Wednesdays, December 2, 2015, 2 p.m., ASH 196

Present: Eesley, Gershovich, Grams, Holley, Kreiling, Nash, Nordness, Sollars, Woody

I. Vice President Grams called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m.

II. The Minutes of November 4, 2015, were approved as written.

There being no objection, Vice President Grams moved three issues forward from New Business, and one committee report from IV Standing Committees, Goals & Direction Committee:

A. From New Business:


   To:                   All UNO Faculty
   From:                 B.J. Reed, Senior Vice Chancellor
   Subject:              F/FW Grading Policy Announcement
   Date:                 November 24, 2015

   Effective for Fall 2015, all faculty will be required to distinguish between two types of failing grades when issuing an F as a course grade in MavLink. As an overview, a grade of F will be entered for students who attempt the majority or all course requirements, but fail to meet expectations regarding performance levels. A grade of FW will be entered for students who fail the course as a result of failing to attempt a significant portion of course requirements because they stopped attending; for the FW, the instructor will need to enter the last date of academic activity participation. Both the F and FW will appear as F on the student’s transcript. The purpose of the F/FW distinction is linked with federal financial aid regulations that require the institution to determine if students who fail receive F grades because of stopped attendance. Please see attached for more specific information and common questions about this policy. The Registrar’s Office will be sending an email to all faculty on December 4th with a reminder about this policy and other grading announcements.

   (The EC&C agreed that Senator Grams would draft text of language to go with the statement. This issue will also be brought up at the next EC&A meeting. Objections will be dealt with separately.)

2. Statement Affirming Free Expression on Campus: Senator Eesley would like UNO to have a statement affirming free expression on campus. The University of Chicago is leading the way in responding proactively to this campus issue: https://provost.uchicago.edu/FOECommitteeReport.pdf
Their committee was appointed by the provost in July of 2014. This has been joined by other schools:

Princeton: http://www.princeton.edu/pub/rrr/part1/index.xml#comp113
Purdue: https://d28htnjz2elwuj.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/2003/02/04160100/Purdue-BoT-resolution.pdf
John Hopkins:
http://web.jhu.edu/administration/provost/initiatives/academicfreedom/AcademicFreedomatJohnsHopkins.pdf
(As a faculty senate resolution)
And other schools like Faculty Senate of Winston-Salem State University.
(This issue was sent to the Academic and Curricular Affairs Committee, and will be brought up at the next EC&A meeting.)

3. **Resolution Concerning Guns on Campus**: Senator Gershovitch reported that Senators Griff Elder and Paul Landow have submitted the following resolution to the Faculty Senate Faculty Personnel & Welfare Committee, with comments from the UNL Faculty Senate:

**Resolution Concerning Guns on Campus**

Whereas the classrooms, laboratories, libraries and residence halls of a university are places for reflection, discussion, study and learning, and

Whereas the presence of firearms, except those in the direct possession of law-enforcement personnel, in the university environment detracts from and interferes with the ability of students to learn, and the ability of faculty to teach and perform research,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Nebraska-Omaha supports the ability of University authorities to restrict the carrying of firearms on campus, and opposes any legislation that would curtail this ability.

Rec. from UNL Faculty Senate President 11/17/15:

*From: John Bender <jbender1@unl.edu>*
*Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 7:53 PM*
*To: Robert Woody*
*Subject: RE: Faculty Senate Resolution*

Bob,

I passed President Bounds’ comments on to the Executive Committee, and they seemed to want to continue with the resolution. They think it would be wise to be on the record in opposition to anything that would alter the present situation regarding guns on campus. Even though the bill would only allow the Regents to change the policy, not require it, the effect would be to create political pressure on the Regents to allow the carrying of concealed weapons. Making clear that we oppose it will help deter that development. Also, if passage seemed to be likely, having the faculty on record opposing the measure could make a difference.

John
Reply from UNO Faculty Senate President 11/18/15:

John: Thank you for your feedback. Two of our Faculty Senators have submitted a brief resolution similar to your resolution, and it has been referred to a committee. By copy of this letter, I am asking our FacSen Administrative Assistant, Sue Bishop, to send the information below to the Committee and our Executive Committee. I am also requesting that Sue keep you and the other two FacSen Presidents informed of what transpires on this matter at UNO. I would welcome you letting me know any further decisions. Bob

(Senator Gershovich moved, Senator Kreiling seconded, postponing this until the January 6, 2016, EC&C meeting. The motion passed.)

B. From Standing Committees:

1. Goals & Directions Committee: Senator Holley reported the Goals and Directions Committee outreach to university committees to ensure faculty representation and reporting to keep the Senate informed about committee issues and actions continues. On behalf of the Committee, Lyn Holley is serving on the UNO Strategic Planning Steering Committee, and is serving as chair of a Committee task force that is inventorying the status of strategic plans at the unit level in UNO. The annual UNO Strategic Planning Forum intended to gather views internal to UNO will be Thursday January 22, 2016 from 8:30am-Noon in the UNO Alumni Center. A representative of the Faculty Senate will be invited to be part of a panel addressing curricular issues.

