

UNL FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
East Campus Union, Arbor Suite
December 11, 2012
Presidents Guevara and LaCost, Presiding

1.0 Call to Order

President-Elect Guevara called the meeting to order at 2:32 pm.

2.0 Announcements

President-Elect Guevara announced that the January Faculty Senate meeting has been moved to January 15 to allow more time for faculty members to return to campus after the holiday break.

3.0 Chancellor Perlman

Chancellor Perlman reported that he had four issues to mention. He stated that an RFP was issued to see if there are health care providers who want to take over the University Health Center. He noted that one provider, Bryan Health, responded and a proposal was made and evaluated by a committee that includes faculty, staff, students, and administrators. The committee said to proceed, but he pointed out that no commitments have been made at this time, and the Board of Regents will have final approval of any plan put forward. He stated that significant cost savings can be found for students but the highest level of health care would still be provided by going to an outside firm. He stated that the campus will be informed as this effort progresses.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the 18th and R Street parking garage will also include housing units which is consistent with his view of increasing enrollment. He noted that we do not have the space to provide more student-housing and the construction of the garage with apartments could get senior students to live closer to campus which could provide more energy to the campus. He pointed out that it also creates an opportunity to have two apartments that would be available for visiting faculty members who are here for either short term or longer term periods. He stated that the wrap around design of the complex would provide two or three apartments that are separate from the other housing units. He stated that he has asked architects to see if this could be done and what the cost would be. He pointed out that the university would have to guarantee that these apartments could be rented out. He stated that he is uncertain what kind of amenities the faculty would want in these apartments and he understands that a survey will be sent out shortly that will address some of these questions. He encouraged that the survey be done as quickly as possible because the deadline for plans on the facility is rapidly approaching.

Chancellor Perlman announced that ConAgra will be our first partner on Innovation Campus and there is a fairly long list of other companies that might be interested. He noted that there is much more interest now that we have a private company that is going to be on Innovation Campus. He reported that construction on the ConAgra facility will be starting at any time. He noted that some people might get the impression that Innovation Campus is all about food and agriculture and while that is certainly what phase one is designed for, he does not want people to think that we are committed just to food and agriculture. He stated that the university hopes to engage other areas as well. He stated that he is aware that there is considerable faculty and administrative angst about what the faculty and college roles will be on Innovation Campus. He stated that this has been discussed before and we still need to determine some of the roles of the colleges but the time frame require us to get some of the priorities completed first. He noted that some people may think that things have not been moving quickly enough on Innovation Campus but compared to similar endeavors, he things we are moving fairly fast.

Professor Katz, Art & Art History, asked what the best way is for a faculty member to indicate interest in working on Innovation Campus. Chancellor Perlman stated that he believes a faculty forum is coming up and faculty members engaging with private companies should let Dan Duncan, Executive Director of Innovation Campus, know of their interest. He noted that Executive Director Duncan has developed good skills in terms of engaging with the private sector to see if they are interested in Innovation Campus. He pointed out it does not have to be a research company. We want to create a pipeline for our students so companies can attract the best students to work in their firm.

Professor Eskridge, Statistics, asked if there is a possibility of having a faculty club on Innovation Campus. He pointed out that as the university grows and gets more faculty members a faculty club is needed so faculty

members can meet in a collegial setting. Chancellor Perlman noted that there is a history here about a faculty club. He noted that a survey has been done in the last ten years asking faculty members if they would use such a club and how they would use it. He reported that some wanted the club to offer lunch, some cocktails, and some don't want a club at all. He stated that an idea is to create a Starbucks model where people can engage in a relaxed way. He stated that the question may be if a faculty club could be incorporated into a facility on Innovation Campus that could be reserved for faculty at certain times. He stated that this might be a possibility.

