**UNO Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Date/Time: Monday, March 25, 2019, 3:30pm
Location: University Center, Innsbruck Room, UC 211 A&B**

1. **Faculty Senate Roster 2018-19 – Roll Call**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |  |   | **Senate Roster** | **2017-2018** |   |   |  |
|   | *#* |  | **Representation** | **First** | **Last** | **Term** | **Board** |
| x | 1 | 1 | Administration | Mahyar | Amouzegar | (18-19) |  |
| x | 2 | 1 | Staff Council | Kristi | Askam | (18-19) |  |
|  | 3 | 1 | SG President | Kenady | Hills | (18-19) |  |
| E | 4 | 1 | Alumni Assoc | Dinah | Paine | (18-19) |  |
| x | 5 | 1 | Adjunct | David  | Lambour | (18-19) |  |
| x | 6 | 1 | Business | Joe  | Beams | (16-19) | Budget |
| x | 7 | 2 | Business | Christy | Corey (SP) | (16-19) |  |
| x | 8 | 3 | Business | James | Logan | (18-21) | Budget |
| E | 9 | 4 | Business | Dinah | Payne (SE) | (16-19) | Administrative |
| x | 10 | 5 | Business | Duygu | Zirek | (18-21) | Academic |
|  | 11 | 1 | Engineering | Donald | Barbe | (17-20) | Administrative |
| x | 23 | 2 | Engineering | Dimitrios | Charalampidis (SE) | (17-20) | Academic |
|  | 13 | 3 | Engineering | Guillermo | Rincon | (18-21) | Administrative |
| x | 14 | 4 | Engineering | Ting  | Wang | (18-21) | Budget |
| x | 15 | 1 | Liberal Arts & Education | Brian | Beabout  | (18-21) | Budget |
| x | 16 | 2 | Liberal Arts & Education | David | Beriss | (18-21) | Administrative |
| E | 17 | 3 | Liberal Arts & Education | Chris | Day | (17-20) | Academic |
|  | 18 | 4 | Liberal Arts & Education | Kenneth | Farizo | (16-19) | Academic |
| E | 19 | 5 | Liberal Arts & Education | Ivan | Gill | (17-20) | Administrative |
| x | 20 | 6 | Liberal Arts & Education | D. Ryan | Gray | (16-19) | Academic |
| x | 21 | 7 | Liberal Arts & Education | Juana | Ibanez (SS, SE) | (18-21) | Administrative |
|  | 22 | 8 | Liberal Arts & Education |  | TBD | (18-21) | Budget |
| E | 23 | 9 | Liberal Arts & Education | John | Kiefer (SVP, SE) | (17-20) | Academic |
| E | 24 | 10 | Liberal Arts & Education | James | Mokhiber  | (17-20) | Academic |
| x | 25 | 11 | Liberal Arts & Education | Peter  | Schock | (17-20) | Budget |
|  | 26 | 12 | Liberal Arts & Education | Robert | Stufflebeam | (17-20) | Academic |
|  | 27 | 13 | Liberal Arts & Education | Zarus | Watson | (17-20) | Budget |
| x | 28 | 1 | Sciences | Nicola | Anthony (SE) | (18-21) | Administrative |
| E | 29 | 2 | Sciences | Adlai | Depano | (18-21) | Budget |
|  | 30 | 3 | Sciences | Ken | Holladay | (18-21) | Administrative |
|  | 31 | 4 | Sciences | Gerald | LaHoste | (17-20) | Academic |
| x | 32 | 5 | Sciences | Steve | Rick | (17-20) | Academic |
| E | 33 | 6 | Sciences | Wendy  | Schluchter | (17-20) | Administrative |
| x | 34 | 7 | Sciences | Greg | Seab | (17-20) | Administrative |
|  | 35 | 8 | Sciences | Joel Andrew | Webb | (17-20) | Academic |
| x | 36 | 1 | Library | Connie | Phelps (SE) | (18-21) | Administrative |
| x | 37 | 2 | Library | Lindsey  | Reno | (16-19) | Budget |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| X | : Present |  |  |  |  |
| E | : Excused |  |  |  |  |
| L | : Late |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Approval of the minutes from 2/26/19 meeting** – Delayed. Minutes recently posted for review so they will be approved at the next meeting in order to give everyone time to review them.
2. **Update from Faculty Senate President**
