

## **UNO Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

August 30, 2016, University Center Innsbruck Room

---

### Meeting Agenda

- Roll Call
- Approval of the Minutes from April meeting
- Updates from Faculty Senate President
  - Student Affairs
  - Committees
  - Budget
  - Research
  - Faculty Retention
  - Training Courses
  - Campus Food
  - Athletics
- 5-minute Presidential Update
- Tenure Revocation Policy Revision
- Report from Academic Board
- Old Business
- New Business
- Adjournment

President Cherie Trumbach called the meeting to order.

Secretary James Mokhiber called the roll (see following page)

<b>Roster of Faculty Senate Members, 2016-1017</b>							
<b>Roll/Attendance August 30, 2016 Meeting</b>							
<b>ATT?</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>Representation</b>	<b>First</b>	<b>Last</b>	<b>Term</b>		
	1	1 Administration Rep.		TBD	(16-17)	Faculty Senate President appt.	
<b>Y</b>	2	1 Staff Council Pres.	LeeAnne	Sipe	(16-17)		
	3	1 SG President	Antonio	Torres	(16-17)		
	4	1 Alumni Assoc. Rep.		TBD	(16-17)	Faculty Senate President appt.	
	5	1 Adjunct Rep.		TBD	(16-17)	Faculty Senate President appt.	
<b>Y</b>	6	1 Business	Dinah	Payne (SE)	(13-16)		
<b>Y</b>	7	2 Business	Joe	Beams	(16-19)		
<b>Y</b>	8	3 Business	Christy	Corey	(16-19)		
<b>Y</b>	9	4 Business	Cherie	Trumbach (Pres., SE)	(14-17)		
<b>Y</b>	10	5 Business	James	Logan	(15-18)		
	11	6 Business	Tarun	Mukherjee	(15-18)		
<b>Y</b>	12	1 Education	Matt	Lyons (SE)	(14-17)		
	13	3 Education	Ivan	Gill	(14-17)		
<b>Y</b>	14	4 Education	Kenneth	Farizo	(16-19)		
<b>Y</b>	15	1 Engineering	Edit	Bourgeois (SE)	(14-17)		
	16	2 Engineering	Dimitrios	Charalampidis	(16-19)		
<b>Y</b>	17	3 Engineering	Ting	Wang	(15-18)		
<b>Y</b>	18	4 Engineering	Guillermo	Rincon	(16-18)	replacing Christy Ikeda (16-18)	
<b>Y</b>	19	1 Liberal Arts	Nancy	Easterlin (SE)	(14-17)		
<b>Y</b>	20	2 Liberal Arts	D. Ryan	Gray	(16-19)		
<b>Y</b>	21	3 Liberal Arts	Chris	Day	(14-17)		
<b>Y</b>	22	4 Liberal Arts	David	Beriss	(14-17)		
<b>Y</b>	23	5 Liberal Arts	James	Mokhiber (Sec'y, SE)	(14-17)		
<b>Y</b>	24	6 Liberal Arts	Peter	Schock	(14-17)		
	25	7 Liberal Arts	Elizabeth	Steeby	(16-17)	replacing Steve Striffler (14-17), on leave	
<b>Y</b>	26	8 Liberal Arts	John	Kiefer	(15-17)	replacing Pam Jenkins (15-17), retired	
<b>Y</b>	27	9 Liberal Arts	Ed	Chervenak	(16-18)	replacing Vern Baxter (15-18), retired	
<b>Y</b>	28	10 Liberal Arts	John	Hazlett	(16-18)	replacing Beth Blankenship (15-18), now admin.	
<b>Y</b>	29	11 Liberal Arts	Robert	Dupont	(15-18)		
<b>Y</b>	30	12 Liberal Arts	Juliana	Starr	(15-18)		
<b>Y</b>	31	13 Liberal Arts	Cheryl	Hayes	F 2016	replacing Jeffrey Ehrenreich (15-18), on leave	
<b>Y</b>	32	1 Sciences	Nicola	Anthony (SE)	(15-18)		
	33	2 Sciences	Melanie	Stiegler	(15-18)		
<b>Y</b>	34	3 Sciences	Kenneth	Holladay	(15-18)		
<b>Y</b>	35	4 Sciences	Wendy	Schluchter	(14-17)		
	36	5 Sciences	Greg	Seab	(14-17)		
<b>Y</b>	37	6 Sciences	Elliott	Beaton	(14-17)		
<b>Y</b>	38	7 Sciences	Joel Andrew	Webb	(14-17)		
<b>Y</b>	39	8 Sciences	Vassil	Roussev (VP, SE)	(15-18)		
<b>Y</b>	40	1 Library	Connie	Phelps (SE)	(15-18)		
<b>Y</b>	41	2 Library	Lindsey	Reno	(16-19)		
	<i>Late arrivals included</i>						<i>SE= Senate Executive Board Member</i>

### *Approval of the Minutes*

A motion to approve the August 30, 2016 minutes was heard and seconded. The minutes were approved.

