Presentation: Mary Schlegamilch and the Cisco Project

Present: M. Bacon, Kelly, Maring, Melanson, Smith, Winter, Woody

Excused: Rech

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:23 p.m.

II. The Minutes of February 6, 2013, were approved as submitted.

III. Officers’ Reports

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

1. President’s met with Chancellor Christensen on February 19, 2013.
   a. We discussed Resolution 4075 and the Chancellor’s memo not supporting this resolution. Chancellor Christensen stated that he appreciated the language limiting the resolution to the UNO campus, but still cannot support the resolution because, as stated in his memo to the Senate, he believes this to be a safety issue for which we have legal and fiduciary responsibility and the absence of some form of background checks for persons employed on campus seems in opposition to best practices.
   b. The Chancellor reviewed possible changes in the calendar suggesting that certain programs are looking at possible changes. Social Work and IS&T twelve–month certificate programs are exploring draft proposals.
   c. We discussed the Alumni Association 100-year celebration and their initiative to have a Maverick landmark constructed on the campus. Chancellor Christensen remarked that the Senate should be kept informed and that perhaps representatives from the Alumni Board could present their plans to the Faculty Senate.
   d. Chancellor Christensen provided information about the plans for a campus arena. A nonprofit 501c3 corporation has been formed to provide leadership and oversight and to work on financial support. It is hoped that the arena can be operational by the fall of 2015.
   e. We discussed the financial resources committed to recruiting. The Chancellor did not know a per-student amount dedicated to this, but agreed that it is less than our competitors. He suggested that this would be appropriate data for the representative of the Enrollment Management initiative to track.
   f. The topic of MOOCs was discussed. The Chancellor agreed that this should be a topic for discussion at the EC&A meeting. He stated that this has been an ongoing discussion topic when he meets with representative from other universities. The Chancellor stated that due to its relation to curriculum, this...
must have faculty input. Decisions as to conditions for acceptance of MOOCs, 
the need to guarantee high quality instruction, the additional opportunity for 
students to get involved in educational opportunities, and a need to provide 
systems control/capabilities are all questions that need to be addressed. 
Chancellor Christensen stated that it’s less about competing with others and 
more about what is good for us and our students and the quality of the 
educational experiences provided.
g. We discussed the Faculty Senate concerns related to the engineering programs 
offered here and at UNL. The program is housed at UNL with part of the 
program offered here. This arrangement is similar to the School of 
Criminology and Criminal Justice, which is a UNO program with students at 
UNL participating. The sharing of programs between the campuses may be an 
area the Board of Regents might want to study to determine effectiveness, 
efficiencies, and impact on enrollment initiatives.
The Chancellor and I agreed that we must remember that all discussions must 
continue to keep students at the center.

2. **EC&A met** on February 20, 2013. 
Members present: Christensen, Reed, Shipp, Morrice, Gilbert, Melanson, Bacon, 
Rech, Smith.
Senate President’s items:
- Discussed passage of **RESOLUTION 4074, 2/1313: Criminal Background 
  Check at UNO.** Chancellor Christensen appreciated the change in the 
  language and our willingness to visit with legal counsel. He stated that his 
  rejection of this resolution was tied to his concern for safety and liability. He 
  stated that there have already been specific cases where the background check 
  policy influenced a decision about hiring an individual in a child-care 
  situation. Senator Bacon suggested that while she recognized the issue of 
  liability, she was not sure that the campus has been made safer. Resolution 
  4075, Newly Elected Senators was reviewed. There was agreement that the 
  new senators will have a positive impact on the work of the Senate.
- We also discussed funding as it relates to the recruitment initiatives. Pelema 
  Morrice stated that while we are out spent by our chief competitors, we are 
  working hard to organize our efforts to make the best use of limited resources. 
  Vice Chancellor Reed added that the Tuition Remission Task Force is making 
  recommendations that impact scholarship funding and enrollment. Also, the 
  work of the Strategic Enrollment Management initiative must be tied to what 
  kind of university we want to be. Need of the community, general role and 
  function as identified by the Board of Regents, our non-residential identity, 
  and dual enrollment activities are all related to our enrollment initiatives.
- We discussed the Faculty Senate interest and concern related to the use of 
  MOOCs. Vice Chancellor Reed stressed the need to be cautious, and agreed 
  that this is a topic directly related to the responsibilities of the faculty. Dr. 
  Rech agreed, stating that we must get faculty input when considering how this 
  technology can be used to enhance learning opportunities for students.
- The UNL Engineering program and its impact on enrollment were discussed. 
  Chancellor Christensen stated that the program is often misunderstood. Other 
  examples of similar arrangements were discussed, including the Criminal 
  Justice Program and MSW program offered at UNK. Engineering students are 
  pleased to be housed here at UNO because of internship and career 
  opportunities. Dr. Rech suggested that this program is perhaps responsible for 
  students staying here for other courses/programs.
• The academic calendar was discussed. Vice Chancellor Reed discussed pilot programs in Social Work and IS&T certificate offerings.

