

UNO FACULTY SENATE MINUTES (OCTOBER 28, 2015)

Senators Attending: Cherie Trumbach, John Nicklow, Dinah Payne, Jim Mokhiber, Connie Phelps, Christy Corey, Vassil Roussev, Edit Bourgeois, Jim Logan, Juliana Starr, Marie Morgan, Richard Speaker, Matthew Lyons, Elliott Beaton, Kenneth Holladay, Chris Day, David Lambour (for Amanda Green), John Kiefer, David Gladstone, Jeffrey Ehrenreich, David Beriss, Steve Striffler, Vern Baxter, Laszlo Fulop, Peter Schock, Wendy Schluchter, Elizabeth Blankenship, Christine Ikeda.

Cherie Trumbach, UNO Faculty Senate President called the meeting to order. She noted that, in addition to our regular agenda, we would be addressed by Dr. Randy Moffett, who should arrive about 3:15. She noted that we are circulating a clipboard for everyone to sign in.

Approval of Minutes and Announcements

Trumbach opened discussion of the minutes from the September meeting. Hearing no discussion, a motion to approve the minutes was heard and seconded. The minutes were approved by voice vote.

Trumbach then proceeded to make some announcements. She noted that she is allowed to appoint an administrator to the Senate. She noted that she had chosen Dr. Nicklow to help facilitate things that we have to get done. The position is a yearly appointment by the Faculty Senate president so it may change in the future. Trumbach also noted that the Senate had tickets to the alumni event next Thursday, November 5th. Dinah Payne, Management, noted the possibility of obtaining other tickets at a reduced price. Trumbach urged faculty to attend.

Presidential Search Update

Trumbach then moved on to discuss the first meeting of the presidential search committee and its web site. The site's address will be posted on Moodle. It includes the timeline and text for the ad. She noted that November 9th there will be a public forum held at UNO, so faculty should mark their calendars for that. We need to show them our level of interest. She also noted that faculty may nominate someone for this position, and faculty should consider naming someone if they believe they know of an excellent candidate. Forward any names to Trumbach. The search firm is also going through its rolodex.

Committee on Committees (Consolidation and reform of UNO Committee Structure)

Regarding the Committee on Committees, Trumbach had several updates. It has identified active UNO committees and grouped them by oversight (e.g. Senate committees, Academic Affairs committees, university wide, etc.) Now it is trying to narrow down the number of committees based on their functions and mission. (For example, grouping all committees having to do with student safety together.) Trumbach indicated that a list of committees to be restructured would soon be made available to the Senate and the wider faculty, probably by the next meeting.

University Budget Review Committee

Trumbach then turned to the University Budget Review Committee. If you have any input about its work, please send it to Jim Logan, the chair of the Faculty Senate's Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee. The latter has been looking at budget priorities and what the UBC did in the spring, reviewing stipends and additional compensation and then also looking at revenue-generating units to determine whether they should be paying overhead or not. There will be a charge to the Senate Budget and Fiscal Affairs Committee to do some further

research and make some recommendations related to stipends and additional compensation policies, with a view toward more standardization.

Jim Logan stressed that the whole issue of fairness and compensation and additional compensation is up for review, and urged senators to contribute their thoughts regarding anything the committee or the administration should be examining.

Senator: What is the definition of stipend?

Logan: That's one of the questions we're discussing. There's not a really strong definition for any of this. The policies are not particularly strong in some areas, so we have to look at the whole issue.

Trumbach stressed that the committees were going to need to do research in order to "get it right" and be detailed. There's no particular rush except to address budget concerns.

Student Course Evaluations and Concerns

Trumbach then moved on to course evaluations. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee sat down with IT with a list of concerns. One of the major issues was the ability to submit evaluations on mobile devices. As it presently stands, the evaluations will be available on those devices but not as an app. The FSEC strongly encouraged IT to make sure that the interface looks good or easy to use on a mobile device. In the future, it should be a mobile app. Trumbach also noted the continuing discussion regarding whether students should be obliged (e.g. through a "threat" of withholding grades) to submit their evaluations. She noted that there is something of a stalemate on the Academic Policy and Standards Committee, which is struggling over the decision. She encouraged faculty members to set aside time for students to do the online evaluations, so as to guarantee a sufficient response. Trumbach noted that Christy Corey has put a number of documents on Moodle that will give Senators an idea for the scope of her committee's work.

Faculty Performance Evaluations

On Faculty Performance Evaluations, Trumbach noted that she has received updates from Dr. Whitley and David Beriss. She noted that Academic Affairs continues to develop the "default" annual faculty evaluation process, but that there here have been some impediments to completion. The most prominent involve Faculty 180, and one of the fundamental requirements is that the default annual faculty evaluation process, no matter what it is, must be implemented within the framework of Faculty 180. Annual evaluations will be based on faculty inputs, and there is a new and much easier interface to govern faculty use. She encouraged faculty to investigate it. While this change will slow down implementation, in the end it is a big improvement over the past interface. It should provide, she said, a process that is much more "trackable" for faculty, the chairs, the deans and academic affairs. On the downside, training for faculty and chairs is crucial or implementation will not go well. Trumbach noted that she had strongly encouraged Dr. Whitley to make available working group-type training to faculty members who may need it to input the data. After a semester or two we should find it much easier to input and thus keep track of all our activities.

Trumbach noted that the default faculty annual evaluation process is based on two documents – the policy found in the employee handbook, section 3.15 on continuing review of faculty achievements, and the draft faculty evaluation policy created by a sub-committee of the Faculty Governance Committee.

Departments must supply the document or rubric that pertains to faculty efforts in the three categories of activity. In scholarly creative work, this must include the threshold of quantity of work and external validation

of quality of work. In the current policy, overall assessment of faculty effort is required to be related to the faculty member's specific duties. In the current process, the overall assessment of faculty effort is not directly tied in any numerical way to the workload. This is something that will be addressed by academic affairs and the faculty Senate in the coming year. The current policy has a timeline under which the chair's evaluation must be completed before the end of the academic year. The dean's review must be completed before the end of the fiscal year. There are discrepancies between the handbook, the governance policy and what we said we would do with SACS. This year, she said, will be "ugly," but if we start working through these issues now, we will have a much better process and one that we can continue to use and not have to change every time we turn around.

She reminded Senators that this year there's a lot of flexibility for the departments. The Senate's participation resulted in some changes in language and more. Categories like "needs improvement" or "not meeting expectations" have been spelled out more clearly, as well as how one is designated as "unsatisfactory" and possibly subject to firing. She noted that the departments are not being required to have specific formulae right now. There is a lot of flexibility built into the process. Psychology and its guidelines might be one useful model. She noted that she had asked Dr. Whitley to have certain people who are trained to help lead the department chairs through how to come up with an evaluation policy. We did not want to change the November 1st deadline, she stated, because we do want to kind of push a little bit. Submitted policies should be interpreted as drafts, and department chairs should just turn in what they have in order to get feedback from academic affairs.