Chancellor Perlman reported that there has been some controversy with the plan to merge the Computer & Electronics Engineering department in Omaha with the Electrical Engineering department in Lincoln. He stated that he is optimistic that this is not going to result in a major battle, although there are a few faculty members who seem to have interest in provoking the issue because they do not want the change. He pointed out that this effort is to be expansive, not contractive and is an effort to open up engineering in Omaha. He stated that the idea is to find more efficient ways to produce the same programs but at less cost, and the idea is to use faculty members from both campuses to provide education and research in both locations. He stated that he hopes the politics will work themselves out.

Professor Shea, School of Natural Resources, stated that he would appreciate the Chancellor's comments or thoughts on the draft document on institutional control that is being considered by the Chancellors/Presidents of the Big Ten schools. Chancellor Perlman stated that there has been a draft document for some time and it arose out of concern over incidents involving athletics such as those that occurred at Penn State, North Carolina, and Ohio State. He stated that the document addresses collectively institutional control of athletics. He pointed out that what happens at one Big Ten school impacts the rest of the conference and the document seeks to provide guidelines that will put the conference in better control of athletics. He pointed out that the latest draft is more respectful to the governing boards and to the autonomy of the campuses. He noted that before anything can be done the Board of Regents and the governing boards of the other Big Ten universities would have to approve the document. He stated that it was his understanding that the draft was to be confidential although he learned that several Presidents allowed a faculty member to read the draft in the privacy of the President's office, but as far as he knows no faculty member has a copy of the draft. He pointed out that Professor Potuto, UNL's Faculty Representative on Athletics, has reviewed the draft from a faculty perspective and he does not believe there is much in the document that will concern the faculty. He stated that he will share the document when it is no longer confidential.

Professor Shea stated that the document sounds like an excellent idea and some kind of agreement should be reached with the Big Ten universities in how athletics matters should be handled. He stated that he recognizes the independence of each institution, but we are talking about a lot more than the structure of each campus and he hopes that an agreement of the Big Ten universities is reached soon. Chancellor Perlman stated that essentially the document states two things, how universities organize their institution in regards to athletics is up to them, but how it is organized needs to be transparent so that the authority of the Chancellor and Athletic Director are clear. He stated that at UNL the Bylaws state that as Chancellor he has full control over athletics. He noted that each institution needs to adopt policies that clearly show how the authority over athletics is laid out. He stated that the second thing is to make sure that athletics, or friends of athletics, does not bring inappropriate pressure on the decision process overseeing athletics. He stated that admission, compliance rules, student discipline process, medical care all should be independent from the coaches. He thinks the faculty will be happy with the final product and he apologized if our representative to the CIC Faculty Leadership conference was embarrassed by the process. He stated that members of the Executive Committee are welcome to read the current draft of the document in his office.

President-Elect Guevara reported that at the CIC Faculty Leadership Conference some of the faculty members were upset that a clause was removed from the draft document on institutional control. He stated that the clause basically stated that no one from athletics can put pressure on a faculty member to assist in some way a student athlete outside of the norm. Chancellor Perlman reported that he just put that clause back into the document, although he does not know whether it will be approved by the other Presidents/Chancellors. He noted that the clause may have been accidentally dropped out with editing. He pointed out that there is a provision that essentially says that any communication about a student athlete that goes to a faculty member should be done through the athletics academic support service. He stated that coaches should not be calling any faculty member asking them to do anything for a student athlete. He pointed out that we have a dual system here in that any concerns are reported to the athletic director and to Professor Potuto.

4.0 Approval of November 6, 2012 Minutes

The minutes of the November 6 Senate meeting were approved.

5.0 Committee Reports

5.1 Academic Planning Committee (Professor Harbison)

Professor Harbison noted that this is a very busy committee that in the past had the relatively unpleasant duty of having to look at elimination of programs and constant changes to academic program reviews. He reported that Professors Bryant and Brand, previous members of the APC, tried to do more forward planning by getting more information as soon as possible with what is happening on campus. This will allow the APC to make recommendations on things that would impact academics.

Professor Harbison stated that the APC spent time collecting information from Sasaki Associates and the administrators in order for the APC to have some influence in the campus master planning process. He noted that an issue that the APC has asked to be considered during the planning process is the transit time needed for students to get to classes. He pointed out that it is difficult for a student to get from the Beadle Center to Andrews Hall in ten minutes for a class and this aspect needs to be considered in the master plan. He reported that the APC wants to look at the buildings to see how they impact academic programs.