The meeting then returned to the President’s report.

III. Officers’ Reports

A. President’s Report: Senator Woody reported In a letter sent to the UNO faculty dated December 1, 2015:

UNO Colleagues: As the Fall Semester winds down, I want to update you on the activities of the UNO Faculty Senate (FacSen).

I wish to express appreciation for the commitment of time and energy that members of the UNO FacSen are devoting to committee work. It is clear that analysis, advisement, and actions by the committees are the driving force for the FacSen, which leads, I believe, to countless benefits for UNO, the NU System, and society. I give my personal thanks to each and every member of the FacSen.

That said, I would like to encourage all faculty, administrators, and staff to make a point of contacting members of the FacSen (any of them!) and offering personal viewpoints on relevant issues. The FacSen folks will, of course, bring those issues back to the FacSen committees for consideration and action.

Another important informational source is Sue Bishop, the FacSen Administrative “Tech” (sbishop@unomaha.edu, or 403-554-3598). Sue is familiar with the myriad of resolutions from and other actions by the FacSen over the past few years. If you have any concern about possible previous FacSen positions on an issue, Sue is a good starting point (or contact me and I will follow up).

Since becoming your FacSen President, one of my objectives has been to
strengthen the linkage between the UNO faculty and the faculties on the other three campuses, along with creating an enhanced awareness of the UNO faculty among the NU Systems administrators in Regents Hall. By the basic definition of a “system,” this means that there is greater awareness, support, and mutual identity among all four campuses. To an unprecedented extent, there have been several face-to-face meetings of and numerous emails between the four FacSen Presidents in the NU System. There are several issues for which there is a concerted effort to have consistency of policies (not exactly the same necessarily) on the four campuses. I will tell you more on this effort in a later report.

I am serving on the Global Risk Management Task Force, which is devoted to emergency preparedness worldwide. In these troubled times, this global framework is obviously of critical importance to overseas students and faculty researchers. To keep faculty informed, the Task Force has agreed to provide relevant documents for the FacSen website. The implementation is awaiting assistance from IT.

An effort is being made for the four FacSen Presidents in the NU System to be invited to join one of the academically-oriented committees maintained by the Board of Regents (which meets at least once a month). As UNO and the System expand and develop, the increased complexity elevates the importance of a FacSen presence. As I reported to you last month (November), the communications and relationships between the UNO FacSen and UNO Administration (as well as the NU System and Board of Regents) are extremely (yes, “extremely”) positive, and it is highly probable that there will be progress on any matter that arises.

Often accompanied by Vice President Laura Grams and Secretary-Treasurer Dale Eesley (and FacSen others), my meetings with Chancellor Christensen, Senior Vice Chancellor Reed, and other campus administrators have seemingly been productive, that is, the “voice of the faculty” is being heard and well received by the UNO administrators. An effort is underway to improve the understanding of the faculty’s role with all administrative staff members.

Among other topics, there have been FacSen-Administration discussions of a possible Alcohol and Illicit Drugs Policy (probably separate policies), the need for more “general” classroom space, improving recruitment and retention of students, having representation on a Regents’ Committee, salary compression, comments on the Office of the Ombudsperson, parking (a continuing matter), and the new policy on F and FW grades (e.g., its application to online courses). The FacSen is seeking more information about and improvements on all of these issues.

As stated previously, you can get additional information on the FacSen efforts on any of these topics. Sue Bishop can put you in touch with the most knowledgeable source (e.g., a Committee chairperson) on a given topic.

On behalf of the UNO FacSen, we hope you will join with us in strengthening the faculty voice in ALL relevant issues.

1. NU System Issues:

   a. Revise and Separate Alcohol and Illicit Drugs Policies: The two topics should be dealt with separately. I have suggested to the Faculty Senate Presidents on the other three campuses that there be a unified approach to the related issues. (See Resolution Log for Resolution 4188 under “To Be Followed Up”) NU President Bounds is also looking at this issue. There is no dispute about separating the two topics. This continues to be looked at, but the Chancellor has no idea where the matter is going, including previous
approvals and contracts for alcohol at certain events or occasions (UNO Baxter Arena and Alumni House).

b. **Retention:** It is believed that increased contacts between an instructor and student will enhance learning. Therefore, the faculty seems to have a positive response to the Senior Vice Chancellor’s stated intention to rely less on adjuncts, giving more emphasis to full-time faculty. *This issue is now in Central Administration. NU President Bounds is doing an analysis of the adjunct issue. There is awareness for faculty/student interaction. Chancellor Christensen will also take the matter to the Chancellor’s Cabinet.*

c. **Regents’ Committee:** In a meeting with the NU President, the four Faculty Senate Presidents in the System requested that the NU President consider allowing a faculty representative to be appointed to the two academically-oriented Regents’ committees. *The chancellor is okay with having the Faculty Senate President on the Board of Regents Committees, but this would have to be decided by the Board of Regents.*

d. **Ombudsperson:** I have suggested to the Faculty Senate Presidents on the other three campuses that there be a unified approach to the related issues. *The Chancellor is concerned about the legal implications for Ombuds services, including reliance on a professional association for directives. The matter has been submitted to Central Administration for legal review. The Faculty Senate will send any feedback of the draft of the Ombuds Policy to the Faculty Personnel & Welfare Committee chairperson by mid-December. Senator Gershovich will then send it to Shireen Bingham.*

