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Call to order

Roll Call

Approval of Agenda

Action on Faculty Senate Minutes:

Special Presentations

A. Meet the Deans: Tim Jares (CBT), Ryan Teten (CAS), Grace Mims (COE)

B. Jon Watts, Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance

C. Nicole Kent and Katie Schultis, Student Body President and Vice President

Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees

A. Oversight Committee:
   
   • Parliamentarian Greg Brown
   
   Standing Committee Elections

B. Executive Committee 30 August 2019

C. President’s Report: 19 September 2019

D. Academic Affairs: 19 September 2019

E. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee:

F. Academic Information and Technology Committee:

G. Artists and Lecturers Committee:

H. Athletic Committee:

I. E-campus Committee:
J. Faculty Welfare Committee:
K. Grievance Committee:
L. Library Committee:
M. Professional Conduct Committee:
N. Student Affairs Committee:

VII. Reports of Senate Representatives to Non-Senate Committees

A. Assessment Committee:
B. Women, Gender and Ethnic Studies Advisory Committee:
C. International Studies Advisory Council:
D. Parking:
E. Safety Committee:
F. World Affairs Conference Committee:

VIII. Reports from Academic Councils

A. Graduate Council: 12 September 2019
B. General Studies Council: 5 September 2019
C. Council on Undergraduate Education
D. Student Success Council:
E. Equity, Access, and Diversity Committee

IX. Other

X. New Business

XI. Unfinished/Old Business:

A. BOR Bylaw Proposal

XII. General Faculty Comments

A. This period is allotted for faculty members to bring matters of importance before the Senate. Speakers are asked to limit their remarks to five minutes or less. Senate meetings are open to all members of the academic community. All faculty members are specifically invited to attend Faculty Senate meetings.

XIII. Adjournment
Faculty Senate Meeting September 5 2019

1. Agenda Approved
   a. Fye First
   b. Hoehner Seconded

2. Minutes Approved
   a. Abbey First
   b. Seconded by McKelvey

3. First Special Presentation
   a. AGB Listening Sessions
      • Regent Pillen was here to listen
      • He introduced himself and his history
      • Talked about the beginning of the search for a new president
      • 9 Pillars of the Next President of UN
         o A proven leader
         o Strategic Thinker
         o Prioritize Higher Education
         o “One Nebraska”
         o Political Acumen
         o Fundraiser and Philanthropist
         o Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion
         o Values NU as a global leader
         o Athletics

   • Senator Fye asked about academics, Regent Pillen re-read pillar #3
   • Senator Abbey asked about including other forms of extracurricular activities
   • Senator Clark asked about the shrinking population of the Midwest and enrollment
   • A question was asked about the culture of Kearney and how a new president will look at Kearney and its culture
   • Senator Porter asked about diversity, and what the definition is. Regent Pillen answered that he believes diversity is about people and that all are welcome at the University of Nebraska.
   • Senator Konecny commented on “One Nebraska”. The general feeling is that sometimes UNK is competing for students.
   • Senator Strain commented that it feels like UNK isn’t being listened to like the larger campuses. She said her colleagues would like it that UNK would be considered more often.
• Senator Hoener commented that former President Bounds was tremendous in bringing a PhD program to UNK.
• Senator Porter commented that he believes that the other campuses have more money to recruit and UNL and UNO have that advantage and use it.
• Senator Abbey commented that former President Bounds always wore blue when he was here, and while it was a small thing, it made UNK feel special. He also said a president needs to have a rural understanding.
• Senator Konecny said we need to look at students’ mental health and inclusion.
• Senator Dettman commented on the pillar of political acumen. He felt that former President Bounds did an excellent job.
• Senator Clark said he would like to see a traditional candidate and not a political candidate.
• Senator Sogar said she likes the pillars. She said would not like to limit the candidate pool.
• Senator Fye said she agrees with Senator Sogar, but wants a candidate who fits educationally.
• Senator Hobbs’ proxy asked about the priority of the pillars. Regent Pillen said the Regents will debate before the hire, and will take the listening sessions into consideration.
• Senator Konecny said he would like to see a candidate who can think far into the future politically. He believes the political acumen pillar is very important.
• A person from the gallery said she wants more emphasis on education, not a business model.
• Senator Louishomme said he believes someone who only has political experience and no higher education experience would be detrimental.

• Regent Pillen then explained the process going forward.
  o No longer do the final four candidates have to be made public.
  o The priority candidate will become public after a regent vote.
  o There will be a 30 day vetting period.
  o The candidate will visit all campuses.

• A comment was made supporting Senator Porter’s comments about the other UN campuses recruiting students and taking students from UNK.

• Senator Louishomme Thanked Regent Pillen for coming.

• presidentsearch@nebraska.edu

4. Sara Bennet from the Nebraska Business Development Center

5. Senator Greg Brown—oversight committee
a. Voted to install Claude Louishomme as Past President
   b. Made announcement on filling standing committees

6. President Mollenkopf gave her president’s report
   a. Highlighted the discussion on AAUP
   b. Asked Senate to read over UNL’s packet, will send it to Senate.
   c. We will deal with it in October.

7. General Faculty Comments:
   a. Homecoming Decorations Competition
   b. Senator Strain requested:
      1. Would like to see an organizational chart from the administration—who
         reports to whom, who is in charge of what and job descriptions, etc.
      2. Committees and counsels—who do they answer to? Please label
      3. What is happening with facilities? Delays and repairs.
         a. Several Senators commented on their frustration with construction

8. Miller motioned to adjourn
   a. Fye seconded
Faculty Senate Executive Committee & Chancellor’s Cabinet Meeting
Friday August 30th, 2019 @ 1:00-2:00PM
Warner Hall Conference Room

Chancellor’s Cabinet Members in Attendance:
Doug Kristensen, Chancellor
Charles Bicak, Sr. Vice Chancellor, AA/SA
Jon Watts, Vice Chancellor, Business/Finance
Gilbert Hinga, Dean, Student Affairs
Kelly Bartling, Vice chancellor, Enrollment Management and Marketing
John Falconer, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for Executive Affairs

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Members in Attendance:
Dawn Mollenkopf, President
Martonia Gaskill, President Elect
Greg Brown, Parliamentarian
Matt Miller, Senate Representative
Ford Clark, Secretary

1. FS President Dr. Mollenkopf began the meeting by thanking everyone for attending the retreat.

2. VC Jon Watts
   - Requested senators to serve committees related to Budget Advisory Group. President Mollenkopf will call out senators to volunteer/serve.
   - Shared the new policy on staff workload and teaching duties
   - There will be hearing sessions on campus for the Facility master plan

3. Cabinet member presentation dates for Faculty Senate meetings: (please change dates as needed)
   - October 3: Jon Watts
   - November 7: Susan Fritz if available; Gilbert Hinga
   - December 5: Charlie Bicak
   - February 6: open
   - March 5: open
   - April 2: Doug Kristensen
4. Chancellor Kristensen
   - NU President Search: The ideal president will value the concept of One University, four campuses, recognizing the unique contributions of each campus. UNK’s focus is on quality and affordable undergraduate education and providing opportunities and access to minority groups.  
   - Interim President Fritz is adjusting well to her new role and we will attempt to bring her to campus.

5. SVC Charles Bicak
   - COE Dean Search: A search committee is expected to be identified in mid- to late September with additional progress on the search process towards the end of October. 
   - UNK IS CIO search is underway and is making good progress. 
   - BIG IDEA: Documentation/inventory of workload such as credit hours, number of courses, # students per course, etc.

6. Dean Gilbert Hinga
   - Student government is concerned with final week policy; Student body president and vice-president also met with FS President Mollenkopf to bring the concerns to the Faculty Senate 
   - Retention Council o Obstacles/themes by the end of October  
     o Subcommittee to address faculty/staff retention 
     o At the FS retreat, Mary & Stancia discussed a proposal to recruit and retain diverse faculty

7. VC Kelly Bartling
   - News release on enrollment to be released around September 9th 
   - Aligning EMM strategic plan with colleges plans 
   - LaVonne Kopecky Plambeck Early Childhood Development Center ribbon cutting on October 8 
   - Upcoming: open forums for enrollment management

Meeting adjourned at 2:10 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Martonia Gaskill
President’s Report for October 3, 2019

Board of Regents’ meetings:
- No Board of Regents (BOR) meetings occurred during between September 5 and October 3.
- The next meeting will be October 25th.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee & Chancellor’s Cabinet Meeting:
- August 30th: See attached notes
- Next meeting: October 4th

Executive Committee: September 19th:
- Planned the October 3 Faculty Senate meeting
- Planned the October 4 Executive Committee and Chancellor’s Cabinet Meeting:
  - President’s search
  - Update on the bylaw change proposal
  - General Studies
  - Big Idea item: How well does our Mission and Vision serve us for our students, particularly in light of our enrollment challenges?

President Search Advisory Committee:
- Comments from the listening sessions were compiled and shared with the committee and used to guide the process for applicant review.
- Currently the search is at a vetting stage in the applicant pool. Process appears to be going well.
Chair Bridges called the meeting to order at 3:34.

Hanson/Boeckner moved to approve the agenda. Motion passed.

Schipporeit walked the committee through items #1-#7 with added clarification on item #2.

Bridges called the question. Motion unanimously passed.

Discussion moved to the content of and open access to the Academic Affairs Archives on the UNK website. The committee believes all minutes from the meetings should be accessible and remain on the website for purposes of transparency and shared governance. Boeckner stated he would talk to Faculty Senate about the issue as well.

Schipporeit/Hanson moved that the meeting adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 3:45.