Chancellor’s topics
• BJ Reed gave an update on the RP&T process.
• Dean Gail Baker provided an overview of the Marketing Communications organizational chart. She discussed the importance of Faculty in designing roles and responsibilities related to marketing. Also this reorganization will support marketing and branding as well as recruiting. The goal is to bring together representatives from colleges and departments to get input.


4. **Written Acknowledgements for Resolutions:**

On February 18, 2013, Nancy Castilow, Asst. to the Chancellor, wrote in an e-mail:

*Resolution 4074: Not supported. As with Resolution 4073, which I opposed, in part, because of its reference to all NU campuses, I also believe this to be a safety issue for which we have legal and fiduciary responsibility. In summary, the absence of some form of background checks for persons employed on campus seems in opposition to best practices.*

*Res. 4075—Accepted for the purpose of information.*

### 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>4075</td>
<td>2/13/13</td>
<td>2013-2016 Newly Elected Faculty Senators</td>
<td>2/18/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted for the purpose of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4074</td>
<td>2/13/13</td>
<td>Criminal Background Checks at UNO</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/18/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not supported. As with Resolution 4073, which I opposed, in part, because of its reference to all NU campuses, I also believe this to be a safety issue for which we have legal and fiduciary responsibility. In summary, the absence of some form of background checks for persons employed on campus seems in opposition to best practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4073</td>
<td>1/16/13</td>
<td>Amended Resolution 4054 on Criminal Background Checks</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/23/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Chancellor cannot support and would like to discuss this resolution at today’s Faculty Senate Exec. Committee / Administration meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Details</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>The chancellor acknowledges receipt of the resolution and has provided the legal opinion requested.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3079</td>
<td>3/9/11</td>
<td>Shared Governance</td>
<td>4/15/11</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 administrator, which is outside the purview of the Faculty Senate.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2944       | 1/4/09 | UCRCA Funding                                                               | X*                   | \*

* From Chancellor Christensen via Nancy Castilow in an e-mail sent on 2/18/13: Not supported. As with Resolution 4073, which I opposed, in part, because of its reference to all NU campuses, I also believe this to be a safety issue for which we have legal and fiduciary responsibility. In summary, the absence of some form of background checks for persons employed on campus seems in opposition to best practices.\n
* From Chancellor Christensen via Nancy Castilow in an e-mail sent on 1/23/13: The Chancellor cannot support and would like to discuss this resolution at today’s Faculty Senate Exec. Committee / Administration meeting.\n
* Legal Opinion:\n
From: John C. Hewitt [mailto:jhewitt@clinewilliams.com] ; Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 9:11 PM; To: Ed Wimes; Subject: Background Checks.\n
Ed,\n
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.\n
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).\n
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.\n
If you would like to discuss further, please do not hesitate to call.\n
John C. Hewitt; jhewitt@clinewilliams.com ; CLINE WILLIAMS WRIGHT JOHNSON & OLDFAHER, L.L.P.; 1125 S.103rd Street, Suite 600; Omaha, Nebraska 68154; Phone 402.397.1700/Fax 402.397.1806\n
* 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.”\n
* 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: \n
EC&C Minutes – 3/6/13
“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.”