2. **Internal UNO Campus Issues:**

a. **General Classroom Space:** The Registrar’s team provided useful information about the forthcoming scheduling system. However, faculty concern continues about how growth can be accommodated without more general-purpose classroom space. Emphasis has seemingly been on the faculty’s solving problems by alternative scheduling, without any indication of forthcoming additional physical space. Note: several former classrooms (e.g., in Roskens, Kayser, and perhaps elsewhere) have been assigned to non-instructional services. There is an effort being made for Capital Funding to renovate Durham Science Center and Arts & Science Hall by 2017 (pending funding).

b. **Salary Compression:** From a survey, the faculty’s top concern is salary compression. *This issue was not discussed with the Senior Vice Chancellor yet, but the Chancellor will take it to the Chancellor’s Cabinet for consideration. The Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee is also looking at this.*

c. **Parking:** It is believed that the UNO Administration has done a good job on remedying certain parking-related problems (e.g., traffic flow in the Welcome Center lot and new traffic arms in the east garage). *Approval has been given for a 1,300 stall parking garage near Mammel Hall and PKI. It should be*
completed by Fall of 2017. There is still the adjunct parking issue to be resolved.

d. **Grading Policy Change for “F” Grades** (Policy draft 11/02/15 by Financial Support and Scholarships Office, updated 11/15/15.) The Chancellor asked the SVC to explain this issue. The SVC said to direct questions to Mark Goldsberry, Director of Records & Registration, and Marty Habrock, Director, Office of Financial Support/Scholarships. As time is of the essence, President Woody has asked Sue Bishop, Faculty Senate Coordinator, to send a memo to both parties for more of an explanation. (See this issue above, out of order under New Business)

e. **Grade Appeals:** Sue Bishop says (11/17/15): "Rita Henry called to tell me that the Appeals Committee was applicable to grade appeals only. It was disbanded by a past Registrar, Wade Robinson, when the decision was made that the Deans were the end in the appeals process."

f. **Faculty Rights & Roles:**
   - Note that I have reason to believe that some (a minority) of middle-tier administrators lack an understanding of the faculty's rights and roles relevant to administrative planning and decisions, and
   - Encourage each Senator to introduce this topic in any contacts that he/she might have with any-level administrator. Incidentally, I exclude the President, Chancellor, and Senior Vice Chancellor (and close staff members) from this concern.

g. **Strategic Planning Forum:** To be sure the voice of the Faculty Senate is heard, members of the Faculty Senate are encouraged to attend the Strategic Planning session being planned for Friday, January 22, 2016, from 8:00 to 1:30 in the Alumni Center.

3. **Internal Faculty Senate Issues:**

   a. **Facilities Planning Committee:** If there is a separate facilities committee that contributes to planning, and, if so, the Faculty Senate would like to appoint a representative to it. *(This will be put on the next EC&A agenda.)*

B. **Secretary-Treasurer’s Report:** Senator Eesley

   1. **EC&A Report:** No Meeting/No Report

   ![2015-2016 Resolution Action Table](image-url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Force</th>
<th>TO BE FOLLOWED UP</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4188  | 3/11/15 Revise and Separate Alcohol and Illicit Drugs Policies | 3/18/15 | • Chancellor supports & will write a response  
• Chanc. sent to VC Conley who sent back to Faculty Senate President. |
| 4185  | 2/11/15 Regarding Establishing Clear and Communicable Policies for Emeritus Status | 2/18/15 | • Acknowledged  
• Sent to James McCarty, Asst to SVC |
| 4074  | 2/13/13 Criminal Background Checks at UNO | 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. |
| 4054  | 7/11/12 Determine Contractual Implications of Background Check Policy (w/participation of bargaining unit and Central Admin.) | 9/6/12 | The chancellor acknowledges receipt of the resolution and has provided the legal opinion requested.*  
(UNO Faculty Senate is not satisfied with this response.) |

*4074 (From Chancellor Christensen via Nancy Castilow in an e-mail sent on2/18/13: 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.)

*Legal Opinion:*

**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

2. **Treasurer’s Report:** Senator Eesley submitted the November 2015 budget report.

IV. **Standing Committee Reports**

A. **Professional Development:** Senator Sollars reported the committee met November 30, 2015.

Present: Harvey Siy, Suzanne Sollars, Vincent Woolf  Participant members unable to be in attendance: Travis Adams, Barry Ford, Adam Tyma

Last month, committee members each selected portions to analyze of the open-ended questions on the adjunct survey. Through the month, we worked to categorize the sentiments and positions stated by the survey respondents.

At the meeting, we reviewed the work of our committee’s evaluation of the open-ended answers. We will be composing an executive summary of the results to present next month.