Steve Striffler, Anthropology: Is this the way that Norm Whitley is going to communicate with the rest of the university, through the Senate and Trumbach? Because the question for me is that I'm a department chair, it's October 28th and while we've heard some rumors, this is the first time I think I've heard that the November first is a draft. Is Whitley going to send this message to the deans for the deans to send along to the chair? Because the other thing is, when we were communicating with other chairs, if they weren't in this meeting the last time, they weren't getting a lot of the information.

Trumbach noted that the decisions with Academic Affairs had just been made the previous day. She said that she would become more involved in the process from now on, and will begin forwarding information to and from Academic Affairs. This will save time and will help Academic Affairs, which has a very full plate. She noted that she had been getting a lot of feedback indicating that many chairs were not comfortable with their draft policies or the timetable expected of them.

David Beriss, Anthropology: We have actually drafted language for the preamble, that's one of the things we were charged with doing and with advice on stuff that should be removed from the previous draft policy. If we decide we're ready to move forward can we do it or not?

Trumbach urged Beriss and his committee to continue to meet with Dr. Whitley directly. There has to be a meshing of the various documents and language, with everyone sitting down to determine 'Yes, this is the final thing that we want to submit.'

Marie Morgan, Earl K. Long Library: There's an awful lot in what you just said. Could we have access to your report as soon as possible?

Trumbach said it would all be in the minutes and that she would put the information in the appropriate Moodle folder.

UNO Honors Faculty Appointments and Designation

Trumbach raised the issue of a number of motions for approval. The first is a resolution to support the recognition of Honors Faculty.

Text of the proposed resolution:

- ▶ “Whereas the Honors Faculty members have dedicated considerable time and energy to many of our most promising students, we support the efforts by the University Honors Program to select and recognize those faculty members who have met the designated criteria for the past 5 years by placing them each fall on a renewable 1-year Honors Faculty appointment.”

She noted that she had sent out the documents concerning the criteria for recognizing the considerable time and energy many faculty members spend on our most promising students. The resolution supports the efforts by the university honors program to select and recognize faculty members who have met the designated criteria for the past five years by placing them each fall on a renewable one-year honors faculty appointment.

The motion was moved and seconded. Senators discussed whether there was a need for debate.

A Senator asked what an “Honors Faculty Appointment” would mean. Trumbach indicated that it was a designation that was intended to recognize the Honors Faculty. It acknowledges their efforts. Discussion amongst senators suggested that it was a purely honorific designation.

The question was called. The resolution passed by voice vote.

Trumbach then turned to a resolution to change the criteria for honors designation at graduation. She noted that the issue of considering only a student’s UNO GPA as a basis for honors awards had been introduced at prior meetings.

Text of the proposed resolution [as reported by Christy Corey]:

- ▶ “The baccalaureate degree is awarded with honors to students who earn a minimum of 60 credit hours at UNO and who maintain a high grade point average. To be eligible for academic honors students must have a cumulative UNO GPA that falls within the ranges below.

Summa Cum Laude 3.9-4.0

Magna Cum Laude 3.7-3.899

Cum Laude: 3.5-3.699

Christy Corey, Management, reminded Senators that term “Cumulative GPA” only includes UNO coursework. Trumbach noted that the Registrar had asked us to consider the issue because that’s the way all other honors are calculated. It seems to be the norm for most schools. Corey clarified that this was the basis for other determinations beyond honors too, like academic probation and many other sorts of determinations of student academic status.

James Mokhiber, History, inquired about language indicated in the text, asking if “the minimum of these” should be taken to mean “the lesser of these?” Several senators replied affirmatively.

Trumbach asked if there was further discussion, and a member of the gallery asked to be recognized.

Member of the Gallery: I've been working with the committee on this and one of the questions that came up in committee meetings was that the cumulative GPA for transfer students is... they have to have a minimum of 60 hours credit, but if they have, let's say, 60 hours credit transferred in and then 60 hours credit at UNO, then their honors is only going to be based on 60 hours credit. Whereas our own students who come here from the beginning and have 120 hours of credit, their honors is based on all of that. So the scenario is that if a student starts at UNO, gets a 3.0 in her first 60 hours at UNO, then gets a 3.9 in her last 60 hours, then her overall GPA would be 3.45 and she wouldn't qualify for honors. Whereas a transfer student who comes in with 60 hours from a transfer school with a 3.0 and gets a 3.9 in their last 60 hours at UNO, that's a *summa cum laude* graduate. So essentially we are rewarding transfer students based on 60 hours of work at UNO, but our own students with the same level of excellence are not rewarded because they did all 120 hours at UNO. So that's just a consideration for the Senate.

Trumbach: Is there any other discussion? Move to call the question?

A Senator: In your research on this, do most universities use this policy?

Corey: Yes, most universities choose not to certify or quantify other universities' work. It usually is limited to the work done at that institution, but Miriam's absolutely right that any time you take in transfer students, the GPA will always be based on fewer courses than a student who started here, so it's a definite downside of this method but it seems to be fairly standard. There were a few questions last meeting about what were the minimum number of hours needed to be obtained here at UNO to get this standard and just in case you didn't notice that it's 60 hours. Basically a couple years of coursework.

Vern Baxter, Sociology: It seems to me that if a student comes here with a really high GPA from another university and is able to sustain that in their 60 hours at UNO, there's no reason not to consider their whole 120 hours...regardless how other colleges do it.

Trumbach: They would still qualify for the honors.

Baxter: Right. But this way you take into account all of their grades. So if they don't sustain it, they don't get honors. If they didn't start out at a high GPA at their other school its harder for them to get honors. I mean, it's an argument for counting all of their credits.

Vassil Roussev, Computer Science/Faculty Senate Vice President: Actually not, because if they start with a high one and then drop somewhat, they could still fall in the range, so even if the UNO GPA is just 3.0, they could still get honors if we counted the previous ones.

Corey sought to clarify that it's the minimum of the UNO grades that would be counted.

Edit Bourgeois, Engineering: The way that we discussed this motion in the past, was that we will only count the UNO GPA, not the smallest of the two, right? So I'm not sure what this means; it looks different from what we discussed before.

Corey: Right. The problem is that in 2013, there was a change in the definition of cumulative GPA...

Member of the Gallery: At some point, the transfer courses had been calculated into the cumulative GPA. At this point some students still have their cumulative GPA calculated in the old way, which is with their transfer courses calculated in.

Corey: So if they were admitted prior to the change, they were sort of grandfathered in and the cumulative GPA is calculated the old way...

Trumbach: I think we set our policy for the future and then we have people that are grandfathered in.

Bourgeois: Yes, let's have one policy and then people who are grandfathered in.

Corey: So that's just an elimination of the last line?

Trumbach: Right.

A Senator: Then you need to change "cumulative GPA" to "UNO GPA," because they're different.

