Wednesday, November 14, 2012, 2 p.m., MBSC Chancellors Room


Excused:  Beard, Chao, Guo, Kwak, Maring, Means, Petrow, Williams

Absent:  Morris, Roland

Presentation:  Bill Conley, VC for Business & Finance (Parking Status and Plan on UNO Campus)

I.  The meeting was called to order by President P. Smith at 2:30 p.m.

II. The Minutes of October 10, 2012, were approved as submitted.

III. Officers’ Reports

A. President’s Report:  Senator P. Smith reported

1. The Executive Committee & Administration met October 17, 2012.

Members present:  Christensen, Morrice, Reed, Conley, Shipp, Melanson, Bacon, Rech, Smith

Senate President’s items:

• Parking concerns including availability and safety were addressed by Mr Conley, Vice Chancellor for Business & Finance. He will visit the full Faculty Senate meeting in November. Mr. Conley stressed the importance of alerting his office or Campus Security of any specific safety issues.

BJ Reed discussed the move from .25 to .20 for part-time faculty members as a means of recognizing more accurately the work of full time faculty. Senator Melanson reviewed the concerns raised by Faculty Senators. Dr. Reed will issue present a written document outlining his beliefs that this move is only being implemented to recognize the amount of time/effort put forth by full time faculty.

• Photographs of faculty award recipients have been hung as requested in Resolution 4023

• When we brought up Res 1054 Senator M. Bacon suggested that a more accurate response from the Chancellor would be that he rejected it because, according to the Chancellor, legal counsel was of the opinion that it was not a matter of concern of the AAUP. He agreed to rewrite his response. If the policy affects current employees in a negative way, then there are two grievance procedures through which faculty may pursue redress.

• Discussion about the enrollment initiative (20,000 by 2020) was discussed. BJ Reed feels that faculty members have much to offer and is anxious to find
ways to increase their input on this initiative. Dan Gilbert will be working with BJ Reed to get input, ideas, and concerns from faculty.

Chancellor’s items:

- Chancellor Christensen discussed the enrollment goals in terms of the Board of Regents metrics. He stated that this is part of a strategic goal with accompanying resources required to meet the goal. Senator Bacon suggested that this goal should be incorporated into the work of the University Strategic Planning Steering Committee. Chancellor Christensen agreed and that by spring, there will have been enough work on the process to include this initiative in the strategic planning process.

- The Chancellor discussed the ideas of looking at the year-round calendar. He hopes that discussions with faculty and others will identify issues and concerns. BJ Reed stressed that this initiative is not intended to change workload. It is designed to make better use of resources and facilities. This may also have implications for how we classify faculty, from research only to teaching only.

2. **President Met with the Chancellor** on October 18, 2012.
   a. Discussed proposed changes in academic calendar. The Chancellor stressed that this will be voluntary, based on the needs and best interests of students and faculty, and with the opportunity to take full advantage of resources and facilities on a year-round basis.
   b. Reviewed the upcoming presentation to the Board of Regents about the possibility of constructing a sports arena on the campus. The Chancellor stressed that this would enhance opportunities for students to be more engaged in campus life and also offer a wealth of opportunities for the community to use campus facilities.
   c. We discussed the continued Senate concern about the background check policy. We made sure that this would be addressed at the next EC&A meeting.

3. **Chancellor’s Council** met October 25, 2012. There was no presentation at the Chancellor’s Council.
   The Roundtable discussion included information from Chancellor Christensen about campus initiatives including the upcoming proposal to the Board of Regents to enter into a letter of intent with developers for construction of an arena at the University of Nebraska at Omaha campus.
   Additional information was provided about Graduate Studies, benefits enrollment, Senator Hagel’s visit to campus, media studio opportunities, robotics interactive exhibit at the Strategic Air & Space Museum, enrollment management activities, the move by the basketball team to the new Ralston Arena, College of Education initiative to recognize and honor military veterans, and the use of Digital Measures.
   The Chancellor’s Council was reminded of upcoming visits to the Faculty Senate by members of the Administrative team. Dan Gilbert will visit the Faculty Senate Executive council and Cabinet meeting in December. Bill Conley will meet with the Faculty Senate in November, and Dan Shipp will visit with the Faculty Senate in December.

4. **Board of Regents** met October 26, 2012.
   **Committee Meeting**
   Friday, October 26
   8:30 AM
Business Affairs Committee
1. Chancellor Christensen and Trev Alberts led a discussion about a University of Nebraska at Omaha Arena. Information was presented showing how this would make the campus more accessible and enhance student engagement. It would help in recruiting and retention and help anchor the south campus to the University. It would help with the long-term financial stability and this letter of intent will allow UNO and Scott Woodbury Wiegert (S2W) to work together to begin raising private funding for the project.
2. Implications of Federal Sequestration (across-the-board federal funding reductions set to begin in January 2013) were discussed. These cuts would impact student financial aid and federal research opportunities. Action will probably be taken after the elections.
3. Energy efficiency efforts at the University of Nebraska were reviewed. Each campus outlined campus initiatives. UNO efforts include upgrades in campus lighting. Annual savings in kilowatt hours and dollars were presented.
4. Manter Hall and UNL Life Sciences Teaching Facilities upgrades were presented.

Academic Affairs Committee
1. Federal Pell grant program changes and impact on Collegebound Nebraska was presented. Recent federal changes including reduction of awards, number of eligible participants, and reduced amounts per students were presented.
2. Robert Hinson presented information about the National Strategic Research Institute (NSRI) and the University Affiliated Research Center (UARC). The Board of Regents approved the creation of the NSRI June 2012. The Mission, organizational structure, tasks, and vision were reviewed.
3. Campus Updates from Student Regents. Presenters Eric Kamler, UNL, Devin Bertelsen, UNO, Cameron Deter, UNK, and Faisal Ahmed, UNMC discussed student initiative and activities. Regent Bertelson from UNO discussed academic program updates, student accomplishments, student centered mission, student newsletter, and student government vision of campus growth. She invited all the regents to visit UNO.
4. An update on student enrollment and a review of the Board of Regents undergraduate enrollment growth metrics was presented. Undergraduate enrollment by campus and University system, enrollment changes, freshmen retention, transfers, nonresident enrollment, international enrollment, top 25% high school students, and online distance only students.
5. Information related to the Rural Futures Initiative was presented. This initiative supports rural development and represents a successful strategy for increased production efficiency. Discussion included the 2008 external review and groundwork for past two years. The use of focus groups, Rural Futures Conference, vision, mission, guiding principles, and immediate steps in Phase I were discussed.