Respectfully submitted,
Brooke Envick, Scribe

Approved via email (September 23, 2019)
#1, Create, Course, HIST 299, The Historian’s Craft, HIST, CASC, New course for all History programs. Will be used as the department’s experiential learning component.

#2, Create, Department, Human Services, COE, The Family Studies Department in the College of Business and Technology (CBT) alongside the Department of Counseling and School Psychology in College of Education (COE) request a merger into one physical Department, named Human Services, to be housed in the UNK College of Education (COE). The disciplines housed in the proposed Human Services Department support and complement each other to the benefit of students and faculty.

Undergraduate programs in the Family Studies Department align with programs for CSP majors, with both encompassing content that involves parenting, marriage & family, aging, early childhood, and adolescents, to name a few. Currently, if undergraduate students approach the CSP Department requesting recommendations for an undergraduate major they are encouraged to explore Family Studies. This has directly benefitted Family Studies enrollment. This merger provides for enrollment advantages to be mutual. Since CSP is a graduate only program, Family Studies will act as a more powerful feeder program into CSP graduate classes with the merger of the two Departments. This merger may also lead to the opportunity for the Human Services Department to offer more online undergraduate and graduate certificates. The attached CSP FAMS Merger Proposal document provides merger leadership support, combined operations, merged identity & department name, recruitment and retention, and process for the programs and Departments to be combined to function more collaboratively as one collective group.

#3, Create, Course, MATH 445, Actuarial Science Seminar, MATH, CASC, We are working toward appending an Actuarial Science emphasis to our comprehensive major. This class will be a key class in this program. We don’t expect this class or this emphasis to attract a large enrollment. But we do have a few students who are interested in Actuarial Science, and we think that we can help them by offering this class and this (yet to be) proposed emphasis. Finally, we can have a faculty member who teaches a five hour calculus class teach the one-hour version of this course--nothing is really free, but offering the one-hour version of this class is something that we can do without canceling other sections or appending faculty or adjuncts.

#4, Alter, Course, Prerequisites, PHYS 276, General Physics II (Calculus), PHYS, CASC, In order to be successful in the Physics major, students must have a minimal level of understanding of essential concepts covered in the first courses; Change prerequisites, Old Value: PHYS 275 and PHYS 275L; New Value: Grade of C or above in PHYS 275 and PHYS 275L.

#5, Alter, Course, Prerequisites, PHYS 346, Modern Physics I, PHYS, CASC, In order to be successful in the Physics major, students must have a minimal level of understanding of essential concepts covered in the first courses; Change prerequisites, Old Value: PHYS 276 and PHYS 276L; New Value: Grade of C or above in both PHYS 276 and PHYS 276L.

#6, Create, Course, SOWK 467, Social Work with Latino Populations, SOWK, CASC, This course is needed to help fulfill the need for competent human services professionals to provide services to Latino individuals and families.

#7, Create, Course, SOWK 490, Special Topics in Social Work, SOWK, CASC, This course will allow the Social Work program to develop and offer courses addressing important emerging issues and/or specific populations in need of services. Some examples might be: (1) military individuals and families, (2) immigrants and refugees.
GRADUATE COUNCIL MINUTES
Thursday, September 12, 2019
WRNH 2147 – 3:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Said Abushamleh, Kazuma Akehi, John Bauer, Matt Bice, Bree Dority, Noel Palmer, Whitney Schneider-Cline, Janet Steele, Marguerite Tassi, Frank Tenkorang, Theresa Wadkins, Mallory Wetherell and Ron Wirtz

ABSENT: Doug Biggs, Dena Harshbarger and Michelle Warren

I. Approval of the April 11, 2019 Minutes – approved via email

II. Approval of the 2019 Summer Graduates – approved via email

III. Graduate Dean’s Report
   A. New Members
   Dean Ellis welcomed Frank Tenkorang, Whitney Schneider-Cline, Said Abushamleh and Theresa Wadkins to the council. Haishi Cao has resigned from the council due to a scheduling conflict and Theresa Wadkins will be completing his term. Three graduate students are needed to serve on the council. Please forward nominations to the Graduate Office.

   B. Graduate Student Organization
   An attempt to reestablish the Graduate Student Organization, which has been defunct for approximately 20 years, is underway.

   C. Graduate Council
   Ellis explained that the Graduate Council is the policy and decision-making body elected from each college who speak on behalf of their graduate faculty colleagues. The council acts as an advisory body to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

   D. Graduate Studies
   A power point presentation on the overview of Graduate Studies highlighted the vision statement, growth and diversity in graduate students, and goals in looking ahead. Ellis informed the Council that graduate student numbers are slightly up.

   E. GPC Survey
   A survey was recently sent to all GPC chairs and information will be compiled to share with departments.

   F. New Programs
   Ellis encouraged the council to talk with their departments on developing new programs, how to enhance existing programs or move existing programs to an online format. The Public Communication proposal is being voted on by the Executive Graduate Council

   G. Family Studies
   The merging of Family Studies and CSP has gone through all approvals in the College of Education and is on the FS Academic Affairs agenda. This comes as an information item only.
H. **GRA – Graduate Research Assistant**
A GRA (Graduate Research Assistant) program was approved with POE funds where 12 GRA’s will be hired to assist faculty with research over the next five years. An announcement will be sent out at the end of September or October for those interested in applying.

I. **Workshops**
A handout was provided listing the professional development workshops for the fall offered by Graduate Studies as well as a university-wide list of workshops. New topic ideas as well as offering to host a workshop was encouraged.

J. **Website**
Graduate Studies has updated their website. Bice demonstrated the new website and asked the council to look at the links to their programs and provide feedback.

K. **Graduate Assistants**
Ellis will be looking at the GA distribution on campus to see how the GA’s are being used and the number in each department. There may be some GA’s that will be reallocated. This was one of the APR items that need to be addressed.

L. **Library**
Wurtz explained that the Library has several online resources including many online books. Faculty have worked with the Library to have books required for their class online so students do not have to purchase books.

M. **Committee Assignments.**
Dr. Ellis provided a brief overview of each committee and upcoming committee responsibilities were discussed. The council broke into committees and named chairs of each committee.

IV. **Committee Reports**

A. **Policy & Planning Committee** – no report.

B. **Academic Programs Committee** – no report.

C. **Faculty & Student Affairs Committee** – no report.

V. **Other Business**
There being no additional business, the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully
submitted, Janna
Shanno
General Studies Council
Minutes September 5, 2019
– 3:30 p.m.
Warner Hall, Warner Conference Room
*** Approved via email ***

Present: Sylvia Asay, Debbie Bridges, Greg Brown, Joel Cardenas, Scott Darveau, Jeremy Dillon, Mark Ellis, Aaron Estes, Tim Farrell, Michelle Fleig-Palmer, Beth Hinga, Kristi Milks, Kim Schipporeit, Sri Seshadri, Rebecca Umland, Jeff Wells, Ron Wirtz

Absent: Julie Agard, Doug Tillman, Beth Wiersma

Guests: Dr. Bicak

I. Call to Order:

Debbie Bridges called the meeting to order.

Bridges welcomed the new General Studies members to the Council: Jeff Wells (CAS), Jeremy Dillon (CAS), Michelle Fleig-Palmer (B&T), and Doug Tillman (COE).

1. Approve Agenda:
Seshadri/Darveau moved to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

2. Minutes from the April 25, 2019 meeting were approved via email.

II. Old Business (Open Items):

III. New Business:

1. Course Proposals (New): Nothing submitted:

   The Council discussed whether the moratorium should continue during the 2019/20 academic year, especially with the undertaking of revising the General Studies Program.

   Darveau/Wirtz moved to approve continuing the moratorium of new course proposals. If a department feels a new course is needed justification will need to be provided as to why it needs to be included in the current General Studies Program. Motion carried with 1 nay vote.

2. Assessment and GS Program:

   a. Initial Results from Spring 2019 Capstone Course Assessment:
   Bridges asked the Council to read through the report and the Qualtrics survey for discussion at the next meeting.

   b. Syllabi Review Results Summary and Feedback (Spring 2019) Faculty:
   Bridges sent the syllabi feedback to the faculty and a few of the syllabi have been revised and resubmitted.

   c. Updated on Syllabi Collection/Review Fall 2019:
   Bridges reorganized the review teams in order to pair the new members on the Council with the present members.
Once Bridges receives all of the syllabi she will load them on Canvas. The Council should have the review completed by the November meeting. As a reminder, each team should send a combined summary on the syllabi to Bridges once the review is completed.

d. Update on Fall 2019 Written and Oral Communication Course Assessment: The Department Chairs and Faculty have been notified on which courses will be assessed this semester.

3. Review/Revision of General Studies Program:

   a. Plans for 2019/20 Academic Year:
   Dr. Bicak thanked the Council for all of their significant and important work last year. Dr. Bicak charged the Council to undertake a revision of the General Studies program. Dr. Bicak suggests a new program that looks decidedly different than our current program with revolutionary changes that are systematic and quick. In carrying out the charge, the Council should consider making fundamental changes, as well as structural changes to the program, and reducing the hours in the program.

   Dr. Bicak suggested the Council look at the processes rather than content in disciplines with a proactive approach. In addition, the first year of the program should be differentiated from other years (i.e., year 2, year 3, and year 4) of the program.

   Dr. Bicak will give campus his charge on revising the General Studies Program at two campus information sessions:

   Monday, September 23 at 3:30 p.m. in WSTC 152W

   Tuesday, September 24 at 3:30 p.m. in COPH 142

   Bridges asked the Council to review the proposed changes to the Governance Document on Canvas. The Council will discuss and act on the proposed changes at the October meeting.

