td>11/10/10</td>
<td>Proposed B.S. degree in Public Health</td>
<td>11/11/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chancellor Accepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Action Date</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3033</td>
<td>5/12/10</td>
<td>Instruction on the Ethical Use of Print and Online Sources in Academic Papers</td>
<td>5/27/10</td>
<td>x*</td>
<td>*Chancellor acknowledges that the subject matter is primarily an Academic Affairs issue and has asked Vice Chancellor Hynes to respond as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3013       | 3/10/10  | Recommended Plagiarism Policy                                                                       | 3/18/10     | x*     | -Returned to Faculty Senate for additional language consideration as discussed at the 3/17 meeting with administration.  
-Relative to the minor language changes on 3013 (Plagiarism), the chancellor indicates that he would like Academic Affairs to share the policy with the academic deans at an upcoming meeting. |
| 3004       | 10/14/09 | Parking Issues (Events Calendar)                                                                     | X*          |        |                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 3003       | 10/14/09 | Regarding Stem Cell Research                                                                         | X*          |        | F.S. sent to all on 1014/09                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 2944       | 1/4/09   | UCRCA Funding                                                                                        | X*          |        |                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 2931       | 11/12/08 | “Shots Fired: When Lightning Strikes” Video                                                           | X*          |        | Senate in-progress following report                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 2930       | 11/12/08 | Park-and-Ride/Park-and-Bike System of Transportation or Other Transportation Alternatives        | Senate Working on | X*     |                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 2928       | 10/8/08  | Electronic Communication                                                                              | X*          |        |                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 2909       | 5/14/08  | UNO Disaster Planning                                                                                 | Senate to Comm | X*     | Return to Senate for further work                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 2899       | 4/9/08   | UNO Child Care Center                                                                                 | Senate Deferred | X*     | 2009 Retreat Item                                                                                                                                                                                    |

*3033 (From Chancellor Christensen via Nancy Castilow in an e-mail sent on 5/27/10: “While he is supportive of Res. 3033, he acknowledges that the subject matter is primarily an Academic Affairs issue and has asked Vice Chancellor Hynes to respond as appropriate.”)  
*3013 (From Chancellor Christensen via Nancy Castilow in an e-mail sent on 3/11/10) “The chancellor said the first resolution” (3013) “needs to be considered by Terry” (Hynes) . . . (From Chancellor Christensen via Nancy Castilow in an e-mail sent on 4/21/10: Relative to the minor language changes on 3013 (Plagiarism), the chancellor indicates that he would like Academic Affairs to share the policy with the academic deans at an upcoming meeting.)  
*3013 (From Chancellor Christensen via Nancy Castilow in an e-mail sent on 3/11/10) “The chancellor said the first resolution” (3013) “needs to be considered by Terry” (Hynes) . . . (From Chancellor Christensen via Nancy Castilow in an e-mail sent on 4/21/10: Relative to the minor language changes on 3013 (Plagiarism), the chancellor indicates that he would like Academic Affairs to share the policy with the academic deans at an upcoming meeting.)  
*3004 (From Chancellor Christensen via Nancy Castilow in an e-mail sent on 10/15/09: “The chancellor will discuss the resolution with Vice Chancellor Conley and Tim Kaldahl, University Relations.”)  
*3003 (From Chancellor Christensen via Nancy Castilow in an e-mail sent on 10/15/09: “While the Chancellor has not taken a public position on this matter, he suggests that, should the Faculty Senate wish to do so, this resolution could be forwarded to Donal
Burns, BOR Corporation Secretary, to document Senate support.” (This was done by the UNO Faculty Senate on 10/14/09)

*2961 (From Chancellor Christensen via Nancy Castilow in an e-mail sent on 4/0/09: “The chancellor acknowledges receipt of the resolutions, but suggests that the Senate may want to make a call to Central Administration to inquire about the existence of the U-Wide Benefits Committee, under whose auspices, this might normally fall. There may be no need to establish a separate task force if this committee, or a subgroup, is active, and would entertain an examination of the existing disability benefit procedure.”) (The Faculty Senate Admin Tech notified the UNO rep to that committee, David Corbin, on 4/9/09. He replied on 4/12/09: “The NU Benefits Committee will be meeting on April 16. I will bring the two resolutions to their attention. It does seem that the Benefits Committee should be able to handle the issues without a new committee, but I’ll wait and see what kind of response I get.”)