Professor Harbison stated that academic program reviews are extremely useful processes but once a department has gone through a review, it can take literally years for the process to be completed. He stated that the APC is trying to streamline the process.

Professor Harbison stated that the APC wants to streamline the promotion and tenure process and met with the Senate Executive Committee to discuss this issue.

Secretary Woodman asked if the APC has reviewed the merging of the Horticulture Ph.D. program with the Agronomy Ph.D. program and whether it has looked at the merging of the two Engineering departments. Professor Harbison reported that the APC reviewed and recommended approval of the merger of the Horticulture and Agronomy Ph.D. programs. He stated that the APC has not reviewed the merger of the Engineering departments, but SVCAA Weissinger has assured the APC that the process for merging departments is being followed. He pointed out that the merging of the two departments is still very early in the process.

Professor Shea noted that the APC's report calls for partnering with the Senate Executive Committee to streamline the promotion and tenure review process and asked for further clarification. Professor Harbison reported that currently the APC is collecting information on how much of a burden the process is for departments and how widespread a burden it is. He stated that the APC is wondering how the promotion and tenure process can be done that does not violate faculty rights. He noted that some of the colleges have new procedures in place and the APC is waiting to see how well the new procedures work.

5.2 Research Council (Professor Bloom)

Professor Bloom reported that the basic duties of the Research Council are to advise VC Paul on issues related to research and primarily to review and award internal grants for research. He noted that the Council is currently in the process of reviewing grants and a breakdown of the number of grants received and awarded is included in the report. He stated that these grants are a nice way for junior faculty members to receive funding for research, especially if they are not ready to seek funding from external agencies. He reported that interdisciplinary grants have been a priority and the Council has tried to be more intentional about reviewing and rewarding these types of grants.

Professor Bloom stated that the Council has developed a score sheet to make sure the same set of criteria is applied when reviewing proposals for funding. He noted that those faculty members reviewing the proposals have been asked to assign points within different categories on the scoring sheet. He reported that the scoring sheet was tried out for the first time this fall and a review of its use will be conducted in the spring.

Professor Bloom stated that in the past faculty members applying for grants from the Research Council were either approved or disapproved but no feedback was provided about the strength and weaknesses of the grant proposals. He stated that the Council wants to provide feedback so faculty members can improve their grant writing skills.

Professor Bloom reported that the Research Council also makes recommendations to the Chancellor about speakers for the Nebraska Lecture Series. He noted that each semester a guest speaker is featured and for this spring Professor Gay from Physics & Astronomy will be giving a presentation. He stated that in the past year no new lecturers were identified because the list of lecturers was full, but he thinks in the spring new people

will be sought for the lecture series.

Professor Bloom stated that the Research Council tries to stay aware of research efforts around campus. He noted that the Council has had discussions about being a member of the Big Ten and how this might impact research on campus.

Professor Bloom reported that a new development for research on campus has been the creation of a University Affiliated Research Center (UARC) that will ease the path for research grants from the Department of Defense. He noted that the university could receive up to \$85 million in research. He pointed out that some of the research will be classified and there will be restrictions on who can participate in the research and whether the findings of the research can be published.

Professor Reisbig, Child, Youth, Family Studies, asked if the rubrics for evaluation will be available to the faculty who are applying for research grants. Professor Bloom stated that he believes the information is available online.

Professor Hay, Southeast Research & Extension Center, asked how much money is available for research and where it is from. Professor Bloom stated that funds available are through the Foundation, but the amount of the funding depends on the interest gained from the Foundation accounts.

