

UNO Faculty Senate Meeting, January 27, 2014

Innsbruck Rooms A-B, UC

1. Call to Order and Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 PM by Dr. Elaine Brooks.

2. Roll Call

Current roster of Faculty Senators

Administration	Rachel Kincaid	(13-14)	Absent
Staff Council	Derek Rodriguez	(13-14)	Present
SG President	Brandon Bonds	(13-14)	Absent
Alumni Assoc.	Dinah Payne	(13-14)	Present
Adjunct	(vacant)	(13-14)	
Business	Dinah Payne (SE)	(13-14)	Present
Business	James Logan	(12-15)	Excused
Business	Matt Zingoni	(12-15)	Absent
Business	Cherie Trumbach	(11-14)	Present
Business	Mark Reid	(13-16)	Absent
Business	Christy Corey	(13-16)	Present
Business	Ivan Miestchovich	(13-16)	Excused
Education	Richard Speaker (SE)	(13-16)	Present
Education	Zarus Watson	(12-15)	Present
Education	Polly Thomas	(13-16)	Present
Education	Matt Lyons	(11-14)	Present
Education	Paul Bole	(11-14)	Absent
Engineering	Enrique La Motta (SE)	(11-14)	Present
Engineering	Malay Ghose Hajra	(12-15)	Excused
Engineering	Nikolaos Xiros	(12-15)	Excused
Engineering	Dimitrios Charalampidis	(13-16)	Present
Liberal Arts	Steve Striffler (SE)	(11-14)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Robert Montjoy	(13-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	John Kiefer	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	Christine Day	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	Elaine Brooks	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Peter Yaukey	(12-15)	Excused
Liberal Arts	James Lowry	(12-15)	Excused
Liberal Arts	Marla Nelson	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Vern Baxter	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Beth Blankenship	(12-15)	Present
Liberal Arts	Connie Atkinson	(11-14)	Present

Liberal Arts	David	Beriss	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	Alison	Arnold	(11-14)	Present
Liberal Arts	Andrew	Goss	(13-16)	Present
Liberal Arts	Renia	Ehrenfeucht	(13-16)	Present
Liberal Arts	Laszlo	Fulop	(13-16)	Excused
Sciences	Jairo	Santanilla (SE)	(12-15)	Excused
Sciences	Elizabeth	Shirtcliff	(11-14)	Absent
Sciences	Greg	Seab	(11-14)	Present
Sciences	Steven	Shalit	(11-14)	Present
Sciences	Mark	Kulp	(11-14)	Excused
Sciences	Leonard	Spinu	(12-15)	Present
Sciences	Vassil	Roussev	(12-15)	Excused
Sciences	Nicola	Anthony	(13-16)	Excused
Sciences	Tu	Shengru	(13-16)	Absent
Sciences	Steve	Rick	(13-16)	Present
Library	Connie	Phelps (SE)	(12-15)	Excused
Library	Marie	Morgan	(13-16)	Present

3. Approval of minutes from the 11/21/13 meeting:

Dr. Brooks asked Faculty Senate Secretary Ms. Marie Morgan to read two corrections that had been submitted via email:

a) Bottom of p. 5 (from Dr. Peter Schock):

“Dr. Schock had tallied up everything **in all academic colleges, including all salaries and fringe benefits**, and found that it did not cost more than **\$59M. \$45M. He suggested that this number should be borne in mind as we prepare for cuts to programs and personnel that are the source of UNO’s self-generated revenue.**”

b) Second-to-last paragraph of p. 7 (from Dr. Renia Ehrenfeucht):

“Dr. Ehrenfeucht added that in COLA, **the college is some departments are in the black, and feeling but there is still a lot of pressure about the on their programs.**”

There being no additional corrections, Ms. Beth Blankenship moved and Dr. Vern Baxter seconded to amend the sections of the minutes as read. The motion passed unanimously as did the vote to approve the amended minutes of the 11/21/13 meeting.

4. Announcements from the Faculty Senate President (Dr. Brooks):

- a) Dr. Brooks announced that the cafeteria would be open tomorrow and Wednesday if necessary for the students who live on campus.
- b) Dr. Brooks read a report sent to her by Dr. James Lowry re the State’s anti-smoking law and its implementation at UNO (**see Appendix 1**). As of August 1, 2014, UNO will be a smoke-free environment.
- c) Dr. Brooks read part of and summarized the remaining part of a report re the General Education Committee (**see Appendix 2**), which we had already received in a memo sent out to all of us. Dr. Brooks highlighted the four reasons why the changes are being made and

emphasized that the deadline to return feedback is January 30. A quick turnaround is necessary in order to implement the changes for fall 2014.

- d) Dr. Brooks asked for and received permission to let Dr. Schock talk. He announced that the committee charged with the responsibility for creating the workload policy for instructors met December 20 and will meet again Tuesday, January 28.