### *Updates from the Senate President*

Trumbach then welcomed the Senate to the new academic year. She expressed hope regarding the implementation of the Senate's new "Board" structure. Senators may have already received emails about the scheduling of meetings for the Board on which they will serve. She expressed the hope that Senators would be engaged and that our body could expedite its processes. She noted a real change of atmosphere regarding shared governance on campus.

### *Faculty Senate Executive Board (FSEB) Meeting with Brett Kemker, Student Affairs*

Trumbach then discussed a new process by which the Senate could be informed by administrators, without devoting excessive time to such matters at Senate meetings. The Faculty Senate Executive Board (FSEB) has thus begun to invite administrators to address that group at its Monday morning meetings. Trumbach encouraged Senators to propose names of administrators to invite, and to submit questions as well. We will again create a link for faculty to submit such questions confidentially via a Google Form through the Moodle website.

Trumbach then updated the Senate regarding the first of these Faculty Senate Executive Board meetings, held with Brett Kemker from Student Affairs. Trumbach will make available a summary of the meeting. Trumbach recounted Kemker's updates regarding the Office of Student Accountability and Disability Services, and described a new partnership with a group called Everfi that will administer a campus climate survey on sexual assault. Trumbach also relayed Kemker's news that 85% of the students who used the Office of Career Services found jobs and internships, and noted that 80% of students who availed themselves of OCS had found work, entered the military or gone on to further education.

Kemker also told the FSEB of the work of the Office of Student Involvement and Leadership, noting over 119 student organizations were active on campus. Greek Life has grown by 63% and these groups raised \$52,000 for charity. Regarding retention efforts, those who participated in Privateer Camp were retained at a rate of 65%, and the transfer retreat rate was 78%. As for Privateer Plunge, the retention rate was 75%. Regarding Health Services, the UNO/LSU clinic is under way. Faculty now can go to health services on campus, and this will should offer a real improvement in terms of delivery of health and wellness opportunities. Concerning Residence Life, there is a new advisory board for programming at Privateer Place and Pontchartrain Hall. There will also be some changes at the Recreation Center too.

As an aside, Trumbach noted that last year the Committee on Committees had expressed a need to increase the participation of all stakeholders in committee activities and discussions. For transparency to work, she said, we must see this kind of involvement, so please be sure to alert the Executive Board or one of the three other Boards if there are matters requiring our attention. We have a commitment from our President to include stakeholders in this way too.

Trumbach turned to Kemker's updates regarding the Space Utilization and Allocation Committee, noting that its activities were expanding this year. The group has met twice since August. The library will increasingly focus on being a "learning hub" and the University Center will serve as a "student support hub." What that precisely means still has to be determined. A new student lounge – potentially a 24-hour space – will be located in the University Center where the old copy center was located. [15:40] Kemker is in attendance today, Trumbach said, and can answer your questions about these initiatives.

#### *New Senate Board Assignments & Activity*

Cherie then reminded Senators that they each have been assigned to a new Board. The chair of each Board will meet with the Executive Board once a month to discuss issues and improve communication. Before this reform, some committees had effectively stopped working, believing that other bodies were carrying out their work. The Faculty Senate is now the governing body of the Faculty Council, and we will have a by-law change at a Faculty Council meeting in October. After that date, issues related to Budget and Fiscal Affairs, Academics and Administration will be housed somewhere in these three different boards.

Budget and Fiscal Affairs, under Chair Jim Logan, has met already. The BFA will be a busy board this year, Trumbach said. There are a number of things coming down the pipeline from the University Budget Review Committee (UBRC), and we are going to ask the Budget and Fiscal Affairs Board to look at those issues and make some recommendations. Last year, the Academic Committee was overwhelmed with issues, and this year promises to be a busy one as well. An Accelerated Master's initiative is one of the things that is going to be high on the list.