Professor Shea stated that he was curious as to whether the Council members are satisfied or happy with their current role in relation to the Office of Research. He pointed out that the Council seems like it is primarily used as a mechanism to disperse small internal grants, but the Council is not engaged much beyond this task. He asked if there is a sense that the Council should have a larger role in the Research Office. Professor Bloom pointed out that the responsibilities of the Council are defined in the syllabus given by the Faculty Senate and one of those responsibilities is to advise the VC of Research and Economic Development on research policies and he thinks the Council does this. He reported that the Council does get asked by the VC of Research and Economic Development to provide feedback on developing guidelines and policy issues relating to research.

Professor Shea asked what role the Research Council will play in regards to UARC. Professor Bloom noted that UARC is still in the early stages of being formed and the Council is still learning about the implementation of UARC. He knows that the Council will not be deciding on who receives the funding.

5.3 University Judicial and Appeals Board (Dean Hecker)

Dean Hecker wanted to thank those faculty members who serve on the Boards and noted that it is not an easy task to stand in judgment of another. He stated that last year there were a few cases that needed to be addressed by the Board, most of them relating to academic dishonesty. He noted that there was a recent case in the fall of a sexual assault which came before the Board. He reported that only a few of the cases were appealed beyond his office which is a good sign that students are respectful of the university judicial process.

Dean Hecker reported that there is a proposal to revise the Student Code of Conduct and he is happy to be involved with moving this along. He asked that the faculty to really consider the academic integrity section of the Code. He stated that the faculty needs to own the academic integrity portion and any feedback and input that the faculty can provide would be greatly appreciated.

Secretary Woodman asked why the sexual assault case came to the Judicial Board and not the Campus Police. Dean Hecker stated that the case did go to the Police. He noted that the incident did not occur in Lincoln but at a biological research center and was investigated by the County Sheriff. He noted that the assailant went into a divergent program. He pointed out that since the crime involved students it came to the University Judicial Board as well.

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Update on ACE Assessment and Recertification

President-Elect Guevara reported that the Executive Committee discussed the concerns raised at the November 6 Senate meeting and decided to charge the University Curriculum Committee to consider revisions to ACE Governance Document Four based upon recommendations from the Executive Committee. He noted that the major revision is to relieve the pressure on multiple section courses for providing evidence each year for the recertification process.

Professor Shea reported that he has heard a lot of commentary on the issue and has been reading the Executive Committee minutes about it. He stated that what struck him was the commentary from Secretary Woodman

regarding whether the other Big Ten schools have to go through a recertification process. He gathered that the other Big Ten schools do not have a formalized recertification program like ours. He pointed out that if other schools have academic integrity than we do as well. He asked why we are doing the recertification the way that it is designed and asked if it is serving the intent. He noted that there was good rationale to have it put into place originally, but quite a few people who were on the ACE committees that created the program are no longer with the university. He suggested that maybe rather than making small revisions to the process that the whole thing needs to be reconsidered.

Professor Sollars, Veterinary & Biomedical Sciences, stated that ACE was discussed at the IANR luncheon. She pointed out that the other Big Ten schools have general education programs that must fulfill certain requirements. She stated that the notion of the ACE courses is common practice in the Big Ten schools. President-Elect Guevara pointed out that he recently attended the CIC Faculty Leadership Conference at Northwestern University and asked this question to the other Senate Presidents in attendance. They reported that all institutions have a general education program with strict requirements, but none of them have a recertification process that is evaluated by outside people. He pointed out that the faculty does not have an issue with the intent of the ACE courses it is the burden of recertification that is the problem.

Secretary Woodman noted that any university has general education requirements and previously we had the ES/IS program. Now we have ACE but what is different is that faculty members now have someone outside the unit watching over their courses and this is creating a time sink. He stated that he has not heard anything positive about the recertification process. He stated that he does not think someone in another department should evaluate a course to determine whether the content still meets the requirement.

Professor Carlson, Veterinary & Biomedical Sciences, pointed out that ACE does not belong to any one unit and the courses need to be accountable. He stated that he does not have a problem with others reviewing the ACE courses. He noted that a second issue raised by the Executive Committee is the new approach to accreditation that the ACE program addresses. He stated that ACE is more focused on program outcomes and program assessments and we are ahead of the game if we have to prove that we are delivering the academic programs the way that they are supposed to be delivered. He suggested that the assessment does not need to be abandoned, but we need to decide how this can be done without burdening the faculty and how the process can be done as efficiently as possible.