*2944 (From the EC & Admin Mtg 1/21/09: The Chancellor supports the concept in Resolution 2944 on funding an UCRCA budget line but opined we wouldn’t get it during the years of budgetary problems.) 6/10/09 Nancy Castilow wrote for Chanc. Christensen: “One clarification related to Res. 2944, dealing with ongoing support of the UCRCA budget. I said that I was open to the concept and supportive of continued funding of the UCRCA budget, albeit we would need to review its funding during times of budget constraints, as we do with other such programs. The decision to fund and how much to fund remains the purview of the Office of Academic Affairs. I did not opine that the UCRCA budget line would automatically see no funding during years of budgetary problems.”)

*2931 (From the EC & Admin Mtg 1/21/09: Senator Sollars gave Wade Robinson a list of faculty willing and qualified to comment on “Shots Fired” While Robinson says all the feedback he has received has been positive, faculty senators reported that students who had viewed the video were not impressed.) (From Wade Robinson via e-mail on 2/16/09: “The Shots Fired issue is resolved based on the wording listed.”) (From Chancellor Christensen via Nancy Castilow in an e-mail sent on 2/20/09: Acknowledge receipt of resolution and list of faculty educators to Assoc. VC Wade Robinson. Robinson reports that presentations to large campus groups is essentially completed with no further presentations scheduled. No additional action required.) (From Wade Robinson via e-mail on 2/24/09: “Based on the information you gave me I have contacted a person at NASP to learn more about their PREPaRE program and learn about the program structure and costs. I have also contacted De. Scott Pollard to get program and cost information as well and hope to hear from both in the near future. I will also be communicating the UNO faculty you provided as well.”)

9/2/09: As a recently appointed member of the UNO Disaster Preparedness Committee, Past-President Suzanne Sollars will be sent to training to be certified, as are the other members of the committee, by the National Incident Management System (NIMS). It is affiliated with FEMA and provides a standardized structure for organizations to coordinate incident management.

*2930 (At the EC & Admin Mtg 11/19/08: VC Conley said that there were a number of components of Resolution 2930, as written, that needed further consideration.) (At the EC & Admin Mtg 1/21/09: Vice Chancellor Conley reported that B. J. Reed was working with MAT and that there will be an integrated campus parking plan. The Regents will be asked to extend the contract with Crossroads. There was some discussion of providing bicycles for students to go between campuses.) (From Chancellor Christensen via Nancy Castilow in an e-mail sent on 2/20/09: Acknowledge receipt and forward to Vice Chancellor Conley for additional review and implementation as feasible.)

*2928 (From 10/15/2008 EC & Adm Mtg: Chancellor Christensen said he would bring up Senate Resolution 2928, 10/08/08, concerning seeking alternatives to Lotus Notes, with the President’s Council. John Fiene is aware of the problems and supports the direction suggested in the resolution.) Follow-up by Sollars via e-mail: “Chancellor Christensen brought the matter to President Milliken who concurred with the Lotus Notes problem, but said the matter needed to be deferred until after SIS implementation.”

*2909 6/20/08 EC&A Mtg: Associate Vice Chancellor Robinson discussed Emergency Planning and asked about the creation of a faculty committee that can assist the administration in planning for the continuation of academic programs in crisis situations. Senate will need to determine in there is a specific senate committee that could do this or if there is a need to develop a committee outside the senate. See Minutes of Exec Committee and Cabinet 7/9/2008 for further information: See Minutes of Exec Committee and Cabinet 7/9/2008 for further information: http://www.unomaha.edu/facsen/minutes/2008_2009/08_7_minutes.php

9/2/09: As a recently appointed member of the UNO Disaster Preparedness Committee, Past-President Suzanne Sollars will be sent to training to be certified, as are the other members of the committee, by the National Incident Management System (NIMS). It is affiliated with FEMA and provides a standardized structure for organizations to coordinate incident management.

*2899 EC&A Mtg April 16, 2008. The Chancellor responded to the Senate’s recently passed resolution regarding the University’s day-care facility. He was primarily concerned about the Senate’s recommendation that UNO develop a lab school as part of the day-care facility, since this represents a significant departure from what the university is doing and would require a substantial investment of resources. He pointed out that the original goal was to develop a day-care that would meet national accreditation standards. The differences between day-care and preschool curricula and facilities was discussed. The administration agreed to provide the Senate with information about the current day-care operation and also agreed to work with the Senate and Student Government to explore the issue if that is desired.

