

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Bradford, Lindquist, Fech, Franti, McCollough, Prochaska-Cue, Rapkin, Zimmers

Absent: Hachtmann, Jackson, LaCost, Schubert

Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2008

Location: Faculty Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

Note: These are not verbatim minutes. They are a summary of the discussions at the Executive Committee meeting as corrected by those participating.

1.0 Call to Order

Prochaska-Cue called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Affirmative Action Initiative

Griffin reported that Danielle Nantkes from Nebraskans United will be speaking on the affirmative action initiative at the October 7th meeting. She noted that she has not heard back from Professor Schneiderjans yet to see if he will speak at the meeting on the initiative.

2.2 Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee

Bradford stated that anyone who wants the FCAC to address faculty salary issues should contact him (sbradford1@unl.edu). He noted that the FCAC will not be meeting for awhile but it would be good to know ahead of time what the issues are that need to be addressed.

3.0 Approval of 9/17/08 Minutes

Bradford moved and Zimmers seconded approval of the minutes as amended. The Committee approved the minutes.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Metrics of Success Measures

Prochaska-Cue noted that the Committee was scheduled to meet with the administrators but the Senate Office learned that they were attending the Deans and Directors retreat in Nebraska City. Bradford thought that the Bylaws state that the administrators are to meet with the Committee on a regular basis. Griffin stated that she will check the Bylaws.

Prochaska-Cue noted that she received an email message from Professor Peterson, Agricultural Economics, who was concerned about these measures. Prochaska-Cue asked the Committee if a special meeting should be set up with SVCAA Couture to

discuss these measures. Prochaska-Cue stated that it seems like every five years we get some kind of new set of measurements, and questioned why we need these measures.

Bradford wondered whether these metrics for success measures were the same thing as the quality indicators. Prochaska-Cue questioned where these measure are coming from, what input the faculty has had on them, who is setting them up, how decisions are being made, and how they are going to impact faculty members.

The Committee agreed that a special meeting with SCVAA Couture is needed.

4.2 Office of Research Policy on Misconduct

Prochaska-Cue noted that Jackson sent an email message to her stating that he recently spoke with Dan Vasgrid, Research Compliance Director, who, after reading the 9/10/08 Executive Committee minutes, believed the minutes did not convey the interaction he had with Professor Works on the drafting of the research policy. Prochaska-Cue noted that during the drafting of the policy (2005) Professor Works, while an Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee member, was not a member of the Senate and Dan Vasgrid was new to the university and may not have understood that the changes needed to go directly to the Senate. She noted that she was on the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee during this time and that full Committee never had the opportunity to review it.

Bradford suggested that Prochaska-Cue meet with the Chancellor to discuss this issue. Prochaska-Cue asked if the Committee should also meet with Dan Vasgrid and Associate Vice Chancellor Espy. The Committee agreed that they should be invited to a meeting.

McCullough pointed out that it should not be a big controversy to get the policy fixed. Bradford stated that the problem is that the policy is already being used against someone.

Lindquist questioned what the federal regulations were on misconduct and what the policy is based on. Prochaska-Cue stated that it was her understanding that the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Procedures for Professional Conduct B were written to comply with federal regulations.

McCullough asked what our role is as the Executive Committee. She asked if we are advocates for the faculty as a whole on this issue. Prochaska-Cue pointed out that if the case had gone through the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee the faculty would have had a role in the process. McCullough asked if the faculty has been cut out of the role in this process. Bradford stated that it has and this is why it has been brought to the attention of the Executive Committee. Rapkin stated that this is a flagrant breach of academic self governance.

Prochaska-Cue stated that she will schedule an appointment to meet with the Chancellor to discuss the Committee's concerns about the policy.

4.3 Information Technology Survey

The Committee worked on further revisions to the survey. Fech stated that special thanks should be given to Professor Jackson, Professor Fuller (Art & Art History), Professor Woodman (School of Biological Sciences), Professor Brassil (School of Biological Sciences), and Professor Marvin (Special Education & Communication Disorders) for their input on the survey.

Franti asked if there are faculty committees that relate to the survey. Griffin stated that there is the Computational Services and Facilities Committee and she will check to make sure that they are also providing a response to the survey. Bradford stated that he believes that people that have an interest in information technology are being actively involved in the survey. Prochaska-Cue stated that she hoped that UNOPA and UAAD were also having a chance to respond to the survey.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Senate Meeting

The Committee discussed the order of items for the agenda for the October 7th Senate meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:52 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, October 1st at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and David Rapkin, Secretary.