Professor Willis, Anthropology, reported that she has an ACE course and finds the requirement of providing evidence as silly. She stated that she submitted three papers: one each of a high grade, a medium grade, and a low grade paper. She pointed out that it is unclear whether the grades the students received is a reflection of her teaching or the amount of work that the student put into the paper. She noted that the process does not measure the quality of teaching. President-Elect Guevara stated that the process supposedly has nothing to do with the quality of teaching, faculty members just need to show that they have met the outcomes of the course, but this is part of the problem. He noted that the process does not work well because we are such a diverse institution. He pointed out that for the process to really mean anything someone needs to read the papers submitted and someone from outside of the discipline could not read the papers in Modern Language courses. He stated that the Executive Committee is going to deal with the trouble that is causing the most problem, the multiple sections. He stated that if there are serious proposals to reconsider the entire ACE program that is a different discussion.

Professor Carlson disagreed that the quality of teaching doesn't bear on the outcome goals. He pointed out that there are two parties involved in learning: the instructor and the student. He noted that instructors do not always do what they are supposed to do. He asked how an instructor is going to improve their teaching if there is not an assessment and recertification process. He stated that he does not agree with the argument that quality of instruction is not part of the problem. President-Elect Guevara stated that part of the problem is that there are guidelines that are to be followed for recertification, but when someone monitoring the process comes in and is willing to bend the rules of the guidelines, it creates problems. He pointed out that instructors having to submit 120 samples of evidence because of multiple section courses creates a lot of work, but if you are told that you don't need to submit all of the evidence than the guidelines is not being followed.

Professor Joeckel, School of Natural Resources, noted that he loves young people and wouldn't be teaching if he didn't. He stated that he does not think we spend enough time worrying about what the students are doing and why a limited number of them are showing up for classes. He pointed out that teaching is a voluntary exercise for him but he wanted to teach 100-level courses and he thinks many share the honor of wanting to reach as many students as possible, but he thinks the ACE program is killing this. He stated that the ACE requirements are making it difficult for him to do his job effectively and motivationally exciting for him and

his students. He stated that ACE is making the teaching robotic. He noted that he has taught at multiple universities on the same subject and the median score remains the same, but he thinks we are taking the heart and soul out of teaching. President-Guevara pointed out that Director Mitchell of General Education Studies, stated that instructors can choose to remove your course as an ACE course.

Professor Sollars noted that ACE was already set up when she first came to UNL, but she does not think the program meets the objectives that it was set up to do. She stated that the focus of the program needs to be on achievement and we need to show that the students are achieving the outcomes. She stated that as a general education program she thinks it is a fabulous program.

Professor Weissling, Special Education & Communication Disorders, stated that looking at the multiple course section problems is a first step in reviewing the ACE process. She noted that although her department does not have multiple sections she heard the most responses she has ever heard on the issue about the burden the ACE process puts on faculty members.

President-Elect Guevara stated that the problem is that all of the colleges approved the ACE program and process. He noted that most of the faculty who approved the ACE documents don't teach the courses and they may not be aware of the problems that exist with it. He stated that revising the program would be a larger effort and the Executive Committee felt that it should tackle the largest problem which is the multiple section courses.

Professor Eccarius, Special Education & Communication Disorders, reported that she sits on the college curriculum committee and they have started to prepare for the recertification process, but there is confusion over what it exactly involves. She stated that her college is asking what the outcomes for the course were when the course was originally approved as an ACE course and whether these are still the outcomes of the course and whether the outcomes are being maintained. She stated that two other kinds of reports are being required but these do not go to the UCC. She reported that when ACE recertification is declined it is usually because too much information has been provided. She stated that those ACE courses that were recertified had very simple statements. She pointed out that by requiring the evidence for ACE recertification the campus will have evidence already gathered for accreditation.

