

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Bolin, Fech, Flowers, Konecky, LaCost, Lindquist, Prochaska-Cue, Rapkin, Schubert, Shea

Absent: Franti, McCollough, Stock

Date: Wednesday, October 28, 2009

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

Fech called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 AFCON Event

Prochaska-Cue reported that none of the AFCON membership fees are being used for the November 14th event where Dr. Ayers will speak. She noted that AFCON reports that registration fees for the event and donations are paying for it.

2.2 Budget Reduction and Reallocation Review Committee (BRRRC)

Prochaska-Cue reported that the BRRRC met for the last time this morning and completed discussions on revisions. She stated that she will be preparing a draft of the changes for the BRRRC to review. She stated that she hopes the document will be presented to the Senate in December or January.

Prochaska-Cue stated that there are two major changes with the procedures: one involves adding UNOPA and UAAD representatives to the budget reduction process of the Academic Planning Committee, and the other involves clarifying the definition of the word "consultation." She noted that the Chancellor has agreed to strongly encourage chairs, heads, and deans to consult with faculty, staff, and students accordingly regarding budget reductions. She pointed out that this will allow all parties the opportunity to explore options and provide input on budget reductions.

Prochaska-Cue stated that the definition of a program is the one issue that cannot be resolved at this time. She noted that the definition used in the Procedures for Significant Budget Reductions and Reallocations is probably from the Regents Bylaws and would take a change in those Bylaws.

3.0 Minutes of 10/21/09

Members submitted their changes to the minutes.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Academic Freedom Recommendations

The Committee worked on revising the recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on the Cancellation of Dr. Ayers Visit. The Committee plans to have the recommendations ready to present to the Senate at the November 3, 2009 meeting.

4.2 Research Misconduct Policy

Lindquist reported that the version recently sent out by Griffin to the Executive Committee is the latest revision. He moved that the Executive Committee bring a motion to the Senate that this version would displace any other existing policies on allegations of research misconduct. The motion was seconded by Flowers.

The Committee agreed that the draft policy should be sent to the Senators asking them to share the document with their colleagues. The Committee agreed to place the version on the Faculty Senate website (<http://www.unl.edu/asenate/welcome.htm>)

The Committee approved the motion to bring the research policy to the Senate.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Pay for Distance Courses

Rapkin stated that he received a complaint from a colleague regarding pay for distance education courses. He noted that an instructor gets paid \$3000 to develop a course but this amount does not include benefits. He reported that the same thing occurs when the course is administered or taught as an overload. He stated that the university, in effect, is paying on a piecemeal basis little money for courses that the university then owns. He stated that the university can also have a faculty member develop a course and then subsequently hire someone to teach the same course using the materials developed by the faculty member.

Fech stated that it is important for the faculty to come up with a list of concerns with these courses. He noted that the intellectual property issue is interesting in that he was told both the professor and the university own the course. Shea pointed out that who owns the course is not clear.

Schubert pointed out that the intellectual property rights could be made clearer. He stated that patent ownership clearly outlines the split of ownership between the faculty member and the university. He noted that a similar policy could be made for distance education courses. He stated that an instructor that develops a distance education course should receive benefits just like a patent. He noted that if the university applies for a patent it is clear ownership, but the university cannot take total ownership away from the faculty member that developed the item that the patent is on.

Shea stated that he understands that courses developed are considered university property, which is of concern.

5.2 Senate Committee Reports

Fech reported that he received a request to use an overhead projector to present the committee reports the Senate receives at the Senate meeting since these materials are now being sent electronically. Schubert suggested that Senators be encouraged to bring their own laptop so they can review the material. Shea pointed out that a faculty member has responsibilities when becoming a Senator and Senators should be responsible for looking over the reports and printing them out or bringing a laptop to the meetings so they have the information in front of them.

Konecky suggested that the Committee observe how things function at the Senate meetings for the next few months and revisit the issue if necessary.

5.3 Student Soldiers and Class Absences

Fech reported that he received an email message from Associate Vice Chancellor Wilson asking if the Senate has ever taken up this issue. He noted that soldiers are being called up ahead of deployment for periodic training and that is resulting in them missing some classes. The email noted that more students will be impacted next year when a large group of soldiers is going to deploy.

The Committee noted that there is a student absence policy. Konecky pointed out that this is a Senate policy and suggested that a class absence policy specifically for student soldiers could be created by using the current class absence policy as a model.

The Committee agreed to review the current policy and work on developing one specifically for student soldiers.

5.4 Digital Tenure Dossiers

Fech stated that he was asked by one of the Faculty Senate Presidents of the Big 12 whether UNL is using digital tenure dossiers. Konecky pointed out that for some faculty members the work they produce is in a digital format. LaCost reported that she has looked at a digital dossier for a promotion and tenure case but this is rare. Flowers noted that he often receives a CD or flash drive with information on it when asked to write an external letter of support for a tenure file. Konecky and LaCost pointed out that security could be an issue and one of the reasons why many promotion and tenure files are still being printed.

5.5 Faculty Interview Summary

The Committee reviewed the summary of the faculty interviews conducted for the five year review of SVCAA Couture. The Committee will be discussing the summary with the Chancellor when it meets with him on November 4th.

5.6 New Initiative for Senior Opportunity Hires

Shea reported that he received a message from the director of the School of Natural Resources about Academic Affairs seeking opportunity hires for senior faculty members. He questioned why there is such a push, particularly given the economic situation. Schubert stated that this effort has been going on for some time because the university is

trying to capture faculty members who might have been cut from other universities. The Committee agreed to discuss this issue with the Chancellor.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, November 4th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and David Rapkin, Secretary.