IV. Other:

V. Adjournment:
   Darveau/Wirtz moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:00 p.m. Motion carried.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Thursday, October 3, 2019 at 3:30 p.m., Warner Conference Room.
Summary of 2019 NSSE Results
Beth Hinga | August 2019

Photo from the 2019 Study Abroad trip to Australia led by Dr. Suzanne Maughan
Snapshot
The Snapshot is a short summary of the extremes in our data. A very few highlights:

- We still excel at High-Impact Practices.
  - 68% of our first year students report participating in at least one high-impact practice. 21% participated in two or more. (Peer institutions report 56% participating in one and 9% participating in two or more.)
  - 92% of our seniors participated in at least one high-impact practice, while peer institutions report 83% participation in at least one high impact practice. 72% of our seniors completed two or more high impact experiences. Peer institutions report 57% of seniors participating in two or more.
- The Snapshot lists the five items we performed highest and lowest on relative to our peer institutions.
  - First year students scored highest relative to our peers in participation in a learning community (+18%)
  - First year students scored lowest relative to our peers in “Institution emphasis on encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds” (-11 points)
  - Senior students scored highest relative to our peers in completion of a culminating senior experience (+24%)
  - Senior students scored lowest relative to our peers in the question “Explained course material to one or more students” (-10 points)
- First year students struggle to find a supportive environment on campus.
- Both our first year and senior students struggle with using the learning strategies specified in the survey’s questions. This includes items:
  - Identified key information from reading assignments
  - Reviewed your notes after class
  - Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials

Engagement indicators
Engagement indicators are separated into four broad categories. These and their components are:

Academic Challenge
  - Higher-order learning
  - Reflective & integrative learning
  - Learning strategies
  - Quantitative reasoning

Learning with Peers
  - Collaborative learning
  - Discussions with diverse others

Experiences with faculty
  - Student-faculty interaction
  - Effective teaching practices

Campus environment
  - Quality of interactions
Supportive environment

**Academic Challenge**
Our first year students scored below peer institutions in nearly every category. Reflective & integrative learning was the only area in which they scored better than their peers, and it was only by 1 point. In that category, they scored 7 points lower than their peers on the item “Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue.” Learning strategies and quantitative reasoning were the two areas of greatest weakness.

Our senior students scored nearly equal to our peer institutions in higher order learning. They struggled in all other areas. Learning strategies was the area of greatest weakness, though they also struggled slightly with quantitative reasoning. One standout under reflective & integrated learning is the item “Tried to better understand someone else’s view by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective. They scored 4 points lower than their peers on this particular item.

Students at all levels struggled in the area of Learning Strategies. It would be helpful for faculty, Learning Commons staff, Student Success Services, Success Coaches, Advising and Career Development, and others providing academic support to give students information about practices that enhance learning. This includes reviewing and enhancing notes after class, spending time after class summarizing information learned in that session, and taking notes while reading so they can identify key information. A university “Teaching and Learning Center” would be a relatively efficient way to disseminate information to faculty about classroom strategies that can enhance learning. If created, the center should employ as its director an expert in the body of literature related to learning and pedagogy.

First year students also struggled to self-assess their own arguments and beliefs. Instructors may be able to help students with this skill through guided practice.

Quantitative reasoning is a major area of weakness. Students are either not encountering the need for quantitative analysis or they do not feel comfortable with the practice. The questions in the survey seem to indicate lack of experience rather than lack of comfort. Our students scored significantly lower than students at both our peer institutions and those within our Carnegie classification. This lack of experience and comfort with quantitative reasoning may be investigated at several points in the curriculum, including in math/statistics classes, in classes across campus where students are asked to analyze and interpret data, and in research with faculty members where they may be asked to do the same. Students may need extra instruction in data analysis and interpretation.

**Learning with Peers**
Our first year students are collaborating more with their fellow students than students at our peer institutions, and much more than students within our Carnegie classification. Our seniors are collaborating much less with fellow students at our peer institutions but at a comparable level with those within our Carnegie classification.

Our students scored significantly behind their peers in questions about how often they had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than their own, and with people from an economic background other than their own. They scored slightly better than our peers in having discussions with people with political views other than their own.

Our peer institutions are emphasizing collaboration among students more than other institutions within our Carnegie classification.

First year students are doing a good job of asking their peers to help them understand course material. They also prepare for exams with other students.
Senior students spend less time than their peers both explaining course material to other students and asking students for help understand course material. They are also not preparing for exams with other students as often as their peers. They might do well with reminders that these can be effective strategies for success.

Regarding discussions with diverse others, roughly 72% of the first year student population identifies as white. The largest groups of other ethnicities are Hispanic or Latino (13%), foreign or nonresident (7%), and Black/African American (4%).

Students are not taking advantage of natural or happenstance opportunities to socialize and study with others of different ethnicities. Silos and cliques develop for a number of reasons, and only concerted efforts across campus can break down those boundaries. Faculty and staff may benefit from learning these results so they can come up
with innovative strategies to ensure students are talking with others unlike themselves. About 80% of the senior population identifies as white. Between the freshman year and senior year, we are losing many of our students of color. The black/African American population fell by 75% from the first year to the senior year. The foreign student population fell 43% from first year to senior year. All of our students (but particularly our students of color and foreign students) are suffering from a lack of diversity in race and ethnicity on our campus. The university would be well served to redouble efforts to recruit faculty, staff, and students from diverse groups. It is critical to find effective strategies to retain these diverse populations. Strategies should address not only academic barriers, but social and community barriers as well. For example, African-American students have trouble finding an experienced cosmetologist to take care of their specialized hair care needs. The closest cosmetologist who specializes in African-American hair care is in Lexington. Perhaps the university could sponsor her or another cosmetologist to join a salon in town part-time in order to serve the university’s African-American student, staff, and faculty population. Or perhaps offering a scholarship at Joseph’s College, the local cosmetology school, for a person to be specially trained in African-American hair care and hair styling could be arranged to create a resource in Kearney for our students, faculty, and staff, as well as for the community at large. Many of our international students are Asian, and a large number of these students do not have cars. The nearest Asian market is in Grand Island. Perhaps the university could sponsor the cost of a van for weekly trip to the market for students who don’t own cars so they can shop for supplies. A diversity climate survey was completed in 2017, and there are many recommendations within the final report that should be investigated for implementation in an effort to help all members of our campus community to feel welcome and supported.

Experiences with Faculty
Both first year and senior students report overall positive interactions with faculty. Particularly positive are items “talked about career plans with a faculty member” and “worked with faculty on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.).” Our students felt much like those at our peer institutions about faculty’s use of effective teaching practices. First year students reported that faculty provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments slightly less often than their peers. They reported slightly more often than their peers that faculty taught courses in an organized way. Students feel by and large, and in the specific areas mentioned, that faculty are using effective teaching practices. However, there is always room for improvement. Faculty need to make sure they are interacting early and often with students and returning work in a timely fashion.

Campus Environment
First year students report that the quality of interactions with their fellow students, student services staff, and other administrative staff and offices is positive more often than at our peer institutions. They are less positive about interactions with faculty (-4 points) and academic advisors (-5 points) than students at our peer institutions. Senior students feel that the quality of their interactions with other students, academic advisors, student services staff, and other administrative staff and offices is positive more often than those at our peer institutions. They are slightly less positive about interactions with faculty than those at our peer institutions. Of particular note is that interactions with academic advisors are 10 points higher than our peer institutions. This represents a 15 point shift in perceived quality of interactions with advisors from the freshman to the senior years. There is clearly room for improvement of interactions between advisors and first year students. Freshmen struggle to find a supportive environment on campus. They feel that the institution does not encourage: contact among student from different backgrounds (-11 points), attending campus activities and events (-8 points), providing opportunities to be involved socially (-6 points), attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues (-6 points), helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities such as work and family (-5 points) and providing support for your overall well-being (-3 points). Senior students also struggle with finding a supportive campus environment. Like first year students, they find lack of support for helping to manage non-academic responsibilities (-6 points), encouraging interaction among students
from different backgrounds (-4 points), attending campus activities and events (-4 points), and attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues (-4 points).

Faculty and staff may need to get creative about ways to engage students in discussions with students different from themselves, about their outside pressures and obligations, the multitude of benefits of becoming involved in organizations and attending presentations outside the classroom, and ways to stay mentally and physically well. They may wish to develop incentives to get students to attend campus events, including but not limited to sporting events, plays, musical and dance performances, lectures, poetry readings, and on-campus conferences and symposia.

Student Affairs is investigating an “outside the classroom curriculum.” This could be one avenue to increase participation and incentives for students to engage more on campus.

**High-Impact Practices**

By far the most positive responses we received relative to our peer institutions and Carnegie class come in the high-impact practices categories. We performed better than our peers in all areas, and much better than our peers in many categories.

- Our first year students engage in learning communities 18% more often than our peers, with 30% of students participating.
- 6% of first year students participated in research with faculty, which is 3% higher than our peers.
- 55% of first year students participated in service-learning, which is 5% higher than our peers.
- Senior students participate in culminating senior experiences 24% more often than those at peer institutions, and 19% more often than students at institutions within our Carnegie classification. 62% of students at UNK have participated in a culminating senior experience.
- 78% of senior students have had a course in which service-learning was a component. This is 15% higher than our peers.
- 23% of seniors have participated in research with faculty, which is 3% higher than those at our peer institutions and 4% higher than students at institutions within our Carnegie classification.
- 92% of seniors had participated in at least one high-impact practice, and 72% had participated in two or more. This is 15% higher than our peer institutions and 17% more than students at institutions within our Carnegie classification.
- The area in which we scored roughly the same as our peer institutions was study abroad. Only 11% of students reported studying abroad.