V. **Other Faculty Senate Committee Reports**

A. **Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee Report:** Prof. E. Johnson, Maher, Ward wrote the committee met November 18, 2015, to discuss the salary compression project. We all agreed that this was a worthy endeavor, that the focus for now should be UNO (a system-wide study was mentioned earlier) and we devised a strategy:

1. Between now and beginning of the spring semester we will be conducting a literature review and working on the dataset;
2. We are meeting in January to discuss the lit review and the existing data;
3. We will send a message to you about our lit review findings which could very well result in additional data needs;
4. We hope to prepare a report by the end of the Spring semester.

VI. Non-Senate Committee Reports

A. Graduate Council: Prof Toller wrote the Council met Monday, November 9, 2015. 

Members present: Heather Hannaford, Christina Dando, Connie Schaffer, Paige Toller, Kerry Beldin, Leah Pietron, Julie Boron, Joan Latchaw, Patrice Proulx, Phyllis Adcock, Emily Wright, Lynn Harland, Jody Neathery-Castro, and Dean for Graduate Studies Deborah Smith-Howell

Dean’s Report

2014-15 Year in Review
This is the second year that we have done this. You will receive a copy in the mail once they are back from print.

Spring 2016 Admission Report-attachment
Last spring we had a decrease in our new students, which was kind of a concern with the number that we were graduating. It was surprising that we had a 1% growth from fall to fall. We are pleased that while the applications are not up the admissions are up from last spring. Enrollments have just begun. You can get these reports through PING.

GA review (for those in their 4th year)-attachment
These shared pool lines are not owned by the individual department that they are on a four year review cycle. We will have guidelines out in the spring 2016 and will have to have them in for the fall decision will be made before December 1st for renewal or reallocation. This information will be communicated with all of the department. We don’t want these forms to be difficult; at the same time we have to have meaningful information. Dr. Smith-Howell is going to do a draft and then run it by the Policy & Planning committee.

GA call for 2016-17
Disused with the Council an idea before communicating this with others. We have at least another $100,000.00 for another call for GA’s that would start for 2016-2017. Dr. Smith-Howell has received feedback on is that because they are all shared it creates kind of a financial hardship as the colleges have to come up with the money. We want the colleges to scrutinize they must be linked to the request and how you use the GA that part is not going to change. Thinking about making an offer to fully fund (stipend and remission) them but would not be able to award as many. If you remember looking at units across the country the GA’s that come out straight out of the Graduate Studies offices are typically support the instructional mission of the campus, whereas the units be more responsible for supporting the research mission.

Two possible options:
1. The idea of the possibility of a full GA line (stipend and remission) if the arguments are made around how these this GA position will support the instructional mission and enrollment growth for that program or the University as a whole.
2. Align with our diversity and inclusion goals is the idea of holding a GA line that if a program recruits a McNair scholar. McNair Scholars Program is a federal TRIO program. Designed to help to help underrepresented groups get a doctorate. At this time we only waive an application fee.

Discussion

MavTrack Charter
Graduate Studies is currently working with ACDC to pilot a UNO software called MavTrack.

MavTrack is an online advising scheduling and note-taking system that is currently only used with UNO undergraduate students. Social Work and IS&T will be piloting this new system for the graduate student population.

Once MavTrack is launched, the same opportunity will be available to other departments and graduate programs.

Sammi Kaiser in the Academic and Career Development Center is coordinating this project with OGS. The minimum baseline requirements for MavTrack are:

- All faculty and staff members using the MavTrack system must use and update Outlook daily.
- Every department must designate a MavTrack lead who would troubleshoot day-to-day issues with the system and train the new users in the department. This could be any staff member determined by the department or graduate program chair.
- OGS is meeting with ACDC on November 19th to see a demo of MavTrack for graduate students. We will keep you posted on future developments and let you know the date MavTrack will be launched for graduate students.

**Common Learning Outcomes-Graduate Programs**

The reason that this has come up recently is that Jill Russell, our Accreditation guru working towards our Higher Learning Commission report that is due in November 2016. The summer 2014 Dr. Smith-Howell was at the Council of Graduate Schools Summer Institute and there were all of these accreditation folks. They were all speaking of this Assessment stuff and what the graduate programs where having to do. After the conference Dr. Smith-Howell came back and spoke with Dr. Paul Barnes. Dr. (s) Barnes and Grams had been working on the program assessment and the good news that our Assessment committee and the way we did it from two or three years ago they were going to do every single degree and major which includes our graduate programs. We do not want to set up a separate review process of our graduate programs.