IV. Standing Committee Reports

A. Committee on Academic and Curricular Affairs: Senator Bartle reported the committee met November 22, 2010 and convened at 2:03 p.m.

Steve Bullock, Assistant Vice-Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs visited the Committee to discuss assessment processes at UNO. Steve made the following points:
Factors that drive assessment at UNO:

- Internal improvement: The main goal is to use the data for action, so helping units identify potential areas of improvement where they can take action is a central goal.
- Board of Regents initiatives: The Board requires each campus to measure learning assessment (See: [http://nebraska.edu/docs/StrategicFramework.pdf](http://nebraska.edu/docs/StrategicFramework.pdf), Goal 6-G).
- Public accountability: To be accountable to the public, students, parents and other stakeholders, it is important to know how well our students are learning and areas of potential improvement.
- Institutional and professional accreditation.

Relevant components of assessment at UNO:

- Assessment reports for units and pilot general education assessment in 2009. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is a measure of student perception. Steve and the Committee are working to tie it to learning outcomes. Data has been gathered from 2005, 2007 and 2009. It will be gathered in 2010 to get on cycle with the other campuses. Previously it was a sample of freshmen and seniors; now it will be the full population of these groups.
- Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)—spring testing of seniors. This spring, it will examine those who took it as freshman which offers an opportunity to see how this group changed in their time at UNO.
- There are significant pockets of effective assessment (e.g., Communication, English)
- Various surveys that indirectly measure student satisfaction (e.g., NSSE, graduation surveys, etc.)

Major issues going forward:

- Increase in attention placed upon assessment by accrediting agencies
- Inconsistencies across campus in collecting data
- BOR seems to be more attuned to student learning outcomes. Assessment will become universal for all departments. Will need to articulate and demonstrate learning outcomes.
- The assessment of general education. As we move to a new model of general education who will assess it and how?
- Allocation of resources: Assessment is time consuming; how much more effort should be spent on it. Are there other approaches such as sampling student papers or other pieces of work? We will need to work on correlating assessment with educational processes.

UNO Assessment Committee
The current composition of the Committee is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFAM</th>
<th>IS&amp;T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shereen Bingham</td>
<td>Peter Wolcott</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Steve would like to expand this committee, so if others are interested, please contact him.

In the discussion, one of the issues raised was the relatively decentralized nature of assessment at UNO. In part, this is the result of differing professional norms. Steve made the point that over time, faculty generally self-correct if the data shows that students are not getting what they need. So the evolutionary nature of the process is accepted. Overall, the most important part of this process is to show how the data is being used to improve programs.

Another question was about assessment at the graduate level for programs in fields without accrediting standards. At this time this is not an issue.

There being no other business, the Committee adjourned at 2:50 pm.


Writing Center update:
This is the second in a series of information gathering efforts by ER&S on the needs and issues facing the learning centers (Math-Science, Writing and Speech).

Prof. Nora Bacon, Director of the Writing Center, presented an overview of the Writing Center. The Writing Center:

- provides individual consultations to writers at any stage of the writing process.
- provides workshops for classes (examples: writing summaries or business reports) and for the campus community (examples: citing sources or preparing for the GRE writing exam).
- houses the Writing Across the Curriculum initiative.

Staffing:
For this semester, the Writing Center consulting staff consists of 11 Teaching Assistants (each TA is a graduate student in English Department, devoting 10 hours per week to the Writing Center in addition to teaching one class), an English faculty member serving as Graduate Consultant (with a .25 assignment) and a professional writing consultant (7.5 hours a week). In addition, one English instructor volunteers for 1 hour on Friday mornings.

There are two half-time directors and two student workers. The student workers serve as part-time receptionists, managing the traffic into and out of the center.

To provide continuous improvement in services, the staff meets weekly to discuss Writing Center pedagogy and to address issues that arise in consultations.

Clients:
The number of clients has been rising every year and currently, the Writing Center serves about 1,400 clients per semester. Most (85%-90%) are students with
writing assignments while the rest are faculty writing research papers and proposals wanting a fresh pair of eyes to review their work.

Many students do not identify their majors. Of those that do, majority come from Arts and Sciences (31%), Education (19%), Business Administration (15%), Public Affairs & Community Service (15%) and Information Science & Technology (11%). There is also a small number of students from UNMC. Half of the consultations are with bilingual students.