5. Committee reports:

Dr. Brooks mentioned the memo on the Faculty Workload Policy (**see Appendix 3**) that she had sent out the same afternoon, which was a response from Provost Payne and Dr. Bill Sharpton to the two resolutions passed at the October Senate meeting. She asked for and received permission to amend the agenda to let the Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee speak briefly on its meeting the previous week with Provost Payne and Dr. Sharpton (in lieu of reporting on the Online Teaching Policy as listed in the agenda).

Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee (Dr. Vern Baxter):

Dr. Baxter stated that we were not here to vote or respond to anything. Academic Affairs responded to the Committee last week, and everyone should have received a copy of the policy today. He would like to highlight some of it (**see Appendix 4**), and the Committee would like to have a response to it at the next Senate meeting.

Cost Containment and Revitalization Committee (Drs. Cherie Trumbach and Marla Nelson) followed by open faculty discussion concerning UNO's future:

Dr. Brooks asked the senators if, once the reports were made, could we open the discussion to everyone in the room. Dr. Polly Thomas so moved and Ms. Blankenship seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Dr. Brooks stressed that the discussion should proceed in an orderly fashion.

Dr. Trumbach read her statement (**see Appendix 5**), which summarized the process that had taken place. Dr. Nelson read her statement, which added some additional insight and emphasized that committee members had raised issues and questions. Dr. Brooks then said that there was now the chance to ask questions.

Dr. Polly Thomas asked whether or not it is permissible to get rid of programs absent a declaration of financial exigency. Dr. Trumbach believed that it can be done for low-completer programs. Dr. Nelson said that it is an HR issue, but tenured faculty cannot be gotten rid of unless we declare financial exigency; that is consistent with the UL bylaws. Dr. Trumbach added that there is a 12-month notification (she believes, two semesters) if a program is cancelled that tenured faculty can be laid off. Dr. Greg Seab stated that there are general rules that you cannot cut a program for financial reasons but you can cut for academic reasons, therefore the 12-month notice, and you have to give priority for re-hiring to those cut. Various universities have contested this but have lost their case.

Dr. Thomas then asked if low-completer was a reason. Dr. Andrew Goss replied that that it is fairly vague as to what is allowed regarding low-completers. Ms. Blankenship said that the last time we cut programs the Board of Regents looked at low-completers across the state. How is this determined by the Cost Containment Committee if it cannot be done because of costs? Dr. Nelson explained that there is a special subcommittee, and it is within that subcommittee that these decisions have been made.

Dr. Baxter stated that it seems that the Cost Containment Committee is kind of a joke. It seems like faculty have not been involved. He inquired of the two representatives if they felt that the process has engaged faculty, and what did they think about the process. Dr. Nelson responded that on the Committee there had been no discussion about RCM. Dr. Trumbach's impression was that the focus of completing that information was to identify low-completers, but if a program had other strengths, there might not be a reason to do away with that program. There was also a desire to streamline programs and reinvest in strong programs. She does not know which programs were considered for cuts; only those on that subcommittee were involved in that discussion. The Provost has reiterated over and over again that cost containment is on the non-academic side. The idea is to protect faculty, but instructors and adjuncts might be cut.

Dr. Baxter understood that the Provost had already met with the deans and will meet with the chairs. It seems like the process is top-down and not square with faculty involvement. Dr. Trumbach said that the College of Business had had significant discussions about that issue the last few days, but they did not necessarily make a fuss about that. In her college, they already had a meeting with the dean, and they felt that the concerns that they had were met, but that might be reflection of her college. She would have hoped to have more input on the academic side and more eyes to look at the proposal, ultimately knowing that the decision rests with the Provost. It was initially presented that the Cost Containment Committee would be more involved. Dr. Nelson added that even if there had been more involvement, it might have been problematic due to the composition of the Committee and the tight turnaround time.

At this point, Dr. Brooks opened the discussion to the gallery.

Dr. Seab had a concern when he sees rubrics like the ones that he saw to evaluate programs when they do not pay attention to the consequences of the decisions. For example, the decision not to have graduate assistantships or to reduce them costs the university money because of the drop in 700 level hours for the summer. The people who understand this are the faculty. It ends up costing money rather than saving it. Ms. Alison Arnold had been hearing in her college about the lack of faculty input, the rubber stamp issue. She would like to have more faculty input. What kind of power do we have as a Senate? Dr. Brooks suggested perhaps a resolution of some sort about the lack of faculty input.

Dr. David Beriss was concerned that, given that we are supposed to be shared governance, and that the Provost and Gregg Lassen were not at this meeting, he has a lack of confidence in the data; it is not what he would consider an essential element of his program. How can it possibly be meaningful? It would be great if the people who put this together could report to us. Dr. Brooks replied that actually the Provost did ask to speak to us, and the Provost was here.