* UNO Tenure and Promotion Guidelines Go into effect 2019-20; Corey: Feedback from Faculty. When will the RTP be posted? The RTP will be posted on website after the document is finalized. Other questions have come up to be clarified now. Is the RTP going into Fall 2018? Provost Amouzegar: Yes, the document can go into effect retroactively into Fall 19 (for reviews in Fall 20). Schock: Clarification of intent – an assistant professor finishing her first year procedures right now will be affected by this policy. Amouzegar: Senate gets to determine if faculty can use the documents in place when they first got hired by the University. For all incoming faculty after this is posted, this will be the “go to” RTP document they utilize. Continuing faculty members can adopt this new RTP process. The stabilization of the procedure is only thing that has changed. If there is a conflict between departmental procedures and this document, the department will need to update their policies to comply with this document. Schock asked a question about the procedure on the election of folks for the RTP committee. Amouzegar: Departments should control the way they elect their committees. The proposed RTP is what the process is and the department faculty will comply with its policies but anything not specified in the RTP can be dealt with as the department sees fit as long as they create a published policy. Schock: When and how will future RTP committees be assembled? Amouzegar: This RTP is Faculty Senate document to be applied to all faculty. Each Department and College has their own system so future RTP committee selection should be decided by the department/college in compliance with the RTP (and UL) policies. That way, there is a decentralization of the RTP process by college and let the college decide system. Each college should have a member on the RTP committee. The UL System sets up when faculty can go up for tenure so that information does not need to be repeated in this RTP document.
* Staff Appreciation Luncheon feedback. Nice event. Ran out of food, but folks started eating at 11:45 so those who arrived on time at noon, didn’t have access to the full menu. 350 RSVP’d. Lots more staff there than faculty. Only 315 chairs at the dining tables. We will need to deal with seating in the future. Majority of seats were taken at the dining tables and many were in the overflow area with bar tables on the side. The people in the overflow area were not served desert.
* April picnic on 17th by fountain coming. This has been very successful in the past and has not run out of food. Come and enjoy it.
1. **Update from Office of the President (via Corey)**
* Board Meeting, April 9th; ULS Day at the State Capitol, April 10th House appropriations is meeting that day so meetings being set up with students and faculty to talk with reps. A lot of fun. HRT will be providing desert. UNO had great presence there last year. Please attend if you can.
1. **Preparation for Senate Elections – April 25th meeting**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| College | FT Faculty | Senators + Executive Board Member | Terms Ending |
| COBA | 45 | 4+1 | 3 rotating off; Need to elect 3 |
| COE | 30 | 3+1 | No terms ending |
| COLAEHD | 132 | 13+1 | 2 rotating off; Need to elect 4 |
| COS | 89 | 8+1 | No terms ending;Elect 1 new senator |
| LIBRARY | 5 | 1+1 | 1 rotating off; Need to elect 1 |