AGENDA
THE BOARD OF REGENTS
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA
Varner Hall, 3835 Holdrege Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68583-0745
Friday, October 26, 2012
12:00 p.m.
UNIVERSITY CONSENT AGENDA
A. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
1. Request for approval of Outside Employment at the University of Nebraska at Kearney for Timothy Obermier Addendum VIII-A-1 APPROVED
2. Request for approval of Outside Employment for Samuel J. Meisels, Executive Director of the Buffet Early Childhood Institute Addendum VIII-A-2 APPROVED

B. BUSINESS AFFAIRS
1. Approve appointment of two members to the Board of Directors of The Nebraska Medical Center: Harold M. Maurer, M.D. from January 1, 2013 to June 30, 2013, and James E. McClurg for a term from January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2015 Addendum VIII-B-1 APPROVED

UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA
A. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
1. Approval is requested to establish the Rural Futures Institute at the University of Nebraska Addendum IX-A-1 APPROVED
2. Approval is requested to create a Bachelor of Science degree in Applied Climate Science in the School of Natural Resources in the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Addendum IX-A-2 APPROVED
3. Approval is requested to establish the Center for Urban Sustainability at the University of Nebraska at Omaha Addendum IX-A-3 APPROVED

B. BUSINESS AFFAIRS
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
1. Approve the Program Statement and Budget for Brace Laboratory Renovation at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Addendum IX-B-1 APPROVED
2. Approve the attached Resolution to authorize expenditure of up to $1,966,468 for capital improvements for the Nebraska Unions and University Housing facilities from the Replacement Fund of the Student Fees and Facilities Revenue Bonds at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Addendum IX-B-2 APPROVED
3. Approve the Resolution to authorize the expenditure of up to $700,000 from the Surplus Fund of the UNL Parking Revenue Bonds to improve certain property and equipment Addendum IX-B-3 APPROVED
4. Approve the development team of America First Real Estate Group, LLC, the project scope for the mixed-use component of the 18th and R Parking Garage at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and the associated Ground Lease and Guaranteed Annual Payment and Excess Gross Revenue Sharing Agreement Addendum IX-B-4 APPROVED
5. Approve acceptance of a gift of audio/video equipment for the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Hendricks Complex Addendum IX-B-5 APPROVED
6. Approve acceptance of a gift of Software License for the University of Nebraska-Lincoln College of Education and Human Sciences Department of Textiles, Merchandising & Fashion Design Addendum IX-B-6 APPROVED
7. Approve the Encroachment Easement Agreement with the Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission for the East Campus Recreation Center at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Addendum IX-B-7 APPROVED

University of Nebraska at Omaha
8. Approve the Purchase Agreement by and between NS-The Heritage, L.L.C., the Papio-Missouri River Natural Resources District and the Board
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of Regents for approximately 76 acres adjacent to University of Nebraska at Omaha’s Glacier Creek Preserve Addendum IX-B-8 APPROVED

9. Authorize the President of the University to enter into a letter of intent with developers for construction of an arena at the University of Nebraska at Omaha Addendum IX-B-9 APPROVED

University of Nebraska Medical Center

10. Approve the Interlocal Agreement with Douglas County, Nebraska, for funding in the amount of $500,000 annually for ten (10) years for the Comprehensive Cancer Center Project Addendum IX-B-10 APPROVED

11. Approve the Interlocal Agreement with the City of Omaha, Nebraska, for funding in the amount of $35,000,000 for the Comprehensive Cancer Center Addendum IX-B-11 APPROVED

5. Deans Forum Summary, as of November 13, 2012, it is still only updated to May 2012. [link]

6. Written Acknowledgements for Resolutions: On October 25, 2012, Nancy Castilow, Assistant to the Chancellor, e-mailed:

   Relative to Resolution 4054, the Chancellor cannot support this resolution; as was discussed at a 10/25 AAUP meeting, the AAUP agrees that they have no jurisdiction over background checks as those affected are not part of the bargaining unit until they are hired and these checks occur pre-hiring.

2012-2013 Resolution Action Table
(Action Pending and Current 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>4062</td>
<td>10/10/13</td>
<td>Replacement on Technology Resources &amp; Services, University Committee on</td>
<td>10/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The chancellor supports and acknowledges receiving the resolutions for the purpose of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>4054</td>
<td>7/11/12</td>
<td>Determine Contractual Implications of Background Check Policy (w/participation of bargaining unit and Central Admin.)</td>
<td>9/6/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The chancellor acknowledges receipt of the resolution and has provided the legal opinion requested.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chancellor cannot support this resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3079</td>
<td>3/9/11</td>
<td>Shared Governance</td>
<td>4/15/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not supported. Chancellor’s Comment: “While I continue to be an advocate for shared governance, I will not support 3079, as I am unable to support any resolution which defines the role and responsibilities of the University’s governing board, the office of the chancellor, or other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED FORWARD
*4054*(Legal Opinion): From: John C. Hewitt [mailto:jhewitt@clinewilliams.com]; Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 9:11 PM; To: Ed Wimes; Subject: Background Checks.

Ed,

In a response to my email of July 14, you have indicated that at this time you anticipate that the “background check” at the University of Nebraska at Omaha will consist of the University reviewing public records (i.e., sex offender registry, criminal convictions, etc.) for applicants for employment. Based on the foregoing you have inquired whether such an approach would constitute a mandatory subject of bargaining.

The simple answer is that the University could, in my opinion, proceed to implement such an approach for applicants without any discussions. The obligation to bargain in good faith concerning mandatory subjects is generally limited to the current employees of an employer. There is generally no obligation to negotiate concerning prospective employees. *Star Tribune*, 295 NLRB 543 (1989).

