

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** Anaya, Bender, Nickerson, Purcell, Rinkevich, Rudy, Sollars, Steffen, Wysocki

**Absent:** Guevara, Joeckel, Konecky, Woodman

**Date:** Wednesday, March 18, 2015

**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

Nickerson called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.

### 2.0 Announcements

#### 2.1 East Campus Business Centers – Travel Reimbursement Procedures

Nickerson reported that he spoke with VC Green about experimenting with the East Campus Business Centers to make travel reimbursement procedures less onerous. He noted that the East Campus Business Centers have more standard procedures in how they operate so they may be easier to monitor.

### 3.0 Approval of March 11, 2015 Minutes

Rinkevich moved for approval of the revised minutes. Motion seconded by Sollars. The minutes were approved.

### 4.0 Unfinished Business

#### 4.1 Non-tenure Track Faculty Forum

Nickerson reported that a room has been reserved on April 17 for the non-tenure track faculty forum, but neither Associate Vice Chancellor Perez nor SVCAA Weissinger can attend the forum in April to speak. He said that Woodman suggested postponing the forum until the fall when hopefully Associate VC Perez will be available to speak. He stated that he was going to see if Dean Francisco from Arts & Sciences could speak in April. Bender stated that the AAUP would be delighted to participate in the forum again.

Griffin pointed out that it could be difficult to get other administrators to speak on such late notice, particularly during the month of April when there are so many events taking place on campus. Wysocki stated that he did not think it is feasible to have a forum well organized in less than a month. He stated that consideration needs to be given that it may be difficult for many non-tenure track faculty members to attend the forum in April because they are so busy with the end of the semester and academic year approaching. Steffen suggested that more ideas for a forum in the fall could be generated over the summer. He stated that it would be helpful to have the forum in the fall when the academic year begins and new people are hired. He pointed out that the downside to not

having the forum in April is that those who participated in the survey might want to know the results of the survey now even if the forum is postponed. Nickerson stated that a summary of the survey can be provided. The Executive Committee agreed to postpone the forum until fall.

#### **4.2 Revising Professional Ethics Statement**

Bender reported that he will review and propose revisions to the preamble of the Professional Ethics Statement over the spring break. Rudy stated that he would assist with revising the document. He noted that the Statement has good principles but needs to be revised, particularly since it was written in 1990.

#### **4.3 Nominees for Executive Committee – President Elect, Secretary, Executive Committee Members**

Nickerson stated that any Senator interested in running for the Executive Committee, President Elect, or Secretary should send him or Griffin an email message indicating their interest. He noted that the latest date people can indicate interest is April 10 because biographical information needs to be gathered and sent to the Senators two weeks prior to the April 28<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting.

### **5.0 New Business**

#### **5.1 April 7 Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda**

Nickerson noted that VC Paul will be speaking at the April 7 Senate meeting. Griffin reported that one of the Pound-Howard Awards will be presented at the meeting and there is a nominee for the Academic Freedom Award which the Senate will need to vote on.

#### **5.2 Academic Planning Committee Request to Add Non-tenure Track Faculty Member**

Nickerson reported that the APC has made a request and suggested language to revise the Committee's syllabus to include a position designated for a non-tenure track faculty member. He noted that he is in favor of adding a non-tenure track faculty member to the APC.

Purcell asked if Extension Educators are being excluded from being a member of the APC since the suggested language includes only Professors of Practice, Lecturers, or Research Professors. If not, Extension Educators should either be included as a category or the examples of the categories should be left out.

Sollars pointed out that the suggested language states that there shall be nineteen members, but section (b) states "if qualified nominees are available and willing to serve." She noted that this creates a problem if no non-tenure track faculty members are willing to serve because the number of members would drop to eighteen. Griffin pointed out that the eight elected faculty members on the APC represent the four disciplines as defined by the Faculty Senate, with no more than two faculty members representing each discipline. She stated that the non-tenure track faculty member would shift the balance of representation from the different disciplines and asked if the non-tenure track faculty member could come from any discipline.

Wysocki suggested that Nickerson contact Professor Hoffman, chair of the APC, to address the problems raised. Griffin noted that these changes may take some time to make because not only does the Senate need to approve the changes, ASUN, the Chancellor, and the Board of Regents all need to approve them because the APC is defined in the UNL Bylaws.