The Writing Center works by appointment. Clients sign up online (http://www.unomaha.edu/writingcenter/appointment.php) for an available 30- or 60-minute slot with one of the consulting staff. Drop-in consulting is also offered at the Criss Library. In Fall 2009, there were 1,209 appointment-based consultations and 221 drop-in consultations. The number of appointments is expected to increase with the opening of the satellite location at Mammel Hall 134K this fall.

**Student reception:**

A survey is administered every semester to gauge clients’ satisfaction. In the Spring 2010 survey, 93% (82 out of 88 respondents) indicated that they were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their consultations. About 60% were return clients.

**Funding sources:**

The Writing Center is mostly funded through Program of Excellence funds. The Office of Graduate Studies provides funds to support the Graduate Consultant and the Center for Faculty Development provides funds for the January Writing Across the Curriculum seminar. The College of Arts and Sciences provides funds for additional consulting hours. The English Department contributes FTE for the director and assistant director (0.5 FTE each) in addition to staff assistance.

Staffing is not adequate to meet demands. For 10 weeks of the semester, students had to be turned away because the consulting schedule is full. More consultants are needed to fully staff both locations, extend weekend hours and add evening hours in the residence halls. The Center is looking into the possibility of training undergraduate consultants. Senator Rech also suggested to tap Secondary Education majors.

The Writing Center is heavily supported by the College of Arts and Sciences, primarily, the English Department. Increased levels of staffing can also be made possible if the budget were supplemented by contributions from other colleges served by the Center.

**Faculty Role:**

Prof. Bacon recommends the following steps for faculty to maximize the value of the Writing Center:

- Send students to the Writing Center, whether by adding a paragraph to your syllabus, by scheduling an orientation – in your classroom or in the Writing Center – or by referring individual students.
- Explain that the Writing Center is NOT a proofreading service and is NOT a “remedial” service. It helps to point out that graduate students and faculty members come to the Writing Center for feedback on papers being prepared for publication.
- If you require that every student come to the Writing Center with a draft, let us know, and please send a copy of your assignment. (There are weeks when we can accommodate 30 or 40 students from one class and weeks when we can’t.)
- If you want to know that a student has visited the Writing Center, ask the student
to request a report. Consultants write a brief report about every consultation, but these are forwarded to instructors only at the request of the client.

- Browse the Writing Center website; familiarize yourself with the Resources for Writers and the Faculty Resources.

**Upcoming Activities for Faculty:**

- Writing Across the Curriculum seminar, January 4-5, 2011.
- Camp Completion, sometime in May 2011. This is a week-long writers’ retreat being planned after the Spring semester. The purpose is to clear a week for writing and bring work in progress to the finish line. Faculty and advanced graduate students working on articles for publication are invited. The Writing Center staff will provide encouragement and coffee.

**Conclusion:**

The Writing Center provides a valuable resource for all UNO students and faculty. Its effectiveness stems from the one-on-one consultation strategy employed, as every writing assignment is, by nature, different. At the same time, staffing concerns need to be addressed to continue meeting the needs of a growing clientele.

**Discussion of SWOT items:**

The committee discussed the SWOT items identified during the August Senate retreat to see if there are other relevant items to include in our agenda. One item identified is to look into the educational resources needed to support distance education. The technological aspects can be discussed when we meet again with Lanyce Keel from Information Services in the spring.

Our next meeting will be on January 26, 2010, 2-3pm. Karen Dwyer and Marlina Davidson will provide updates on the Speech Center.

**C. Committee on Faculty Personnel and Welfare:** Senator Erickson reported the committee met November 22, 2010. Those present: (Committee) Carballal, Erickson, Melanson, Proulx, and Srithongrung.

Items discussed:

1. **Faculty Development Fellowships (FDF) policy**
   We have decided to ask Senator Hendricks to take the lead on this problem. He has knowledge about the issues, and is particularly passionate about the potential for problems this policy may cause if continued indefinitely. Senator Srithongrung has agreed to assist Senator Hendricks should it be necessary.