If there remains any discussion about expanding such an approach to current employees, then the answer becomes more complicated. Nevertheless, I do not believe that the University would be required to bargain over the decision to review public records at its own cost and expense. As I indicated previously, this decision would likely be within the employer’s managerial discretion. However, I also believe that the University would be required to bargain over the “effects” of such a decision; such as (a) whether any information in a person’s criminal record would remain confidential; (b) whether certain employees would be exempted based upon length of exemplary work records; (c) the appeal rights of employees who claim that they have been incorrectly identified of having been convicted of a particular crime or who believe there are extenuating circumstances that would exclude their disqualification; and (d) the categories of offenses that would result in automatically exclusion from employment.

If you would like to discuss further, please do not hesitate to call.

John C. Hewitt; jhewitt@clinewilliams.com; CLINE WILLIAMS WRIGHT JOHNSON & OLDFATHER, L.L.P.; 1125 S.103rd Street, Suite 600; Omaha, Nebraska 68154; Phone 402.397.1700/Fax 402.397.1806

*3079*(From Chancellor Christensen via Nancy Castilow in an e-mail sent on 4/15/11: Not supported. Chancellor’s Comment: “While I continue to be an advocate for shared governance, I will not support 3079, as I am unable to support any resolution which defines the role and responsibilities of the University’s governing board, the office of the chancellor, or other administrator, which is outside the purview of the Faculty Senate.”)

*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.”)

1. **Treasurer’s Report:** Senator M. Bacon submitted the October Budget Report.

IV. **Executive Committee Report:** Senator Winter

A. Senator Winter moved the following resolution for the EC&C. It passed and Senator Chmidling was welcomed to the Faculty Senate.

**RESOLUTION 4063, 11/14/12: CPACS Senator Replacement**

BE IT RESOLVED, that, as CPACS Senator Ken Kriz resigned from the Faculty Senate in October due his Administrative duties, Catherine Chmidling, has been appointed to complete his term to 5/14/14 on the UNO Faculty Senate.

B. **Resolution Following Up on Chancellor’s Reply to FSRes 4054**

The following was brought before the EC&C and was passed to the Faculty Personnel & Welfare Committee. That committee plans to hold an open meeting so any and all interested parties may contribute. Faculty Senate Coordinator, Sue Bishop, will send all Senators the date, place, time for this meeting as soon as she receives it from
Senator Melanson. The authors of this resolution, Senator R. Smith and Senator N. Bacon, were thanked for their time and efforts.

Whereas criminal background checks have been instituted as of September 1, 2012 by the administration of this University for all new Faculty hires and all part time adjunct Faculty on an annual basis,

And whereas the apparent rationale for said background checks is in reaction to the sad events that occurred at The Pennsylvania State University,

And whereas background checks of Faculty or Staff on the part of that University would not have prevented any of the sad events from occurring,

And whereas security measures in modern American life already impose unwarranted and demeaning intrusions into personal lives,

And whereas criminal background checks will constitute a waste of public monies to no effective purpose,

And whereas criminal background checks will, in some cases, be viewed by prospective Faculty hires as obnoxiously intrusive, thereby limiting this University from hiring the best Faculty possible,

And whereas Justice dictates that those who have been punished for crimes should be able proceed with their lives—that punishment incurred should serve as a veil of obscurity over past transgressions of the Law.

Therefore, be it Resolved, that this Faculty Senate opposes said criminal background checks for any Faculty position, whether current or prospective, whether part time or full time, and whether adjunct or otherwise, and urges the administration of this University to cease conducting them forthwith,

And be it further Resolved, that a copy of this Resolution be promulgated to the Faculty head of each academic unit along with a letter from the Faculty Senate President asking each Faculty head to cooperate as little with the administration in this matter as is consistent with the dictates of conscience.

V. Standing Committee Reports

A. Committee on Academic and Curricular Affairs: Senator Tiller reported the committee met with BJ Reed and spent most of the time discussing the 20,000 students by 2020 idea.

The committee also met with Peter Wolcott and reviewed his program proposal for a Certificate in Information Technology Administration. The proposal was approved and Senator Tiller moved the following resolution for the committee.

Senator Woody moved, and Senator R. Smith seconded to table this motion until the full Senate had read the proposal. This motion passed. The proposal will be sent to all Senators to review.

WHEREAS, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the number of individuals employed in occupations related to Information Technology
administration and Information Technology development is projected to grow significantly in the years 2008-2018, and

WHEREAS, there is no certificate program at the University of Nebraska Omaha for Information Technology Administration, and

WHEREAS certification programs may serve as a draw for students compared to 4 year-degree programs because of the reduced course load, and

WHEREAS the exclusively on-line nature of the program may serve as a special draw for this targeted population of students, and

WHEREAS the degree would be offered jointly with the University of Agder in Norway, such that their students would also enroll in these courses, and

WHEREAS UNO would offer the only such certificate program in the state, and

WHEREAS, the Committee on Academic and Curricular Affairs has reviewed the proposal for a program leading to a Certificate in Information Technology Administration and concluded that such a program fits well within the strategic plan and the mission of the University of Nebraska at Omaha and that the resources necessary for such a program are available or can be developed through reasonable and appropriated allocations of resources, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the University of Nebraska at Omaha supports the proposal from the Department of Information Systems and Quantitative Analysis in the College of Information Science and Technology to create a Certificate in Information Technology Administration at the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

B. Committee on Educational Resources and Services: Senators R. Smith and O’Neil reported the committee met October 31, 2012.
Guests: John Fiene, Lanyce Keel, Karen Hein, Matt Morton and Bret Blackman

The meeting began with Bret Blackman presenting on the new Application for Admission form. This form has been revised significantly and shortens the completion time for prospective students. It replaces a form that was not particularly “user friendly.” This new form can take less than 4 minutes to complete. The new form is linked to the CRM (constituent relationship management system) so the student data goes to PeopleSoft student records, and to Talisma, the communications system from UNO. This will allow their application information to be integrated so that as the system gathers student data, it allows for tailored communications at various stages of their career. Financial Aid, ACT scores and other relevant student documentation is gathered and now there are opportunities to analyze the data to see what students are applying and enrolling. The application will be “device independent” and functionally the same whether viewing on a smart phone, computer or tablet. The new application form will be live for summer and fall admissions 2013. Since September 10, we’ve received over 2,000 applications.