IV. Standing Committee Reports

A. Committee on Academic and Curricular Affairs: Senator N. Bacon reported the committee addressed an issue that Senator O’Neil had called to our attention. A student who came to UNO after studying engineering for two years was unable to use his advanced calculus-based physics course to satisfy a Gen Ed science requirement. Instead, the student was advised to take an introductory course covering material he already knew – clearly not a choice in the student’s or the institution’s best interest. We invited Deb Smith-Howell, who convened the campus Gen Ed committee, and Melissa Berke, who now chairs the committee, to discuss this issue with us.

We learned that the specific problem mentioned by Senator O’Neil had been corrected (see Dr. Berke’s note below). But the example raises a broader question. As a rule, courses with pre-requisites cannot be used to meet Gen Ed requirements. Nevertheless, PHYS 2110 and a small number of other courses, mostly in the physical sciences, can be used in specific circumstances - when the student comes to UNO already having met the pre-requisite, and when the course syllabus has been submitted to the Gen Ed Committee for approval. Other conditions may have to be met as well; the specific criteria that warrant an exception to the no-prereqs rule have not been articulated.

After the meeting, Dr. Berke sent an email indicating that the Gen Ed committee would take up this matter at its next meeting:

I reviewed the meeting minutes of UNO Gen Ed Committee from 12/7/2012. The committee reached a consensus that students should be able to use PHYS 2110 for Natural Science when they come to UNO already meeting the prerequisite (see course description below).

The procedures for identifying how these courses would be approved and how that information would be communicated to department chairs was left undecided.

I have put this on the agenda for our next meeting which is March 8. I will provide a more detailed update after we meet.

Thank you again for the opportunity to visit about this. Conversations like this will help us to clarify our process!

Dr. Smith-Howell offered to attend a faculty senate meeting for a “Gen Ed refresher.”

B. Committee on Educational Resources and Services: Senator Maring reported the committee met February 27, 2013, with two UNO faculty (Dr. John Erickson from CBA and Dr. Phil Nordness from the CoE) who have been actively involved in online education. Each faculty shared their experiences with teaching completely online or in a hybrid environment and they addressed technology, testing, grading, and course development support.

Some of the concerns included testing and how to avoid cheating in an online environment. Dr. Erickson uses Blackboard's testing center and typically designs multiple choice tests.

Adobe Connect, Camtasia and Echo 360 were some of the technologies/software products employed with varying degrees of satisfaction. There is no standard technology/software recommendation or mandate by UNO's IS Department. One factor that needs to be considered with online instruction is that students need to have
a good computer with adequate bandwidth to be able to download content efficiently.

Grading was discussed and the demand on faculty in an online course is often greater. Dr. Nordness mentioned that grade inflation however, has been in decline.

Dr. Nordness shared some experiences in the Special Education and Communications Master’s program. He received a $30,000 grant from Online Worldwide which supported course development, marketing, a retreat and software. He described how his program has established itself as a niche program with its emphasis in Behavior Disorders. One area that still needs work is in the area of marketing. Dr. Nordness has received help in marketing from Online Worldwide but it needs to be more aggressive.

Both faculty discussed how to grow their programs and how there needs to be more tenure-track faculty rather than adjuncts teaching these courses. Dr. Erickson mentioned that they would like to add two more courses to the online BGS program. Currently, there are 4-5 faculty teaching online courses in the CBA and 4 core faculty are teaching in the online Master’s program in the CoE.

The Paul Beck Scholarship deadline is April 15, 2013. The Scholarships will be distributed as follows:

- One $1,000 Full-Time UNO Undergraduate Scholarship
- One $1,000 Full-Time UNO Graduate Scholarship
- One $500 Part-Time UNO Graduate or Undergraduate Scholarship

As this was Senator Maring’s last meeting she received gestures of appreciation from the entire EC&C. She will be taking a position with the Omaha Public Library.

C. Committee on Goals and Directions: Senator Kelly asked the EC&C for a decision on replacing the previously passed resolution (R 3079). That resolution, with new suggestions for wording, is below. The EC&C decided to send the resolution back to the committee with suggestions to be sent to Senator Kelly. President P. Smith will contact the UNL Faculty Senate President to see what their ideas are on Faculty Governance. The subject will also be brought up at the next EC&A meeting to, hopefully, begin a dialogue, i.e., what does the Chancellor/Administration feel is “Shared Governance.”

