EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Anaya, Bender, Guevara, Joeckel, Nickerson, Reisbig, Rinkevich, Sollars, Wysocki, Zoubek

Absent: Ruchala, Schubert, Woodman

Date: Wednesday, April 16, 2014

Location: Faculty Senate Office

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
Guevara called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

2.0 Announcements
2.1 Outgoing Executive Committee Members
Anaya and Zoubek reported that this would be their last meeting as their terms expire on the Executive Committee. Guevara and the rest of the Executive Committee thanked them for their service and wished them well.

3.0 Approval of 4/2/14 Minutes
Anaya moved for approval of the revised minutes. Rinkevich seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business
4.1 Report on NAVEX Global Program’s Ethics and Compliance Platform (Nickerson)
Nickerson noted that the Chancellor is looking for a system that will allow public reporting of ethics violations on campus and previously the administration reviewed the TIPSPrevention program. He stated that NAVEX is the second program being reviewed. He stated that NAVEX has a very well established system for reporting at various universities and has over 500 clients (1000 university campuses use it) and the company is well established. He reported that there is a toll free phone number for each client and anyone can call it at any time. He stated that the call would go into one of two call centers which are staffed 24/7 and people speak to a real person rather than getting a computerized menu. He noted that the people handling the calls are trained on how to interpret what is being reported and the presenter reported that they are 90% accurate in categorizing the calls.

Nickerson stated that each call is designated to a pre-assigned risk category. He noted that Oklahoma State University, which uses the system, has five categories, but most universities have nine to ten. He noted that categories include financial, research, human resources, athletics, and health care but others can be added such as student affairs. He
pointed out that each major category has a sub-division of categories. He stated that the list of risk categories can be customized for any client and the Chancellor made it clear that he wanted a category for students at risk to themselves or others.

Nickerson reported that the actual number of reports received by Ohio State University is approximately 150 a year and Ohio is two or three times bigger than UNL. He stated that he had the impression that few frivolous reports were made. He noted that the telephone number of the caller cannot be tracked and only 50% of the callers wish to remain anonymous. He noted that a report goes into a storage system maintained by NAVEX but the reports are considered UNL property. He stated that reports can be made via phone or through the web and universities typically report through the web.

Nickerson stated that after a call is received a report comes back to UNL. People will be designated as an events manager for each of the categories. He pointed out that the information about the calls is not sent openly through an email message. The events manager is notified that they have a message at a location and will need to go into the site to see the report. He noted that a select group of UNL personnel would be involved in identifying and resolving problems. He stated that the question is who would be assigned. He noted that some people would be designated as a case manager and would be responsible for finding out as much as they can about the case and would have to make a report.

Nickerson stated that 80% of those in higher education who report an incident will follow up later to see what has been done about the issue. He pointed out that the person making the report can remain totally anonymous, but if they call back a second time and ask for a follow up they will need to provide information on how they can be contacted. He stated that the only danger he sees is if the administrator would turn over a report if they didn’t think it would fit a category.

Nickerson noted that the program is updated two or three times a year. He stated that the person in charge of the program at UNL can make comments back to the phone bank. He stated that NAVEX would come to UNL to train the administrators and whoever receives the reports. He pointed out that there are six weeks between the agreement and deployment of the program and Associate to the Chancellor Nunez said there would likely be a 12 month trial period in the contract so the campus can discontinue using it if it wasn’t pleased with the program. He stated that NAVEX would provide posters, cards, user guides both for those on the receiving end of the reports and those reporting.

Guevara pointed out that Associate to the Chancellor Nunez is aware of the concerns of the Executive Committee. He noted that of particular concern is who appoints the people who receive the report. He stated that if the report involves a faculty member that person should be notified. Bender stated that he has concerns that the administration could allocate some responsibilities for reports that already belong to the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee. He pointed out that unique to the academic profession is that faculty are self-governed and we need to make sure that there is a mechanism in place that would ensure that the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee handles
Nickerson stated that many of the reports appears to be non-faculty complaints, but if a case is the purview of the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee the university’s response should be that it will be given to the Committee to handle.

Nickerson stated that two programs are being considered for use: TIPSPrevention, which is a local company, and NAVEX. Guevara pointed out that TIPSPrevention is less expensive. Nickerson pointed out that NAVEX is very well established.

Reisbig wondered if department chairs and deans hear of some of these complaints and whether the system could route the complaints more efficiently. Wysocki pointed out that every mechanism for making complaints can be misused and a program is only as good as those managing it. Joeckel stated that this is a concern. He noted that in the past UNL used to have an ombudsperson who dealt with these kinds of cases. Guevara stated that these programs are a modernization of the ombudsman system. He pointed out that the Chancellor has said that students already complain about faculty members on social media sites all of the time but the faculty member often isn’t aware of the complaint. These systems would allow the faculty member to be notified.

Guevara stated that one of the questions is whether having this kind of program will be worth the money. Nickerson stated that he believes the Chancellor will implement one of these systems, but the faculty need to have an influence on the implementation of it. Joeckel stated that faculty should be able to look at the categories where the complaints are categorized. Guevara noted that the Chancellor has the right to put a system in place and pointed out that the Chancellor has had considerable consultation with the Executive Committee so far.

Nickerson stated that the Chancellor hopes to make a decision within a couple of weeks. He stated that he was impressed with NAVEX. Guevara stated that he thinks NAVEX is the better program and addresses more of the Executive Committee’s concerns.

5.0 New Business
5.1 Class Scheduling Conflicts between Campuses
Guevara noted that a concern from a faculty member came in last year concerning a problem with class schedules between east and city campus with the professor stating that some students would have to leave his class at least ten minutes early each day to get to another class on city campus. He pointed out that the system is supposed to keep students from registering classes that meet at the same time, but it does not take into consideration the distance between the two campuses. He stated that whoever is in charge of scheduling needs to be realistic about the time that it takes to commute between the campuses. He stated that this issues needs to get resolved.

Reisbig pointed out that the time to travel between the campuses may increase once bus service to Innovation Campus is established. Anaya asked if there is a simple option for correcting the problem. Guevara suggested that registration should disallow a student’s
ability to take courses when there is only fifteen minutes between the courses when they are on a different campus.

Nickerson noted that there is supposed to be a set schedule of course times that faculty members are supposed to adhere to. Griffin pointed out that when she worked in CBA some faculty members would only teach at specific times and on specific days which were outside the set schedule. She noted that at times this created conflicts for students’ schedules. Guevara stated that faculty members should have to follow the set schedule. Griffin and Reisbig stated that it is difficult to force some faculty members into teaching courses at the set times. Joeckel wondered if there are some faculty members that might need special accommodations which might require that they teach at different times.

Griffin suggested that the Executive Committee meet with University Registrar Morrell to discuss the problem. The Executive Committee agreed to invite the University Registrar to a meeting.

5.2 Summer Schedule
Griffin reported that she will send the Executive Committee a copy of the summer schedule. She noted that the schedule has been set up so the Executive Committee can meet with the Chancellor a couple of times during the summer when he is not traveling.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday April 23 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Toni Anaya, Secretary.