Should the university decide to set a goal of having every student participate in at least one high impact practice prior to graduation, it is within reach. One area of focus is “experiential learning,” which is our Higher Learning Commission-mandated Quality Initiative. The vision for this program is that every student will have a meaningful experience that develops skills valued by employers in students’ future careers. A large number of existing experiences would satisfy this requirement, including internships, research with faculty, study abroad, and culminating senior experiences.

It might be helpful to survey students to identify barriers to study abroad. Likely possibilities include cost, worry that they have to interrupt progress toward their degrees for a semester, lack of understanding of options available to them, and parent buy-in. There are a number of other possibilities, of course. Identification of our students’ barriers to studying abroad may help the university develop resources that would enhance students’ interest and participation in study abroad.

**Academic Advising**

220 universities, including UNK, participated in a topical module which consisted of an additional set of questions regarding student experiences with academic advising.

First year students report experiences on par with other institutions that participated in this module across most
areas, with one exception. Students were asked how often academic advisors have reached out to them about their academic progress or performance. Our students reported “often or very often” less frequently than those at other institutions in the cohort. 44% of students said “never.” 35% of students said “sometimes.” 15% of students said “often” and 7% said “very often.” These results lag behind our peers.

There is clearly room for more work on the part of first year advisors to reach out to students and ask how they’re doing academically throughout the year. This would also help improve students’ perceptions of UNK creating a supportive environment, particularly if advisors encouraged students to talk about their lives in a more holistic manner, reaching beyond classroom concerns. In other words, advisors could help students feel more supported by asking about obligations and activities outside the university, if they are attending on-campus events, getting involved in organizations, meeting new friends, etc.

First year students’ answers about the primary source of advice regarding their academic plans was surprising. 44% said their primary source of advice was the academic advisor assigned to them. 4% said an academic advisor available to any student, and 7% said faculty or staff not formally assigned as an advisor. 7% said an online advising system. 4% reported that they used the website, catalog, or other published sources. 17% said friends or other students were their primary source of advice regarding their academic plans. 15% said family members were their primary source of advice. Fully 32% of students are receiving their academic advice from someone other than a faculty member or official university sources. This result indicates that it would be worthwhile to reach out to parents and give them advice about how to respond to their students when they ask for academic information.

Senior students seek advice more frequently from official sources. 49% report that their primary source of advice was the academic advisor assigned to them, 1% was an academic advisor available to any student, and 16% was a faculty or staff member not formally assigned as an advisor. Only 10% reported friends or other students were their primary source of advice, and 7% cited family members as their primary source of advice.

It should also be noted that our senior students reported more positive results than other members of the cohort in the majority of questions regarding advising. Particularly positive was the question about to what extent your academic advisors have discussed your career interests and post-graduation plans.

34% of seniors report that academic advisors never reached out to them about their academic progress or performance. 35% report that advisors sometimes reached out, 22% report they do so “often,” and 9% said advisors reached out “very often.” This is slightly better than other cohort institutions. There is still room, even at the senior level, for advisors to approach students and ask them about their academic progress, their concerns and obligations outside the classroom, and their overall wellbeing.

**Honors Consortium**

UNK elected to join an Honors Consortium for purposes of the 2019 NSSE administration. All students were asked the same 12 questions, regardless of their honors affiliation at their respective institutions. Overall, our students appeared to give similar responses to others in the consortium for the majority of topics.

First year students reported that they spent less free time learning more about interesting topics discussed in classes, and that they were less interested in taking a course on a topic outside of their major area or comfort zone less often than their peers. They also discuss socio-political issues with family or friends slightly less often than others in the cohort. They are slightly less likely than others in the cohort to take a position they thought was correct or inventive event if they thought it might be challenged by a professor other person in authority. They report that their courses have delved deeply into complex issues less often than others in the cohort. First year students put less importance on earning a lot of money, and more importance on using their creativity to make artistic works or new contributions in a field than other students in the cohort. They place more importance at arriving at a personal understanding of the meaning and purpose of life than others. They get less exercise or physical activity than others in the cohort, but feel so depressed that it was difficult to function less often than others in the cohort. A greater percentage of students at UNK reported being in an honors program than other schools in the cohort.

Like first year students, senior students report discussing socio-political issues with family or friends less often than others in their cohort. They also are less interested in taking a course on a topic outside of their major area or comfort zone than other students. They also placed less importance on making a lot of money than those at other
institutions in the cohort. They feel their experiences at the university have increased their comfort with asking difficult questions or taking unconventional positions more often than others in the cohort. They report feeling so depressed it was difficult to function less often than others in the cohort, and felt mentally or emotionally exhausted less often than their peers in the cohort.

Only 33% of first year students voted in the November 2018 elections, despite the fact that only 5% of these students were too young or otherwise ineligible to do so at that time. This is significantly less than at other institutions within the cohort.

50% of senior students voted in the November 2018 elections. 3% were not old enough or otherwise ineligible to do so. This is also significantly less than at other institutions within the cohort.

UNK students in general report less interest in socio-political issues and in attending events that highlight social or political issues than their peers. It is possible that programming in these areas by faculty and staff could develop additional interest and comfort with these areas. Incentives to participation in these events may be helpful as well. Increased efforts in on-campus voter registration and education could have a big impact on the number of our students who vote in the presidential election next year.

Work, Volunteerism, and Caring for Dependents

50% of first year students work off campus, and 25% of students work on campus. The average time first-year students spend working for pay (either on or off campus) is 10.2 hours per week. This is higher than that of our peer institutions, which is 8.2 hours per week. 3% of first year students work more than 30 hours per week. 55% of first year students perform at least one hour of community service or volunteer work weekly, with the most common response (44%) that their time commitment is 1-5 hours per week.

20% of first year students report spending some time each week providing care for dependents (children, parents, etc.). 3% of first year students spend more than 30 hours per week caring for dependents.

36% of seniors work on campus, and 75% work off campus. 20% of seniors work more than 30 hours per week off campus. (More than 30 hours was the choice with the greatest frequency for seniors.) The average amount of time our senior students spend working is 20 hours per week, higher than that of our peer institutions, which is 17.3 hours per week.

56% of seniors report spending at least 1 hour doing community service or volunteer work weekly. Most of these seniors (43%) are spending from 1-5 hours per week volunteering.

31% of senior students report providing care for dependents at least one hour per week. 9% of seniors spend more than 30 hours per week caring for dependents.

Many of our students have significant responsibilities in their lives other than attending class and doing homework. The university may wish to consider increasing the number of classes taught at non-traditional course times (evenings and weekends) and online offerings to make it easier for working students and those caring for dependents to attend school. Additional scholarship funds and grants can reduce the financial burden on students working their way through school.

It is unclear how many of these students are involved in paid internships, but it would be helpful if the university could cultivate relationships with local and regional employers, government agencies, county offices, etc. and encourage them to provide paid internships so students get a double benefit from engaging in this high-impact practice. It might prevent some students from needing both an internship and a separate job to get through that final year of school.

Demographic Information

Among students who responded, the following apply:

- 11% of first year students and 14% of seniors plan to complete more than one major.
- 96% of first year students and 81% of seniors were full-time students in Spring 2019.
- 41% of first year students and 60% of seniors were taking at least one online class in Spring 2019. 3% of first year students and 15% of seniors were taking ALL classes online.
• 11% of first year students started college at an institution other than UNK. 1% started at a vocational or technical school, 12% started at a community or junior college, 13% started at a different 4-year college or university, and 5% reported they started at another type of institution.

• 32% of seniors started college at an institution other than UNK. 3% started at a vocational or technical school, 28% started at a community or junior college, 23% started at a different 4-year college or university, and 3% reported they started at another type of institution.

• 48% of first year students and 46% of seniors claim first-generation status. 5% of first year students and 8% of senior students have at least one parent who did not finish high school.

• 87% of first year students are 19 years of age or younger. Another 8% are aged 20-23. 4% are considered non-traditional students, who are 24 years of age or older.

• 78% of senior students are aged 20-23. The remainder are non-traditional students. 11% are aged 24-29, 7% are aged 30-39, 3% are age 40-55, and 1% are 55 or older.

• 6% of first year students identified as international students. 77% were from Asia, 9% were from Europe, 9% were from Latin America and the Caribbean, 5% were from the Middle East and North Africa.

• 3% of senior students identified as international students. 100% were from Asia.

• 22% of first year students and 20% of seniors were members of a Greek organization.

• 23% of first year students lived off campus, with 12% living farther than walking distance from campus. 84% of senior students lived off campus, with 47% living farther than walking distance from campus.

• 11% of first year students and 9% of seniors were student athletes.

• 0% of first year students and 3% of seniors were veterans of the US Armed Forces, Reserves, or National Guard.

• 8% of first year students indicated that they had been diagnosed with a disability or impairment. (3% preferred not to respond.) 48% of those students were diagnosed with a mental health disorder, 24% had a learning disability, 7% had a mobility impairment, 3% had a sensory impairment (vision or hearing), and 34% had a disability not specified in the question.

• 13% of senior students indicated they had been diagnosed with a disability or impairment (1% preferred not to respond.) 56% of those students had a mental health disorder, 33% had a learning disability, 15% had a sensory impairment (hearing or vision), 3% had a mobility impairment, and 19% had a disability or impairment not specified in the question.