Trumbach: Anything else on this? Trumbach asked for a vote on the measure to use only UNO GPA for honors designations. The motion passed with 13 ayes and 6 nays.

Presentation by incoming interim president Dr. Randy Moffett

Trumbach then introduced Dr. Randy Moffett, who is scheduled to serve as our interim president as of February 1st. She noted that, until then, he will be conducting an "institutional review" at UNO, a standard practice when there is a transition of presidents.

Moffett thanked Trumbach and the Senate, introduced himself, and noted that UNO is a special institution, the newest member of the UL system. It has also experienced some challenges beyond those experienced at other schools as a result of Hurricane Katrina, the budget crises and changes at the senior administrative level.

Moffett noted that he had started his career as an assistant registrar at Southeastern, and was very familiar with the kinds of issues that the Senate was debating today. He voiced support for the Senate and its role in debating academic-related policies as well as budgetary and other issues on campus.

Moffett reiterated that he will serve as interim president from February 1st, but indicated that he would be working with the transition team before that date chairing an institutional review team. He indicated that other members of that team will be Dr. Bill Sharpton, obviously known to us at UNO, as well as Robbie Robinson, who is retired System finance VP and who worked in the auditor's office for the State of Louisiana for a number of years. Moffett noted that the institutional review team will also be engaging faculty in that process as we meet and ask questions and get information from the campus as a whole. As Dr. Trumbach indicated, he said, in our system we usually complete an institutional review when there's a change in the presidential leadership. The review is not intended to be a definitive 'you have to do' something kind of blueprint for the new president. It's intended more to identify issues and serve as a kind of roadmap of both opportunities and challenges. But it will be a little bit different in that this campus went through an institutional review back in the late fall of 2011 with the transition to the UL system and the selection of a new president. Moffett thus does not feel like the review will need to start at ground zero. It will look at the recommendations that were made and use its best professional judgment of progress made so far.

Moffett also noted that the team will be composed of people who have a good familiarity with both UNO and the State of Louisiana and the issues that we face as members of the higher education community in the state, including budget issues. He noted that the group had just spent three hours the previous day on a conference call. He expected to be on campus Monday for a face-to-face meeting to discuss our next steps in the institutional review and how to include the faculty. He noted that the process was evolving, especially given that the length of time since the last review was not very great. Much of the previous findings were still relevant,

but Moffett indicated that the review group also wants to bring forward issues that are new and different than what were identified before.

Moffett expressed excitement about stepping back from retirement, being involved in the transition and coming to UNO. While administrative life poses many challenges, he said he viewed the transition assignment as an “invigorating opportunity.” He said he hoped to come to know his colleagues and friends in the faculty better in the months ahead. He stressed his desire for transparency, openness and collaboration, noting “from a personal standpoint, I’m pretty much what you see is what you get. You ask me questions, I’m going to give you the best answer I can.” He also stressed a desire to involve everybody on campus in the dialogue about academic, budget, and other issues. You might not like my views sometimes, he said, but he stressed that he was open to changing his ideas and create the kinds of synergies that collaborative decision-making provides. He indicated a desire to work closely with Dr. Fos and Dr. Nicklow and others “so that when that transition officially occurs on the interim title, it’s not as if I start at ground zero.” Dr. Woodley has brought him into all of the discussions she is leading with the System presidents.

He indicated that he was already meeting with UNO administration officials on everything from budget to election results and their possible effects. He stressed that the election of a new governor and new legislature would present UNO to present its story to a different audience. He said he was very optimistic, no matter who is elected, that there would be significant changes, and new focus on higher education. So this transition comes on the cusp of an opportunity that has not existed for higher education for the past eight years.

Moffett praised Provost Nicklow for his work and understanding of UNO, and then opened the door to questions.

Questions for incoming Interim President Dr. Moffett

Jim Logan, Management: I have not so much a question but a comment. There’s been a tremendous amount of work done by various faculty committees over the last year and a half, in the financial area and other issues, and those faculty committees produced reports. I would just urge you to dig those reports up and go through them because they were and are the best effort, I think, of several of these committees. Almost everybody here was on one or both of them.

Moffett indicated that he was familiar with their work. I would totally agree, Moffett said, having been here in the spring. He noted that he was very familiar with work of the University Budget Committee and the Faculty Governance Committee. He noted that he had read their reports. He is also aware of some of the initiatives that Dr. Nicklow has undertaken in terms of looking at issues ranging from online/distance learning to summer sessions and retention. Retention, he stressed, is one of the first things that has to improve on this campus.

Moffett noted that the institutional review team will probably seek to converse with the members of those committees and will be looking for recommendations. There was a great deal of positive work that occurred over the last academic year at the university. He noted that his team would look at what revenue is coming in, what revenue is going out, how we’re spending our dollars, how we’re making decisions about various issues, budget, academics, etcetera. We’ll probably end the process by saying that we wish we’d done this or looked at that, but we’re going to be as thorough as we can. We see our task, Moffett said, as giving a report, and it will be a public report. You will see it, and we’ll give our report to the System as well as the new president to help move the university forward with some positive recommendations. Not all of these recommendations will be implemented by the new president, of course. We do not want to tie the hands of the new president. But Moffett

said he hopes to create a document that is somewhat a breath of fresh air and identifies positive things as this university moves forward.

Richard Speaker, Curriculum and Instruction: Your interim presidency might be short, but it might not. However, I see it happening at a very crucial time in the political structure of the state of Louisiana. Could you talk a little bit about relationships you have with the commissioner of higher education and the legislature and various other officials in higher education, and how you would work to improve the status of the universities, especially the University of New Orleans?

Moffett noted the timetable was a little hard to predict, but observed that the schedule for appointing someone to the presidential position was “fairly aggressive.” He urged faculty to go to the public meeting on November 9th, and he dismissed concerns that often surface that candidates have already been selected. Much will be determined by the candidate pool, he stated, and the goal is to have a candidate identified in April, taking over in the summer or the fall.

Regarding the broader issue of political contacts, Moffett noted that he was born and reared in Louisiana. Throughout his career he has long served on committees and in various capacities in Louisiana during his time at Southeastern and at the System office and knows many people. He sought to distinguish an ability to talk with a wide spectrum of people from simple politics. He does have positive and friendly relationships with a number of people, including the Regents and members of the legislature like Senator Appel, as well as leading gubernatorial candidates like David Vitter and John Bel Edwards. Moffett said he had met with Vitter in Louisiana and in DC on several occasions. Moffett also said he had worked with Edwards even before the latter had become a legislator, on issues having to do with Southeastern in the past. There has been great turnover in the Board of Regents in recent years, he observed, though he has close relationships with several still on the board now. While he does not know LA Commissioner of Higher Education Dr. [Joseph C.] Rallo very well personally, he has been in meetings with him in recent days. He does not always agree with the legislators or Board members he talks with, but he always seeks to act and speak tactfully in a way that reflects well upon the entities he represents.