The thing that has come up now is what we want for all graduate students. It is kind of like GenEd for graduate students only it is more of an end of career outcome. When we received a request from Jill that she needed a matrix not a problem we have this and will get it from Candice. Come to find out that was not exactly the matrix she wanted it was an overall matrix; well there is not one and we are not going to make them up. It is not completely clear that we have to have them but the other thing that is clear to me is that actually have implicit expectations for all of our graduate programs. Every single graduate program has an exit requirement; it comes in different forms (i.e. thesis, comprehensive examinations, capstones, etc...) the genesis of that exit requirement is a level of integration and synthesis to the discipline. We want to take a little bit of time to think about and talk about what it is that we expect out of our master’s programs. All we are talking about is making explicit what is implicit. What is it that when you get a master’s degree how is it different than an undergraduate degree. One of the places I want to share with people is with Lumina Foundations Degree Qualifications Profile. It is a fascinating project they do an overall and a number of things by discipline. They talk about what type of overall learning should there be for an associates, bachelors, and for a master’s degree. It is the broad base and then the discipline is specific. Think that it might be useful if we could articulate those and the Graduate Council and Graduate Program
Chairs buy into them that it would help people understand some of the individual rules and policies and practices that we have because all of those are about what it takes to get a master’s degree. It really is about what makes a master’s degree different than an undergraduate degree. When we have been asked to cross-list 2.0/8.0 level courses we say “no”. If I talk about that if you are at a graduate level you must be operating at a higher level of background in synthesis and research makes more sense than saying “no”. We are clear that there is an exit requirement for every graduate program. If we make it explicit that we expect mark of a master’s degree is a level of something (synthesis, integration, and expertise) is different than a doctoral degree. It is not a collection of hours we want them to do something different. If we were to adopt a set of overall outcomes it would be done at the program level. We are not talking about graduate GenEd. We are talking about things that cut across. The first thing to do is a content analysis of the existing program learning outcomes by doing so we would find two to three common threads that would be our overall outcomes. These would be the two things that we would do what do we as a Graduate College require and then look at a content analysis of the program outcomes and find out those common themes that already exist and then articulate the overall outcomes. We have always supposed to of been doing this with our graduate programs for at least 20 years. The thing about graduate programs is we do it with your thesis, your comps, graduate programs are the easiest to do.

Committee(s):
1. Policy & Planning Committee (A)-Dr. Wright-beginning to work on sections of the Graduate Studies Policy & Procedure manual.

Courses, Programs & Evaluations (B) –have met twice and reviewed and approved 19 new syllabi and 3 revised syllabi.

VII. Old Business

A. Revise and Separate Alcohol and Illicit Drugs Policies (See Resolution Log for Resolution 4188 under “To Be Followed Up”) (in Faculty Personnel & Welfare, also in Central Administration) (to 11/2015 EC&A agenda for follow up)

B. Regarding Establishing Clear and Communicable Policies for Emeritus Status (See Resolution Log for Resolution 4185 under “To Be Followed Up”) (from 4/15 EC&A Minutes: Update on Professor Emeritus Progress – Arts and Sciences have a draft policy. James McCarty is making sure there is at least a policy at the college level. Follow up in the fall 2015.) (e-mail 11/5/15 to James McCarty asking for status w/a follow-up call from President Woody.)

The following was received from Patti Jacoba, per James McCarty:

1. College of Communication, Fine Arts and Media
   Emeritus Status Procedures
   a. The faculty member must express an interest in emeritus status.
   b. Faculty member’s unit’s full-time tenured faculty will vote to recommend or not.
   c. Recommendation is submitted to the dean.
   d. The dean will forward recommendation/s to the Senior Vice Chancellor.
   e. The Senior Vice Chancellor will decide and his recommendation/s will be submitted to the Board of Regents for vote/approval.

2. IS&T
   Our policy is simple – On request or nomination by a faculty themselves or by a
peer, appropriate departmental/school faculty review and support a request for Emeritus status. This recommendation is then made to the dean on behalf of the department/school for further approval at UNO.

3. **College of Arts and Sciences Emeritus Policy DRAFT**

**Preface**

In spring 2015, the Faculty Senate at UNO requested through resolution that deans charge their units with developing and publishing policies and criteria to be used in recommending individuals for emeritus status.

Currently, the Nebraska Board of Regent Policy 4.2.6 on emeritus status states the following:

*Emeritus status is the rank customarily awarded by the President or Chancellor of each campus to a faculty member at the time of his or her retirement. Emeritus status is given in recognition of substantial service rendered to the University in the field of teaching, research, or service and to facilitate retired faculty to continue their research and to provide advice and the benefits of their expertise to colleagues and students....While length of service is not necessarily material, employment for at least ten years is to be presumed, although exceptions to this term may be made by the President or Chancellor awarding the emeritus rank.*

According to this policy, in order to be recommended for emeritus status, the person must 1) hold faculty rank, 2) be retired, 3) have a record of substantial service to the university in teaching, research, or service, and 4) have ten years of employment (with the noted exception above). Pre-requisite age for retirement - though not specifically stated in RP4.2.6 – is 55, with ten years of service.

At UNO, the Chancellor’s approval of emeritus status has been delegated to the Senior Vice-Chancellor (SVC), who alerts candidates of their official emeritus status by mid-May. Therefore, the dean of the respective college must receive and forward to the SVC recommendations of emeritus status by the end of a regular academic year (early May). The SCV’s designee sends the list of emeritus faculty to Central Administration in July of each year for reporting at the September board of Regents.