Professor Joeckel noted that an earlier statement was made saying that ACE courses are voluntary for faculty members. He pointed out that some faculty members are told by an administrator that they must teach the course. President-Elect Guevara stated that there are a lot of motivations to have faculty members teach ACE approved courses.

Professor Carlson stated that an important issue with the ACE program is with the outcomes. He pointed out that students taking 100-level courses cannot accomplish many of the outcomes listed in ACE. He stated that ultimately graduating seniors might be able to meet the outcomes. He asked if exposure to these courses is the goal or whether some achievement centered outcomes is the goal. Secretary Woodman pointed out that his daughter has completed nine out of the ten outcomes in only three semesters and asked how the outcomes could be met so quickly.

Professor Shea stated that he read in the Executive Committee minutes that President Schubert has stated that it was the students who wanted a better general education program. He stated that he wanted to be reassured that ACE absolutely was a result of students' requests. Professor Konecky, University Libraries, pointed out that the ES/IS program had fallen into such a complicated state that students were having difficult in making the program work. President-Elect Guevara noted that multiple section courses use the same syllabus and ACE helps to make sure that the sections are all being taught the same.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Dean Cerveny, Enrollment Management Council, and Director Hunter Admissions

President-Elect Guevara reported that Director Hunter is not able to attend the meeting.

Dean Cerveny reported that this fall Admissions was kicking off an enrollment initiative of having a decade of success in enrollment. He noted that at many universities, if the enrollment goes up the academic profile of the institution goes down but here the key informative indicators are going up simultaneously. He stated that even though enrollment figures went down this fall, some important things occurred. He stated that the median ACT score for incoming freshmen as 25.4 which is the highest it has been in the history of the university. He noted that the ACT scores have gone up a full point in the last ten years at UNL and the average math sub score has increased, combined these two factors made a remarkable increase in our profile.

Dean Cerveney reported that out-of-state enrollment has increased and we had 835 new out-of-state students from across the country which is the highest number we have ever had. He pointed out that we have the most diverse freshmen class that we have ever had with 13.4% of the students being minorities and there has been a 13% increase in on-line student credit hour production. He reported that there was a 20% increase in international students, but overall our new student enrollment went down because we had a 7% drop in Nebraska high school students. He stated that the decrease in Nebraska students was primarily from the Lincoln and Omaha area. He pointed out that the cost of education today is a reason why many students, particularly undeclared students, choose to go to a community college. He stated that we need to emphasize that UNL is a great place to explore a wide range of subjects.

Dean Cerveney stated that we need to think about the cost of education in Nebraska. He pointed out that there are 97 counties in the state, but in only 11 of these counties is the family income over \$50,000 and a large number of students are worried about how they can afford to get an education at UNL. He stated that we need to communicate that we are affordable.

Dean Cerveney reported that Admissions is studying a number of cases from Nebraska to determine why there was a decrease, but he believes that last year may have been an anomaly. He noted that this year inquiries were up significantly from this same time last year but we need to continually be concerned with increasing enrollment. He stated that the good news is that one out of every four high school students going on to college comes to UNL, which is 15% of the population. The bad news is that there is not a tremendous growth in the number of high school students in the state and he thinks we are starting to bottom out. As a result we will have to work extra hard to maintain our numbers.

Dean Cerveney reported that ethnic breakdown of students shows that in 2002, 90% of high school students were Caucasian, but by 2020 this number will be under 20%. He reported that accordingly, we are already dramatically changing our recruiting efforts. He stated that the college going rate for minorities is not as high and we need to work hard on changing this. He reported that only 65-66% of Nebraska high school students go to college.