Again, we are trying to straighten out some of the information available on campus. A number of things were pushed through due to SACS accreditation, and it has required a lot of sorting out. The Senate's Moodle site is being reorganized, so please be on the lookout for changes. We now have a Senate graduate assistant – Harish Kadambala -- who is working with us, and we thank Amanda Athey for helping that. There is a section online for each of the Boards now, and the membership is indicated there. Administrative Board members are the only ones that have not been contacted yet, Trumbach believes. Christy Corey is chairing the Academic Board, Jim Logan is chairing the Budget and Fiscal Affairs, and a chair has not yet been named for the Administrative Board. This decision should be made at their first meeting. We are looking to make

some website changes that will allow for greater sharing of information, and improving our transparency. [23:00]

### *New UNO Budget Reallocation Formula*

Trumbach then turned to the issue of the university budget. She noted that the University Budget Review Committee (UBRC) met over the summer and continues to meet. One of the things that Trumbach has been tasked with doing, and which will come out with other news in October, is going back to the original University Budget Committee (UBC) report and figuring out how we have progressed in a number of areas. A number of UNO's units have implemented UBC recommendations already. Others have not begun implementation, possibly for legal or staffing reasons. A report detailing this will be coming out along with some other reporting next month.

Right now the Senate's Budget and Fiscal Affairs Board is working on a Stipend and Extra Compensation Policy for both faculty and staff, she said.

Trumbach then noted that, within the UBRC, a Budget Priority Subcommittee has been created. The president has asked for a new Budget Model that would be transparent and change the way we do things, ceding a great deal of control over decisions to Business Affairs in an ad hoc way. Sometimes it is difficult to understand where budget decisions are coming from. Deans don't know their budgets for a very long time, and money in an account might be moved without the Deans' knowledge. We are looking for a better Budget Model that will allow Deans to know what their budget is a lot sooner in the cycle. [26:18]

Trumbach then read to the Senate the following prepared statement regarding where this Budget Model process stands, and asked that it be included in the minutes:

#### **Draft Summary of Budget Model Report**

Please note that no decision have been made in regards to the budget model. Thus far, the Budget Priorities subcommittee has been evaluating models and developing a framework that the entire committee [UBRC] is tweaking based on possible impacts. We are also working on ensuring that we have the appropriate and accurate data. The subcommittee reviewed various budget models. These models fall into six main categories: incremental budgeting, zero-based budgeting, activity-based budgeting, responsibility center management, centralized budgeting, and performance-based budgeting. The subcommittee determined that a simplified version of performance-based budgeting focused on revenue generation utilized from RCM would be appropriate for UNO. Overall, it is the recommendation of the committee that the proposed funding model with supporting policies should supersede other transitional policies wherever possible. The funding model should address the following factors:

- 1) Prioritizing Academics

- 2) Enrollment: recruitment and retention
- 3) Accounting for the cost of actually providing the disciplinary education
- 4) The weighting that the state of Louisiana uses in its funding allocation.
- 5) Efficiency in course offerings
- 6) Objective and justifiable metrics
- 7) The strategic mission
- 8) The health of the college

First and foremost, though our charge for this year is to develop a model based on the total university allocation to the colleges, the first recommendation to the President is that the model should start with the full initial state allocation and tuition amount and include the allocation to the Non-Academic Units. The initial recommendation is that 50% of the budget should go to the colleges before fringe is considered.

There are three main components to the model, Instructional SCHs, Major SCHs, and a Strategic Mission Fund. We are currently reviewing alternatives that separate how tuition/fees and state allocation is treated with the LA Board of Regents weights applied (Texas Model) to our state allocation portion. In addition, the model should include a Strategic Mission Fund which would be allocated by the Provost. In the long-term, the Strategic Mission Fund should be at least 2% of the total tuition/fees and state allocation added to that 50%.

We are currently considering variations of the model, investigating why other Universities may have made certain decisions and evaluating the impact of these decisions on our colleges. As a result of our initial findings, we recommend a damping factor be applied to the yearly change in funding.

There are a number of outstanding issues which need to be addressed in the transition period including the Academic vs. Non-Academic allocation, Strategic Mission Fund, fee policies, Graduate Assistants, Adjuncts, vacant lines, return of indirects and other research related issues, Summer School and Extended Campus. The Senate Budget and Fiscal Affairs committee will have a crucial role in those decisions.

We assume that the basic model will be applied starting this year with a release of the budget numbers in October. We are also working on a transition plan that would evaluate the outstanding issues over the course of the next couple of years with the

objective of implementing them and reviewing and revising the model over the next 5 yrs.