#### **5.4 Non-tenure Track Survey – Extension Educators Response Summary**

Purcell reported that more Extension Educators responded to the 2012 survey than the 2014 survey. She stated that 42% of the 2014 respondents have been at UNL less than five years. She noted that Extension Educators receive a letter of offer, not an appointment letter, but at the same time they receive the offer letter they are given a position description which helps clarify their duties. She reported that Extension Educators are on a 12-month special appointment which is renewed each year based on evaluations and available funds. She pointed out that they can be given a 90-day notice of termination. Nickerson asked how often is funding not available. Purcell stated that most Extension Educators are on hard dollars with only a few paid by grants.

Purcell stated that while UNL dictates the responsibilities of Extension Educators, there is a partnership with the counties of the State and some things are expected of the Extension Educators from the county, but these responsibilities are not always put into writing. She noted that Extension Educators appreciate the partnership with the counties and work with them to address the needs of the people of the county. She pointed out that the county has ownership of the building where Extension Educators have offices, pays for the office staff, and pays basically everything except the salaries of the Extension Educators. She noted that Extension Educators do not have tenure track positions. She pointed out that most work more than 40 hours a week. Nickerson suggested that administrators should convey this information when explaining the work of the faculty to the Regents and outside entities.

Purcell reported that most of the respondents know about the requirements for promotion and it is easy for Extension Educators to get guidance about promotion. She noted that the Associate Directors and Directors of the Research and Extension districts are very helpful, as well as other Extension Educators. She stated that Extension personnel want to see everyone worthy promoted. She reported that when there is a new evaluation form, it is distributed in advance to everyone so they know how they will be evaluated.

Purcell stated that one of the concerns raised by the survey is that the majority of them did not know about faculty development leaves. She noted that very few Extension Educators take a development leave. In part, because it would be difficult to leave, especially for those in smaller offices because it would increase the workload of colleagues. She pointed out that she has never seen anything in writing that says that Extension Educators can take a faculty development leave. Nickerson asked if an Extension Educator can be shifted from another office to help out if an Extension Educator goes on leave. Wysocki pointed out that faculty development leave requirements may be college specific and this may also be true for Extension.

Purcell reported that she is not aware of bylaws specifically for Extension. She noted that Extension would follow IANR's bylaws. She stated that 60% of the respondents stated that there were not aware of their rights as a faculty member. She reported that 40% of the respondents stated that they feel like they are a fully recognized faculty members, but 30% said they do not. She noted that there was a comment that they feel like they are treated as second class faculty members and this feeling is exacerbated by the fact that they are not eligible for the VSIP.

Purcell stated that one response on the survey questioned why Extension Educators are not tenured. Steffen wondered if it has something to do with the counties involvement in Extension. He stated that one of the questions is how well Extension Faculty are integrated with the rest of the faculty.

Purcell reported that most of the four Extension Districts have district meetings (one in the fall and one in the spring) rather than department meetings. She noted that voting rarely takes place at district meetings, but when a vote is needed all Extension Educators can participate. She stated that fully promoted Extension Educators can serve on promotion committees and Extension Educators can be on committees that design curriculum.

Nickerson stated that the Executive Committee now needs to determine how to make recommendations for departments/colleges on best practices for non-tenure track faculty members. He noted that information pertaining to non-tenure track faculty members is scattered and suggested that one of the efforts of the Committee should be to gather the information into a resource page. Rudy suggested that the information from the presentations on each of the categories of non-tenure track faculty members be summarized. He pointed out that there seems to be a lack of communication to non-tenure track faculty members about policies and procedures. He noted that when it comes to non-tenure track faculty members not feeling like they are part of the faculty, one of the difficulties is in trying to determine what is actual and what is perceptual. He stated that his own experience shows that it can be an actual problem in how one department treats its non-tenure track faculty members compared to another department. Bender pointed out that even if the problem is perceptual, it still needs to be addressed. Steffen stated that the perception can also vary with the position. For instance, research professors funded on a grant may not feel like they are part of the faculty because of their limited contract.

Nickerson noted that the Executive Committee will need to write a summary about the findings of the survey and get it distributed to the Senate and the non-tenure track faculty members.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, April 1 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Tad Wysocki, Secretary.