Dean Cerveney reported that after the Chancellor announced his goals for enrollment, SVCAA Weissinger charged the Enrollment Council which has representatives from each of the colleges to look at how to manage growth. He noted that an increase in 5,000 students will have impacts on every college and program and we need to be thoughtful to prepare for this increase in students. He stated that the Council has embarked on a process to bring in more out-of-state students and to try to increase the number of Nebraska high schools students going to college. He stated that increasing our enrollment is not just a process where are growing larger, we will be dramatically changing the university. As a result, our recruiting and enrollment services will be reinvented. He pointed out that if we are going to be successful we need to involve everyone across the campus. He stated that the Enrollment Council wants to communicate what it is planning to do and to engage people in a conversation. He noted that the campus blueprint lays out what the Council is thinking about doing. He stated that the other objective is to design a data driven culture. He pointed out that recruiting has become big business and we need to see where our recruiting efforts can be most productive. He stated that we need to adjust to changing marketing conditions.

Dean Cerveney reported that the increase in enrollment will be from undergraduate students rather than graduate and professional students. He stated that the Council is looking at having a student population of approximately 84% undergraduates. He noted that a lot of major research institutions have 70% undergraduate and 30% graduate students, and while we want our graduate programs to grow, we need to hire more faculty members to do this and to be able to do this we need to increase our revenue through increased undergraduate enrollment. He stated that the goal is to increase the number of out-of-state students to 1500. He noted that when students visit our campus they are blown away by Lincoln, the campus, the faculty, and our facilities. He stated that one of our problems is that we do not have the brand identity that other institutions have. He reported that the university hired Archival, a local marketing firm that specializes in marketing to young people resulting in some special targeted commercials and billboards in the Chicago area. He stated that less expensive ways of advertising is through Facebook, internet advertising, and through our website. He reported that we have gone through a great deal of effort to redesign our website. He stated that special features, special academic or extra-curricular activities can be put on the web. He noted that we have one of the best campus virtual tours on the web and it includes an academic tour and a student life tour providing students with an opportunity to visit each of the colleges. He pointed out that having a great virtual tour helps to attract visitors to campus.

Dean Cerveny stated that the domestic plan for recruiting is to significantly increase our pool of prospective students by actively recruiting in IL, MN, KS, MO, CO, SD, IA, PA, MI, WI, IN, CA, and NJ. He reported that there are some full-time admissions people living in some of these areas and working to recruit students to UNL. He stated that the international recruiting program has recently been reinstated. He noted that during the 2003 budget cuts this program had to be eliminated in order to save domestic recruiting.

Dean Cerveny reported that UNL has been developing a program to recruit more transfer students. He noted that the main question that transfer students want to know is whether their credits will transfer into UNL, consequently UNL has been working hard to make sure that we have a strong transfer articulation. He pointed out that previously an evaluation of the transfer credits was not done until after new student enrollment and while we have a good yield rate of transfer students, we do not have students who are looking at different universities to attend because we do not have a mechanism in place that allows these students to check immediately to see if their credits will transfer.

Professor Archer, School of Natural Resources, noted that demographic projections indicate that a fairly large portion of potential students will be Hispanic, but pointed out that recruiting in Latin America seems to be lacking. He suggested that recruiting in this region could be helpful. Dean Cerveny reported that students from Brazil are showing interest in attending UNL and recruiting efforts are being considered for this country. He noted that while the population of Hispanic high school students has increased, many of them are not putting themselves into a position to be able to get into college. He stated that school counselors are talking to 8th and 9th graders to let them know what classes they need to be taking in order to get into college. He stated that high school students need to be encouraged to take a college prep program.

Professor Carlson stated that there are students who are bringing AP courses from high school, but consideration needs to be given as to how these courses count towards a degree program. He pointed out that Biology 101 courses in high school and community colleges are not at the university level and may not count towards a degree in some disciplines such as in the Life Sciences. He asked how we as an institution are going to deal with this situation. Will we allow other classes to be substituted for the required courses or will the students be required to take Biology 120 and 121 courses in addition to their biology AP courses to meet the standards of a program. Dean Cerveny noted that this is a difficult issue because of the political sensitivity to us not accepting credits from community colleges. He pointed out that unlike other states Nebraska does not have advanced placement programs which has specific standards. He stated that these programs allow universities to feel confident that a student meets the requirements of UNL. Professor Carlson pointed out that some professional schools will not accept AP credits without some strings attached. He stated that he does not like the AP program and finds it more difficult to deal with than the traditional community college courses. He pointed out the AP courses can be problematic for certain disciplines. Dean Cerveny noted that the mathematics placement exam makes sure that students get into the right program, but other programs do not have a placement exam which can cause difficulties. He stated that parents may be delighted that their child has taken AP courses, but if we just accept that the student has the required skills from the AP courses and put the student into an advance program and the student does not do well, parents will be critical as to why we put their child in an advanced program. He stated that UNL is trying to work with high school counselors to explain some of these issues to students and their families.