The new UNO website is being designed with the focus on new and prospective students. Lipman–Hearne is the consulting firm that has been hired to assist in the redesign. The new UNO website will not change the departmental pages. The
previous website was a Dreamweaver web template and we are moving toward a wireframe web design with a content management system and editing guidelines for how departments can unify pages. This new design is a “reactive web design” which means it will adapt to whatever screen it’s viewed on (smartphone, computer or tablet).

Bret continued his presentation on the Performance Information Gateway (PING), describing the type of reporting that is possible now. Dr. Pelema Morrice will be talking to Faculty Senate in a future meeting. If people have questions about generating reports, call the Office of Institutional Effectiveness at 402 554-3750 or to submit a report request @ http://www.unomaha.edu/infogateway/Google/report_request.php or email at rsmith@unomaha.edu.

Matt Morton presented on the initiatives the Office of Information Security is involved in and his role as Chief Information Security Officer. Matt and John discussed the various threats to information security, including corporate espionage, data/research hacking, and other security breaches that the FBI has identified as growing. I am including a link to Matt Morton’s presentation: InfoSec Summary_talking_points.ppt.

The last portion of the meeting was spent discussing the issue of improving/expanding the delivery of online education at UNO in light of the 2020 enrollment goal. Faculty expressed some frustration with the demands of online delivery and their lack of expertise in instructional design. There were questions about what level of support is currently available and how that might increase over the next several years to meet the enrollment goal. There was discussion of the support provided to faculty through the Academic Partnership for Instruction and the new Technology and Teaching Center (in Kayser Hall) for instructional design, course development release time, and development of business and marketing plans as well as funding opportunities for new distance program development. In addition, it was discussed that currently more than two-thirds of distance education tuition and fee revenue are distributed to the colleges.

We were running short on time and decided that this is an ongoing conversation and deserves the committee’s full attention at the next ER&S meeting in November. The IS team agreed to return to allow sufficient time to delve into the 10 questions that the ER&S committee had prepared in advance.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Senator Woody moved and Senator Wileman seconded the following, which then passed:

**RESOLUTION 4064, 11/14/12: Faculty Involvement**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Executive Committee assign the appropriate committee or committees to give consideration to adequacy of faculty involvement, input and decision making to administrative issues, including, but not limited to, the major change of the web site redesign and the decision to pursue an arena.

Then Senator Surface moved and Senator Wileman seconded the following, which then passed:

**RESOLUTION 4065, 11/14/12: Revisit Shared Governance**
BE IT RESOLVED, that the Executive Committee revisit shared governance as it relates to issues on campus, not limited to, but including the web re-design, distance education, and the building of the arena.

B. Committee on Faculty Personnel and Welfare: Senator Melanson reported that no meeting was held in October. The committee will continue to work through its agenda. We celebrate the Senior Vice Chancellor clarifying his position on changing the part-time faculty workload assignments and the proposed year-round academic calendar.

---------------------------------------------------------------

Report on Meeting with Senior Vice Chancellor B.J. Reed on September 26, 2012

Question regarding proposed reduction of adjunct teaching assignments from .25 FTE to .2 FTE

1. What is the general motivation for reducing part-time workload designations for 3-credit courses down from .25 FTE?

   • The Senior Vice Chancellor explained that the change in part-time workload designations for 3-credit courses was motivated by a desire to see workload equivalences for part-time faculty set more appropriately. It is structured on the idea that to designate a part-time faculty teaching a standard 3-credit course as equivalent to a full-time faculty teaching a standard 3-credit course overlooks the sort of service that full-time employees generally do and part-time employees generally do not do. Although part-time faculty do teach, grade, and provide some general course advising, they generally do not do general advising, committee work, and the like.

   The Senior Vice Chancellor stressed that the move to .2 FTE part-time workload designations for 3-credit courses should be seen as a floor and not as a ceiling. If a department employs part-time faculty who do general advising, committee work, teach intensive service learning courses, and the like, those departments are free to set workload designation higher for those part-time faculty. Such departments should be able to provide a rationale for setting the workload designations higher.

   The Senior Vice Chancellor noted that the reduction in part-time workload designations for 3-credit courses does not affect salary of part-time faculty. The decision of what to pay individual part-time faculty is primarily a departmental decision. It is obviously made in collaboration with Deans and is influenced by actual workload, expertise, market factors, and the like. But, it is not determined by the Senior Vice Chancellor. If a department judges that particular part-time faculty need or deserve more compensation, that it a matter for that department.

   Furthermore, the Senior Vice Chancellor noted that the reduction is not being driven by benefits considerations. He noted that like salary, faculty benefits come from department budgets. Thus, departments ought to provide benefits to employees who deserve benefits.

2. What is the motivation for reducing from .25 FTE to .2 FTE (as opposed to .249 FTE or other possibility)?

   • The Senior Vice Chancellor explained that the .2 FTE part-time workload designations for 3-credit courses was intended to be a reasonable designation representing typical workload. James McCarty investigated and found that many comparable universities set part-time workload designations for 3-credit courses at either .12 FTE or .15 FTE. If there are suggestions for a more
appropriate part-time workload designation for 3-credit courses, the Senior Vice Chancellor is happy to entertain them.

Once again, the Senior Vice Chancellor stressed that a .2 FTE part-time workload designations for 3-credit courses should be seen as a floor and not as a ceiling.

3. Will part-time workload designations for non-3-credit courses also be correspondingly reduced?
   - Yes. The Senior Vice Chancellor noted that there is no fixed table of reductions. Reasonable and comparable workload reductions for part-time workload designations should be done across the board where appropriate. Again, where reductions are not appropriate (e.g., intensive service learning courses), there should not be reductions.

4. How does this change affect workload designations for courses taught by full-time faculty?
   - It is not intended to affect workload designations for courses taught by full-time faculty.