RESOLUTION 3079, 3/9/2011: Shared Governance

WHEREAS, in the tradition of academic freedom, peer review, and shared governance, it is of critical importance that faculty, administrators, and governing boards share a common understanding of shared governance in order to fulfill commitments to the educational mission of the university in seeking, discovering, and disseminating knowledge,

AND WHEREAS, the practice of shared governance is a necessary condition for academic freedom, the mission of the university, and effective peer review whereby peers determine the curriculum and standards that define competence and ethical conduct in the disciplines,

AND WHEREAS, the university's mission of seeking, discovering, and disseminating knowledge can best be achieved through the joint effort of faculty, students, administrators, and governing boards,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the UNO faculty and administration will work toward a commonly acceptable and agreed-upon vision of shared governance, and that it be understood as a system of authority and responsibility in keeping and in compliance with the Bylaws of the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska which delegate authority in matters academic and educational to the elected representatives of the faculties [Citation] and in matters administrative and financial to the administrations.
presumes that faculty members are best qualified to direct the university’s educational course, while administrators are best qualified to direct the university’s finances and organization, with both units understanding that these areas form a symbiotic relationship of interdependency that functions most effectively when faculty, administrators, and governing board partners engage in a high degree of interdependent consultation, respect, trust, and collegiality.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the voting faculty at UNO the Faculty Senate of the University of Nebraska at Omaha should thereby understand that the faculty have been delegated have primary (but not exclusive) initial authority for decisions in the following areas: the curriculum; procedures of student instruction; standards of student competence; aspects of student life which relate to the educational process; the requirements for degrees offered; research; standards of faculty competence and ethical conduct, including faculty appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. (the governing board, the chancellor, and its administrative agents should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail),

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Regents and its administrative agents at UNO have primary (but not exclusive) responsibility for decisions in the following areas: determination of mission; strategic decisions and comprehensive planning; physical and fiscal resources; budgeting and distribution of funds; the decision to declare financial exigency; the decision to create a program, department, school, college, or division; and selection and assessment of the chancellor, vice chancellors, and deans.

(The resolution [3079] passed unanimously.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3079</th>
<th>3/9/11</th>
<th>Shared Governance</th>
<th>4/15/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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.”

D. Committee on Professional Development: Senator Woody reported on February 27, 2013, there was a meeting of the Faculty Senate’s Professional Development Committee.

The Committee was concerned that the Administration seems to continue to neglect or resist shared governance (examples included the Administration’s defining a job description and determining use of part-time instructors and classes to be assigned—without known consultation with the faculty).

The Committee discussed Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), and requested that the Faculty Senate consider a Resolution that (1) the criteria used by CPACs for evaluating a MOOC for possible transfer to a UNO academic program be clarified, and (2) there be faculty involvement in future decisions about MOOCs.

The next meeting (scheduled for March 27, 2013) will focus on, among other possible agenda items, long-range objectives for the Committee.

E. Committee on Rules: Senator M. Bacon moved the following, which were both approved to be brought before the full Senate next week.

1. RESOLUTION: Student Publications Committee, Position B
BE IT RESOLVED that the following names constitute the Faculty Senate approved list of nominees to the Student Publications Board, Position B, to replace Michael O’Hara, from which the Chancellor is to select one for a three-year appointment from 07/01/13 through 06/30/16 as specified in the By-Laws of the Board of Regents:

Courtney Fristoe
Tammie Kennedy.

2. Replacement on Excellence in Teaching Award Committee

BE IT RESOLVED, that Ana Cruz has agreed to replace Cynthia Robinson, who resigned last year and whose term runs through 7/31/14, as the College of Communication, Fine Arts and Media representative, on the Excellence in Teaching Award Committee.

V. Non-Senate Committee Reports

A. Alumni Association, Board of Directors: Senator Rech

The Board met February 19, 2012.
1. President’s Report Lee Denker: reported on progress of 100th Anniversary Project. Board approved commitment of $200,000 from UNO AA Reserve. (Maverick Statue on campus)
2. Investment Policy Updates Laurie Ruge: Board Approved the updated policy statement that was created by the Operations Committee. Related, approve the sale of approximately 10 shares of Berkshire Hathaway so no single stock is more than 20% of the combined market portfolio.
3. Nominating Committee Laura Kapustka: Looking for new Board members, as some current members terms are expiring.
4. Discuss Strategic Priorities and Teams: (Engagement of alumni and financial stability)
5. UNO Chancellor’s Report John Christensen: Updated on construction on campus, reaction to proposed statue to commemorate 100th anniversary for AA, and took questions from Board.

