Faculty Senate Retreat
Wednesday, August 20, 2003, 10:30 a.m., Alumni Center

Attendees: Akers, Allen, Bacon, Benjamin-Alvarado, Bennett, Bishop, J. Carroll, M. Carroll, D’Souza, Dando, Dasgupta, Dickson, Garver, Helm, Latchaw, Littrell, Madsen, Mei, Metal-Corbin, Mitenko, Nazem, Neathery-Castro, Owens, Pasco, Pedersen, Ritter, Sadlek, Schulte, Shroder, Simpson, Tixier y Vigil, Williams, Zigurs

Excused: Kosloski, Krause, Ortman, Shuster

Absent: Lewis

The Faculty Senate Retreat began at 10:45 a.m. with the following guest presentations:

A. Chancellor Belck
B. Interim Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs Christensen
C. John Bartle (with Julie Totten) for the Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee
D. Joyce Crockett for Campus Information Technology Services
E. Senator James Carroll: Parliamentary Tips

II. Senator Sadlek called the August Faculty Senate meeting to order at 12:45 p.m.

III. The minutes of the May 16, 2003, meeting were approved as distributed.

IV. Officers Reports

A. President’s Report: Senator Sadlek reported on the following:

1. Board of Regents Meeting: August 8-9, 2003

   Among the items of business were the changing of the UNO Juvenile Justice Initiative to the Juvenile Justice Institute, the approval of a pilot program between UNO and the Millard School District, the transfer of ownership of UNO’s Scott Village from the Suzanne and Walter Scott Foundation to the Board of Regents., the approval of a library storage facility in Lincoln, the UNO/Crossroads Parking agreement, and approval of the UNO Graduate Certificate in Technical Communication.

2. Executive Committee and Administration Meeting: July 15, 2003

   The Administration received Senate resolutions 2687-2688. Discussion was held regarding the Juvenile Justice Institute, Nebraska Foundation fund-raising for faculty development, facilities needs, diversity funding, and priority programs.
B. Secretary-Treasurer’s Report: Senator Dickson submitted the July 2003 Budget Report.

V. Executive Committee Report: Senator Bacon submitted Resolutions 2687-2691 for review. These resolutions were passed by the Executive Committee and Cabinet which met during the summer in lieu of the full senate.

The meeting was recessed for lunch at 1:05 p.m. and resumed at 1:40 p.m.

VI. Standing Committee Reports

A. Committee on Academic and Curricular Affairs: Senator Neathery-Castro reviewed the actions and ideas of the 2002-2003 committee.

B. Committee on Educational Resources and Services: Senator Dickson reported the account for the Paul Beck Scholarship has surfaced again. It was moved from UNO Grants Accounting to UNO Accounting. The Faculty Senate Coordinator, Sue Bishop, will keep this information, and current budget number, in the office files, and it will also be filed in the ER&S notebook.

C. Committee on Faculty Personnel and Welfare: Senator D’Souza reported that the committee will be working on the Faculty Handbook in the coming year.

D. Committee on Professional Development: Senator Nazem noted that something to keep in mind is conferences that are sponsored by this campus. Faculty should be able to use them as outlets for papers and presentations in these times of budget/travel restrictions.

E. Committee on Rules: Senator Littrell noted that the committee submitted names of faculty to be considered for Search Committees. Senator Sadlek read the names of the members of the Search Committees.

VII. Faculty Senate Advisory Committee Reports

A. Budget Advisory Committee: Assoc. Prof. Bartle gave a short presentation at the beginning of the Retreat.

VIII. Non-Senate Committee Reports

A. Academic Planning Council: Senator Williams noted that 5-6 programs are slated for Academic Program Review.

B. American Association of University Professors (AAUP): Senator D’Souza noted that there are no outstanding grievances.

IX. New Business
A The meeting was recessed at 2:30 p.m. to enable Committees to break out to discuss the following items:

1. Goals for the next year,
2. Faculty Handbook (Sections assigned were taken from 1976 UNO Faculty Handbook)
   a. Academic & Curricular Affairs Committee: (4) Rights & Responsibilities of the Professional Staff
   b. Educational Resources Committee: (6) University Resources for Teaching and Research
   c. Faculty Personnel & Welfare Committee: (5) Fringe Benefits
   d. Goals & Directions Committee: (7) Miscellany
   e. Professional Development Committee: (3) Terms and Conditions of Employment
   f. Rules Committee: (2) Governance of University
3. Prioritization
   c. What should be the general purposes of prioritization?
   d. What have been the weaknesses and the strengths of prioritization on the UNO campus?
   e. Have the published criteria for prioritization proven adequate for our purposes?
   f. In what ways can the procedures for assessing departments and programs be improved?
   g. With the coming of a new academic Vice Chancellor, is it time to review our priorities?

The meeting reconvened at 4:15 p.m. Each committee reported its discussions:

B. Committee Goals for the Year 2003-2004

1. Academic & Curricular Affairs: Senator Neathery-Castro reported that the committee will continue to follow-up on the administration's implementation of Senate resolutions, consider how repeated violations of the academic-integrity policy should be reported in the absence of a Student Affairs division, discover what resources are available for students in academic jeopardy, consider faculty oversight of articulation agreements and standardization, investigate UNO's participation in the Elderhostel program, and will work on the section of the Faculty Handbook assigned to them.

