Faculty Welfare Committee  
Copeland Hall 203 G  
University of Nebraska Kearney

Minutes  
28 Feb. 2014 – 3:30 p.m.

Present: Jeremy Dillon (Chair); William Wozniak; David Palmer; Ronald Wirtz; Ting-Lan Chen; Kimberly Carlson  
Absent: Tommy Hansen

The meeting was called to order at 3:33 p.m.

Dillon asked if any particular survey was better than others as an example. It was generally agreed that the survey from Appalachian State University would be a good model. Chen noted that it would be preferable not to single out the chancellor or any other administrators by name or title.

Wozniak suggested replacing chancellor by “local administration.” He noted that persons taking the survey would be able to mention any individuals they wished in open ended questions. After discussion, was decided to use “UNK administration”.

Palmer suggested adding a question including “best interest of the students,” suggesting that it might read: “UNK Administration is concerned with the best interest of the students.” This would be a parallel construction to “UNK Administration is looking out for the best interests of the faculty,” as suggested by the ASU survey.

In discussion concerning the adequacy of the library collection, it was the consensus of the group that there did not seem to be significant problems with the library collection. However, Wirtz noted that it might not be good to leave out the question about the “collection being adequate to support my teaching goals,” since an assessment of faculty opinion might be enlightening.

Carlson stated it was good to include the questions regarding adequacy of classroom for the support of teaching needs. She noted that problems in obtaining adequate classroom space had occurred, and that technology used for teaching and technical support was a problem at times.

Wozniak suggested placing question regarding the number of committees in the demographics section, i.e., “On how many committees, councils and task forces do you serve?” Following discussion, it was decided to include this question in the main question section, but to reword to: “In general, participation on committees, councils and task forces is valued”

Wozniak suggested adding: “Recognition and rewards for teaching are satisfactory” after the question referring to “rewards for research and creative activities.”
Although included in the ASU questionnaire, the committee decided to delete the question regarding the distribution of salaries by department chairs, since that was not applicable on the UNK campus.

The committee decided that questions regarding Deans should be included in the survey. Wirtz suggested these should parallel the questions referring to Department Chairs in the ASU questionnaire. Palmer asked if Grad Program chairs should also be included, but consensus was reached that it would not be necessary.

However, it was decided to add a question such as: “My college dean / department chair is fair in the distribution of summer teaching assignments.”

Discussion then moved to any open-ended questions that might be included in the survey. There was consensus on the addition of a question that would ask: “Outside of those items previously covered, is there anything else that negatively impacts your morale?”

In other discussion, it was suggested that a five-point scale could be used for ranking specific criteria for administrators, as was done in the questionnaire from James Madison University.

Carlson suggested adding a number of other questions to the section with five-point ranking, including items such as:

- “Teaching expectations are clear.”
- “Research expectations are clear.”
- “Service expectations are clear.”

Other suggestions for inclusion in the 5-point scale section:

- “The relative importance of teaching, scholarship and service is clearly defined at all levels.”
- “The UNK Administration, Chair, Dean understands the relative importance of teaching, scholarship and service.
- “UNK should eliminate the current system of distribution of raises in favor of merit pay.”

Carlson and Wozniak noted that the questions selected thus far were a good start, but that would not like to add others since that would adversely affect the response rate.

Dillon volunteered to compile the selected questions and send out to the Committee for review and approval. The group agreed that it might be necessary to revise and/or remove some of them, since there were over 50 questions at this point.

Wozniak also volunteered to format the questions for the rating scale section. Dillon stated that he would prefer to use a 5-point scale throughout for the sake of uniformity.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:36 p.m.