2. **Domestic Partnership Resolution**
   We engaged in an extended discussion of this problem. There is agreement among a majority of the committee that Faculty Personnel and Welfare should draft a new resolution that is more in line with the recently passed UNL resolution on domestic partnership benefits. We have written a draft copy of the resolution which we will bring to the Executive Committee and Cabinet on December 1 for discussion as a prelude to a more complete version which we will attempt to finish in the December committee meeting, for presentation to Faculty Senate in early Spring, 2011.

3. **Tenure clock pause for pregnancy or tenure clock pauses for other reasons, and pregnancy as disability.**
   We will explore the separate problems of employee education and language revision in later meetings of this committee.

4. **Proposal for a Total Smoking Ban on UNO campus**
   We will discuss this issue at a later meeting.
5. Employee Plus One Benefits:

The following resolution is a draft only. The committee will continue to work on this resolution.

WHEREAS, Nebraska Revised Statute 85-106 gives the NU Board of Regents the power “to equalize and provide uniform benefits for all present and future employees…” and restricting non-dependent beneficiaries to legally married spouses unfairly provides lesser benefits to those employees in non-married cohabitation relationships and those employees not in cohabitation relationships;

WHEREAS, the University of Nebraska has no interest in legislating which forms of relationship are legitimate and ought to be privileged,

WHEREAS, any attempt to define which forms of relationship are to receive preference will in practice be inherently unfair,

WHEREAS, any attempt to provide sufficient evidence that one is engaged in a designated relationship will produce unequal burdens of proof,

WHEREAS, the University of Nebraska derives no more benefit from providing health care coverage to individuals who cohabitate with an employee than to any other individual deemed worthy by an employee to share in the employee’s benefits,

WHEREAS, the nation is aging and many employees might prefer to use their fair share of the university benefits to cover an aging parent, sibling, or friend,

WHEREAS, expanding the scope of those covered by health insurance policies is seen to be in the national interest,

WHEREAS, expansion of benefits to any designated adult would be an attractive draw for recruiting and retaining faculty and staff in order to remain competitive in both university and private industry markets;

WHEREAS, at least 83% of Fortune 100 companies and at least 59% of Fortune 500 companies offer some form of employee plus 1 health care benefits (as of 2009; Human Rights Campaign);

Therefore be it resolved that the UNO faculty senate:

Requests that the NU Board of Regents create a “Plus One” category of beneficiary and incorporate this into the benefits package for all NU employees.

Each employee will be able to designate one and only one Plus One beneficiary during the coverage period. A Plus One beneficiary is an individual over 18 whom the primary beneficiary chooses to designate prior to or during the coverage period.

The meeting ended at approximately 3:00pm. Next meeting: December 15, 2010

D. Committee on Goals and Directions: Senator Marx reported the committee met on November 18, 2010. Members present: Lewis, Lomneth, Marx, Kelly. Excused: Anderson, O’Connell.

The committee met with AAUP president David Corbin to discuss how shared governance works at UNO. While there is no formal definition of shared governance, there appears to be an agreement between the Union and the Administration as to what shared governance is and how it should be implemented, although Dr. Corbin pointed out that there have been conflicts in the past in the implementation of shared governance. For the AAUP, shared governance is addressed in two ways: the contract and the “meet and confer” meeting that happens once a month between the executive
officers of the Union and the Administration. Most of the discussions have to do with following agreed-upon procedures, and the AAUP sets the meeting’s agenda. The Administration can choose to ignore the advice of the AAUP (and FS committees), but is bound to being fair. The areas where faculty should normally be considered for consultation are working conditions, the ability to improve the education of students, the curriculum, hiring, and the use of buildings.

The Goals and Directions committee will next decide if and what resolutions may be necessary on this issue, which will most likely begin with a new definition of shared governance.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00. The next G&D meeting has not yet been scheduled.

E. Committee on Professional Development: Senator Benjamin-Alvarado reported members of the Professional Development committee attended the "Engaged Scholarship and Promotion and Tenure" presentations by Dr. Diane Doberneck of Michigan State University on November 19, 2010. The committee will be reviewing the materials provided at the presentation and will begin writing a faculty senate resolution on the role of the scholarship of engagement at UNO in January 2011. Senator Benjamin-Alvarado has submitted his resignation from the Faculty Senate and a new Chairperson for the Committee will be selected.

F. Committee on Rules: Senator Barone moved the following two resolutions for the committee. They will be sent to the full Senate next week.

RESOLUTION: Commencement Committee

BE IT RESOLVED, that the following faculty member be appointed to the Commencement Committee for a term of one year (11/1/10-10/31/11):

Bill Corcoran.