Provost Payne stated that the University is not good on data collection. The template is going to be revised, and there will be annual progress reviews every year. There have been a lot of suggestions on how to streamline the programs, and a number of recommendations have been put out to the deans. In some cases, the deans are sharing that information. How can we be proactive in looking at low-completer programs? He thought that it was first fair to share with the deans initially and then get it into the pipeline. He is going to report to the Cost Containment Committee. But given the time constraints? The intent is not to eliminate programs but to strengthen programs.

Dr. Brooks asked if that means that in the information being disseminated this week there will be reports on what has been communicated through the deans to the faculty. The Provost responded that he has encouraged the deans to talk to department chairs. A lot of what they have shared with the deans has to do with ADA compliance and cost information to try to improve the programs. Dr. Brooks asked if we will then have a report of what is being streamlined, to which the Provost answered yes. Dr. Brooks asked if those decisions will have been made. The Provost responded that these are recommendations. Dr. Brooks asked if the Senate will have a chance to review his report and comment on it, and the Provost said yes and that he was right now trying to schedule one-half hour meetings with the deans and chairs. Dr. Brooks asked again if we would be able to review that material and provide feedback. The Provost responded yes, but it would go to the Cost Containment Committee first. Dr. Brooks asked if we would get a report two weeks before the next Senate meeting on February 25, and the Provost replied that he hoped to get it finalized in two weeks.

Dr. Richard Speaker stated that it seems that we very often lose focus on what is going on. A lot of faculty are frightened, worried about their job and about program cancellations. More importantly, we need to articulate a view of what we see the University to be in the future, and he does not see that stated very often. Our programs were being discussed today on the radio. Dr. Thomas explained that it was President Fos and five successful business people who graduated from UNO. Dr. Speaker replied that we need to hear again what the vision is. Mr. Derek Rodriguez thinks that the vision is the 5-year strategic plan, and he asked if the strategic plan is being looked at on the committees. Dr. Nelson responded that it was not in the subcommittee that she is on. Dr. Speaker suggested that maybe we need to bring the 5-year plan back.

Ms. Blankenship asked that if scheduling needs to start next week, how can we have feedback on these decisions. Dr. Trumbach said that the advice she would give is to start scheduling as before with the chair; the deadline is not actually until mid-February. Dr. Matt Moore explained that there would be a meeting on February 4 on strategies for building scheduling for next fall. The process will start on February 4 and runs through February. We should start with things that we know we can do and not wait until the last second. Dr. Brooks said that it sounds like a good goal, but in the document that was just sent out about the workload pilot, it looks like the actual implementation would not be until January 2015. The Provost stated that fall 2014 is the pilot. They are not looking at the evaluation piece, just the workload. People wanted more flexibility. Within the departments, they will be looking at four areas. They want to run a pilot and clarify policy.

Dr. Thomas asked if the Cost Containment Committee is discussing restructuring and what are the dollar amounts associated with restructuring. Dr. Trumbach responded that they have not got into the dollar amount or talked about restructuring at all on the academic side. They are still in the data-gathering piece of the non-academic side. She has been documenting problem areas, particularly in background processes, such as hiring and purchasing. They are still very much data gathering. Each group sent out their own survey. A lot of information in HR is not really accurate. She would like to identify priorities. Dr. Thomas replied that she was thinking more of the merging of colleges and schools. Dr. Trumbach's understanding is that the Cost Containment Committee will have an opportunity and the Senate plenty of time to discuss.

Dr. Christy Corey was worried about the timeline of June 30. When can we expect some of these major mergers and changes when there is a 12-month requirement? The Provost explained that the burden really is on the non-academic side. On the academic side, the priority is to get scheduling for the fall. The whole idea of restructuring will come after we build the schedule, which will not be done in two weeks. We are looking at the University of Louisiana at Monroe, which is what the ULS would like us to do. There are no decisions about the colleges, no smoke and mirrors. It might be a timing issue. It is not just about administrative savings; part of revitalization is how can we reposition the programs. Once we go through this exercise, there needs to be a marketing program. Having been here a year, to establish some accountability, he is going to develop a work plan for administration and will be breaking down this coming year what offices are responsible for what.

At this point, Dr. Brooks announced that she had a 4:30pm class at the Jefferson Center and that Dr. Trumbach would continue the meeting.