2. Educational Resources & Services: Senator Dickson reported:
   a. check on using Social Security numbers in SIS;
   b. research the implementation of the new Lotus Notes system;
   c. fund raising and advertising for the Paul Beck Scholarships;
   d. working with Financial Aid to get a list of UNO based scholarships which is available to students.
3. Faculty Personnel & Welfare: Senator D’Souza reported that regarding the Faculty Handbook, committee members were assigned specific responsibilities having to do with Fringe Benefit issues. They will discuss prioritization during the semester.

4. Goals & Direction: Senator Garver reported for Senator Simpson:

Present were Senators Caroline Simpson (chairperson), Chris Allen, Jonathan Benjamin-Alvarado (vice-chairperson), and Bruce Garver

At the conclusion of this meeting, Senator Garver reported that the Committee will focus on the following during the coming academic year:

a. In regard to UNO’s Strategic Plan, the G&D Committee agreed that we shall work within the existing framework, but will adopt a more pro-active response to elements of the plan.

b. We shall investigate the possibilities of UNO’s initiating a capital campaign to fund faculty research and travel, and to create additional endowed chairs. We shall encourage departments to pursue extramural funding aggressively.

c. We shall work with UNO’s administration to promote a more positive public image of UNO, including UNO’s manifold contributions to the well-being, not only of our community and state, but also to the United States. For example, UNO trains many of the secondary school teachers who prepare students for admission to excellent undergraduate programs in Nebraska and nationwide. Moreover, many UNO graduates go on to success in graduate and professional schools throughout the United States.
d. The Committee shall work to advance the following policy whose implementation we believe to be essential to maintaining and improving the quality of UNO in the future: UNO should give the highest priority to recruiting and supporting the ablest young faculty members whom UNO can hire and retain.

Senator Simpson, who left the retreat early to attend a CFA meeting, thanks Senators Jonathan Benjamin-Alvaredo (vice chair), Chris Allen, and Bruce Garver for their committee work.

The Goals & Direction Committee will have its next meeting on September 24 at 2 p.m. in Room 318 of the Fine Arts Building.

5. Professional Development: Senator Ritter reported for Senator Nazem that they would look into supporting junior faculty, including both formal and informal systems of mentoring, will investigate the current status of UCAT and UCR, and travel budgets. They would like to work on a policy to prioritize funding for travel funds for junior faculty and perhaps to see how to get more information out about/for endowed chairs. The committee recommended that their assigned section of the proposed web-based Faculty Handbook be linked to the AAUP contract, and they will then work on those items not covered by the contract.

6. Rules: Senator Littrell reported that it is a balancing act between working with the administration in identifying folks to serve on different types of committees. The committee doesn’t want the administration to take over naming faculty members to committees.

C The Goals and Directions Committee also returned with names to fill two campus committee vacancies: Senator Chris Allen was selected to serve on the Academic Planning Council (APC), and Senator Bruce Garver was reappointed to serve on the Strategic Planning Steering Committee.

D President Sadlek opened the floor for responses to the prioritization questions, which were considered in order.

1. General purposes of prioritization?

Any further prioritization should disconnect between priority programs and cutting programs. There should be no linkage between a program not being a Priority Program and the cutting of that program.
2. Weaknesses and the strengths of prioritization on the UNO campus?

The committee consensus was they liked the way it was written, but, in most cases, not the way it was followed. The way it stands now prioritization, and the process, divides and fragments the faculty. There are some benefits to have some programs reassessed. The program might have led to misappropriation of funds. The Senators agreed that they did not want the prioritization process to weaken the Liberal Arts foundation of the university. Priority departments should be reviewed after a period of time to see if they are still performing within the documented criteria.

3. Published criteria for prioritization proven adequate for our purposes?

No. Criteria itself should be up for review. Some Senate standing committees didn’t spend time on this question and assumed that the administration wouldn’t either. There were substantive rather than procedural points. An example of this deficiency in Lincoln was the decimation of the Museum and Antiquities at approximately the same time the new Golf Course Administration Masters Degree was announced.

4. Procedures for assessing departments and programs be improved?

Statements should be first, then the college vetting. Many felt there were priorities set before the meetings and then vetting set up. For example, most expected IS&T to get more funding, and after the process they did.

5. Time to review our priorities?

Yes, if it is done well. Concrete arguments are needed. We must insist upon consistency. We must make sure what we are told and what is actually done is the same thing. There has been no evidence that the allocation to priorities has generated positive outcomes, - - no accountability. Whether it is time to revise criteria or priorities or not, it is time assess the earlier prioritization and communicate this to the faculty, the incoming VCAA, and, if it hasn’t been done previously, to Central Administration. We must raise the issue of prioritization with candidates of the various Search Committees. We should look at what other states have done with prioritizing programs.

Senator Sadlek asked that any new ideas or insights be forwarded to him or Sue, the Faculty Senate Coordinator.

IX  The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.