   To assuage worries about how this might be interpreted in the future, the Senior Vice Chancellor offered to draft a note indicating his rational and that this was not intended to be a stepping stone toward increasing faculty workload. The Senior Vice Chancellor made this offer to AAUP representatives. The members of the Faculty Personnel and Welfare Committee urged that such a note be produced and suggested that it would likely go far to calm faculty worries. [10/18/2012: The Senior Vice Chancellor reported that he will produce a draft of such a memo in the next week or so.]

5. Will full-time faculty be expected to change how they document workload (e.g., document a 3-credit course as .2 and document .05 of service)?
   - No.

6. How will the change affect those units that do not traditionally have 3 credits of research leave, but teach four 3-credit classes?
   - It will not.

7. Will this change be at all affected by the source of funding for a course (e.g., a particular college vs. continuing studies)?
   - No.

8. Do most colleges require service of full-time non-tenure-track instructors? If so, how does this new model of 2.0 FTE affect full-time non-tenure-track instructors?
   - The Senior Vice Chancellor stressed that the new model of .2 FTE part-time workload designations for 3-credit courses will not affect full-time non-tenure-track instructors. 1.0 FTE is 1.0 FTE. It is assumed that all full-time faculty are sharing in the burdens of service. This is not a step toward requiring 5 courses from full-time non-tenure-track instructors.

9. Will this change also affect TAs? If not, why are TAs and adjunct faculty being treated differently in this regard?
   - The Senior Vice Chancellor explained the change will not affect TAs. The Senior Vice Chancellor admitted that TAs are treated differently. They are assigned a workload of .33 FTE for a workload of 20 hours per week. Admittedly, this does not meet the “standard” calculation of 1.0 FTE = 40 hours per week. The Senior Vice Chancellor noted that the workload designation of .33 FTE for a workload of 20 hours per week for TAs is fairly standard for many comparable universities. Furthermore, the Senior Vice Chancellor noted that raising the workload designation to .5 FTE for a workload of 20 hours per week for TAs would have drastic repercussions that
the University is not currently prepared to handle. James McCarty is looking at this issue.

10. Will adjunct faculty or TA salaries be at affected by the drop to .2 FTE?
   • No.

11. How does the proposed reduction to .2 FTE affect benefits and who is benefit eligible?
   • The Senior Vice Chancellor noted that it appears that a part-time faculty who taught three 3-credit courses in the Fall Semester and two 3-credit courses in the Spring Semester (or vice versa) would be benefits eligible, but a part-time faculty who taught two 3-credit courses in both the Fall Semester and the Spring Semester would not be benefits eligible.

Related Topic

12. Is there a systematic discussion of whether current remuneration levels for adjunct faculty are sufficient for finding and hiring enough high quality adjunct faculty members?
   • The pay scale for part-time faculty is a departmental budget issue, not something dictated by the Senior Vice Chancellor. Departments ought to pay part-time faculty what part-time faculty ought to be paid. The standard $2,700 per course is a floor, not a ceiling. It a department judges that it needs to pay part-time faculty more than this to ensure suitable expertise, this is a departmental budgetary decision. Obviously, departments must make these decisions in collaboration with their Deans.

13. There is already some wide disparity between faculty income from college to college and within colleges as well (partly as a result of each discipline's supply and demand). Cost savings in salary seems to be a major factor driving hiring of full-time non-tenure-track instructors. This will push income disparity across the University even wider. Is administration concerned about this? Retention could be a big issue, especially with year to year contracts. Are there any plans to offer longer term contracts and clearer raise and promotion guidelines for full-time non-tenure-track instructors?
   • The Senior Vice Chancellor noted that he is not sure that salary is the primary driver of this issue.
     AAUP shares the concern of a lack of multi-year contracts.
     Although the Senior Vice Chancellor was not committal on this point, he seemed sympathetic and willing do consider the issue if raised in reasonable terms that take into account the overall good of the university.

14. Are full-time non-tenure-track instructors and lecturers eligible for institutional support (e.g., UCAT, UCRA, college travel money)?
   • In the opinion of the Senior Vice Chancellor, UCAT should be available to full-time non-tenure-track instructors and lecturers and UCRA should be available to full-time non-tenure-track researchers. He would be willing to consider what changes would be necessary to allow this.

Other Topics Discussed

The Senior Vice Chancellor was asked about and spoke to the issue of documenting service. It is widely recognized that there are faculty who devote a great deal of time to service and some faculty who devote little time to service. This is inherently unfair. The question is how to establish credit for service.

This is a matter of equity among the faculty. There is no doubt injustice in cases where one faculty member merely teaches three 3-credit hour courses and does no
research or service while other faculty members also teach equivalent three 3-credit hour courses while doing research and/or service.

The Senior Vice Chancellor acknowledged that establishing accountability is the “Third Rail” of negotiations. Yet, it does need systematically addressed. It would be best if a solution were to come from the bottom up (i.e., from the faculty) rather than from the top down (i.e., the administration).

One possibility would be to change full-time faculty workload accounting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload Component</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.2 FTE per standard 3-credit course x 3 courses for standard tenure-track faculty</td>
<td>.6 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2 FTE for research</td>
<td>.2 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2 FTE for service</td>
<td>.2 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTE</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those faculty not doing adequate research or service could make up the difference by teaching an extra class.

The Senior Vice Chancellor also noted the changing environment of higher education calls for creative change on the part of the university in these respects. There ought to be room for creative solutions. For example, there ought to be room for:

- Traditional full-time tenure-track faculty who teach, research, and do service
- Full-time teaching faculty with no research and service requirements
- Full-time research faculty who have little or no teaching and service requirements
- Part-time faculty
- And others

The Senior Vice Chancellor admitted that the kerfuffle over the “20,000 by 2020” was the result of a lag in engaging faculty input and buy-in on the issue. (“kerfuffle” was not the Senior Vice Chancellor’s word choice.) The Senior Vice Chancellor noted a number of “novel” approaches that would make significant progress toward that goal. For example, increasing retention rate from 43% to 50% would account for most of the goal.

To avoid similar problems in the future and to increase the fluidity of dialogue between the administration and faculty, a new position has been created and will be filled by Dan Gilbert beginning October 9, 2012.