Dr. Schock referred to the \$6M structural deficit and asked Dr. Payne to confirm that he had heard him correctly: that most of the budget cuts required to reduce the entire deficit to zero will be made on the non-academic side. The Provost replied that he wants to get with the others and see where they are on the non-academic side. Dr. Schock continued by saying that he was aware that it was difficult to make academic cuts in the duration of this fiscal year, and that he and many others had the impression that we would have to plan for academic cuts next year in order to entirely zero out the structural deficit. In fact, in the run-up to today's meeting, he said, the prospect of cuts to programs and academic personnel next year has terrified many. He said: if it turns out that it is not possible to retire most of the deficit through cuts to the non-academic side, then his modest proposal is that the Faculty Senate request information. Specifically, we need to know the amount that has to be cut this fiscal year and the next to convince the ULS that we have done our due diligence. Those budget cut targets seem necessary for planning. He concluded by saying that he strongly believes that we need to be looking not only at cuts, but at encouraging enrollment growth as well: academic departments can work in partnership with the Office of Enrollment Services to recruit new students for the fall. He forwarded a proposal today to the academic deans that asks them to consider directing department chairs to build student recruiting activity into departmental strategic plans. Last semester, English brought 58 high school students to campus for a two-day recruiting event, and we will continue the effort this semester. Dr. David Meredith, Director of Enrollment Services, has pledged to assist any department willing to take on student recruiting activity; his staff has provided essential support to English.

Ms. Arnold was curious if the Cost Containment Committee or the Senate Executive Committee had ever seen a breakdown on where the money in the deficit is from, and, if not, cannot the Senate request to see it. Dr. Trumbach explained that a number of presentations were given. In past years, we based our budget on student projections, and when the money did not come in, we took it out of Reserves, for many years. Now, there is not much wiggle room in the Reserves.

Dr. John Gery said that he would like to reinforce and add to Dr. Baxter's earlier statement about faculty participation. He had written something down but not really a whole statement. He was not sure in the January 9 memo which changes had been made and which were proposed, and he would like in writing a clear indication of how decisions were made and what faculty members were consulted. Dr. Gery read from the first page of his draft statement (see **Appendix 6**) and emphasized question #23 re minimum class size. Dr. Trumbach requested that Dr. Gery give Ms. Morgan his document and perhaps the Cost Containment Committee can address it. A lot of it is related to SACS, and they had talked specifically about class size. We have been told that if a minimum class size did not make, the class would be cancelled, but we have also been told that is not true. Ms. Michelle Esposito asserted that if we have this minimum, we cannot reach it, and we cut classes before they begin, people will not be able to graduate and we are set up to fail. She concluded by stating that people should not talk about adjuncts – they are real people, too.

A faculty member from the Sociology Department said that waiting a month to have more conversation about this is really too long and asked if we could have a UNO community meeting. Dr. Speaker responded that there are several mechanisms: The Senate can have additional meetings; there is also the Faculty Council, but it needs the signatures of 50 people to call a meeting and it can be called on short notice. He said that he is also frustrated by the deliberate slowness when the Senate meets only once a month. He is the Parliamentarian of the Faculty Council Committee. Dr. Goss suggested that we might write up what we want, address it to Ms. Connie Phelps, Faculty Council President, and request her to call a meeting at the earliest possible date according to the bylaws. Another faculty member who works with graduate students asked if it is appropriate to invite Administration to come, and students and staff as well. Dr. Speaker replied that the Faculty Council Committee can invite anyone it wants to invite. Dr. Baxter stated that he is in favor of a Faculty Council meeting and added that in about two weeks we should have more knowledge of the proposal and the fall schedule will be in progress. The numbers do not really add up, clarity is not there, and it does not add up to him if we can close a \$6M budget deficit by June 30. Communication is very important.

Dr. Christine Day stated that she came in late and someone might already have asked this question: Is the Cost Containment Committee trying to cut costs without knowing what costs what? Dr. Trumbach responded that they had pretty good information; no targets, but how much each unit is costing. In response to Dr. Spinu's question, Dr. Trumbach replied that they had not seen any proposals yet. She does not know how far along they are in putting things together, but she has heard rumors. Dr. Ehrenfeucht added that it would be useful to have more information. Dr. Trumbach explained that the non-academic side was 62% of the budget; it should be flip flopped to 40/60 (academic/non-academic). There has been a lot of work on the non-academic side, and they discovered a lot of places where people are doing duplicative jobs. Dr. Ehrenfeucht said that it would be nice to have a breakdown of which divisions cost what. Dr.

Trumbach closed by saying that she would like to see questions by Friday so they could address those questions at the meeting.

6. Old Business. None.

7. New Business. None.

8. Adjournment.

A motion to adjourn was moved by Dr. Enrique La Motta and seconded by Dr. Speaker. The meeting adjourned at 4:44pm

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Morgan
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2013/14
February 18, 2014

APPENDIX 1 (Announcement re Anti-smoking Law and Its Implementation at UNO):

Since I will miss the Senate meeting (class) I wanted to send you a short report on the anti-smoking law and its implementation at UNO. The LA legislature enacted Senate Bill 36/Act #211 in 2013 which mandates Louisiana public colleges and universities be smoke-free by August 1, 2014. The law allows us to also be tobacco-free if we desire and that is the direction the implementation committee has taken from President Fos. We're currently working on devising and implementing a tobacco-free policy for UNO, to take effect August 1, 2014 and have been asked to tell our colleagues (in my case faculty) that the policy is coming so nobody is surprised on August 1. Can you please make a short announcement about this for me?