 Before April 25 meeting:

* Elect new senators (See end of minutes document *2018-19 Faculty Senate Roster* for highlighted positions that are rotating off that we know about).
* Submit nominations for Faculty Senate officer positions (President, Vice President, Secretary). Corey will create a google board for nominations and to vote.
* Ken Holliday will be retiring so that information needs to be added to the college. Peter Schock is also retiring.
* Please make sure as you organize elections in your colleges that the newly elected senators will be expected at the April 25 meeting. Be aware that April 25 is the first day of Jazz Fest and we are meeting because the Senate voted to be here that day.
* Any questions about elections? None asked.

 At April 25 meeting

* Officer elections will be held.
* New senators must attend the April 25 meeting.
1. **Report from Academic Board and Dr. Amy King – Changes to Academic Integrity Policy and Process**

Amy King -- Academic Board has been working with King about changes. History about the problem. There are concerns about academic dishonesty reporting because it has been inconsistent or delayed (as much as 1 – 6 months). It is hard to have adjudication procedures if the report arrives after the student has already graduated. The current form in use was created by the Faculty Senate in 2008. Colleges had different ways to report. Faculty discussions demonstrated that there were multiple transgressions by individual students without any acceleration of consequences in part because of the different ways to report by the colleges and the delay in reporting. Consistent enforcement is needed. A new form has been proposed by the Faculty Academic Board utilizing Dr. King’s concerns. The new form has faculty flexibility. English 1157 example. It is possible that a student was put into a class in a course for which they were not prepared. If that student plagiarizes the penalty is severe especially considering that the student may be unaware at that stage of her academic career regarding what plagiarism could consist of. Such a penalty is egregious for the student since they were not properly educated about academic dishonesty and they were in a class in which they were not prepared to participate. The new form now includes an educational option for a situation where the student has a problem that was not intended. The timing of the reporting also needed to be addressed. Receiving reports at the beginning of the new semester for something that occurred at the end of the previous semester delays academic dishonesty procedures. If the dishonest action occurs at the end of the semester, then student should receive an incomplete, not a grade, but not every faculty member seems to be aware of this. If the dishonesty report makes it to office at the beginning of the semester, students from out of town get notification that they are not allowed back into the University (worst case scenario) after they have paid expenses to start their new semester. Currently, most offenses must be reported within 7 days. To facilitate timeliness, the form is being adjusted to deal with the timing of the reporting and will be available on *Sharepoint* so everyone (Chair, Dean, Student, Student Affairs) gets timely notification. The faculty member must address this with the student first as the creation of the assignment and its grading is responsibility of the faculty member. The *Sharepoint* routing being worked out but the form is finalized. It should be in place by fall.

Questions: Wang: does the policy state how soon student discussion should take place? Is there a time frame for issues to be resolved? King: Difficult to judge how quickly things can be resolved. For example: English class plagiarism. Here’s what they wrote and here is the source. Therefore an F for the paper. If the student disagrees they can appeal. Due process after discussion with the faculty member includes a Board of Review (faculty staff and students so difficult to coordinate), & a Dean of Students appeal after that. Therefore students have several months to drag out the decision. Wang: Student in appeal but had to register and did not show up for class after the first time. Can penalties be assessed despite the appeal for missed classes? King: Students are advised that they should be attending class regularly. They are advised to continue class until appeals are exhausted. Having an ongoing appeal is not a justified excused absence from class unless you as faculty member choose to excuse them.

1. **Report from Academic Board – Teaching Evaluation Item Reduction**

Steve Rick – Senate Academic Board charged with reducing the number of questions on student evaluations. Fewer questions may allow for extra comments. 8 questions out of existing 20 were the best. 2 questions out of each of the 4 section of evaluations were included in this first edit. The questions were sent to Chairs for feedback. The current evaluation has ten questions as a result of the feedback. Most Chairs loved the idea of reducing the number of questions. Some suggestions emerged about certain types of questions that were needed and Academic Board did their best to accommodate those needs. The questions will be posted in Moodle on Senate page. These should be the questions on this semester’s evaluation. Logan: Are we going to lose information? Rick: We kept questions that provide details. Most faculty have not seen the new evaluation questions.

Corey pulled her email with the questions so we could read them at the meeting. Corey will send it out for review. Rick’s presentation is an update on where they are with it. Response scale is the same. 3 prompt sections still the same: Strengths, Areas of Improvement, Big thank you to the Academic Board for working on this.

Questions? Wang: Science classes sometimes have a lab. The lab is taught by student assistants. Is there any way to add a section for feedback on the TA? Rick: Lab class should have a separate evaluation sent to the students. It is up to the department.

Schock: Does this evaluation need formal Senate approval? Corey: Yes. We will have both forms up on Senate Moodle page and they will be sent to all faculty via email so you can compare and contrast the old to the new. If we can get the vote accomplished by next meeting, we should be able to use the new form this semester. Corey will request feedback via email between now and next meeting to facilitate the vote.

The original three open ended areas for comments is still on the proposed form. The proposed revision of the student evaluation questions is as follows:

BROAD CATEGORIES OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS:

ENGAGEMENT/INTEREST (The extent to which an instructor engages students in and outside of the classroom, holds their interest in the subject matter, and challenges them to think.)

1. The instructor demonstrated enthusiasm for teaching this course.

2. The instructor interacted with students in a courteous manner.

3. The instructor was available to help me with matters related to the course.

ASSESSMENT (The extent to which an instructor measures attendance and performance in an appropriate, timely, and fair manner, and he/she provides useful performance feedback.)

4. Graded work addressed key course concepts and skills.

5. My work was returned with useful feedback.

6. My work was graded/returned in a timely manner.

ORGANIZATION/CLARITY (The extent to which an instructor is prepared and well organized, and presents course information in a way that is clear and easily understood by students.)