The Senior Vice Chancellor also expressed openness to considering any practical alternatives to dealing with the changing environment of higher education. For example, the university ought to be willing to consider having more 15 week courses in the summer semester and more 8 week courses in the Fall and Spring Semesters. Once again, Senior Vice Chancellor urged that suggestions for coping with the changing environment of higher education be initiated from the bottom-up (i.e., from the faculty). [10/18/2012: The Senior Vice Chancellor reported that he will produce a draft of a memo in the next week or so regarding the pilot “voluntary” program regarding a 12 month campus. In particular, it was suggested that he specifically address (i) the issue of not increasing individual faculty course loads, (ii) the availability of teaching over-load classes in floating fall and spring “off terms”, and (iii) how funding would necessarily have to increase over the long-run to accommodate the envisioned increase in number of courses.]

October 29, 2012

Memorandum
To: Peter Smith, President, and Faculty Senate
From: B.J. Reed, Sr. Vice Chancellor
Subject: Initiatives concerning Part Time Faculty Workload and Pilot 12 Month Program
Bill Melanson, representing the Faculty Senate’s Personnel and Welfare Committee has asked that I clarify the purpose and intent regarding two areas of recent activity. First is the action to restructure the workload of part-time faculty and the other concerns the intent surrounding seeking pilot programs interested in exploring creation of 12 month, year-round programs. I am happy to do so.

PART-TIME WORKLOAD

As reflected in Dr. Melanson’s minutes of my meeting with the Personnel and Welfare Committee, the intent of adjusting Part-Time faculty workload for those teaching a three credit hour course from .25 to .20 is to more accurately reflect the distinction between the role of full time faculty workload and that of most part-time faculty. There is no other rationale for the adjustment. Part-time faculty who do more than the basic instructional role within the classroom can certainly be awarded higher workload equivalency should the College or Department/School deem it appropriate.

There is no plan, intent or support from my office to, in any way, adjust the workload expectations of faculty with regard to the current eight course equivalency over an academic year. For full-time faculty, including instructors and lecturers, there would be no change in workload expectations. The basic equivalency for full-time faculty is not affected in any way by the proposed change in part-time workload.

12 MONTH PILOT

Academic and Student Affairs is currently soliciting proposals from academic units to establish pilot programs that would allow departments/schools to develop “year round” academic programs and also allow the eight course equivalency to be allocated over a 12 month period. Currently that eight course equivalency has been structured such that four course equivalency occurs in the Fall Semester and four in the spring. Pilots will be considered on a volunteer basis whereby faculty may be able to allocate that eight course equivalency over fall, spring or summer. We believe this voluntary program will allow us to determine the viability of a broader approach to achieving enrollment management goals as well and increase responsiveness to student needs and increase flexibility for faculty wishing to allocate their workload in a way that promotes their professional goals.

Under this pilot unit faculty members, working with their chairs/directors could fashion a year round program where faculty could teach or do research or service in the fall, spring or summer. How this might work would be up to the unit and the faculty members. Should a faculty member and the unit decide to exceed the eight course equivalent across any of these “semesters” the would receive “overload” of 9 percent for that three course equivalency in a manner that is identical to how this is currently treated in the summer. The difference in this case is that the 9% overload could occur at any time during the year not just in the summer.

There is no plan or intent to either increase the eight course equivalency that currently exists nor is there any intent to reduce the dollars available to provide compensation to faculty members who wish to teach overload where departments/schools have the financial resources to do so. Just as exists today, should financial capacity decline within the college or unit, the ability to hire faculty members to teach in the summer may decline. However, the ability under the pilot to expand the opportunity for faculty compensation to teach beyond the 8 course equivalency now would extend across all three “semesters”. The decisions as is true with part-time faculty concerning workload and overload remain at the
College level and are part of the College’s budget. These decisions would remain at that level.

Problems with the proposed adjustment to part-time faculty workloads:
Nora Bacon, College of Arts and Sciences
1. In his memo to the faculty senate, SVC Reed indicates that the purpose of the adjustment in part-time faculty workload is “to more accurately reflect the distinction between the role of full time faculty and that of most part-time faculty.” In fact, however, the adjustment mischaracterizes the actual workload of faculty members in both categories.

Let’s begin with the assumption that a full-time workweek is 40 hours. While the amount of time it takes to teach a class varies with the discipline, the teacher’s pedagogical choices, and many other factors, it typically takes 10-12 hours per week to teach a 3-credit class. This work, therefore, has long been recognized as .25 of a full-time workload. The time necessary to teach a class does not vary with the status of the teacher.

As studies of faculty workload consistently show, full-time faculty members typically work more than 40 hours per week. At UNO, most of us teach three classes, devote as much time as possible to our scholarship, and engage in university, professional, and/or community service as well. The service is not calculated as part of our workload. Our workload assignment accurately indicates that we carry a full-time load of teaching and research and that service comes in addition to a full-time load. Hours spent on service do not reduce our commitment to teaching well; we do not, in fact, steal the time for service from our classes. Like part-time faculty, we typically give a solid 10-12 hours per week to each 3-credit class, a time commitment accurately reflected by an assignment of .25 FTE for each class.

Because there is no reason to believe that adjunct instructors spend less time per class than full-time faculty, different workload assignments for teaching do not accurately reflect the difference in faculty roles.

The difference between an expectation of 40 hours and an expectation of 40 hours + service is reflected in the pay differential for the two categories. An adjunct instructor with a Ph.D. earning $3500 per course would, if he or she were permitted to teach 4/4 (or 1.0 FTE), earn an annual salary of $28,000. A tenure-line faculty member with the same qualifications and a full-time assignment of teaching and research starts, in the College of Arts and Sciences, at about $55,000 plus benefits. Given the wide disparity in salary, it hardly seems necessary to take further steps to reflect the distinction in roles.

2. The proposed adjustment is designed to account for the service performed by full-time faculty by building service into our workload (absorbed somehow in “teaching” but present nonetheless – presumably taking one-fifth of the time we thought we were spending on teaching). For full-time faculty, then, service would be conceived as an essential part of our jobs rather than (as now) extra work that we are expected – but not, every semester, required – to perform.