APPENDIX 2 (Announcement):

General Education Notes

Faculty Senate Meeting

January 27, 2014

The General Education Committee has worked diligently since Spring 2013 to ensure compliance with related SACSCOC standards. The existing menu of 1725 courses that satisfy general education requirements creates a number of problems, not the least of which are conducting student learning assessment and supporting the curriculum in a cost effective manner. In light of cost containment measures and in an effort to responsibly allocate critical faculty resources, a proposed course menu has been developed.

In summary, changes to the general education curriculum are being made for the following reasons:

1. Improve general education assessment (which in turn will inform program improvement)
2. Reduce cost associated with the general education component of the programs of study
3. Ensure compliance with SACSCOC standards associated with general education
4. Build capacity to thread critical skills across general education courses in the future

While menu decisions must be made very quickly in order to implement for the 2014-15 academic year, please note that the menu will evolve and general education discussions will continue. A two year plan is being developed to ensure that assessment specific to the general education student learning outcomes will be conducted in the selected courses.

Faculty should review the memo and proposed course menu, then send feedback to the Office of Academic Affairs by Thursday, January 30.

More information: www.uno.edu/general-education

APPENDIX 3

Response to Faculty Resolution Regarding Proposed Faculty Workload/Evaluation Policy

January 23, 2014

The Office of Academic Affairs has reviewed the resolution developed by the UNO Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Our office recognizes the importance of all faculty members to the fulfillment of UNO's mission including tenure track and non-tenure track faculty hired on a full or part time basis.

We recognize that the draft policy developed by the Office of Academic Affairs **did** not address the workload circumstances of all faculty employed at UNO as it primarily was conceptualized as a model for faculty in tenure/tenure track positions. We are committed to developing an effective model of assigning, reporting, and evaluating workload for all faculty.

This response is organized in three parts: a response to each Resolution and an outline of our plan to develop a faculty load policy.

Resolution 1

Elimination of the requirement for quantification of the distribution of faculty effort dedicated to teaching, learning, and service.

The Office of Academic Affairs endorsed the concept of using a single metric to assign faculty workload but supports the ability of individual weights for specific faculty tasks (e.g., teaching, research, service) to be adjusted for individual faculty. We concur with the resolution that a "more flexible approach is warranted to determining the distribution of

faculty effort". Please see the notes below related to designing a revised Faculty Workload Policy.

Resolution 2

Establish a committee to develop a workload/evaluation policy for full and part-time faculty members hired primarily to teach.

The Office of Academic Affairs is committed to developing a workload policy that encompasses the needs of both full and part time faculty engaged in differing levels of teaching, research and service responsibilities. (see plan outlined below). Appointing a specific committee of comprised of part time faculty and faculty primarily assigned to the role of teaching will not support our effort to develop an inclusive policy.

The Office of Academic Affairs will appoint a committee to assist in the implementation of a new Faculty Workload Policy and ensure representation of full and part time faculty as well as faculty more heavily engaged in teaching, research, and/or service. In addition to faculty, the committee will include other constituencies relevant to successful implementation of the workload policy (see plan outlined below).
Outline to Develop a Revised Faculty Workload Policy

Part One: Workload assignment

The first step is the design of the framework used to assign faculty workload. Initial work has begun to develop a working model based on a percentage metric. Following are principles informing the model:

- Model should be developed to apply to all faculty
- Model should address the three main responsibilities of faculty: teaching, research and service
- Model should allow flexibility to adjust to individual responsibilities assumed by faculty in a given semester

Part Two: Evaluation

The second step is the design of the specific procedures to be used by each unit to establish expectations and evaluation targets for each of the three areas of faculty work: teaching, research, and service. Following are principles informing the model:

- Performance targets should be individualized to meet the need of each unit
- Performance targets should align with expectations of for each critical faculty role: teaching, research, and service
- Performance targets should be stated in a manner to support accurate reporting and effective evaluation of faculty efforts
- Policy should include accountability measures to ensure that faculty productivity is reported, measured and recognized

Development and Adoption of New Workload Policy

Phase I – Pilot

With input from the Office of Research, the Office of Academic Affairs is in the process of adjusting the original model presented in the initial policy statement

Working procedures need to be developed to support pilot implementation

Draft procedures will be piloted in Fall 2014

Phase 2 – Adoption

Draft workload policy and procedures will be revised/finalized based on Fall 2014 pilot and adopted for Spring 2015 implementation

To prepare for the pilot activity, the following actions must take place during the Spring 2014 semester:

- Assignment of unit-specific teaching, research, service weights by deans to use for the purpose of the fall 2014 pilot
- Charge of a committee to support the pilot
- Development of draft procedures to support the pilot
- Alignment of pilot work with implementation of Faculty 180 to report faculty effort