**Department’s Responsibilities**

Departments will be charged with developing and publishing emeritus policies and criteria for their units, including procedures for approval of recommendations.

Criteria for application might cover (examples only) –

- Meets minimum retirement eligibility (55 years old, ten years of service)
- Is a member in “good standing” or has provided meritorious or distinguished contribution to the university (**departments will develop a specific list of what would constitute good standing or meritorious or distinguished contributions**)
- Holds full time faculty rank

Policies and Procedures might cover (examples only)

- How applicant applies for status (self-nominates, nominated by peers, nominated by ad hoc committee, etc.)
- Who in unit votes (full department, tenured faculty, specific committee, etc.)
- How the vote takes place (via email, by written or voice ballot, etc.)
- Mechanisms in place when applicant and/or Chair disagrees with
unit vote (including time limits for appeals, extra documentation necessary, etc.)

- Special exceptions (retirement before 55 because of disability or illness, etc.)

The appropriate body within the unit will vote on the recommendation and will communicate those voting outcomes with enumerated reasons for the vote to the unit Chair.

The Chair will provide the Dean with a written recommendation for a faculty member’s emeritus request, which will include the outcomes of the unit’s vote taken for recommendation and a copy of the criteria used to make the recommendation.

**Dean’s Responsibilities**

The Dean will forward emeritus recommendations to Academic and Student Affairs by the end of the academic year (no later than early May).

In the event the Dean does not concur with the recommendation sent by the unit Chair, the Dean will provide specific enumerated reasons for the Dean’s recommendation to Academic and Student Affairs.

The Dean will communicate his/her action to the Department.

4. **College of Business**

CBA follows the NU Board of Regents policy regarding emeritus ranking. Department faculty vote on each retiree’s proposed status. The department chair then sends a request to the dean, who follows up with a request to the Vice Chancellor’s office.

5. **College of Education**

Emeritus Status Process

April 6, 2015

According to the Policies of the Board of Regents “Emeritus status is given in recognition of substantial service rendered to the University in the field of teaching, research, or service and to facilitate retired faculty to continue their research and to provide advice and the benefits of their expertise to colleagues and students.”

Designations of emeritus status are reported to the Board of Regents in the regularly scheduled personnel reports.

The College of Education grants “Emeritus Status” to those faculty retiring from the University of Nebraska at Omaha with at least ten years of service as recommended in the Board of Regents Policies (RP-4.2.6). The process followed:

a. The faculty in the retiree’s respective unit vote to recommend Emeritus Status.

b. The recommendation of the faculty is forwarded to the Dean with a letter of support from the respective chair/director.

c. The College of Education Dean sends a letter of support to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs for approval.

d. This information is forwarded to the Board of regents as a party of the personnel report.

e. A letter confirming Emeritus Status is sent to the recipient by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs.

f. Personnel Action Forms are completed to document this status in SAP.

6. **College of Public Affairs and Community Service**

We follow the Board of Regents policy.

7. **Criss Library**
Procedure for Granting Emeritus Status
- Approved at Library Faculty Meeting, 4/23/2015 –

The NU Board of Regents describes emeritus status as “the rank customarily awarded by the President or Chancellor of each campus to a faculty member at the time of his or her retirement. Emeritus status is given in recognition of substantial service rendered to the University in the field of teaching, research or service and to facilitate retired faculty to continue their research and to provide advice and the benefits of their expertise to colleagues and students.” *(Regents’ Policy 4.2.6)*

The library faculty may recommend emeritus status to acknowledge a librarian’s longstanding contributions to the Library and University. The Regents indicate that “while length of service is not necessarily material, employment for at least ten years is to be presumed, although exceptions to this term may be made by the President or Chancellor awarding the emeritus rank.” *(Regents’ Policy 4.2.6)*

- A librarian may self-nominate or be nominated for consideration for emeritus status. Nominations may come from colleagues in the Library or from other academic units of the University. Ordinarily a nomination and application should be submitted two months before the scheduled retirement date.
- The application shall include a letter summarizing the nominee’s contributions and accomplishments and an updated curriculum vitae. The nominee or nominator may, but is not required to, solicit and submit additional letters of support.
- The Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee shall coordinate consideration of the application, making the documentation available for review by the library faculty and conducting a vote among the tenured and tenure-track faculty, including Directors and any Assistant/Associate Dean. The faculty shall have at least two weeks to review the documentation and submit their votes.
- The Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee shall submit the application, the result of the vote, and its written recommendation to the Dean within two weeks of the conclusion of the vote.
- The Dean shall review the documentation and send a written recommendation to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs. The Dean shall also convey this written recommendation to the nominee and nominator. The Dean’s recommendation shall ordinarily be completed within one month.

*Any privileges or perquisites attendant to emeritus status shall be governed by Regents’ Policy 4.2.6.*

C. Adjunct Instructor Issues: (in Professional Development Committee 3/15)
“Improve the onboarding, training, performance evaluations and interpersonal and organizational treatment of adjunct instructors.”

Actions to Date: Professional Development Committee led by Senator Sollars is drafting a survey of adjunct instructors and has solicited and received feedback from the Faculty Senate.