After concluding her reading, Trumbach noted that the UBRC was looking at alternatives and that final decisions are still to be made. The UBRC, she said, is receiving feedback as it is evaluating the alternatives. In addition to Trumbach, the Senate representatives on the UBRC are Bobby Dupont and Jim Logan. Trumbach said she is primarily working on the Budget Model itself; Dupont and Logan will be working on the issues raised by the implementation of the new Budget Model over the next year. [32:04]

#### *Update regarding the Research Council*

Trumbach then turned to an update on the Research Council. Trumbach noted that she had invited Carol Lunn to come to speak to the Senate Executive Board at its meeting next Monday. New incentives to encourage research are under discussion, as well as related faculty retention initiatives. She invited Vassil Roussev to discuss the issue of summer fringe rates, which were the subject of an ad hoc committee assembled by the president. Roussev noted that the application of the full fringe rate during the summer is under discussion. The distinction between fringe rates for teaching and research is also under discussion. A memo, to be drawn up by Bobby Dupont, will call for the equalization of fringe rates between teaching and research, with the actual rate still to be determined. It will also call for extra compensation to be treated in the same way, subject to a reduced rate. Finally, the memo will call for a mechanism by which faculty could accumulate some funds towards helping with sabbatical leave. This issue will come up as more and more people become eligible under the UL system, which is different. [35:00]

#### *Update regarding Academic Program Review*

Returning to the committee issue, one of the things that the Academic Board is taking on is implementing Program Review, though under a different name so as to be certain that there is no confusion whatsoever with the initiatives that are coming down from the UL System office, regarding completers, etc. We are looking instead at creating a consistent and ongoing type of Program Review or Evaluation or Assessment – whatever we choose to call it – that will, in a positive manner, evaluate our programs on a regular basis. The draft that has been circulated will be considered by the Academic Board, which will take charge of populating that committee. This committee can include people not on the Senate. The Academic Board will have oversight over the new Program Review committee. This will ensure we can evaluate our programs every 5-7 years so as to get a little outside input into our programs. [36:30]

#### *Update regarding Faculty Retention*

Trumbach reiterated that the Research Council is looking at the issue of Faculty Retention. There will also be a Retention Retreat soon. We hope that this means we will

begin to examine the issue of faculty retention as much as we have student retention in recent years.

*Question on Training Courses.*

Trumbach noted that a Senator had asked why our list of training courses has grown over the past few years. This is a requirement imposed by the Legislative Auditor, Trumbach noted, and is unavoidable.

*Update regarding Campus Food.*

We expect changes by December regarding the dining opportunities available on campus.

*Update regarding Athletics.*

Trumbach noted that Matt Zingoni will be the faculty athletics representative. Zingoni addressed the Senate, and indicated he expects greater transparency with regard to athletics. He will report back to us as appropriate. A number of us are particularly concerned given the budget situation, Trumbach noted. If you have questions or opinions in this regard, please make contact with him. Trumbach noted that the general Google Form on the Moodle website would be the appropriate method for sending him questions confidentially. [39:50]

*Update by UNO President John Nicklow*

Trumbach then welcomed President Nicklow for an update. Nicklow welcomed the faculty, and expressed the hope that they had enjoyed a productive summer. Nicklow then noted the involvement of over 200 faculty and staff in the student move-in process. He signaled the new tradition of holding a Convocation at the start of the year. The challenge, he said, is to keep the momentum up and ensure that we continue to engage the students. Our 14<sup>th</sup> day is September 5 or 6, just after Labor Day, and we are about (unofficially) 8080. We are down overall, but it is because of the pipeline issue. If you look four years ago we had 2,000 more students. Those students are now in our pipeline so for enrollment to actually be flat we would have to bring in roughly 2,950 students, and that is unrealistic. The good news is that if you maintain our current level of new enrollments for three years in a row you build the pipeline. We'd had some early estimates that enrollment would be about 7,600 students, so the fact that we're near 8,100 is a "big deal." Many of you were involved throughout the year in making this happen, he said. We made robocalls to about 6,000 people, including students who had stopped out, and set out waves of email to students who had not registered. We have done over 180 school visits over the last year, and we are blanketing this area. We've really amped out our efforts and our enrollments folks deserve a lot of credit.

Nicklow noted that the third-party work we are doing with Lipman-Hearne concerning our rebranding and enrollment marketing efforts – supported by private dollars – has



begun. Nicklow said the administration is going to contact Trumbach regarding the convening of some faculty focus groups with each different constituency on campus to discuss the university.