APPENDIX 4 (Report from Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee re “Response to Faculty Resolution Regarding Proposed Faculty Workload/Evaluation Policy”):

January 27, 2014

- I. Senate Committee on Academic Freedom met last week with Provost Payne and Bill Sharpton to discuss response of Academic Affairs to Senate workload policy resolutions passed last October.
 - A. We did not discuss on-line teaching policy. That will happen at a later meeting
 - B. Each Senator should have a copy of Academic Affairs’ “Response to Faculty Resolution Regarding Proposed Faculty Workload/Evaluation Policy, 1/23/14.” [see **Appendix 3**]

1. I will briefly summarize the meeting and then the entire Senate can decide at our next meeting if we should respond in any way to the proposed policy
- II. Summary of Resolution
- A. Response to resolution 1 about workload policy: Academic Affairs proposes a single metric to assign faculty workload (each unit must propose percent teaching, research, and service) that generally applies to all faculty
 1. However, the Provost supports flexibility, including individual weights for each task adjusted for individual faculty members.
 - B. Response to resolution 2 about workload policy for non-regular faculty: Academic Affairs proposes a single committee charged with implementation of workload policy for both full-time and part-time faculty.
 - C. Academic Affairs proposes a 2-phase implementation process:
 1. Pilot program in Fall, 2014
 2. Full adoption of workload policy in January 2015

APPENDIX 5 (Dr. Trumbach's Cost Containment and Revitalization Committee report):

The CCRC is co-chaired by VP of Business Affairs Gregg Lassen and Provost Jim Payne. Gregg Lassen has spearheaded the efforts to review the non-Academic units at the University as the primary areas for Cost Containment. The Provost has been in charge of all efforts related to restructuring the Academic units as a means to improve efficiency and position the University for revitalization. The Cost Containment and Revitalization Committee consists of approximately 20 individuals from throughout the University, with 2 Deans from the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Education, 2 Department Chairs from the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences and 4 other faculty members from the Colleges of Liberal Arts, Sciences and Business. The Committee met three times last semester for broad information gathering meetings, one of which was with the Deans and Department Chairs. From those meetings we learned that there would be sub-committees to consider Cost Containment options. Department Chairs were asked to submit information to fit into a rubric to be used to evaluate programs. I believe that as faculty members, we were all under the impression that our main responsibility was to be to sort through that information and contribute to a plan for the restructuring of the Academic Units. We were also wary that we may end up as a "rubber stamp," committee but hoping that the decisions would not happen that way.

The committee has met every Friday since January 11th. On January 11th, Dr. Lassen assigned members to one of six subcommittees: a) evaluation of academic programs; b) evaluating student worker assignments; c) evaluation of graduate assistant assignments; d) evaluation of assignments of periods of appointment; e) evaluation of assignment of probationary classified employees; and f) evaluation of assignment of unclassified staff appointments.

Some of us were surprised to learn that only Dean Graves from Liberal Arts and Dean Kruger from Education were on the Academic Restructuring Sub-Committee. However, the committee assignments were handed out at the end of the meeting and there really was not time for questions or discussion on the matter.

Since then the committees have been interviewing departments around campus, focusing on identifying cost savings on the non-Academic side of the institution. Our recommendations will be turned in this week. In general, on Academic side, the faculty members on the CCRC have had opportunities to discuss the process by which decisions were made but have not been involved in the decisions making at all. The document that the Provost sent out last week with all his many points was discussed at great length with the CCRC committee.

APPENDIX 6 (Dr. John Gery's draft statement):

For Questions from the floor, UNO Faculty Senate, Monday, 27 January 2014

[This is a draft statement only]

In whatever way it is appropriate, I would request that members of the Faculty Senate propose and vote on a resolution to be presented to the relevant UNO administration as an effort to address the following statement of concern:

John Gery, Research Professor of English

As a member of the faculty in the Department of English since 1979, I appreciate the critical situation of the "current financial situation" of the university. Also, I appreciate the Provost Payne's concern (stated in his Memorandum of 16 January 2014) about the difficulty of finding "a common time by which we might meet to best disseminate information" addressing the situation. Further, I appreciate his wish, stated in the same memorandum, of making a "continued effort to be as transparent and communicative as possible."

Furthermore, as far as I understand it, by the longstanding policy of shared governance of the university, I as a faculty member have not only the *right* but the *obligation* to participate in

matters that affect the day-to-day operation of the university – in particular as pertain to all academic and curricular matters. In order to exercise that participation, it is important that I as a faculty member be as informed as possible about pending proposals and changes in these matters and that I offer my views on these matters as part of the process of their being implemented – *before* they are implemented.