The current practice of designating every 3-credit class and equivalent research assignment as .25 FTE recognizes that faculty members earn our salaries by fulfilling our responsibilities as teachers and scholars. While the expectation of service is clear in our workload policy and RPT policies, faculty members have considerable autonomy in determining how much service and what kind of service we engage in. For example, pre-tenure faculty are often advised to limit their service in order to focus on research, and faculty members who are teaching
new classes or launching new research projects may choose to cut back on service. If our workload is re-conceived in such a way that service is considered part of our workload, this autonomy and flexibility are at risk. Again, the point is that faculty do service in addition to our assigned loads; this understanding of service is worth preserving.

3. In his conversation with the Faculty Personnel and Welfare Committee, SVC Reed described the .20 appointment as a floor, not a ceiling, stressing that department chairs could make the case for continuing a .25 assignment for adjunct faculty who serve on committees or who teach especially labor-intensive classes. However, the .20 appointment is presented as the norm – other appointments need to be justified – and, in fact, the dean’s office in the College of Arts and Sciences has already instructed staff members to adjust adjunct appointments to .20 for the spring, 2013 semester. Department chairs were not asked for input about appropriate appointments in their units.

4. While it seems unlikely that continuing adjunct faculty will reduce the amount of time they give to their classes, especially as their salaries will remain constant, an appointment does send a clear, explicit message about how much work is expected. If future adjuncts are assigned .20 FTE per course, they will understand their commitment to be eight hours per week. The quality of instruction will suffer.

5. SVC Reed has provided written assurance that his office has no intention of extending the .20-per-course assignment to full-time faculty. But time marches on, and SVC Reed will not always occupy that office. His intentions may not be shared by subsequent Senior Vice Chancellors. Establishing the teaching of a 3-credit class as .20 FTE re-frames faculty workload in a way that undervalues the work of current part-time faculty and, in the long term, imperils the quality of every faculty member’s work life and the quality of instruction at UNO. In discussions of this adjustment, no actual benefit to any student or faculty member has been identified. On the other hand, the risks are real. I urge the senate to request that SVC Reed postpone implementation of the adjustment until he has, in consultation with representatives of the faculty, considered alternative ways to recognize our service contributions.

C. Committee on Goals and Directions: Senator Kelly reported the Committee discussed next steps in our analysis of student outcomes, specifically trends among community college transfers. The G&D Committee will continue to work with Russ Smith in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to track performance of these transfer students within particular colleges and departments, as well as within specific courses. The objective of these efforts remains improved articulation between UNO and the community colleges.

The G & D Committee will also work with OIE to track performance of 4-year UNO students from area high schools. The information collected has the potential long-term benefit of better informing recruitment efforts. In the short term, the information that is acquired will be vetted by UNO and by the school districts themselves before it is publicly disseminated.

VI. Non-Senate Committee Reports

A. American Association of University Professors (AAUP): Senator Richter-Egger reported

1. The UNO AAUP sent a link to all faculty in the bargaining unit (not just to those who are AAUP members) to collect faculty input regarding a 12 month schedule
pilot program survey. 219 faculty responded and results will be discussed at the next AAUP business meeting.
2. A faculty member asked that consideration be given to addition of hearing loss coverage to medical insurance as a faculty benefit. Would faculty senate consider taking up this question? The AAUP is also referring the request to the University benefits committee.
3. Fall member dinner is Nov 9th at the field club
4. Fall business meeting Thursday, Nov 29th 2:30-4:00 location tba
5. 2013-2015 collective bargaining is ongoing
6. Information requests
   • faculty senate reports on faculty use of HPER
   • faculty senate report on consideration of 12 month schedule

B. Graduate Council: Senator Surface reported

C. Parking Advisory Committee: Prof. Paterson wrote that the meeting was held October 5, 2012. Attending: Doug Paterson, Ed Tisko, Stan Schleifer, Brian Barry, Vanessa Rath, Jim Ecker, Heather Overton, Dave Nielsen
   - Meeting times were discussed
     • Future meetings will be held at 10:00 AM on the first Friday of every month
   - Karen Kemppes volunteered to take minutes of the meetings
     • will be out of town for November meeting
   - Campus parking maps are being revised by Geography Dept.
     • Will be distributed by Jim Ecker when they are available
   - A concern was raised regarding the lack of uniform official abbreviations used on maps
     • Facilities assigns numbers and abbreviations
     • This topic will be discussed as more information becomes available
   - A safety concern was raised regarding standing on shuttles without grab bars
     • Jim Ecker is checking into this.
   - Lot M update:
     • 70 stalls added for a total of 162
     • Estimated completion date 11/01/12
     • The Pacific route shuttle pick up and drop off will be shifted to this lot from Lot Q
   - Lot Q update:
     • Closed 18-20 months, March 2014 estimated completion date for Community Engagement Center
     • Unsure how 60 lower level heated parking stalls will be utilized
   - Surface Lot E will be used for Community Engagement Center visitor parking
   - Parking Permits still available for sale
     • A limit has been established for permits to be sold
     • General use in Crossroads parking up 12% this year
     • Down 246 permits for on-campus permits
   - Concern that people are not aware they can park in mixed use Lot T
     • Possibility of having visitors use that level was discussed
   - It was suggested that a sign at entrance of Lot U may be helpful for informing people they can also park in Lot T
   - Contact Jim Ecker regarding parking for special events
   - Lot 14 on Pacific Street campus has less than 30% utilization
• Discussion about how to change perception of parking at UNO
  o Ideas: work with Public Relations dept., use flashing signs that show open parking areas, contact Deans
• Safety concerns expressed for people walking to cars after dark
  o Reminder that officer escorts are available
• Concern regarding collisions in parking structures
  o Point made that it is important to promote safety issues at first of the year
• Lot G concerns received from Dr. James Carroll
  o Request to make walking path to avoid hazardous areas, especially in bad weather and snow
• Discussion of a “parking issue” handout so people are better informed of how parking and shuttles work
• Looking at separate shuttle map that is designed more like a mass transit map
• A request was made to open the Parking office at 7:30 AM
  o Determination made to look at changing staffing hours
  o Decided it would be helpful to give Heather Overton a supply of visitor parking passes
  o A reminder was made that e-permits are also available
• Garage Passes and Parking Enforcement

Other Committee Reports

A. Educational Policy & Advisory Committee (EPAC): Prof. Dhundy (Kiran) Bastola reported that there was a meeting on October 12, 2012 (EPAC) and went over two new courses (ITIN 4990 and MATH 1940) and discussed the content to approve these new courses.