Christy Corey: I was filling up my gas tank last week for a dollar eighty a gallon and all I could think was “poor UNO” and what budget cut was going to come next? What is your role in terms of addressing our current budget crisis and I heard you talk about sort of helping the next president with an assessment of what’s going and needs to be addressed. Is that primarily what you plan to get done this year or can we expect you to be a little bit more instrumental in some changes happening this year?

Moffett repeated the dual nature of his interim role at UNO, the first being the institutional review underway and the second involving working with Dr. Fos and the senior team so that we don’t lose ground in the run-up to February 1st. We really need to start now. Dr. Woodley shares his view of the situation and his role, he suggested. Some of this will unfold in the next few weeks. The goal is to make the transition as seamless as possible. He returned to the idea that the elections are coming up. We know that a special session (and maybe two) will follow the gubernatorial election. He noted how serious the situation is, with the drastic reduction in state spending on higher education. He compared the situation today to that in 2008, when he was System president, noting that we are in a “total flip-flop” with regard to funding sources, reductions and so on. He looks forward to formal and informal conversations with faculty about all of these issues.

Vern Baxter, Sociology: I wonder if in your role as president or as part of the institutional review committee there will be any specific recommendations for program closures during your time?

Moffett replied that UNO already has a Faculty Governance document that deals with program reviews. He believes that document was “well thought out, well done.” He added that he believed that UNO was “probably a little behind on Phase Two of that process” and he didn’t know why that was the case. He noted that he plans to talk to Dr. Nicklow and Dr. Fos about the upcoming phase, and doesn’t see a reason to suspend the effort. There’s a great deal of work that has been done, he said, and the truth of the matter is it might need to be fine-tuned, and we might need to clarify some of the recommendations or issues. But Moffett noted he “wouldn’t see right now a reason to suspend or hold that up because some of the issues there have to do with transforming the program so they’re more productive. Some of them had to do with budget. None of those issues have changed...I don’t think it has to go back and start at ground zero.” He indicated he had similar feelings about the Budget Committee’s work. He called its report “an excellent document” and praised its recommendation to reduce the size of the overall committee. He did note that it would be wise to remain open to thinking about some of these recommendations differently in the future.

Jim Mokhiber, History: Could we just give you the opportunity, given your position in the UL System, to speak a little bit to our specific mission, how you see us as distinctive vis à vis other universities in the UL network?

Moffett acknowledged first that UNO is distinctive in its urban mission. He praised its long-term engagement and history as a research institution, as well as its teaching role. As an aside, he reiterated that the transfer of UNO to the UL system was embraced by UL but not initiated by it. It was more driven by the legislature, faculty, alumni and others. But UL was very happy to have UNO join the system’s ranks. He noted that UL-Lafayette and Louisiana Tech are both larger and stronger, in terms of research initiatives, but UNO’s dimension is a little bit different. He emphasized that he believes research plays a significant role in shaping and improving undergraduate and graduate teaching; it is not research for the sake of research, it should carry over into student engagement and enrichment. What he has heard, Moffett said, without wanting to specify from whom, was that UNO “really needs to go back and sharpen focus and make sure that we have identified appropriately our mission and our priorities and where that fits in” with our direction.

Moffett thanked the faculty for their time and restated how excited he was by the opportunity to come to UNO during this transition.

Dinah Payne expressed her appreciation for Dr. Moffett’s willingness to come to UNO in a difficult time and help out.

Presentation and Academic Affairs Updates by Provost John Nicklow (PURSUE, Campus Advising, Retention and Distance Learning, Provost Fellow position)

Cherie Trumbach noted that no questions for administrators have been asked that have not been covered. We have a five-minute update from Provost Dr. John Nicklow now.

Provost Nicklow began by thanking Trumbach for the appointment to the Senate. He wanted to briefly note several developments within Academic Affairs. He noted that the first PURSUE grants – Privateer Undergraduate Research and Scholarly University Excellence award -- to foster undergraduate research have been awarded, with 135 applications overall and 65 potential faculty mentors volunteer. The undergraduate research council chose twenty student winners, half at the freshman/sophomore level, and half at the junior/senior level. The goals of the program are to introduce undergraduates to research and provide mechanisms for students to connect with and find faculty research mentors.

Nicklow noted that we have awarded eleven faculty on campus with the Louisiana WISE grant, distributing a total amount of about \$213,000. Also, we have increased the indirect cost return from the Office of Research by

5%, and that is directed to the PI. Not necessarily to create a separate account – what we don't want to do here, as it often creates audit findings, if we create too many accounts – what we want to do is create that in the college and flag it for use by the PI. So the idea is to incentivize additional research.

Nicklow noted that we have conducted an external evaluation of campus advising. I expect a report...probably this week, based on the debrief, the evaluator really identified a number of inconsistencies and is making a lot of recommendations for us to tweak our advising model. She said we had about four different models, all trying to occur at the same time on campus. The other external evaluation that Dr. Moffett noted was an external evaluation of online and non-credit activities. Yesterday the Distance Education Oversight Committee met. It is made up of faculty and a number of different staff. The idea is that we want to create a structure and organization to finance an incentive model necessary to grow our own online and non-staff credit programming enterprise.

The last has to do with our recruitment and retention retreats. Many of you were involved in those that occurred three or four weeks ago – overall we had 150 faculty and staff engaged in those two retreats. What has come of that talk that is about 25 action teams organized around specific 'at risk' populations and strategies on the recruitment and retention side. Nicklow thanked Peter Schock and Tumulesh Solanky for being part of that and leading the steering groups. The process is going extremely well, he said, and within a month we will have a campus-wide, retention plan, rolling on a two-year basis. And a similar plan for recruitment.

Nicklow also noted that the Provost Fellow application deadline is November 1st. He noted Alumni Week is all next week, highlighted by the distinguished alumni celebration on November 5th at Lakefront Airport. The Homer Hitt Presidential Lecture will be that Tuesday.

A Senator: A comment about how tremendous this PURSUE is, I can think of one student in my laboratory that is a tremendous student and it's a small amount of money but in the big scheme of things, it is going to be a life-changing situation for this guy, because he never thought about academics as a career. And for the first time he's been recognized at the university level, and you've taken a great student and put nitrous in the system, so to speak. So I think this PURSUE thing is a really tremendous addition to retention but also giving some students, the kind of students who really try to serve UNO, a real boost, both financially but also psychologically.

A Senator: I had heard a rumor – that's what it is, a rumor – that a number of administrators and faculty had just been awarded pay raises. I wonder if the provost might make some comments about that to either confirm or deny the truth of that rumor. I wonder if anybody in the room has heard similar rumors or know anything about it.

[crosstalk] Trumbach stated that the Provost just indicated he hasn't approved anything. Trumbach wondered what timeframe of any such rumored pay raises. Last year or last month..?

The Senator responded that the rumor held it was recent, and restricted to a small group of faculty and administrators, not for the entirety of the faculty or administrators.