Having considered with some care the three recent electronic memoranda received from the Provost dated 9 January, 16 January, and 24 January, I have a list of questions related to what I consider to be significant academic and curricular matters for which greater transparency and communication is needed before I can understand their efficacy. I think I also may be speaking for other colleagues on the faculty who are not currently serving in administrative positions and who share with me a wish more fully to understand both the *nature of the deliberations* and the *full rationale as to how each of the “efforts towards Cost Containment and Revitalization” listed by the Provost in these memoranda will “reflect not only cost savings but will also enhance the academic integrity of the institution in the long-run.”* But whether I am alone in these having questions or not, I am asking the Faculty Senate to consider a resolution to request specific information in response to these questions, according to my reading of the memoranda:

9 January 2014:

1. [para 1] Is it possible to provide an outline or detail how the “major culture shift” proposed is “a result of years of fiscal mismanagement and lack of willingness on the part of the academic leadership [in the past] to make tough decisions”? I do not have such a memory of past leadership behaving this way.

2. [para 1] Which academic committees and/or members of the faculty* participated in determining how the items listed in this memo “will...enhance the academic integrity” of UNO “in the long-run”?

[*I recognize that members of the administration are also members of the faculty, but when I use that phrase here I intend it to refer to those not serving in administrative roles.]

3. **General education:** Which members of the faculty participated in the process of determining the “streamlining” of enrollment in general education courses with a minimum of 30 students. What specific courses are included in this number?

4. **Scheduling policy:** Were members of the faculty consulted in advance of the new university scheduling policy as relevant to the appropriate course of study in their separate fields? If so, who?

5. **Annual Program Reviews:** Which members of the faculty participated in the process of “developing databases and analyzing data” relevant to the widely diverse programs of study and research at UNO?

6. **Scholarships from General Revenue:** Which members of the faculty participated in the process of determining to “reduce the amount of scholarships funded from general revenue”?

7. **Graduate Assistantships and Tuition Waivers:** Which members of the faculty participated in the process of determining the “decoupling” of Graduate Assistantships and Tuition Waivers, and was any study made of what the impact such a “decoupling” will have on recruitment of students in the fields where this decoupling will take place?

8. **Advising:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate in the evaluation of advising and the effectiveness of the current procedures?

9. **Additional Compensation Policy:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate in revising “the additional compensation policy to control costs”?

10. **College Administrative Restructuring:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate before the fact in the proposed realignment of the administrative structure within colleges and departments? Will Deans do more than “discuss” these proposed changes with faculty, or will faculty members be given the opportunity to propose changes, to advocate for changes that will “effectively position programs for growth with the appropriate support staff and marketing of programs,” and to vote on those changes, if necessary?

11. **Library Restructuring:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate in evaluating the Library and the long-term advantages and risks of its evolving into a “Library as a Teaching and Learning Commons”? Will that term be defined?

12. **Study Abroad Programs:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate in evaluating the “financial transparency, efficient use of resources, and appropriate credentialing of participating faculty” in UNO’s Study Abroad programs?

13. **Jefferson Center:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate in evaluating the role of the Jefferson Center as a teaching resource and facility relevant to UNO’s urban mission?

14. **Centers and Institutes:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees are participating in the evaluation of “all centers and institutes,” not only in terms of their “cost-benefit” but also in their role in the city, the region, the state, the nation, the world, and the profession?

15. **INTO Joint Venture:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in composing and approving the “Letter of Intent with INTO”? What will be the role of faculty in evaluating potential international students, as well as in determining whether their eligibility for undergraduate and graduate study at UNO might not qualify them to be competitive for financial support or “tuition discounting”?

16. **Substitutions:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining the policy that no more than 5 substitutions of coursework prescribed can be used toward the satisfaction of degree requirements?

17. **Waivers:** Is the requirement that all waivers be approved through Academic Affairs a change in policy? If so, what alternatives for appeal or other means will students and faculty have, in the event that a waiver is approved by faculty in the field but denied by Academic Affairs (or the other way around)? How is this policy change a change from the current policy, exactly?

18. Waivers of Degree Requirements: How is this a policy change? Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in changing this policy?

19. Percentage of Coursework toward Undergraduate Degree: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in the deliberations of these figures? What rationale was provided for these figures to be set? Was there any dissenting view? What alternatives were discussed? By whom?

20. Undergraduate Second Degree: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining that the SAP toward a first degree completion should be “frozen” never to be re-used? Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining that “new/second degrees should be at least 30 hours of unique coursework within the major of the new/second degree” and was any discussion held concerning different degrees with varying requirements and options? Was any study made of the potential impact of this change on efforts to recruit students interested in earning two degrees? If so, by whom?

21. Cross Listed Coursework Applied as Graduate Credit: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining the policy that no more than 25% of hours taken at the 5000 level can be applied to graduate graduation requirements? Was any discussion held concerning the widely varying current requirements in different fields for graduate degrees, the ability of individual departments and faculty members to meet this policy effectively while also meeting the new requirements for minimum class-size (see No. 23 below), and other issues related to the academic content of 5000-level courses?