• 12% of first year students identified as LGBTQ, with 3% preferring not to respond. 9% of seniors identified as LGBTQ, with 2% preferring not to respond.

• Our respondents were overwhelmingly female (72% first year and 70% senior). This does not accurately reflect the student body demographics. The actual population of first year students is 58% female, and of senior students is 61% female.
Executive Summary of 2019 Results from the National Survey of Student Engagement
Beth Hinga, Assistant to the Senior Vice Chancellor
September 2019

1. We still excel at high-impact practices.
   - Many more of our students are participating in high-impact practices than students at our peer institutions. High-impact practices include learning communities, research with faculty members, service-learning, culminating senior experiences, and study abroad. We far surpassed our peers in all areas except study abroad.

2. Students at all levels struggle in the area of Learning Strategies.
   - It would be helpful for all who provide academic support to students to give students information about practices that enhance learning.
   - Providing support to faculty in innovative, engaging, and effective teaching practices that enhance learning would also be helpful, perhaps through a Teaching and Learning Center with a director whose expertise is in the science of learning and effective teaching pedagogy.

3. Quantitative reasoning is an area of weakness.
   - Students are either not encountering the need for quantitative analysis or they do not feel comfortable with the practice. This can be addressed not only in math and statistics classes, but also in any class or research project with faculty in which students are asked to analyze and interpret numerical data.

4. Our students scored significantly behind their peers in questions about how often they had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than their own, and with people from an economic background other than their own.
   - Students need guidance and incentive from faculty and staff to interact with students from different races and ethnicities. They are not moving outside their own cliques and silos on their own.
   - The university would also do well to redouble its efforts to recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff from underrepresented ethnic groups. 72% of the first year student population identifies as white, and 80% of the senior class identifies as white. From the first year to the senior year, we lost approximately 75% of our black/African-American students, 42% of our international students, and 8% of our Hispanic/Latino students. We are losing our diverse voices that enhance and enrich our campus. A recent diversity survey has a number of recommendations that would be helpful in both recruiting and retaining students, faculty, and staff from diverse ethnic backgrounds.

5. First year students struggle to find a supportive environment on campus.
   - Specifically, they do not feel the university encourages: contact among students from different backgrounds (-11 points), attending campus activities and events (-8 points), providing opportunities to be involved socially (-6 points), attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues (-6 points), helping them manage non-academic responsibilities such as work and family (-5 points), and providing support for their overall wellbeing (-3 points). Senior students also struggle in most of these areas.
   - Faculty and staff need to get creative about ways to engage students in discussions with students different from themselves, about their outside pressures and obligations and ways to handle those stressors, the multitude of benefits of becoming involved in organizations and attending performances and presentations outside the classroom, and ways to stay mentally and physically well.
   - Student affairs is investigating an “outside the classroom” curriculum, which could be one avenue to increase participation and incentives for students to engage more on campus.
6. First year students report that they are less happy (-5 points) with advising than students at our peer institutions.
- 44% of first year students said an advisor never reached out to them to ask about their academic progress or performance. 35% of students said “sometimes,” 15% said “often,” and 7% said “very often.”
- There is clearly room for more work on the part advisors working with first year students to reach out and ask how they’re doing academically throughout the year. This would have the added benefit of helping students feel more supported. Toward this end, advisors could also have conversations with students about how they’re handling their obligations and activities outside the university, if they’re attending on-campus events, getting involved in organizations, and meeting new friends.

7. Seniors students are more happy (+10 points) with advising than their students at our peer institutions. This is a 15 point shift from the freshman year to the senior year.
- Seniors report more often than their peers that advisors have talked with them about career interests and post-graduation plans. However, 34% of seniors report academic advisors never reached out to them to talk about their academic progress or performance.

8. 32% of first year students and 17% of seniors report that their main source of advice regarding academic decisions is a friend or family member rather than official university resources.

9. Only 33% of first year students voted in the November 2018 elections despite the fact that only 5% of this population was too young or otherwise ineligible to do so. 50% of senior students voted in the November 2018 elections, and only 3% were not old enough or otherwise ineligible.

10. Our students work more than their peers.
- 25% of first year students work on campus and 50% work off campus. The average time spent working for pay is 10.2 hours per week.
- 36% of seniors work on campus and 75% work off campus. The average time spent working for pay is 20 hours per week. 20% of seniors work more than 30 hours per week off campus.
- Many of our students have significant responsibilities in their lives other than attending class and doing homework. The university may wish to consider increasing the number of classes taught at non-traditional times and the offerings of online classes to help students who work and care for dependents to attend school. Cultivating relationships with local and regional employers and encouraging them to provide paid internships to our students could alleviate the need for both an internships and separate job to get through that final year of school.

**Demographic information of interest**

32% of seniors started college at an institution other than UNK. Transfer students are a significant component of our population.

22% of first year students and 20% of seniors were members of a Greek organization.

8% of first year students indicated they had been diagnosed with a disability or impairment.
- 48% were diagnosed with a mental health disorder
- 24% had a learning disability
- 7% had a mobility impairment
- 3% had a sensory impairment (vision or hearing)
- 34% had a disability not specified in the question.
13% of senior students indicated they had been diagnosed with a disability or impairment.  
56% were diagnosed with a mental health disorder  
33% had a learning disability  
15% had a sensory impairment (hearing or vision)  
3% had a mobility impairment  
19% had a disability not specified in the question

12% of first year students and 9% of seniors identified as LGBTQ.

4% of first year students are older than age 23.  
11% of seniors are between ages 24-29, and 11% are aged 30 years or older.

48% of first year students and 46% of seniors claim first-generation status. 5% of first year students and 8% of senior students have at least one parent who did not finish high school.
UNL Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee
Addressing the AAUP Censure

Recommended Board of Regents Bylaw Changes

Summary of Changes

Section 3.4.4
The first change is to section 3.4.4 which addresses the Assignment of Duties. Currently, bargaining agreements at UNK and UNO stipulate that assignment of duties are to be in consultation with the faculty. That process would now be uniform for all campuses.

Section 4.6
The committee is proposing a minor wording change to limit the sources to be used in faculty evaluation.

Section 4.7
This section is a completely new section to the Bylaws. The purpose of this section is to define sanctions, suspensions (immediate and regular suspensions), suspensions that are terminations, and terminations. It also points the reader to the appropriate process for dealing with each of the situations, such as filing a grievance, initiating a professional conduct complaint, or termination proceedings.

Section 4.8
This section is a completely new section to the Bylaws. The purpose of this section is to explain the appropriate process for dealing with Immediate Suspensions. Essentially, Immediate Suspensions can be imposed immediately but last no longer than 90 calendar days. If a mutual settlement cannot be reached between the professional staff member and the administrative officer, then the chair of an informal faculty committee (on UNL’s campus this would be the ARRC) must be contacted by the administrative officer prior to or within two calendar days of an immediate suspension to review each of the following, as applicable: a briefing from the appropriate threat assessments review team, claims of serious disruptions to University operations, and/or suspension through end of contract. The committee is to be notified by the administrative officer if the contract will expire within 90 calendar days. Finally, the committee is charged with either validating the immediate suspension or rejecting it, in which latter case the administration should pursue the suspension through a formal hearing. The principles found in this section originate from section 5 of the AAUP’s “Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure”.

Sections 4.9 and 4.10
There are no changes to these sections other than sectional references.

Sections 4.11 and 4.12
These sections are essentially not changed with the exception of clarifying that Faculty Practice Appointments are separate from Faculty Research Appointments, and updating sectional references. This would also require a change to 4.4.8 not included in these recommendations.
Sections 4.13 through 4.16
There are no changes to these sections other than sectional references.

Section 4.17
This section deals with the Academic Freedom Committee. On the UNL campus this is the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee (ARRC). The only changes other than sectional references are to 4.17.2(i) where the reader is reminded of sections 4.7 and 4.8 in regard to immediate suspensions, and a change to the burden of proof.

Section 4.18
This section deals with the Professional Conduct (PC) Committee. On the UNL campus this is the ARRC. Since the PC Committee will be used for imposing a suspension or other major sanction on a professional staff member, we made several changes to this section to specify and strengthen the procedural standards for PC Committee. For example, the professional staff member has the right to hear the charge against them and respond to it. The PC Committee will hold a hearing whereby documentary evidence is presented and witnesses testify under oath. Witnesses can be cross-examined and rebuttal evidence is allowed. Also, the burden of proof rests with the complainant and will be satisfied by the greater weight of the evidence.

Section 4.19 and 4.20
These sections have no changes.

Recommended Bylaw Changes

3.4.4 Assignment of Duties. The service and teaching obligations for each full-time member of the instructional staff in any semester shall consist of such amounts of one or more of the types of services necessary for a successful University program, including teaching, research, directing and supervising research, advising or counseling, committee assignments, administrative duties, field work, extension activities, and other miscellaneous assignments as may be deemed reasonable in each instance by the department chair, and Dean or director concerned, within standards approved by the Chancellor, the President, and the Board, and after appropriate consultation with the instructional staff member.

Members of the instructional staff other than those appointed primarily for research may be relieved of all or part of their teaching obligations for one or more semesters to pursue a program of research, if recommended by the appropriate research council, where established, and the Chancellor and the President, and approved by the Board. An instructional staff member who is relieved of all teaching obligations for one or more semesters to pursue a program of research shall be expected, as a rule, to resume regular teaching obligations after completion of the assigned program. Employment by the University of members of the staff who are in the academic-year service class for non-instructional work during the summer vacation period shall be governed by the following:

(a) Such employment shall be limited to not more than three months.