B. UCRCA: Prof. Gert-Jan de Vreede reported the committee met October 12, 2012. Those present included Julie Delkamiller, GJ de Vreede (Chair), Victoria Kennel (student representative), Barb Simcoe, Peter Szto, Ex Officio: Mary Laura Farnham, Beth White. Those not able to attend: Karen Falconer al-Hindi, Ann Fruhling, Lisa Knopp, John McCarty, Lotfollah Najjar, Wei Wang Rowe. The meeting began with introductions.

1. Minutes from September 20, 2012 meeting were approved
2. Associate Vice Chancellor Scott Snyder was unable to attend due to a scheduling conflict/error.
3. Budget
   Mary Laura reported Scott indicated funding is available to support two rounds (fall and spring deadlines).
4. Review of Proposals

   Faculty minigrant proposals:
   Funded
   The following faculty minigrant proposal was recommended for funding:
   • Courtney Snyder, #2013-02-MG, $947.00

   Student proposals:
   Not Funded
   The following graduate student proposals were not recommended for funding:
   • Daniel Leib, #2013-04-SG – revise and resubmit
   • Troy Rand, #2013-05-SG – previously funded project and missing final report
• Christine Rhodes, #2013-06-SG – revise and resubmit
The following undergraduate student proposal was not recommended for funding:
• Morgan Simones, #2013-12-SG – revise and resubmit

Funded
The following graduate student proposal was recommended for funding:
• Anne Beethe, 2013-03-SG, $446
The following undergraduate student proposals were recommended for funding:
• Jared Brown, 2013-07-SG, $447
• Megan Durham, 2013-08-SG, $447
• Ed Getzlaff, 2013-09-SG, $447
• Matthew Morse, 2013-10-SG, $447
• Keith Schoening, 2013-11-SG, $447
• Nate Van Fleet, 2013-13-SG, $447

5. Initial discussion on Role and Scope of Committee – move discussion to November meeting
• Review of other internal funding programs (GRACA, FRI, FISS)
• Discussion about the possibility of an expanded role for the UCRCA in review and funding recommendations of these internal grant programs. The committee discussed the increase in the volume of proposals to review in addition to the UCRCA proposals.
• A decision was made to table the discussion until next month when Scott Snyder would be present.

6. Upcoming meetings - email going out to committee to see if we can begin the November 16th meeting either 30 minutes early or going 30 minutes later – to allow for more time.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:05 PM. Next meeting: Friday, November 16, 2012 – MBSC Gallery Room – 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM (pending decision to being 30 minutes earlier or end 30 minutes later)

C. University Committee for the Advancement of Teaching (UCAT): Prof. Melanie Bloom wrote that at the October UCAT meeting we did the following:
• Identified a potential keynote speaker to invite to campus to provide faculty workshop/s on teaching international students. The UCAT chair has contacted Rebecca Oxford to see her availability/interest in coming to UNO.
• Began developing a rubric for evaluating UCAT travel grants for use of both applicants and UCAT committee members. The rubric will be finalized at our November meeting.
• Discussed how to better promote UCAT activities. We are considering producing a bi-yearly newsletter promoting the instructional activities that UCAT supports and highlighting the work of UCAT grant recipients.
• Reviewed and awarded four faculty travel grants.

D. Wellness Stampede Advisory Committee: Prof. Ronald Bartzatt wrote the committee meeting was held in October before the Wellness Fair (November 1, 2012), and the following was discussed:
1. Number and quality of vendors appearing for the Wellness Fair.
2. Volunteers to help set up, maintain, and deconstruct the Wellness Fair.
3. Miscellaneous other matters such as:
   • Vaccinations available at HPER med clinic
Upcoming health insurance coverage and sign-up
Introduction of new graduate assistant.

VII. New Business

A. Nominations and Election for Faculty Senate President-Elect will be held December 12, 2012. The following are eligible. Their term endings are also noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Term Ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>Meredith Bacon</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nora Bacon</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Bragg</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juan Casas</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wai-Ning Mei</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gregory Petrow</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa Scherer</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert W. Smith</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas Stack</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Williams</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Ziaul Huq</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Management</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wikil Kwak</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAM</td>
<td>Christine Beard</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marshall Prisbell</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomm Roland</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Phyllis Adcock</td>
<td>TED</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harrison Means</td>
<td>TED</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeanne Surface</td>
<td>EDAD/Supervision</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS&amp;T</td>
<td>William Mahoney</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Informatics</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stan Wileman</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPACS</td>
<td>Jeanette Harder</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenneth Kriz</td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick O’Neil</td>
<td>Aviation Institute</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. RESOLUTION 4066, 11/14/12: 3 CH Classes Remain .25 FTE

Senator N. Bacon moved, and Senator R. Smith seconded, the following resolution, which passed with 3 dissenting votes:

Whereas the adjustment of part-time faculty’s teaching assignments from .25 per course to .20 per course is designed to recognize the extra work that full-time faculty do;

Whereas the full-time faculty has not sought and does not wish to accept such an adjustment as a way of recognizing our work;
Whereas the adjustment undervalues the work of teaching by indicating that the actual work of teaching a 3-credit class warrants only a .20 appointment;

Whereas this reduction to the teaching assignment may have unintended consequences in the long term that would affect faculty workloads and the quality of instruction at UNO;

Whereas the adjustment confers no material benefit to any faculty member, full-time or part-time;

Therefore be it resolved that the faculty of UNO urge that teaching assignments for a 3-credit class continue to be represented as .25 FTE.

C. Senator Richter-Egger moved, and Senator Surface seconded the following, which passed:

RESOLUTION 4067, 11/14/12: Shared Governance Education

That, at a strategic time with respect to the installation of new senators, time and attention be given to communication and discussion of the Faculty Senate’s view of shared governance for the benefit of all senators, particularly those new to the senate.

VIII. The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m. with announcements