RESOLUTION: Technology Resources & Services, University Committee on

BE IT RESOLVED, that since Timi Barone (08/01/09 through 07/31/12 term) and Harvey Siy (08/01/10 through 07/31/13 term) must temporarily step down from the University Committee on Technology Resources & Services, the following two names go forward to serve on the committee until May 2011:

Mark Leonard (temporarily replaces Timi Barone),
TBA (temporarily replaces Harvey Siy).

V. Non-Senate Committee Reports

A. Academic Freedom Coalition of Nebraska (AFCON): Senator Mitchell attended the annual meeting. The slate of candidates for next year’s board was announced.

B. American Association of University Professors (AAUP): Senator Mitchell
reported the AAUP is still in negotiations for the next contract.

C. **Commencement Committee:** Professor Bill Corcoran submitted that in previous meetings the Commencement Committee decided for very good reasons to go ahead with planning on having the May 2011 Commencement on campus.

This necessitates having the different colleges having their ceremonies at different location and over different time periods. For example, Arts and Sciences and the College of Business Administration, the two largest colleges, would have theirs on Caniglia Field at different time periods.

Much of the concern at the meeting was about coordinating the flow of automobile traffic and the flow of people between ceremonies over the day of commencement. This problem appears to be especially knotted if there is inclement weather. Most of the discussion involved unraveling these problems.

There was also a request by the Chair for suggestions on who should be the commencement speaker. A few were mentioned and I am willing to deliver to the committee any more suggestions from the EC&C.

D. **Graduate Council:** Professor Jeanette Harder submitted the following report.

(UNO Graduate College has 45 graduate programs, 8 doctoral programs, 19 graduate certificates, and 3,000 graduate students)

Website: [www.unomaha.edu/graduate](http://www.unomaha.edu/graduate)

Graduate Council met on 11-8-2010

**Issues discussed:**
- Would like increased and more consistent UCRCA graduate student research support. Graduate Studies welcomes more applications.
- Graduate Studies welcomes more applications for graduate student travel support.
- Working on Graduate Assistant report.
- Spring 2011 admissions are down, especially in the area of non-degree students.
- A group is meeting on recruitment/promotion of graduate education.

**Important dates:**
- Fall Graduate Faculty meeting, Monday, December 6, 2010 @ 2:30, MBSC, Dodge Room
- Elton S. Carter Graduate Honors Reception, Wednesday, March 16, 2011 @ 5:00, MBSC, Ballroom
- Spring Graduate Faculty meeting, Monday, April 25, 2011, @ 2:30, MBSC, Dodge Room.

VI. **New Business**

A. Senator Benjamin-Alvarado submitted his resignation, effective December 31, 2010, from the Faculty Senate due to taking on additional responsibilities in his field. Senator Barone moved to reluctantly accept his resignation. Senator Bartle seconded. The A&S senators will caucus to fill his senatorial position. President Laquer will appoint a replacement Secretary/Treasurer.

B. The Senate President-Elect election at next week’s meeting was discussed.

C. Topics for the next Executive Committee and Administration meeting on December
15, were discussed and approved. The topic will involve Research at UNO. AVC for Research Scott Snyder will be invited to the meeting, as the logical person to answer questions on research. The following are a few of the questions approved:

- Goal – Doubling of external grant funding to $24 million by 2020. How are we moving toward that?
- How does the potential shut-down of Federal Earmark funds impact that process (OWH Nov 30)?
- What sorts of strategies need to be employed?
- Undergraduate vs. Graduate research priorities. What is the balance?

D. It was decided we will ask that President Milliken speak (12/8/2010) (10-15 minutes to speak, 10 minutes for questions) on, “What changes does he foresee in Higher Education in the next ten years and how does he see UNO meeting those?”

E. There was a very short discussion on the Constituency meeting, held with the Chancellor a day or so before each Board of Regents meeting.

F. Tracy Bridgeford, chairperson of the University Committee on Technology Resources & Services, asked if the Faculty Senate Coordinator, Sue Bishop, could send a survey to the entire faculty through an e-mail list available to the Coordinator and a few others in Academic Affairs. The EC&C decided that if the Faculty Senate was to send anything out to that list, it would need to be vetted by the Faculty Senate.

VII. The meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m., with announcements.