(b) The monthly rate of remuneration for such employment shall not exceed one-ninth of the staff member’s full-time remuneration during the preceding academic year.
(c) Vacation for such employment shall be earned at the rate of two days per month, and cannot be carried beyond the summer period in which it is earned.

History: Amended, 43 BRUN 168-169 (28 July 1979)
Amended, 42 BRUN 152 (10 November 1978)

4.6 Evaluation of Faculty Performance: Procedure. Each major administrative unit, or appropriate subdivision thereof as stated in Section 4.5 (Standards for Promotion, Continuous Appointment, and Salary Adjustment) of these Bylaws, shall establish procedures for gathering relevant information from all appropriate sources, including student evaluations and peer judgments, as part of an annual review of faculty performance in relation to the standards established under Section 4.5. Individual faculty members shall have the opportunity to submit materials deemed relevant to their remuneration and status as a part of the annual review, or as such information becomes available. When appropriate, the judgment of others in each faculty member’s specialized field of competence may be included in a review. Faculty members shall have access to all material submitted for their evaluation and the opportunity to respond in writing.

The annual review shall be considered in determining merit salary adjustments, promotions, and for awarding Continuous Appointment. The results of the review will be communicated to the individual faculty member.

4.7 Sanctions, Suspensions, and/or Termination of a Professional Staff Member: Definition.

§ Suspension. Any involuntary removal of a member of the professional staff from some or all of said member’s duties constitutes a suspension. A suspension through the end of a contract or one that is indefinite is a termination. If a suspension is imposed, salary will continue during any period of suspension and an assignment to other duties shall not diminish a professional staff member’s salary.

(1) Immediate Suspension. A suspension where the administrative officer has reason to believe that immediate removal or reassignment of duties is necessary because:

(a) the professional staff member’s presence in the workplace presents a clear and present danger of physical harm being incurred to the professional staff member, to others within the workplace or to University property or facilities as determined by the University threat assessment team, or

(b) an investigation that could result in the imposition of a sanction or other remedial action has been or is being initiated into whether the professional staff member has violated University policy and the leave is necessary during the investigation in order to protect University resources, prevent the destruction of evidence, or avoid a continuing violation of the policy.

Alleged conduct that could give rise to an immediate suspension includes, without limitation:

(a) threats of death or physical harm against a professional staff member, self or others.
(b) research misconduct by a professional staff member;
(c) misappropriation of institutional or grant funds or monies by a professional staff member;
(d) behavior by a professional staff member towards a student, colleague or others that can be reasonably construed as threatening, menacing, or bullying;
(e) inappropriate sexual behavior, including sexual harassment, unwelcomed sexual touching or sexual assault, by a professional staff member against a student, colleague or others; or
(f) conduct related to the professional staff member’s assigned duties that could lead to the filing of felony criminal charges against a professional staff member.

Immediate suspensions can last no longer than 90 calendar days. After 90 calendar days the professional staff member must be reinstated, unless formal proceedings have been filed against the professional staff member as specified in sections 4.17 (Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee) or 4.18 (Professional Conduct Committee) of these Bylaws or a second review of the committee specified in 4.8 (2) (Procedures for Immediate Suspension of a Professional Staff Member) of these Bylaws has determined that harm or disruption still remains, in which case the suspension may continue pending the conclusion of those proceedings.

(2) Suspension. All suspensions that are not classifiable as Immediate Suspensions are Suspensions. To impose a suspension on a professional staff member, the administration must file a complaint as specified in sections 4.17 (Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee) or 4.18 (Professional Conduct Committee) of these Bylaws.

Other Major Sanctions. Major sanctions other than suspension include but are not limited to demotion or salary reduction. The appropriate administrative officer will notify said professional staff member of the basis of the proposed major sanction and provide said member with an opportunity to persuade the administration that the proposed major sanction should not be imposed. The administration must file a complaint as specified in section 4.18 (Professional Conduct Committee) of these Bylaws to impose a major sanction on a professional staff member.

Other Sanctions. If the administration determines that the conduct of a professional staff member justifies imposition of a lesser sanction, such as a written reprimand, the administration will notify said professional staff member of the basis of the proposed sanction and provide said member with an opportunity to persuade the administration that the proposed sanction should be rescinded or not imposed. If the proposed sanction is imposed, then said professional staff member can file a complaint using procedures under sections 4.16 (Grievance Committee), 4.17 (Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee) or 4.18 (Professional Conduct Committee) of these Bylaws.

Termination. An appointment of a Professional Staff Member may be terminated prior to the expiration of the stated term, if applicable, only for adequate cause, in which case procedures in section 4.17 (b) (Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee) of these
Bylaws must be followed; retirement for disability; bona fide discontinuance of a program or department; or extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigency.

4.6 Procedures for Immediate Suspension of a Professional Staff Member. Before the imposition of an immediate suspension upon a professional staff member may occur, the following shall take place:

(1) Where possible, discussions between the professional staff member and appropriate administrative officer looking toward a mutual settlement; if no mutual settlement is attained, then;

(2) An informal inquiry by the duly elected faculty committee whose membership is separate from the committee outlined under sections 4.17 (Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee) and 4.18 (Professional Conduct Committee) of these bylaws.

Prior to or within two calendar days of an immediate suspension of a professional staff member, the administrative officer shall notify the chair of the appropriate elected faculty committee.

The faculty committee is charged to evaluate any claim made by an administrative officer as to whether an immediate suspension is warranted under the conditions stipulated in 4.7.1 (1) of these Bylaws. The committee shall ensure that less stringent action has been considered, protect against claims of arbitrary or capricious action, and ensure that the faculty member has been informed of their right to due process. The committee must decide within 10 business days after being notified of the imposed suspension whether to validate the immediate suspension or to rule that the suspension be pursued as a suspension or other sanction as referenced in section 4.7.1 of these Bylaws. Failure to rule on the immediate suspension within the stipulated timeframe will result in the justification for needing an immediate suspension being deemed valid. In the event that the administrative officer’s decision to continue an immediate suspension is at variance with the recommendations of the committee, the administrative officer shall detail the reasons in a written opinion, and copies shall be provided to the parties concerned and the committee.

In all cases, the administrative officer must notify the committee if the professional staff member’s contract will expire prior to the 90 day suspension limit. Accordingly, the committee must rule whether the suspension through end of contract is approved or whether formal termination proceedings are warranted.

Should the committee rule that a formal complaint is warranted, then;

(3) The appropriate administrative officer files a complaint under sections 4.17 (Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee) or 4.18 (Professional Conduct Committee) of these Bylaws, to include a statement of charges, framed with reasonable particularity by the appropriate administrative officer.

4.79g Termination of an Appointment by a Professional Staff Member: Time.
(1) A member of the professional staff (Section 3.1.1) employed on an academic-year basis may terminate his or her appointment at the end of an academic year, if he or she gives notice at the earliest opportunity and not later than the latest of the following:

(a) May 15, or

(b) Thirty days after receiving notification of the terms and conditions of appointment for the coming academic year.

(2) A member of the professional staff employed on other than an academic-year basis shall give notice at the earliest opportunity and in no case later than the latest of the following:

(a) Four months before the termination date of the appointment, or

(b) Thirty days after receiving notification of the terms and conditions of appointment for another term.

A member of the professional staff may properly request a waiver of the time requirements contained in this Section in case of hardship, or where he or she would otherwise be denied substantial professional advancement or other opportunity, but the member should abide by the decision on his or her request.

4.7.10 Termination of a "Special Appointment" Prior to Expiration of the Stated Term: Reasons; Rights of the Appointee. A "Special Appointment" may be terminated prior to the expiration of the stated term, or with less than 90 days’ notice by the University if no term is stated, only for adequate cause, retirement for age or disability, bona fide discontinuance of a program or department, or extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigency. The President or Chancellor, as appropriate, shall be empowered to approve appeal and grievance procedures that will insure to staff with respect to termination of their non-faculty special appointments the rights similar to those provided by Section 4.16.2 (Powers of Faculty Grievance Committee) and 4.147.2 (Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: Powers; Rules of Procedure) of these Bylaws to staff with respect to termination of faculty appointments.

History: Amended, 49 BRUN 300 (16 June 1984)  
Added, 42 BRUN 52-53 (29 July 1978)

4.118 Termination of an “Appointment for a Specific Term,” “Health Professions Faculty Appointment,” or “Faculty Practice Appointment,” and/or “Faculty Research Appointment” at Expiration of the Stated Term; Rights of the Appointee. When the University notifies a person holding an Appointment for a Specific Term, Health Professions Faculty Appointment, or Faculty Practice Appointment, and/or Faculty Research Appointment, that his or her appointment will not be renewed at the expiration of the term stated, the appointee shall:

(a) Have the opportunity to request a reconsideration by any individual or group making a recommendation or decision not to renew such an appointment and to offer evidence for that reconsideration.
(a) Have the right to petition the Grievance Committee, if one is established at his or her major administrative unit pursuant to Section 4.163.1 (Grievance Committee: Power to Create), and upon such petitioning shall have the rights provided by Section 4.163.2 (Powers of Faculty Grievance Committee).