Professor Hay, Southeast Research and Extension Center, pointed out that he has heard transfer students say that UNL has more issues with transfer credits than with other schools in the surrounding area. He stated that he is glad to hear that UNL recognizes the problems that transfer students are dealing with because it has impacts on our recruiting. Dean Cerveny reported that UNL is trying to be in a position where we can respond quicker to difficulties transfer students may encounter.

Professor Dahab, Civil Engineering, asked how we compare to other schools with the number of out-of-state students. Dean Cerveny reported that approximately 24% of freshman students are out-of-state. He stated that a lot of other schools average between 30-40% of out-of-state students. He stated that he does not think a majority of our incoming students will be from out-of-state, but he is seeing a lot of great interest in UNL since we moved into the Big Ten, particularly from students in Minnesota and Wisconsin. He pointed out that with Rutgers becoming a member of the Big Ten, recruiting in New Jersey will be a real opportunity for us.

Professor Zlotnik, Earth & Atmospheric Sciences, asked if Admissions has enough resources to be recruiting in the high schools. Dean Cerveny reported that recruiters visit all of the feeder high schools in Nebraska. He pointed out that the state has a large number of very small high schools with graduating classes of less than 25 students, but Admissions is working with IANR and Academic Affairs through a rural initiative coordinator who is working with extension educators to talk to students in these small schools. He stated that Admissions

is making an effort to visit every high school in Nebraska. He pointed out that it really means something to the student, and people in the community, when we visit these schools and it is important that we serve all of Nebraska, not just Lincoln and Omaha.

Professor Purdum, Animal Science, stated that she is disappointed about the expectations for graduate students in that we need to hire more researchers before we can increase the number of graduate students. She stated that we need to build distance education programs and graduate programs and we need to develop a curriculum that builds adult education across the campus. Dean Cerveny stated that he is working closely with Executive Director of Distance and On-line Education Marie Barber to address these needs. Professor Purdum stated that there is no incentive to fill on-line programs but people need distance education and further education to get a master's degree so we need to build on our distance and graduate programs. Dean Cerveny agreed but stated that we have to deal with available resources and the priority is to build up the enrollment numbers of undergraduate students first. Professor Carlson pointed out that we need to have programs that attract graduate students and this falls back on the faculty to build these programs. He pointed out that graduate faculty members have to build graduate programs first before Admissions can help recruit graduate students. He noted that it is important that we design programs that we really want. Professor Stoltenberg, Psychology, stated that his department gets numerous applicants for their graduate programs, but there are not enough available slots for these students. He pointed out that what is really needed is more support for graduate teaching assistants.

Professor Anaya, University Libraries, asked if there are any programs that are focusing on students in junior high schools across the state. Professor Carlson stated that extension educators are bringing students to campus to explore possibilities in disciplines. He stated that this is one group that is trying to plant the seed that college is a possibility for all students. Dean Cerveny stated that Admissions has a program that is conducted in late April with visits to middle schools across the state but they hope to do more with this age group. Past President LaCost stated that there are eight challenge grants being supported by the Post-Secondary Education Commission that requires support of the university to bring students to campus. She noted that it is not a university program but it requires cooperation of UNL and the other post-secondary colleges in the state.

Dean Cerveny thanked the Senate for providing him the opportunity to speak about recruiting efforts and stated that he would be happy to provide updates on recruiting initiatives.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:29 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, January 15, 2:30 p.m. in the East Campus Union, Arbor Suite. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, and David Woodman, Secretary.