Faculty Survey indicated a top 10 concern regarding adjunct instructor issues
The Student Senate survey also indicated several concerns about adjunct instructors
Next Steps? How to integrate this information and work with administration to address all these adjunct issues.

Correspondence from an Adjunct Professor to President Woody:

From: Robert Woody
Sent: Saturday, November 07, 2015 9:21 AM
To: Sue Bishop
Subject: Memorandum for ALL faculty
November 9, 2015

Attached is a letter to all faculty and administrators at UNO. It is essentially an update of Faculty Senate information.
Bob Woody
UNO 2015-16 Faculty Senate President

From: David Becker <djbecker@unomaha.edu>
To: Robert Woody <rwoody@unomaha.edu>; psychlegal <psychlegal@aol.com>
Sent: Thu, Nov 26, 2015 10:53 am
Subject: Fw: Memorandum for ALL faculty

Dr. Woody,

I am an adjunct professor of geology in the Department of Geography/Geology where I have taught for 16 years. I read with interest the update you provided to the faculty about your impressions of Dr. Bounds and the UNO administration. In particular, there was a mention of an issue regarding quality control for adjunct professors. I was wondering if you would elaborate on that for me. Are there additional actions or investigations planned by the administration regarding the teaching skills, course content, course evaluations, etc.? Any information you could provide would be appreciated. Thanks.
Dave Becker, P.G., MS
Adjunct Professor of Geology
University of Nebraska Omaha
and Geologist, US Army Corps of Engineers

From: Robert Woody <psychlegal@aol.com>
To: djbecker <djbecker@unomaha.edu>
Cc: sbishop <sbishop@unomaha.edu>
Sent: Thu, Nov 26, 2015 11:27 am
Subject: Re: Memorandum for ALL faculty

Dave: Thank you for your letter. Note that, in keeping with the Faculty Senate policies and bylaws, I am sending a copy of this letter to our Executive Committee for possible assignment to a committee for a response. By copy of this letter, I am asking Sue Bishop, the Faculty Senate’s administrative assistant, to forward this communication to all members of the Executive Council and Cabinet.

I am aware that one adjunct took offense at the term "quality control." My personal view is that "quality control" applies to everyone in the University. To my knowledge, it is not a "loaded" term. At this point in time, you are aware of as many details of "additional actions or investigations planned by the administration regarding the teaching skills, course content, course evaluations, etc." as I have knowledge. Anything along this line that emerges from the administration or any source will be reported to the Faculty Senate, which means that its actions will be made available to everyone.
Again, thank you for your letter. Cordially, Bob Woody, President, UNO Faculty Senate

From: David Becker <djbecker@unomaha.edu>
To: Robert Woody <psychlegal@aol.com>
Sent: Thu, Nov 26, 2015 2:28 pm
Subject: Re: Memorandum for ALL faculty
Dr. Woody,

Thanks for the quick response, on Thanksgiving yet. Unlike the other adjunct professor, I do not take offense at the use of the term "quality control." In fact, in my "real" job, the function of our group is really one of quality control for the environmental cleanups conducted by the Corps of Engineers. I am not concerned about any assessment of my own performance, as I believe I provide quality instruction to my students, as indicated by the course evaluations and the feedback from former students. I am, however, interested in the administration's perception of the adjunct staff and what they may have in mind to address any problems they perceive exist. I appreciate the sharing of information via the Faculty Senate.

Thanks very much. Enjoy your holiday.
Dave Becker

D. UNO Constituency Safety & Well-being: (in Faculty Personnel & Welfare, 5/15)
Senator Scherer reported better education, coordination and communication of information to all constituencies on how to facilitate the health, safety and well-being of ALL of its constituents:
1. Student Safety Website—very impressive but would like to see a Faculty and Staff Safety website
2. Confusion on resources for faculty staff (Ombudsmen, EAP person, Counseling, Behavioral Review Team, etc.). What information is confidential? What is not? Where to go?
3. BRT: Student Concerns—Student is the focal person or person of concern and faculty, staff and students can report here? If is the person of concern is a faculty or student, where does a faculty or staff person report? What are the mechanisms for dealing with the issue(s)?

E. Mental Health Related Issue: A senator asked the Faculty Senate to follow up on what specific resources are available to report students needing help (from harming self or others) and how the process works. (in Professional Development Committee, 10/14/15)
What is the structure of reporting an issue, and how is this being advertised to faculty?

F. Parking Issues:
Some of the information given to the Faculty Senate did not match with the days and times adjuncts may be on campus. (The Senate thought fees for Adjunct parking were still too expensive and asked that this be put on the next EC&A agenda.)