History:
- Amended, 73 BRUN 46-48 (9 October 2015)
- Amended, 62 BRUN 14 (28 February 1998)
- Amended, 53 BRUN 150-151 (6 May 1988)

4.12 Termination of an “Appointment for a Specific Term,” “Health Professions Faculty Appointment,” or “Faculty Practice Appointment,” and or “Faculty Research Appointment” Prior to Expiration of the Stated Term: Reasons; Rights of the Appointee. An Appointment for a Specific Term, Health Professions Faculty Appointment, or Faculty Practice Appointment, or and Faculty Research Appointment may be terminated prior to the expiration of its term only for the reasons stated in Section 4.141 (Termination of a Continuous Appointment: Grounds), and before such termination the appointee shall have the rights specified in Section 4.174.2 (Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: Powers; Rules of Procedure).

History:
- Amended, 73 BRUN 46-48 (9 October 2015)
- Amended, 53 BRUN 151 (6 May 1988)

4.13 Total Period of Service Prior to a "Continuous Appointment." The total period of full-time service on an Appointment for a Specific Term prior to acquisition of a Continuous Appointment shall not exceed seven years, including all previous tenure-related full-time service with the rank of instructor or higher in all accredited institutions of higher education.

For faculty members with three or more years of previous tenure-related full-time service with the rank of instructor or higher at accredited institutions of higher education, a written agreement to an initial appointment for an Appointment for a Specific Term will not normally extend the period of service on an Appointment for a Specific Term at the University beyond four years before a Continuous Appointment is acquired, and in no case shall such agreement extend the period of service on an Appointment for a Specific Term at the University beyond seven years before a Continuous Appointment is acquired. The President may provide an adjustment of a faculty member’s appointment where full-time service by the faculty member is interrupted by leave of absence due to maternity, disability or family and medical leave. Unless a contrary agreement is reached at the time the leave of absence is granted, time spent on an academic leave of absence shall be included in the period of service. A Continuous Appointment may be granted earlier, but not later, than the time limits specified in this Section. A person who is eligible under Section 4.4.3 (Continuous Appointment) but not granted a Continuous Appointment in accordance with the time limits in this Section shall be given a Notice of Termination, but such notice shall comply with Section 4.4.2 (Appointments for a Specific Term).

History:
- Amended, 75 BRUN 4 and 13 (25 January 2018)
- Amended, 62 BRUN 14 (28 February 1998)
- Amended, 44 BRUN 137 (15 March 1980)
- Amended, 42 BRUN 53 (29 July 1978)
- Amended, 40 BRUN 3 (20 November 1976)
4.141 Termination of a Continuous Appointment: Grounds. A Continuous Appointment may be terminated only for adequate cause, retirement for age or disability, bona fide discontinuance of a program or department, or extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigency. Before any termination for cause may occur, it shall be necessary to submit the matter to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee in the manner provided in Section 4.174.2 (Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: Powers; Rules of Procedure).

4.152 Termination of Appointments for Financial Exigency or Because of Discontinuance of a Program or Department: Time. When any type of appointment is terminated because of financial exigency or discontinuance of a program or department, whether the termination is effective on or before the date stated for termination in the written appointment contract, the University shall give notice of termination as soon as possible, and shall make reasonable efforts to notify persons twelve (12) months prior to the effective date of termination. In such a case the released faculty member’s place will not be filled by a replacement within a period of two years unless the released faculty member has been offered reappointment and a reasonable time within which to accept or decline it.

4.163 Grievance Committee.

4.163.1 Grievance Committee: Power to Create. Pursuant to authority granted by these Bylaws, the faculty governing agency of each major administrative unit is empowered to create a Faculty Grievance Committee, which shall have the powers specified in Section 4.136.2 (Powers of Faculty Grievance Committee), in addition to any other powers granted by the faculty governing agency pursuant to these Bylaws.

4.163.22 Powers of Faculty Grievance Committee. Any Faculty Grievance Committee established under Section 4.163.1 shall be empowered:

(a) To consider a complaint filed by any faculty member alleging any grievance;

(b) To seek to settle the grievance by informal methods of adjustment and settlement, either itself or by using the services of any officer or body directed to settle grievances and disputes by mediation, conciliation, or other informal methods;

(c) To draft rules of procedure for the orderly and fair handling of grievances by the Committee, which rules shall become effective after notice and hearing when approved or modified by the Board, and, upon approval, shall be effective as a part of the Rules of the Board; and

(d) To proceed, if informal methods fail to resolve the matter satisfactorily, with further proceedings, to be conducted in accordance with the Rules of Procedure approved by the Board under this Section, and in accordance with the following principles:

(1) If the grievance alleges that inadequate consideration was given to relevant matters by the person or body that took the action or made the decision that led to the grievance, the Grievance Committee shall investigate the facts, and, if convinced that inadequate consideration of the relevant matters occurred, state the facts found and the respects in which the consideration was inadequate. The Committee may order the matter reconsidered by the appropriate person, group
or groups, or recommend that other rectifying action be taken. The Grievance Committee shall not substitute its judgment on the merits for that of the person, group, or groups that previously considered the decision.

(2) If the grievance alleges that a discontinuance of a department or program is not bona fide, or that no extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigency exist, the Committee shall investigate and state its factual findings, conclusions, and recommendations in writing, which shall be filed with the Chancellor of the major administrative unit involved, the complainant, and the faculty governing agency.

4.147 Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee

4.147.1 Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: Creation. The faculty governing agency of each major administrative unit shall create an elected faculty Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, which shall have the powers specified in these Bylaws, and any other powers granted by the faculty governing agency and approved by the Board.

(a) The Committee shall consider any complaint filed by any member of the professional staff alleging any procedural or substantive grievance that constitutes an allegation that action taken, or threatened, violates the complainant's academic freedom or academic tenure.

(b) The Committee shall consider any complaint filed against any member of the faculty seeking to terminate his or her Continuous Appointment, his or her Appointment for a Specific Term prior to the termination date stated in the appointment, or his or her Special Appointment as a faculty member prior to its termination date, or his or her Health Professions Faculty Appointment, or his or her Faculty Practice and Faculty Research Appointment prior to the end of its stated term.

(1) The Board, or the President, shall have the authority to direct that proceedings under this subsection be instituted in the manner herein provided.

(2) Any Chancellor, Dean, director, or department chair, any Grievance Committee, or Professional Conduct Committee believing that there is reasonable cause to terminate a Continuous Appointment, an Appointment for a Specific Term, Health Professions Faculty Appointment, or a Faculty Practice and Faculty Research Appointment prior to the end of its stated term, shall certify his, her or its conclusion to that effect to the President, who shall determine if the complaint has sufficient merit to warrant investigation.

(i) In cases where the grounds for termination of a Continuous Appointment or an Appointment for a Specific Term are based in whole or in part on questions of professional competence, no such certification
shall be made until the tenured members of the faculty member's school, division or department, or college in the absence of smaller units, have been consulted on the issues involving professional competence. Such consultation shall be effected through the appropriate administrator (department chair, school or division director, or dean) calling on fourteen (14) days' notice a meeting of the tenured faculty of the unit for the specific purpose of discussing the faculty member's professional competence. Votes on substantive matters relating to the faculty member's professional competence shall be by secret ballot. The report of such meeting, in the form of approved minutes containing a summary of the matters discussed and the votes taken, shall be forwarded by the administrator to the Chancellor for transmission to the President.

(ii) In cases where the grounds for termination of a UNMC Health Professions Faculty Appointment, or a UNL Faculty Practice and Faculty Research Appointment are based in whole or in part on questions of professional competence, no such certification shall be made until the faculty holding such a UNMC or UNL appointment who have received at least one promotion in academic rank while holding such an appointment and the tenured members of the faculty member’s school, division or department, or college in the absence of small units, have been consulted on the issues involving professional competence. Such consultation shall be effected through the appropriate administrator (department chair, school or division director, or dean) calling on fourteen (14) days' notice a meeting of the eligible consulting faculty of the unit for the specific purpose of discussing the faculty member’s professional competence. Votes on substantive matters relating to the faculty member’s professional competence shall be by secret ballot. The report of such meeting, in the form of approved minutes containing a summary of the matters discussed and the votes taken, shall be forwarded by the administrator to the Chancellor for transmission to the President.

(3) If the Board or President has determined that an investigation should be made, the President shall employ an attorney to make the investigation and report to the President if he or she believes reasonable cause exists for termination of the appointment. Investigation shall be made in such manner as the attorney so employed determines to be appropriate, but shall not involve a public hearing and shall be conducted on as confidential a basis as possible. The investigator shall prepare a report of the investigation and provide it to the President. The President shall provide a copy of said report to the Chancellor of the administrative unit involved. The report shall be considered a confidential communication. If the report recommends that no basis exists for terminating the appointment, and the Board accepts said report, no further proceedings shall be had with reference to terminating the appointment. If the Board does not accept said report, it may cause such further investigation to be made by such persons and in such manner as it deems appropriate and consistent with these Bylaws. If the report recommends that there is reasonable cause to terminate the appointment, the President or the Board may order the attorney making the report to file a complaint with the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee,
and to take the affirmative with respect to producing evidence to support the
complaint.

(c) The procedure with reference to complaints filed under paragraphs (a), (b), (b) (1),
Section 4.147.2 [Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee: Powers; Rules of
Procedure] shall be conducted in accordance with the following principles:

(1) The complaint must be filed with the Committee and copy thereof served
upon the person or persons charged in the complaint.

(2) The complaint shall state in concise terms the facts upon which it is based
and the relief sought.

(3) The person(s) so charged shall have a period of twenty (20) days from the date
of service of the complaint to file an answer in writing to the complaint. Copy of
the answer must be served by such person(s) upon the attorney filing the
complaint by regular United States mail with sufficient postage attached, properly
addressed to said attorney, and mailed on or before twenty (20) days after filing
the complaint.