President Nicklow indicated that a good deal of legislative action occurred over the summer. After three sessions it seemed higher education was fully funded, but on the back end the Board of Regents cut us \$1million through the application of a new formula. Every four-year institution was cut, while nearly every two-year institution was awarded something. Nicklow indicated that the UNO administration has serious issues with the formula. At a recent summit, Nicklow and others expressed concern about how to incentivize an outcomes-based or performance-based formula effectively. The problem is if you implement a cost-based formula, or run adjustments alongside that, it undermines the incentives. And that's what's happening, he said. Nicklow is going to have a legislative team hold a legislative retreat bringing in all the New Orleans delegation to hold a conversation about what this does for UNO, and what is happening with the formula. The word on the formula, he indicated, has not gotten out.

Nicklow noted some other initiatives underway. A week ago the UNO Student Success Collaborative was launched. Predictive analytics are underway for Science and Business. The other colleges will go live soon. Any faculty adviser, professional adviser, dean, chair or, frankly, anybody who wants access should let us know. The provost and a leadership team put this together and now it is important that we use it.

Nicklow noted that the work of the University Budget Review Committee (UBRC) had been discussed earlier in the Senate meeting.

Nicklow turned to some upcoming dates, regarding the "State of the University" Address and Faculty Retention Retreat in late September. In early November we will put on a number of events as part of what is becoming known as a "Week of Celebration," including events like the Presidential Lecture Series, the Distinguished Alumni Gala at the World War II Museum, his official Investiture, a Legislative Brunch and more. English is having an alumni event too at that time. Our goal is to raise \$250,000 in scholarships around that event, and we've raised \$130,000 in the last two months. [47:30]

Trumbach asked if it would be possible to post the documents from the Formula Summit. Nicklow indicated those are public documents and could be posted, and he would be happy to discuss any questions faculty might have. This is an area we need to work on as a state. Two hundred people were in attendance at the summit, he indicated, and the first question was "What is our goal?" Nobody knew how to respond, and that, to Nicklow, was the problem. If you are going to incentivize performance you need to identify that goal or objective clearly. It turns out there is a goal: to be at the SREB average of degree completions by 2025. Nicklow said that he wants to pursue this conversation with our legislators, to determine who we want to be and what are goal is to be. Is the goal to incentivize degree completion, to acknowledge diversity, encourage research? We have to know the goal, he said.

Nicklows concluded by noting that tonight was going to be the first Very Important Falcon event, a Ben Franklin outreach event tonight. A number of Franklin faculty want to be more connected to us, and it looks like a great opportunity for us. [50:00]

### *Dismissal of Tenured Faculty Policy*

Trumbach reassured the Senators that the issue of dismissing tenured faculty had come before the Senate simply because there were contradictions identified in our policies last year. Some committees named in the policy did not actually exist, and some Senators did not want an ad hoc committee to be charged with this important responsibility. We want a standing committee of selected and trusted individuals to make these decisions.

Discussion of the approval of the policy then ensued. A Senator indicated that the usual procedure called for us to introduce such a measure in one meeting and then the Senate votes on it in the following meeting. Trumbach acknowledged that there were delays in disseminating the policy before today's Senate meeting.

A Senator noted with satisfaction that this version did not cite "financial exigency" as a potential "cause" for dismissal, as previous policies did. Are these changes being implemented, he asked, because of UL System rules? President Nicklow responded that "financial exigency" had been removed because it was in direct conflict with another policy and UL System rules, and that was why we wanted to clean this policy up. The idea is to strictly confine the idea here to cause.

Another Senator noted that clause 3(A) says that the "Charges Committee shall..." while 3(B) may or may not refer to the Hearings Committee. Trumbach noted the distinction should be made, with the Charges Committee determining whether there is a "cause" or not. The Hearings Committee would begin reviewing and organizing the evidence against a faculty member. The Senator continued, asking if the Charges Committee's decision there is no valid "cause" would that be the end of the process, at least as far as possible termination would go? Trumbach indicated that was the case. The Senator further continued, noting that the Hearings Committee's decision was subject to the President's final decision; in effect, then, does the Charges Committee have more power than the Hearings Committee? Trumbach said that could be one interpretation, but returned to the point that the Charges Committee simply had to determine whether there was a cause at issue, which she described as a "short hurdle." Senators noted that the Charges Committee was, in effect, like a Grand Jury in the criminal justice system.