G. University of Nebraska Awards (IDEA, ORCA, OTICA, UDTA) (back to Rules Committee, 10/7/15)
H. Distribution of Funds and Salary Compression (to Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee, 10/7/15)

I. MavCard Bus Pass for Faculty (Resolution 4224, then to Faculty Personnel & Welfare Committee, 10/7&14/15)

Received 11/23/15:

From: Brock Lewis <bblewis@unomaha.edu>
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 8:59 PM
To: Robert Woody; Teonne Wright
Subject: MavRide Future

Hello,

I wanted to reach out with an update to the MavRide program. Patrick Wheeler has taken the lead on discussions that would make MavRide a university wide sustainability initiative. Starting this spring MavRide will be supported by the Office of Business and Finance along with Student Government, and will be open to all of UNO 24/7 365 days a year. As far as I am aware of anyone with a MavCard will be able to use the Metro buses whenever they want.

Due to these changes we will not be moving forward with switching faculty and staff over to using passes. This is due to students no longer needing a pass so there is no need for anyone to switch over to a pass.

Please feel free to reach out with any questions or concerns.

Brock Lewis
UNO Student Body President/Regent

The EC&C asked that this issue be put on the next EC&A agenda to be sure that all faculty/staff/students are notified.

J. UNO Ombudsman Charter/Confidentiality (See President’s Report) [The EC&C sent this to the Faculty Personnel & Welfare Committee 11/11/15 to collect and collate suggestions to send feedback to Shereen Bingham in December 2015.]

K. Class Scheduling/Classroom Space (in Educational Resources & Services Committee, 10/14/15)

L. Disability & Support Services: Senator Nordness reported that this committee met a couple of weeks ago and agreed to meet again. AVC Jonathan Benjamin-Alvarado set up the committee.

VIII. New Business

A. Resolution for Temporary CPACS Replacement Senator: The following resolution was moved by Senator Nordness, with Senator Kreiling seconding. The resolution will be presented to the full Senate next week.

BE IT RESOLVED that CPACS Senator Nancy Kelley Gillespie will be taking Faculty Development Leave next semester (Spring 2016), Jieru Bai will be appointed as her temporary replacement (1/1/2016-5/11/2016) on the UNO Faculty Senate.
B. **Faculty Senator Elections Statistics** were discussed. Senator Nordness moved, with Senator Kreiling seconding, to accept these statistics.

C. **Faculty Senate President-Elections** were discussed the nominations and election will take place next week.

D. **GenEd Assessment Committee**: Senator Grams discussed where the committee is now and felt that this issue affected more than one college, as shown below in an excerpt from the Board of Regents Bylaws. The EC&C thus felt that this issue should be looked at by a Faculty Senate standing committee. It was sent to the Academic & Curricular Affairs Committee.

2.12 **Provision for Faculty Government.** The faculties of each major administrative unit shall establish a governing agency for dealing with matters of interest to more than one college. Such agencies shall be democratic in structure and operation and shall determine rules concerning membership. They shall conduct business in open session, and minutes of meetings shall be public information. By no less than a majority vote of those present, an executive session may be authorized. An agency may include student participation under conditions and circumstances approved by the agency. All rules and regulations of such agency shall be adopted in accordance with Section 1.2 of these Bylaws.

*History:* Amended by the corporation Secretary pursuant to the authority of Sec. 1.12 (b) of these Bylaws (27 April 2012)

2.12.1 **Responsibilities of Faculty Governing Agencies.** Each agency shall have the following general responsibilities.

(a) Adopt its rules of procedure, in accordance with Section 1.2 of these Bylaws;
(b) Act as the official voice of the faculty of which it is composed;
(c) Act on academic matters that affect more than one college; …

E. **Online Evaluations:** Senator Grams said that setting the period for evaluation does not work. It is a programming issue. The EC&C sent this to the Educational Resources & Services Committee, and also asked that it be put on the next EC&A agenda.

IX. The **meeting adjourned** at 4:05 p.m. with announcements.

X. **Announcements**

A. **Faculty Senate Mtg:** Wednesday, December 9, 2015, CEC 230
   2 p.m. Presentation: SVC BJ Reed.

B. **UNO Holiday Open House:** Wednesday, 12/9/15, 3:30-5 p.m., Alumni Center,
   RSVP by 12/2 to dhathaway@unomaha.edu

C. **EC&A Mtg:** Wednesday, December 16, 2015, 2 p.m., EAB 200

D. **EC&C Mtg:** Wednesday, January 6, 2016, 2 p.m., ASH 196

E. **Faculty/Staff Awards Banquet:** Wednesday, April 27, 2016, MBSC Ballroom, 6:30 p.m. Social, 7:15 p.m. Dinner
## Schedule for 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC&amp;C Meetings</th>
<th>Faculty Senate Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Usually 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Wednesday of month)</td>
<td>(Usually 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Wednesday of month)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2</td>
<td>December 9 <em>(Prep Week)</em> (CEC 230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Commencement 12/18/15)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; <em>(Semester begins 1/11/16)</em></td>
<td>January 13, 2016 (CEC 231)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3</td>
<td>February 10 (CEC 231)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2</td>
<td>March 9 <em>(Spring Break 3/20-3/27/16)</em> (CEC 231?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6</td>
<td>April 13 (CEC 231)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4 <em>(Finals Week)</em></td>
<td>May 11 <em>(Commencement 5/6 &amp; 5/7/16)</em> (CEC 231)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>