(4) The Committee shall set the matter for hearing on as early a date as possible
in order to permit the parties to reasonably prepare for the hearing.

(5) The person(s) charged shall be entitled to be represented by counsel at the
expense of such person(s).

(6) The person(s) charged shall be entitled to be notified at least ten (10) days in
advance of the hearing of the witnesses to be called by the attorney filing the
complaint and of documents to be offered in evidence at the hearing, and the
attorney conducting the hearing shall be obligated to provide such information
within that time. The person(s) charged shall notify the attorney filing the
complaint in writing at least five (5) days before the hearing of the witnesses to
be called and documents to be offered in evidence at the hearing. No witnesses
or documents not so listed shall be heard or received at the hearing, except in
cases of surprise, or for the purpose of rebutting oral testimony of the other party,
or for other justifiable cause found to exist by the Committee.

(7) Testimony shall be taken under oath. Every party shall have the right of
cross-examination of witnesses who testify and shall have the right to submit
rebuttal evidence.

(8) The Committee may admit and give probative effect to evidence which
possesses probative value commonly accepted by reasonably prudent persons in
the conduct of their affairs. It may exclude incompetent, irrelevant, immaterial,
and unduly repetitious evidence; provided, that any party may file with the
Committee at least three (3) days before the hearing a written request that the
rules of evidence followed by the District Courts in the State of Nebraska shall be
applicable. If such a written request is filed, the Committee shall notify the parties
that the proceedings shall comply with the principles of law with respect
to proceedings in the District Courts in Nebraska, and all counsel and parties shall be bound by such rules and standards of ethics and codes of trial conduct as are applied in the District Courts.

(9) In the event any party to the proceedings desires the issuance of a subpoena, such subpoena shall be issued at the direction of the Corporation Secretary, and may be served in the manner provided for subpoenas in the Nebraska Court Rules of Discovery.

(d) The Committee shall draft rules or procedures not inconsistent with these Bylaws for the prompt, orderly and fair hearing of all complaints filed with the Committee. Said rules shall be submitted to the Board, and when approved or modified, after notice and hearing, shall constitute a part of the Rules of the Board.

(e) The Committee shall submit to the Board the complete verbatim account of the hearing and all exhibits filed with the Committee, and report promptly to the Board and the staff member involved the Committee’s findings, conclusions, and recommended action that the Committee deems advisable.

(f) The Board has power to make the final decision, but except as herein provided, the Board shall decide upon the basis of the evidence submitted to the Committee and the report of the Committee. Unless clearly erroneous, the findings of fact made by the Committee shall be accepted. The Board shall give the Committee’s findings and conclusions due consideration, and shall take into account the fact that the Committee is a representative committee of the faculty and had the opportunity to see and hear the witnesses who testified personally before the Committee. In the event that the Board’s decision is at variance with the recommendations of the Committee, the Board shall detail the reasons in a written opinion, and copies shall be provided to the parties concerned and the Committee. Once the Board has rendered its decision, the matter shall not be subject to further review except by appropriate court proceedings.

(g) The Board on its own motion may receive additional evidence at a public hearing, after notice to interested parties, in any case where the Board in its discretion determines that justice requires such further hearing before the Board. Any person desiring to present additional evidence to the Board may apply to the Board for hearing before the Board. Before any such hearing is granted, showing shall be required that there is additional relevant evidence that has been discovered, or has developed, or which could not be produced at the prior hearing; that the same was not available at the prior hearing and could not have been discovered or produced by reasonable diligence.

(h) In all proceedings before the Committee in which the termination of a Continuous Appointment, the termination of an Appointment for a Specific Term prior to its stated termination date, the termination of a Special Appointment as a faculty member prior to its termination date, or the termination of a Health Professions Faculty Appointment or a Faculty Practice Appointment and Faculty Research Appointment prior to its stated termination date are in issue, the burden of proof rests with the University, and will be satisfied by the shall have the burden of proving adequate cause for the termination by the greater weight of the evidence in the record considered as a whole.
(i) Prior to a decision by the Board, the staff member involved shall not be suspended from his or her duties or assigned other duties unless an Immediate Suspension is warranted. If an Immediate Suspension is to be imposed prior to a termination proceeding, the procedure outlined in section 4.8 (Procedures for Immediate Suspensions upon a Professional Staff Member) of these Bylaws must be followed in accordance with the conditions stipulated in section 4.7.1 (1) (Immediate Suspension) immediate harm to himself or herself, others or property is threatened by his or her. Salary will continue during any period of suspension and an assignment to other duties shall not diminish a staff member’s salary.

(j) The Committee shall have power to consider a request filed by any person, board or committee that alleges that a staff member should be subjected to sanctions less severe than appointment termination, and power to recommend in any case sanctions less severe than appointment termination where less severe sanctions seem appropriate.

History:
Amended, 73 BRUN 46-48 (9 October 2015)
Amended, 70 BRUN 47-48 (8 December 2011)
Amended, 53 BRUN 151-154 (6 May 1988)
Amended, 53 BRUN 80 (12 December 1987)
Amended, 49 BRUN 300 (16 June 1984)
Amended, 42 BRUN 53-54 (29 July 1978)

4.15 Professional Conduct Committee.

1 Professional Conduct Committee: Power to Create. Pursuant to power granted by these Bylaws, the faculty governing agency of each major administrative unit is empowered to create a Professional Conduct Committee, which shall have the functions and powers specified in Sections 4.1518.2 (Powers and Procedures of Professional Conduct Committee) and 4.1518.3 (Function of Professional Conduct Committee), in addition to any other power granted by the faculty governing agency to the Committee pursuant to these Bylaws.

2 Powers and Procedures of Professional Conduct Committee. A Professional Conduct Committee shall be empowered:

(a) To receive complaints from any person charging a member of the professional staff, as defined in Section 3.1.1 (Professional Staff) of these Bylaws, with professional misconduct. This includes complaints filed by a University officer against a member of the professional staff seeking a suspension or other major sanction less than termination as described in sections 4.7 and 4.8 of these Bylaws. A copy of the complaint shall be served upon the person or persons charged in the complaint. The person(s) so charged shall answer in writing to the complaint, and a copy thereof served upon the person or persons filing the complaint.

(b) To investigate the facts relevant to the charge and to make factual determinations, to interpret standards of professional conduct applicable to members of the professional staff, and to apply those standards to the facts. Said investigation shall include reviewing documentary evidence and witness testimony from or on behalf of all parties involved in the complaint. The Committee shall set the matter for a hearing as early as possible.
Testimony shall be taken under oath. Every party shall have the right of cross-examination of witnesses who testify and shall have the right to submit rebuttal evidence. When the complainant is a University officer, the Committee shall arrange for a verbatim account of the hearing and archive all exhibits filed with the Committee. All parties shall be entitled to be represented by counsel at their own expense. The hearing will not be bound by strict rules of legal evidence and may admit any evidence that is of probative value in determining the issues involved, advising the affected party of the charge, hearing his or her response, and considering any evidence produced by such party.

(c) To conclude decide whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that the person against whom the charge is directed committed acts that amount to professional misconduct. In cases brought to Committee, the burden of proof rests with the complainant and will be satisfied by the greater weight of the evidence in the record considered as a whole.

(d) To advise the person filing the charge all parties, and any other appropriate person or groups, of the Committee's conclusion and factual findings.

(e) To recommend to the appropriate University officer, or group, whether action should be taken with respect to the charge, and the nature of such action.

(f) To recommend sanctions less severe than appointment termination where the Committee judges less severe sanctions appropriate.

(g) The Committee shall draft rules or procedures not inconsistent with these Bylaws for the prompt, orderly and fair hearing of all complaints filed with the Committee. Said rules shall be submitted to the Board, and when approved or modified, after notice and hearing, shall constitute a part of the Rules of the Board.

3 Function of Professional Conduct Committee. The Professional Conduct Committee's function shall be to ascertain facts, to interpret standards of professional conduct applicable to persons engaged in teaching, extension work, research, service, and administration at the University, to apply those standards to the facts, to advise other persons or groups whether a violation of professional conduct has occurred, and to recommend an appropriate sanction, if it concludes a violation has occurred. The Professional Conduct Committee does not have power to impose sanctions, and its findings of fact, interpretations of professional standards, advice, and recommendation are not binding. The Professional Conduct Committee shall not serve as a prosecutor of cases involving alleged violations of professional standards. The Committee acts only in an advisory capacity. An appropriate University officer has the power to make the final decision on sanctions, but the University officer shall decide upon the basis of the evidence submitted to the Committee and the report of the Committee. Unless clearly erroneous, findings of fact made by the Committee shall be accepted. The University officer shall give the Committee's findings and conclusions due consideration. In the event that the University officer's decision is at variance with the recommendations of the Committee, the University Officer shall detail the reasons in a written opinion, and copies shall be provided to the parties concerned and to the Committee.
4.196 “Extraordinary Circumstances Because of Financial Exigencies” and “Financial Exigency” Defined. As used in Chapter IV of these Bylaws the term "extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies" or the term "financial exigency" shall mean a bona fide, imminent financial crisis of such magnitude, caused by financial circumstances beyond the control of the Board of Regents, that within a particular major administrative unit (campus) as a whole normal operations cannot be maintained and programs of the major administrative unit must therefore be significantly altered.

**History:** Added, 53 BRUN 80 (12 December 1987)

4.1207 Declaration of a Financial Exigency. A state of financial exigency may only be found and declared by the Board of Regents upon the recommendation of the President in accordance with policy established by the Board for declaration of a state of financial exigency.

**History:** Added, 53 BRUN 80 (12 December 1987)