Nicklow responded that there was nothing widescale, unless you were referring to WISE funding set aside for stipends in computer science and accounting. It's part of the WISE grant approved by the Board of Regents. Nicklow said it was for one year stipends and then they go away. If that's what you're referring to...? Just two departments, and faculty only. Other than that, he said, he has no idea.

The Senator noted that a stipend was different from a salary increase. Nicklow responded that he could not imagine what else to refer to.

Trumbach: Right now, anything to do with raises at this point have to be Board-approved. I'm not aware of any.

Beth Blankenship: So that's no longer subject to some kind of a threshold, as had been the case before?

Trumbach: Any major decisions have to go through Dr. Woodley, especially a raise for an administrator.

A Senator: A question regarding research, regarding PURSUE. I that it's the first year we have this program, and I wonder if the application can be set earlier, because this time was a little bit rushed, and in the middle of the semester.

Nicklow responded that it would, and that his office wants to do the whole process earlier, and to use it in recruiting.

The Senator continued, asking about the need for a faculty member to be a member of the PURSUE program to work with students? I was disqualified because I wasn't included. The policies were not very clear.

Nicklow responded that was not the case, and indicated that the idea was to create a single portal for students to engage in undergraduate research. Previously it was difficult to know where to go. Nicklow noted that his goal was to allow any member to participate in the program.

Edit Bourgeois noted that there were several emails sent to faculty, asking for mentors.

The Senator continued: Regarding research accounts, another problem involves fixed rate accounts. We have money for research, and the current policy here is that you have eighteen months to spend that money. So those monies are very important, and wonder if we could reevaluate that policy. Eighteen months means you don't use the money wisely, because this money is difficult to earn. I wonder if we can merge the account, move to a shared account, so that people can use the money more effectively?

Nicklow indicated that he would bring that up to the Research Council.

Alumni Association Excellence in Teaching Award nominations

Trumbach offered one last announcement before moving on to new business. Nominations for the excellence in teaching awards from the Alumni Association are coming up. They give two annual teaching awards that consist of \$2000 and a commemorative plaque. Nomination instructions are available from the Office of Alumni Affairs. Due Friday, November 20th.

New Faculty Senate Business: Geography Department Resolution

Trumbach noted that last spring, we had a vote concerning Geography but we still have a lot of questions. Some faculty members came forward with this resolution, regarding whether the policy was followed. Steve Striffler submitted this resolution, so I leave it to him to discuss. The main thing seems to be that there are 3 positions available for Geography faculty and, according to policy, they should be considered.

Text of the Proposed Resolution:

- ▶ “WHEREAS, UL System policy number FS-III.XV .B-1a, which outlines Systems' policy on academic program discontinuance, stipulates that efforts will be made to find positions for tenured faculty from terminated programs within the university or within another institution in

the state (in fact the FS-III.XV .B-1a stipulates that efforts will be made PRIOR to terminating the appointment of a faculty member with tenure because of program discontinuance), and

- ▶ WHEREAS, departmental chairpersons, in consultation with their faculty, are the best qualified persons to determine whether a faculty member proposed for termination from another department would be a suitable addition to their own department, and
- ▶ WHEREAS, existing salary lines that support an unoccupied faculty position constitute open positions suitable for relocation of a tenured faculty member,
- ▶ It is therefore resolved by the UNO Senate that
 - ▶ Rather than terminate tenured faculty, the University transfer them into any open faculty lines for which the department chair has judged them to be suitable
 - ▶ This standard be applied to relocation of geography faculty, Drs. Lodhi and Yaukey.”

Steve Striffler, Anthropology: Actually by way of introduction, the Geography faculty put this together and I support it, and I'm on the Faculty Senate so I'm in charge of presenting it. I'll read the policy itself_UNO. The section of the UNO policy that applies is under "Obligations to tenured faculty," subheading A, "Before terminating the appointment of a faculty member with tenure because of program discontinuance, reasonable efforts will be made to find another position within the university for which the faculty member is academically qualified where a position is available." And then B, "Assistance will also be provided by the system office for possible relocation to another campus within the system or to another institution within the state. Inter campus transfers will be made if usefully acceptable." And I think this resolution is, if I understand it correctly, is an appeal to follow that policy in a genuine way, both at UNO but also at the System level in the sense that this type of policy only at moments of crisis, and that's when it needs to be followed. And also that if you don't follow it to the letter, you can also open yourself up to legal problems as well.

Connie Phelps, Earl K. Long Library: Another point of information, I'm sorry it's not up there, because I emailed it to Cherie but she didn't get it. In September, the Department of Planning and Urban Studies appealed to the university to have the two remaining geography faculty members added to their department. They have vacant lines. It was a very persuasive letter, and I'm sorry we don't have it available up there, because it delineated the classes that the two faculty members could teach in the Department of Planning and Urban Studies and mentions classes that they have already taught in the geography concentration in that program. I thought it made a very convincing argument. And in October, Dean Kevin Graves conveyed to them that the university had denied their request to be transferred to the department. It reads "we regret to inform you that the College's proposal to transfer you to the faculty of the Department of Planning and Urban Studies effective January 4, 2016 has been denied by the university. As a result, the terms of the letter addressed to you as of December 4th, 2014 from President Fos stands. Your employment at UNO will terminate effective December 18th, 2015."

Peter Yaukey, Geography, from the Gallery: Connie, I'd like to add that Dean Graves, who is right here, also endorsed the recommendation that we be transferred to Planning and Urban Studies. A basic question would be, if this doesn't constitute a valid place to switch us to, an honest effort with integrity to do so, what would? It seems like a pretty basic instance of good opportunity to transfer somebody with tenure rather than fire him. I already teach an Urban Studies class every year, a statistics class, have for several years. Dr. Lodhi and I participate on thesis committees, and Dr. Lodhi has chaired a number of them.

Phelps projected the letter in question for the Senate to read.

Striffler: The broader question – besides whether it's the perfect fit for that department, which I think that it clearly is, the broader question is that there has to be a process by which this is done before the termination of a tenured faculty. That there needs to be an effort to look for alternative places within the university and then even beyond that. The system is required to look for it at the system level.

Bourgeois: I'd like to speak again the resolution. As Cherie's introduction indicated, we already had a very similar resolution – certainly the first part of that resolution -- last semester. I think that repeating ourselves, or bringing up the same issue over and over again simply diminishes the power, which is already too small of our resolutions. Secondly, that last part is way too specific, reads like a personnel issue, human resources administrative issue, which doesn't look to me like its under the purview of the University Senate.

Jeffrey Ehrenreich, Anthropology: I wonder how you would feel if it was you who had a job that was on the line. I think it's perfectly appropriate for both this Senate and for the faculty in general to be concerned about the implications of this with reference to their own tenure, and I think that not only does further investigation about whether or not this can in fact be done, is an important thing for us to be doing... but I think we should be concerned about the fact that it hasn't been done up to this point and that procedures have not been followed.