22. Graduate Students Taking Undergraduate Courses for Credit: Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining the graduate students will be restricted to enrolling for credit no more that [sic: than] 10% of their graduate program hours with undergraduate hours”? Was any discussion held concerning the widely varying current requirements in different fields for graduate degrees, or the ability of individual departments and faculty members to meet this policy effectively while also meeting the new requirements for minimum class-size (see No. 23 below)?

23. **Minimum Class Size:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining the numbers for all courses on minimum class size? Was any research conducted in various fields to determine whether these minimum numbers have proved effective, not only in terms of the academic success of students, but in terms of retention, in terms of recruitment, in terms of graduation rates, and in terms of success of students in gaining employment after university? If so, can we see the results of that research, as well as study the rationale for these class sizes, specifically as related to the “academic integrity of the institution in the long-run” as expressed by the Provost in the lead paragraph of this memo?

24. **Change of Grade:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining this policy change? How is it a change from the preceding policy?

25. **W Policy:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining this policy? To what, exactly, does the directive, “Faculty need to consider some evaluation before mid-term” apply? Are faculty to consider the revised process of evaluation to be used before midterm in the current term? Or are faculty members being directed to evaluate students before midterm in some fashion this term? Clarification is needed.

26. **Defining Excused Absence:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate in developing a “university-wide excused absence policy”?

27. **Intellectual Property:** By what means is it proposed to enforce the current intellectual property policy”?

28. **Posting of Syllabus in Moodle:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining this requirement? What is the rationale for instituting this as a requirement for courses not taught on Moodle? What if an individual faculty member prefers not to post a syllabus on Moodle?

29. **Changes of Major, Minor, Concentrations:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining that no changes to these can be made in the final term of enrollment? What if a student discovers a full compliance with one of these areas during the last term?

30. **Academic Amnesty:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate in reviewing (and revising or deciding not to revise) the current policy of academic amnesty?

31. **Placement Exams:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining that placement exams will not be accepted beyond 2000 level courses and/or will not be allowed in the final term of a student's enrollment?

32. **Variance Model:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining the use of variance funds and their impact on department's curricular efficacy?

Memorandum of 16 January 2014:

1. [para 2, point 1]: With what members of the faculty and/or with what faculty committees did the Office of Academic Affairs consult before "beginning to compile recommendations for program restructuring to be more cost effective"? Were programs, departments, and/or colleges given an opportunity to identify for themselves how to become more cost efficient, as well as to determine their necessity to the core mission of UNO?

2. **General Education Committee:** What rationale was discussed by this committee in determining the need for courses as 1000-2000 level? Were faculty consulted in studying the importance of these courses to the core mission of the university? Are the minutes of their meetings available for review by the faculty?

3. When UL President Karla Hughes visited the UNO campus, was she invited to meet with or consult any members of the faculty? Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees were consulted beforehand in determining which efforts toward cost containment need to be emphasized in discussions with the UL Board?

4. **Scheduling policy:** Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees participated in determining the new scheduling policy?

5. **Workload policy:** What timeline is being considered to develop a workload policy that involves faculty participation in its design and implementation?

6. **Evaluation of academic programs:** What procedure will be followed in the evaluation of academic programs that will precede any proposals for restructuring of academic units? Which members of the faculty and/or what faculty committees will participate in both drawing up the procedure and evaluating programs to assure a knowledgeable and informed evaluation of UNO's widely diverse departments and programs?

I am certain that some of these questions may be moot or may be considered outside the purview of faculty or of shared governance. I also suspect many further questions are unanswered, as I have drawn up these questions in a short time without a chance to consult colleagues for responses and insight into the particulars. Please forgive the oversight or my lack of sufficient knowledge of the by-laws of shared governance at UNO. Still, I do hope the spirit of this document is clear and that it can be seen to express the wishes of UNO's faculty (especially those of us with a lifetime of commitment to the sustenance, growth, academic and professional success, personal well-being, and cultural empowerment of UNO's remarkable students and alumni) to nurture and strengthen the university for the foreseeable future, in keeping with the distinctive, honorable, and substantive character of its past. While all of us I recognize, I think, the financial realities which the times have imposed on our day-to-day efforts to educate and build a rich long-term future for this city, the region and the world outside us, to lose sight of our fundamental vision, our stellar record of diversity of every kind (socially and ethically, as well as intellectually), and our steadfast commitment not to agencies or institutions but to the people who come to us eager to improve their lives is to render "cost containment" as an empty gesture on behalf of those who may not be unaware of what we actually do here. Without careful consideration of the full impact of each of these proposed or mandated changes, we risk abandoning the fundamental interests of those in our community (namely, our students and fellow citizens), without whom we have no purpose.

Thank you for your consideration.