Senator Connie Phelps indicated that she had a copy of the Faculty Conduct Policy in her possession. She noted that, under Charges Committee, it notes that if the committee decides that there is not a violation of the Faculty Conduct Policy, then it is dropped "if the Provost agrees." If the Provost disagrees, the Provost shall also state his or her reasons why in writing the Charges Committee should initiate proceedings. Summarizing, the first Senator noted that it seems that the intent is that the Charges

Committee can be overruled by the Provost, and the Hearings Committee can be overruled by the President. Trumbach indicated that some changes in language would need to be made to the text of the proposed policy.

A Senator then asked what the justification for having these committees would be, given that it is the Provost who would presumably be making this charge in the first instance. President Nicklow said that the point was to create a shared governance environment, and to gather input. It was a similar situation with regard to the Faculty Senate, which does not create legally-binding decisions but rather creates recommendations that the institution enacts.

Another Senator noted that a clarification was required, indicating that the Hearings Committee would be drawn from the Hearings Pool, an elected group. Senator Phelps added that the Charges Committee would be similarly elected. Phelps noted that some issues arise from the role the Faculty Council plays in designating an “at large” pool of 21, from which the five people are drawn.

Another Senator noted that, in the list of “causes,” the last of these cites “actions that impair the efficiency of the institution.” Is this an appropriate cause on a list like this? Many faculty I have spoken with question whether that is a good idea. Also, “impair the discharge of duties” is also hard to determine. These causes do not seem to be in the same league as breaking the law. Trumbach agreed to look into the matter further, to see if there was better language that would clarify the intent. Another Senator noted that the final elastic clause in the text did not prohibit anything from being cited as “cause,” though he noted that the process itself is clarifying.

A Senator requested that Connie Phelps post a copy of the Faculty Conduct Policy, given that it should define what, for example, constitutes insubordination. Phelps agreed to do so, noting that sometime after the switch from the LSU to the UL System the Faculty and Staff Handbooks had been combined. References to the Faculty Conduct Policy exist in the combined handbook, but not the policy itself. Phelps has a copy, however, because she was Chair of the Academic Procedures and Standards committee when the handbook was being revised. She agreed to post what she believes is the most current version of the handbook.

Another Senator noted that, in #4, it mentions “the Board,” and that might not be clear now given that we have so many Boards. If it is a UL Board we need to specify that clearly. It also says “thirty days when the institution is in session” and it is not very clear whether that means a regular semester or otherwise. What does that mean? Trumbach asked senators and other faculty to pose any other questions in advance of the next session if at all possible.

*Old Business: Academic Board, Christy Corey, Chair*

Trumbach then recognized Christy Corey, Chair of the Academic Board. Corey noted that we will be voting, in the next meeting, regarding an undergraduate degree

requirement that requires 50% of in-major coursework or 50% of in-minor coursework, to be 3000-level or above. This has apparently caused some problems in Science and Music. Corey has requested a degree audit from the Registrar so that we can see the number of degree problems and minors that this is affecting. By next meeting, when we are ready to vote on this, we will have some firm numbers in terms of how many programs this is affecting. This is a change that was made under Provost Payne, and it was put through by the University Courses and Curricula Committee. It was difficult to trace exactly when the change happened. Norm Whitley seems to be in favor of keeping this provision in place, but hopefully the degree audit will shed some light on the issue. Some students, who haven't been aware of this provision, get up to the point of the degree audit and realize that the classes they had for their minor will not satisfy the requirement. It affects students at the last minute when they think their ducks are all in a row. A Senator asked what the opinion of the Academic Board was on the matter, and Corey said that they would be meeting to discuss the matter the following week and that she would let the Senate know.

Corey added that the most immediate charge of the Board was developing the new Program Review Committee and getting a pilot study underway. On this front, Corey acknowledged that some Senators believed the previous Program Review Process had been a failure. This time we will approach the process differently, as more of a continuous review process. There will be no rank ordering of all programs at one point in time, she said. It really is meant to evaluate the programs one-by-one according to a set of standards and use that as the evaluation. Corey's understanding is that there will be no comparing of programs against other programs, no designation of "Category I" or "Category IV" groups. The goal is to create a much less contentious process that will result in program improvement and not "complete frustration."

#### *New Business and Adjournment*

Trumbach thanked Corey and asked for new business. Hearing none, Trumbach heard a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded, and approved by voice vote.

[END]

*--James Mokhiber, UNO Faculty Senate Secretary, [jmokhibe@uno.edu](mailto:jmokhibe@uno.edu)*