Dinah Payne: Does anybody know that procedures have not been followed?

Jim Logan: We know that we brought the resolution up last year and Dr. Fos said 'No.' That was where it got to last year...

Ehrenreich: Dr. Fos saying 'no' is not following the procedure...

Vern Baxter: Dr. Fos claimed he had followed the procedures. There was no real explication of what he did or did not do. He just said, 'I followed the procedures and so the termination stands.' So the idea that we bring it up again, especially in light of Planning and Urban Studies losing a lot of faculty and having positions available and our claim that the university really did not follow the procedures beforehand makes a compelling case that we bring this resolution up, pass it and consider strongly this letter to retain the Geography faculty within planning and urban studies.

Kevin Graves, Interim Dean of the College of Liberal Arts: May I speak? Related to the System, in July of last year, President Fos wrote a letter to Sandra Woodley, requesting that the credentials of the two remaining Geography faculty be reviewed and distributed to all other System universities. That came back to Academic Affairs. I was contacted. I contacted the Geography faculty, gathered the information necessary to send forth to the System, passed it on back to the level of Academic Affairs and it was in turn distributed to the System, and then the System office sent it out to all of the universities in the system, providing the CV as well as a personal statement that I requested that the faculty write, regarding their scholarship interests and so on and so forth. And David Beriss requested that information... what, two weeks ago or so?... on behalf of a committee of the university Senate, and I forwarded him emails, evidence of that process. And then what you talked about earlier and you... the record stands, because it was on the screen, of what we had done internally within the College of Liberal Arts and it was in fact true that the Department of Planning and Urban Studies made a request for those two faculty members to be transferred, which I endorsed and I sent forward to Academic Affairs. And so the two legs of that process that is mandated in the System policy was followed both internally on campus, as well as throughout the System. I have no idea whether there has been any response back to the candidates or to the two Geography faculty from other campuses in the System. I have not been provided with any information that

leads me to believe that that has occurred but I cannot deny it either. I just don't know whether they have been contacted by another campus within the System or not.

Mahtab Lodhi, Geography, from the Gallery: We have received, both Peter and I, one email from Southeastern. But let me also point this out regarding the UL System assistance to us, the UL System is very aware of where Geography stands in term of other UL System institutions. Our System institutions have Geography in the form of either a minor or, there is only one school where Geography is offered at the bachelor level. Other places Geography is basically a concentration or minor. However other System schools do have full-time, tenured faculty even those places where they have Geography as a minor. So even there they have full-time faculty in Geography teaching those courses. Also, the System is very aware of this situation that there is no opportunity anywhere in System schools, so when we were asked by Dean Graves to provide him with that information, we did this research on our own. I provided that research to Dr. Beriss. So it was very clear to us that at that time, the System was just trying to cover itself. This internal effort, and the external effort, are basically after the fact, not before the fact. These efforts were made after we had been terminated. So as we stand right now, we are terminated faculty. The other thing is that, as you mentioned, this is not a personnel issue, this is a policy issue. This is our last effort to basically, an internal effort to, address this issue. We have other avenues available as well, so it is basically in your hands. I repeat myself: it is obvious to us, even a dumb person can see it...these are just to cover the System and UNO...

David Beriss, Anthropology: In terms of following the policy, one of the questions I have to ask here, it says, 'reasonable efforts will be made to find another position within the university for which the faculty member is academically qualified where a position is available.' And although it is true, Kevin did send me the paper trail indicating where those efforts had been made outside of the System, it was also pointed out the positions within Urban Studies were denied despite the fact that the Chair and the Dean asked for these people to fill them. And if that means that the Chair and the Dean think that they are academically qualified, why are they not being offered those positions? I mean, it seems like that's not following the policy. I think that's a large reason why this resolution is relevant at this point. We have apparently positions for which qualified faculty members are available and we have decided not to give them those positions, despite the policy.

A Senator: Okay, I look at it here as there are two different problems. I'm trying to understand this. The problem is the process. There's a process, there's people to make these decisions. Who makes the decisions? People can deny anything. So the problem is the process. I'm just trying to understand. Who makes the decision? A committee or the president himself? Who makes the decision to hire people? It's not clear here.

Ehrenreich: But it's also relevant, not just that we have a process, but that the process be applied correctly and fairly to the faculty involved and if that has not happened, and it is my belief that is hasn't happened, then they're in a position that I would not want to be in myself.

A Senator: I think of myself and of course I am trying to hire...in a position to hire people for my department. I have twenty applicants...ten are qualified...

Ehrenreich: These are tenured faculty members, similar to certain appointments are made for faculty spouses...one looks for an opening that might exist and in this particular case, it does exist.

Trumbach: Two things: one, we have to be careful we don't make it a personnel issue because that actually would be more problematic for us, so with that regard I do want to make a motion to amend the resolution to remove the...

Richard Speaker, Senate Parliamentarian: As presiding officer, you cannot do that.

Dinah Payne instead submitted the motion, and Connie Phelps seconded it.

Trumbach: So now we vote on whether to remove this second statement here so that we can make sure that we are not going into murky waters.

Beriss: I don't see why we should remove that and I don't understand why these are murky waters. This issue has arisen precisely because these faculty members...

Trumbach: If the point is the process and whether we think the process was followed or not...but it's not within our purview to discuss personnel issues...

Beriss: According to who it is not within our purview?

Trumbach: Legally, it is not within the realm of this body that we have discussed...

Beriss: Could you bring in a lawyer to explain that to me, because I'm afraid I don't agree with you.

Payne: This is not a human resource function. That's not what we do. We do academic sides of the house, which would be the policy. But it is not...I am not comfortable at all whether it's about a particular person or not, a generic someone, it's not for me to say whether the university should employ this person in a continued fashion or not. I'm not that person's boss. I'm not that person's dean.

Trumbach: Right. The question is removing the specifics on the individual, so not those lines...just the second ones.

Beriss: Okay, then let's move it. All right? One of the reasons for this resolution is because it arises in this case. If this case had not occurred we would not be having this discussion. That's a fact. So you simply move this standard be applied to one of the wherases: Whereas the Senate has found in an earlier resolution we passed that the policy was not applied in this instance... and then you can have the rest of the resolution.

Payne: That's not the motion that is currently on the floor.

Beriss: We're amending the resolution right now.

Trumbach: We're discussing the current motion to remove this...

Beriss: All right. Then I move to substitute another modification to your substitution. That's standard parliamentary procedure. And that would be to move that line you find objectionable to the whereas because its one of our findings that motivates this resolution.

Payne voiced her objection to Beriss' modification of her amendment, and Connie Phelps withdrew her second of Payne's original motion.

Richard Speaker, Parliamentarian: So, David, I think the floor is open for you to make a motion if you still want to.

Beriss: Well, if we don't have the first motion then we don't need the second one.