B. Parking Advisory Committee: Prof. Carballal, Paterson, Tisko

The committee met February 1, 2013. Attending: Doug Paterson, Dave Nielsen, Alec Schoreit, Ana Carballal, Heather Overton, Jim Ecker, Ed Tisko, Stan Schleifer, Karen Kempkes. The new student representative on the committee, Alec Schoreit, was introduced. Sustainable Transportation and Green UNO Taskforce update

- Guest presentation by Angie Eikenberry
- Goal of not building more parking and keeping spaces green or higher use
- Also on committee: Jim Ecker and representatives from Student Government
- Are there things UNO Parking Advisory committee can collaborate on with UNO Green Taskforce committee?
- Parking Dept. provided funding for bike related items, and is participating to reduce the need for parking
- UNO Support Services also involved and contributing
- Discussion about working with Metro bus system to improve service for those coming to campus
Need to improve communication on campus re: parking issues and shuttle stops
- Safety issues prohibit shuttle stops in Elmwood Park
- Using real time equipment and GPS for shuttles is expensive and more than we need at this point
- Concern regarding how shuttles are not evenly spaced time wise in their routes, causes stackups, working with Chief to address this problem
- MavRide program has successfully freed up parking spots
  - Student Government pays half of expense for 600-800 free passes
  - Not sure how long this program will continue
  - Question if faculty will be able to use Mavride program, suggestion made to have discussion with Faculty Senate to fund, Doug will contact them; Angie will talk with Victor Winter
- The Green UNO taskforce meets the 4th Monday of the month in CPACS 109A at 11:00 AM, email Angie to be added to their email list aeikenberry@unomaha.edu

Map Status
- Wayfinding Project committee working on map
- Concern about use of Google Maps
- Official UNO maps will have current and consistent building codes listed

Request from Student Health
- Jim Ecker brought up request to give Student Health one more reserved parking stall for physicians
- Heather Overton made motion to approve request, Ed Tisko seconded motion, all in favor.

Booting Procedure
- Reviewed three step process now in place
  - 2 or more offenses more than 14 days old
  - Warning (no fine)
  - Booting
- Request to add $50 fine to cover cost of booting
- Question as to why only $50; amount chosen to be consistent with UNK ($35) and UNL ($60)
- Asked Alec for input as a student
  - Possibility: $50 for 1st boot, higher fine for next, keep amount at a number that has possibility of being paid
- Karen Kempkes made motion to pass request, Ed Tisko seconded, all in favor.

Crossroads Renovation
- Ultimately garage will not be available
- Other parking possibilities discussed
  - Synagogue property
  - Chili Greens area
- Consultant looked at worst case scenario
  - Loss of 1000 stalls at Crossroads
  - Loss of parking in Elmwood Park
  - Loss of neighborhood parking
  - 2.8 person use ratio
  - Currently 2.1 people per stall now
  - Will have to build parking garage
  - Estimated cost of constructing additional parking: 18-20K per stall

Shuttle Changes
- Jim Ecker discussed working with Chief on the “no standing” rule on shuttles
  - Safety issues, hard on vehicles
  - Asked Chief to review manufacturer and Dept. of Transportation safety standards; what would it take to upgrade shuttles with grab bars
  - Adding extra bus in AM and PM peak times, will continue to add as needed

Fees
• OK to send out proposed parking fee document, will go to Board of Regents in March

Zip Cars
• Now on campus, parked in Lot T and Lot N
• Event rollout 02/12
• $35 Annual membership; fuel costs and insurance included in rental fee
• Hourly rental $8
• Weekend hourly rental rate $10-$12
• Other rates available
• Will add additional car(s) as needed