7. The instructor was prepared and well organized.

8. The instructor communicated effectively and clearly.

OVERALL EVALUATION/LEARNING (The general assessment of teaching effectiveness in a course including students’ judgments of how much they learned and their willingness to recommend faculty.)

9. This course broadened my knowledge or perspective about the subject.

10. Overall, this instructor is an effective teacher in this course.

1. **Old Business** – Beams: Just confirming -- the new and old Senators come to next meeting? Yes and then we participate in election of new officers for next year.
2. **New Business** – none
3. **Adjournment** – Motion to adjourn by Jim Logan. Seconded by Connie Phelps. Motion passes by acclamation.

***Faculty Senate Roster 2018-19***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *#* |  | **Representation** | **First** | **Last** | **Term** | **Board** |
| 1 | 1 | Administration | Mahyar | Amouzegar | (18-19) |  |
| 2 | 1 | Staff Council | Kristy | Askam | (18-19) |  |
| 3 | 1 | SG President | Kenady | Hills | (18-19) |  |
| 4 | 1 | Alumni Assoc | Dinah | Payne | (18-19) |  |
| 5 | 1 | Adjunct | David | Lambour | (18-19) |  |
| 6 | 2 | Business | Joe | Beams | (16-19) | Budget |
| 7 | 3 | Business | Christy | Corey (SP) | (16-19) |  |
| 8 | 4 | Business | James | Logan | (18-21) | Budget |
| 9 | 5 | Business | Dinah | Payne (SE) | (16-19) | Administrative |
| 10 | 6 | Business | Duygu | Zirek | (18-21) | Academic |
| 11 | 1 | Engineering | Donald | Barbe | (17-20) | Administrative |
| 12 | 2 | Engineering | Dimitrios | Charalampidis (SE) | (17-20) | Academic |
| 13 | 3 | Engineering | Guillermo | Rincon | (18-21) | Administrative |
| 14 | 4 | Engineering | Ting | Wang | (18-21) | Budget |
| 15 | 1 | Liberal Arts & Education | Brian | Beabout | (18-21) | Budget |
| 16 | 2 | Liberal Arts & Education | David | Beriss | (18-21) | Administrative |
| 17 | 3 | Liberal Arts & Education | Chris | Day | (17-20) | Academic |
| 18 | 4 | Liberal Arts & Education | Kenneth | Farizo | (16-19) | Academic |
| 19 | 5 | Liberal Arts & Education | Ivan | Gill | (17-20) | Administrative |
| 20 | 6 | Liberal Arts & Education | D. Ryan | Gray | (16-19) | Academic |
| 21 | 7 | Liberal Arts & Education | Juana | Ibanez (SS, SE) | (18-21) | Administrative |
| 22 | 8 | Liberal Arts & Education | Brett | Kemker | (18-21) | Budget |
| 23 | 9 | Liberal Arts & Education | John | Kiefer (SVP, SE) | (17-20) | Academic |
| 24 | 10 | Liberal Arts & Education | James | Mokhiber | (17-20) | Academic |
| 25 | 11 | Liberal Arts & Education | Peter | Schock | (17-20) | Budget |
| 26 | 12 | Liberal Arts & Education | Robert | Stufflebeam | (17-20) | Academic |
| 27 | 13 | Liberal Arts & Education | Zarus | Watson | (17-20) | Budget |
| 28 | 1 | Sciences | Nicola | Anthony (SE) | (18-21) | Administrative |
| 29 | 2 | Sciences | Adlai | Depano | (18-21) | Budget |
| 30 | 3 | Sciences | Ken | Holladay | (18-21) | Administrative |
| 31 | 4 | Sciences | Gerald | LaHoste | (17-20) | Academic |
| 32 | 5 | Sciences | Steve | Rick | (17-20) | Academic |
| 33 | 6 | Sciences | Wendy | Schluchter | (17-20) | Administrative |
| 34 | 7 | Sciences | Greg | Seab | (17-20) | Administrative |
| 35 | 8 | Sciences | Joel Andrew | Webb | (17-20) | Academic |
| 36 | 1 | Library | Connie | Phelps (SE) | (18-21) | Administrative |
| 37 | 2 | Library | Lindsey | Reno | (16-19) | Budget |