Bourgeois: Then I second Dinah's motion.

Beriss: All right. Then I move to amend that motion.

Debate about parliamentary procedure and the status of the proposed motions ensued. Given the new second offered by Bourgeois, the Parliamentarian ruled that the original motion by Payne was again up for consideration.

Beriss then moved to amend Payne's amendment, to substitute an amendment that moves the second line of the therefores to a "whereas."

Parliamentarian Richard Speaker noted that there would thus be a third "whereas" noting "Whereas this standard has not been applied to relocation of Geography faculty, Drs. Yaukey and Lodhi."

Payne: Am I allowed to say that I won't have that amendment...?

Parliamentarian Speaker: He has not said it is a friendly amendment.

Beriss: I just need a second.

Striffler seconded Beriss' motion.

Parliamentarian Speaker: Okay, so now we have an amendment to the amendment, and just to keep things going, I think we should either do a quick discussion, or vote. Cherie, is it clear what the amendment to the amendment...

Trumbach: We're discussing whether to put the specific examples in as a third whereas. Discussion?

A Senator asked whether this was a causal relationship.

Trumbach noted that she would be more comfortable if we said "Geography faculty" but did not have the specific names.

Parliamentarian Speaker: But that's not the motion that is the amendment to the motion.

Trumbach: That is my discussion on the "whereas." I would feel more comfortable...

Vern Baxter: Point of Information? David did you intend to say in the "whereas" "This standard has not been applied to the relocation of Geography faculty, Drs. Lodhi and Yaukey"?

Beriss: Yes.

Discussion of the language and intent of the resolution and amendments continued, with the text projected on a screen.

A Senator: So the "whereas" just means "for example?"

Beriss: Right. The structure of this kind of resolution is the legislative body puts together a set of 'findings' and then it says because of these findings, we assert or request or whatever. And so what we have here is we have currently two whereases and we're about to add a third one, so three findings and then we resolve that the administration should do something or aim for something. In this case, we resolve what is says there...

Bourgeois: I have a question for the parliamentarian. Can we make all these amendments and vote on the amendments before the one...I mean, is the rule of one month presentation applied only to the main motion or to the amendments themselves.

Parliamentarian Speaker: I think we have to have it only apply to the main motion. It doesn't make sense. Otherwise, we're going to be months and months doing each one of these things, and I did just text the by-laws of this body and the one-month statement is not on the by-laws, it's a practice. It's the standard practice that we've followed for years and years. It is not enshrined in the bible. All right. And so precedent requires us to follow that.

Trumbach: All right. Is that what your amendment...is that how...

Nicklow: Is "the standard has not been applied," does that mean...which aspect of the standard has not been applied. Are we saying that efforts to relocate were not conducted? Or that they weren't conducted prior? A clarification? What was not followed or applied?

Discussion of Nicklow's question ensued.

Logan: I'm not trying to answer for them, but I mean the point was last year when we brought up the resolution asking the rules be followed, the termination letter had already gone out, hadn't it? At that point. So, I mean, that's the point. This is not recent. This was last year, the rules were the rules and I remember I brought the resolution forward and all we were saying is follow the rules, but the rules hadn't been followed at that point. Now that was last year. So I don't know from there to now is a different question. I don't know. So, I think we ought to notice that's why this whole issue is still out here again.

Trumbach: And the other issue, I guess, is whether there are open faculty lines, whether those faculty lines are considered open or not. So were those faculty lines open once these people left?

Beriss: It looks to me – and again, I didn't write this resolution but it looks to me like the paragraph preceding the red one, the second whereas, we're asserting that the chair person and faculty of the department in question are the best qualified for making determinations about whether or not faculty are qualified to be in the department, right? But it is also true that the hiring process involves the dean, who made a recommendation in this direction as well, and the provost, and I assume the president, maybe even the Board of Regents. But in this instance, the policy outlines the people having to approve it being the university. Maybe we want to add another whereas saying the full hiring policy wasn't followed. I don't know.

Trumbach: You mean the full hiring...

Beriss: Well, no, nobody's been hired into those positions.

Discussion of the resolution and standard continued.

Nicklow: I'm trying to understand. What is the intent of the resolution? The intent of the resolution is to identify the specific aspects of the standard that was not followed and that we need to address now. That's one issue. If the intent of the resolution is to require the university to hire these individuals into lines, that presumes the line, the money, that all that still exists, that it's been in the dean's hiring plan -- the prioritization plan. That these two positions are at the top of the College of Liberal Arts hiring plan. So there's a lot of other aspects to hiring. So I guess...my question to you is what is the intent we're trying to do here, and then let's, as a Senate, create language that follows that.

Striffler: I guess I agree with that, although it sets a fairly high bar. In the sense that I mean, I think the bar is somewhat lower than that it has to be at the top of the dean's hiring plan. Like in the sense that these are tenured

faculty who are already here and that...I think implicit for me in the policy is that they have some privileged access to being hired, that does not neatly follow the plan.

Nicklows: I would agree. The only caveat is the current finance model which the dean and I and the other deans have been working on is that forty percent of the vacated lines are returned to the college in the current fiscal year. That freed up money has already been accounted for, so where does the added expense, added funding for the salaries?

Striffler: I guess that's why the "before" is key. That needs to be done before they are terminated because there needs to be a plan to say, okay, if we're going to return forty percent, it needs to go to the tenured faculty that are already here, or something along those lines. I think that's why that line should be more or less what Cherie outlined...because it applies both to the before question and then the second thing is we're also suggesting that that second whereas— that it also applies to the fact that the department chairs and the college have deemed them qualified. I think they're both there. To say now that there's no money...that's why it should have been done before.

Trumbach: If you see the language where it says whereas the process was not followed...

Bourgeois: I thought it was made clear that some of the process had been followed. Now you're saying it hasn't.

Trumbach: Some of the process was followed. One of the issues was that it was not done prior to the termination letter. That's an indication that the process was not followed. The terminations were done before the process was followed. Which then leads to, what Steve is saying, is that you're in the position where you're having to hire somebody, which kind of eliminates any of the benefit of tenure, as opposed to simply finding a position where somebody fits.

Striffler: Yes.

Trumbach: If somebody is terminated before the process is followed, then they're no longer an employee and you're saying does it meet the prioritization, as opposed to you're tenured faculty, and you say is there some place where they would fit within the institution before you terminate them. And if they had asked that question prior to the termination, the answer may have been yes. There is a place where they fit in the university.

Striffler: I think an example would be if you did that beforehand, you would have a process by which you would say there are a finite amount of places where these people can be placed within the university. Let's look at where those places are. If then, in those places, people leave, then that's a possibility where you put them in. But that would be a plan you would have prior to...my sense is that that wasn't done.

Bourgeois: You think that must be done, even before the faculty affected are notified? I don't understand, prior to when, termination, the notice of termination?

Trumbach: That's the policy.