Next meeting 03/01/2013, CPACS 208, 10:00 AM

Other Committee Reports

A. Education Policy & Advisory Committee (EPAC): Prof Bastola reported the committee met February 8, 2013. Members present: Bruce Chase, David Carter, Sherrie Wilson, and Nora Hillyer presided.
   1. Approved summary 1-11-13
   2. Approved minor in IT Innovation
   3. Course Syllabi
The following new courses were approved:
   1. ENGL 3290: Irish Literature II, 3 hrs.
   2. BIOI 8100: Introduction to Biomedical Informatics, 3 hrs.
The following new courses were approved pending minor edits:
   1. PSCI 8816: Politics and Film, 3 hrs
   2. CSCI 2310 Video Gaming Design, 3 hrs.

B. Excellence in Teaching Committee: Prof. Bill Wakefield reported the Excellence in Teaching Award Committee met on Friday, February 22, 2013 in order to discuss the finalists for the 2013 Excellence in Teaching Award and vote for the 2013 recipient. It was a very good meeting and the decision was difficult as the finalists were all extremely well qualified for this award. There was considerable discussion of each candidate, three preliminary votes for narrowing the list, and a final vote between two candidates with the eventual recipient receiving all but one vote. A “healthy” process!*

Additionally, the committee spent some time discussing any suggestions or issues regarding the entire selection process which may be helpful with future selections for this prestigious award. Listed below are some of the ideas which the committee discussed:

1. Consider having the nominee provide information about their respective “Teaching Load”. For example, it might be helpful to know if the candidate had a “4-4, 3-3 load, or even a 2-2” load between teaching, research, or even community service responsibilities during the past 5 years of their employment.
2. Due to the ‘variations’ of the Teaching Summary’ information presented this year, consider formalizing a 1 or 2 page ‘Teaching Summary’ of course evaluation data before presenting all the supportive teaching evaluation paperwork for the past 5 years. Perhaps, consider not even requiring the ‘course evaluation’ data sheets, but note they are “available on request”.
3. “Back-up” the nomination due date—perhaps even into November or first week of December. We had one individual who withdrew due to his being a relatively ‘new’ faculty member and simply did not have the time to compose the extensive portfolio (support letters, data compilation, etc.) required of a nominee during the start of a new semester.
4. Consider the possibility of keeping nominees on a list for three, four, or even 5 years if nominated again for a current award. Thus, only requiring an “update” of their materials covering the period of time since their most recent nomination.
5. Is there a policy on “repeat nominees/recipients”? Perhaps consider individuals who may have received the award 10, 15, 20+ years earlier—we were uncertain if there is a written policy on this possibility.
Overall, as a third year member of this committee, I was very pleased with the efforts, patience, and dedication of all the committee members and commend them for “a job well-done”! Perhaps, a note could be sent to the Chair/Director of their respective units regarding the service on this committee and even a copy to the Dean of their College?

We want to extend a big “Thank You” to Paul Barnes for all his help with this process. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me!

Prof. Teten reported:

The committee met on Feb. 22nd to discuss 5 nominees for the Excellence in Teaching Award. The committee agreed on its top choice and forwarded our recommendation to the chancellor.

C. Student Publication Board: Prof. Michael O’Hara, in a report received via E-Mail on February 28, 2013: Late in the fall semester the Student Publication Board, due to graduations, replaced the two key newspaper employees. The new Editor-in-Chief is Nate Tenopir and the new Advertising Manager is Kathryn White. Both have taken up their new tasks and have validated the Board's confidence in their abilities. Every year the Gateway has detailed and (sometimes contentious) negotiations with the Student Government for adequate funding. The Gateway's employees performed that task unusually well this year, earning the confidence of the Student Government and a restoration of the major cut imposed last year.

D. University Committee for the Advancement of Teaching: Prof. Melanie Bloom reported the list of Committee Members: Melanie Bloom, Ana Cruz, Carol Ebdon, Rene Erlandson, Sara Myers, Bob Ottemann, Donald Rowen, Theresa Stanton.

At our February UCAT meeting we did the following:

- Discussed our remaining budget for the year. We will be able to fund approximately three faculty travel grants or teaching circle instructional materials grants and 10 curriculum development grants this year.
- Discussed a proposal to support a workshop on Leadership, Creativity, and Liberal Arts Education.
- Reviewed and awarded nine faculty travel grants.

E. University Committee on Technology Resources, Services & Planning: Senator Robert Woody reported that as a representative of the UNO Faculty Senate, I attended the meeting of the Committee, held on February 6, 2013.

There were presentations by each of the following:

- Bret Blackman, Director of Administrative Information Systems
- Erin Owen, Director of Marketing
- Matt Morton, Chief Information Security Officer
- Patrick Snyder, Assistant Director of IS Help Desk
- Jay Killion, Business Analyst and Assistant Director for Academic Computing
- Joyce Crockett, Project Management Director
- Lanyce Keel, Executive Director of Information Services
- Shelley Schafer, Assistant Director for Academic Computing, Distance Education, and Manager of the Academic Partnership for Instruction
- Karen Hein, Senior Coordinator for Instructional Design and Faculty Support

The messages emphasized: community engagement; the lack of personnel and resources for fulfilling the marketing needs; the commitment to a greatly enhanced website (big impact, photos and graphics, stimulating concepts, relying on black, gray, and white); a commitment to shared governance for deciding what is needed; templates for information at the college level (being developed with the College of Education); and profound attacks by “cybercriminal individuals.”

For what it is worth, I support getting Matt Morton meeting with the Faculty Senate forthwith regarding cybercrime relevant to UNO faculty members.

Prof. Andrew Swift sent the official minutes of the University Technology Committee meeting minutes: 2/6/2013

Attending: Bret Blackman, Paul Davis, Erin Owen, Robert Woody, Dean Hayes, Beth
Leader-Janssen, Joyce Crockett, Mike Boettcher, Gary Meyer, Karen Hein, Laynce Keel Stan Wileman, Matt Morton, Greg Morin, Harvey Siy, Jay Killian, Tracy Bridgeford, Pat Snyder

- UNO website update – Bret & Erin: The new website is designed to recognize “Who we are.” Designed to look clean, sophisticated. Last update in early 1990s. Peak days get 28,000 visits. The aim is to reduce technology as a barrier for creating and maintaining web pages. What can faculty/staff do right now?: Inventory pages and keep them up-to-date. Invite faculty, staff, and students to provide feedback through process.
- Update on Student Technology Fee Proposals – Joyce outlined changes this year including an agreement that recipients write about the impact of the funding.
- Gartner product testing: See www.unomaha.edu/gartner, a system designed to evaluate technologies.
- Serena Helpdesk: Currently, Serena product is being used as the new backend for Helpdesk ticketing. Please provide feedback. Also introduced was Patrick Snyder - Assistant Director Help Desk.
- Security Awareness – Matt discussed increasingly sophisticated phishing attempts and the need to be vigilant in viewing links in e-mails. Also, the need to secure servers was discussed, and that Apple is disabling Java by default.
- Overview of the API team and discussion on technology tools. A discussion and brief overview of the API team was presented, and an invitation to use the Suggestion Box at api.unomaha.edu

VI. New Business

A. UNO Directories: For the first time ever, and without notice, each campus department was billed for $6.50 for each UNO Campus directory delivered. Each person listed in the directory was sent a copy. It was decided to bring this up at the March 20, 2013, EC&A meeting. At the very least, the departments should have been notified earlier. Perhaps directories could only be ordered for those who need or want one. There was also discussion about a searchable on-line directory.

B. MOOCs (Massive Open On-line Courses): There was much discussion on this topic. President P. Smith decided look into forming an Ad Hoc Committee, with Senator Victor Winter chairing, with membership to consist of both faculty and administration representatives. President Smith will also decide on when a final report will be due and to whom.

VII. The meeting Adjourned at 3:36 p.m. with announcements.

VIII. Announcements

A. Faculty Senate Mtg: Wednesday, March 13, 2013, 2 p.m., MBSC Chancellors Room
B. EC&A Mtg.: Wednesday, March 20, 2013, 2 p.m., EAB 200, Chancellor’s Conference Room
C. EC&C Mtg: Wednesday, April 3, 2013, 2 p.m., ASH 196
D. Faculty/Staff Awards Dinner: Wednesday, April 24, 2013 (6:30 Social, 7:15 Dinner) Alumni Center