Bourgeois: What does termination mean? The notice? Or the day they're terminated.

Striffler: I think the reason why the bar is set that high is because tenure is serious.

Parliamentarian Speaker: Just to re-cap our process, we have several votes that have to occur. We are currently discussing this re-wording of an amendment to the motion. We have to vote on the re-wording, then we have to vote on the amendment before we vote on the motion. Just to keep us on what the procedures are.

Payne: I get what you're saying, and I agree with it. The only thing that makes me maybe, as an attorney, uncomfortable is that we've got those names in. Because the process is not relative only to two individuals or one individual or any individual. It is indeed to protect all of us. So I truly get what you're saying and I agree in principle that the process must be followed, and so you are sure you would not take out those names?

Striffler: Are you fine with agreeing that "whereas the process is not involved in the cases of Geography faculty...?"

Payne: No, I'm not. I don't want to make it that specific. In the case of any faculty, because that's what the policy should be. Not a single faculty member should not have this process applied.

Striffler: I totally get that. I just think that it loses its meaning in some fundamental way and we're doing this, in this specific case because it's right before us, right now. But to just have a thing that says you should follow policy...

Payne: But you should! Maybe this is my fault...as the attorney kind of guy, that's what precedent means, and precedent is really important and it cannot be related to just to one person.

A Senator: The whereases are supposed to be evidence...evidence is worthless if it's not specific. Therefore it needs to be specific in order to be valid evidence. Therefore I think you're completely wrong. It should be very specific. If you want to say, it's the Geography faculty, when that is in fact just those two people, that's kind of irrelevant, but you might as well just say the Geography faculty. No, the broader you evidence is, the less it's worth. It needs to be specific to be evidence.

Jim Mokhiber, History/Secretary: I'm just reading from Marie Morgan's notes here. This is what we recorded in last year's minutes, from the April 23 meeting. I'll just read it to you. "Dr. Jenkins read from President Fos' email response regarding the termination of Geography faculty. He was asked in the spirit of transparency for specific information about how policy AP-AA-18.2 was followed. Dr. Fos responded that all of his recommendations were vetted by the UL System staff, and the UL System outside legal counsel before he made his recommendations to the Board in December. Dr. Jenkins suggested the committee – the Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee – think about the strategy they wanted to do or follow, and if they want to recommend further action to the Senate at the May meeting." So really what we're talking about is consistent with our previous actions, including the mentioning of the Geography people, and consistent in tone with our dissatisfaction with the response of the president.

Chris Day, Political Science: And I would just add to what Jim just said that it's not totally redundant to what we passed last year because it's pointing out that this policy we asked be followed in last year's resolution has not been. And this is an example of how it has not been.

Senators indicated a desire to vote on the measure.

Nicklow: I refer back to my early comments on what are we trying to get to. I pulled up the UL website, the policy does say "before terminating the appointment." It doesn't say notice or before notice is given. So what are we trying to address? Does the Senate believe that no attempt or no effort to find these individuals a home –

and it is “or” – either internally or externally. And that is what the policy requires. I just want the resolution to clearly identify what standard was not followed.

Striffler: I think maybe how one votes hinges around that question. Just whether you think on some level that the process was followed adequately. Like, for me, it’s the before and it’s the second one in terms of how that happened at the university and the effort that was made. Like if you feel that that process was followed perfectly, then I suspect you vote against it. Do you have an additional way of clarifying that?

More discussion about whether action was required before the termination and whether it was adequate.

Striffler: I mean, technically, if you interpret the “before” broadly enough they could just wait until the last day they were employed, and then look.

Trumbach: Was there a “good faith” effort...

A Senator: Point of Order...

Bourgeois: We’re starting to add adjectives to whether it was done or not. How well it was done, how much effort. Was it done or was it not done? And I think the statements today were that it was done.

Parliamentarian Speaker: A point of order takes precedence.

A Senator: Point of order. Do we still have a quorum?

[Crosstalk] Parliamentarian Speaker noted that there was a call for a quorum and the quorum was met.

Trumbach: So we have to vote first on the amendments, correct?

Parliamentarian Speaker: No, first on the wording that has been offered with the red “whereas.”

Trumbach: Right, so let’s vote on the amendment to the amendment. If you support the amendment to the amendment to move the “whereas” in red to where it is and strike it from the bottom, then raise your hands.

Parliamentarian Speaker: Just vote on the amendment to the amendment.

Cherie opened the vote. The amendment to the amendment passed by show of hands.

The Senate then voted to approve the underlying amendment.

Parliamentarian Speaker noted that a vote to suspend the rules was necessary to allow consideration of the motion in the session in which it was introduced.

Striffler moved to suspend the rules, and was seconded.

Parliamentarian Speaker noted that this vote would have to pass by a 2/3 majority before the Senate could actually vote on the motion. The vote passed and the rules were suspended.

Trumbach then opened the vote on the resolution. Twenty one were in favor, with two opposed.

► Resolution on Geography, as amended and passed:

► WHEREAS, UL System policy number FS-III.XV .B-1a, which outlines system policy on academic program discontinuance, stipulates that efforts will be made to find positions for

tenured faculty from terminated programs within the university or within another institution in the state (in fact the FS-III.XV .B-1a stipulates that efforts will be made PRIOR to terminating the appointment of a faculty member with tenure because of program discontinuance), and

- ▶ WHEREAS, departmental chairpersons, in consultation with their faculty, are the best qualified persons to determine whether a faculty member proposed for termination from another department would be a suitable addition to their own department,
- ▶ WHEREAS, this process has not been followed in the cases of geography faculty, Drs.Lodhi and Yaukey,
- ▶ It is therefore resolved by the UNO Senate that
 - ▶ Rather than terminate tenured faculty, the University transfer them into any open faculty lines for which the department chair has judged them to be suitable.

Trumbach opened discussion of a final measure, intended to allow for electronic introduction of Senate resolutions. Parliamentarian Speaker noted that he had reviewed Article X of the Senate's by-laws, regarding amendments to by-laws, and observed that these simply require "prior written notice of one week" for amendments. Speaker suggested that, to be technically correct we would add the word "electronic" to the sentence that suggests that notice must be "written."

Bourgeois: Do we really? Electronic is still written. It doesn't say written on paper.

Speaker: Then this is moot, because it only one week prior to the meeting already.

Trumbach thus announced that would we be changing our way of doing things, to allow for faster consideration of measures.

Speaker: Point of Order. This is not an amendment to the by laws. This is just a change in Faculty Senate procedures.

Discussion of the scheduling of a vote on the proposal ensued.

A motion to suspend the rules to vote on the change was heard and seconded. A vote to suspend the rules passed.

The Faculty Senate then approved the change in procedure by voice vote.

- ▶ "Faculty Senate procedures regarding submission of motions in writing at least one week prior to consideration shall be interpreted to include the electronic submission of motions."

A motion to adjourn was heard, seconded, and voted.

[END of Minutes]