EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Bradford, Fech, Franti, Hachtmann, Jackson, LaCost, Ledder, Linquist, McCollough, Prochaska-Cue, Rapkin, Schubert

Absent: Zimmers

Date: Wednesday, April 30, 2008

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
Prochaska-Cue called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

2.0 Announcements
2.1 Welcome New Executive Committee Members
Prochaska-Cue welcomed new members Tom Franti, David Jackson, Martha McCollough, and Mathias Schubert.

2.2 Deans and Directors Meeting
Prochaska-Cue reported that the deans and directors will be meeting on May 12th to hear a presentation on the Advisory Board’s report on diversity. Rapkin noted that he was surprised that the Chancellor said that he thought there were just two or three big things that we can do to help with recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty. Rapkin pointed out that he doubts just trying to do a few major things will improve the situation.

3.0 Approval of 4/16/08 Minutes
Bradford moved and Rapkin seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business
No unfinished business was discussed.

5.0 New Business
5.1 Senate Meeting – Tabled Motion
Prochaska-Cue noted that Professor Zorn, Finance, made a motion at the April 22nd Senate meeting calling for the legislature to provide more funding to help with recruiting a diverse faculty rather than punishing us by reducing our budget. Ledder stated that he plans to oppose the motion. Lindquist pointed out that the legislature has never reduced our budget for not meeting diversity goals and this motion is really something of a red herring. Prochaska-Cue pointed out that the motion will need to be dealt with at the September Senate meeting.
6.2 Increase in Parking Fees

Prochaska-Cue stated that a request was made by a faculty member to address another increase in parking fees. Bradford suggested putting the faculty member on the Parking Advisory Committee.

Fech asked how much the fees were going to increase? Griffin reported that a parking area A permit this year is $492 but will cost $522 next year; a reserved permit is $972 this year and will increase to $1002; and the parking garage permit is currently $552 and will increase to $582. Ledder noted that this is approximately a 10% increase.

Rapkin pointed out that this is a concern that is perennially raised but nothing ever happens to alleviate the situation. He noted that we haven’t really heard anything about the carpooling incentive and this may be more pertinent with the price of gasoline.

Bradford stated that the parking garages are being built by the employees through the cost of their parking permits.

Prochaska-Cue stated that she is concerned about the staff members and what the increased fees are doing to them. She stated that she is thinking about talking to UNOPA and UAAD to see if jointly we could press upon the administration the effects the high parking permit fees are having on employees.

Ledder stated that he can accept that it may not be feasible to have a graduated parking fee scale but having a set fee for faculty members and one for staff is reasonable.

Lindquist stated that the Parking Advisory Committee should be looking into these matters. He thought that the Senate had agreed to the increase in fees a number of years ago. Bradford pointed out that the Senate didn’t really agree to the fees. Rather the fees were pretty much forced upon us. Lindquist suggested that the history of the fees and the parking garages be checked. He wondered when the planned increases will stop.

Jackson stated that there are two issues that need to be considered. First, are there ways that Parking & Transit Services could be operating more efficiently. Second, any adjustments to how Parking & Transit Services gets their funds still needs to generate sufficient dollars to cover their costs and bond obligations. The question is how Parking & Transit Services gets the money. Bradford stated that they raise revenue through parking permits and game day parking. LaCost pointed out that nobody pays for a handicap parking space in the garages on game days. She speculated that there may be a substantial amount of parking not paid for on game days.

Schubert asked what the improvements are with the increased fees because he isn’t seeing any. He pointed out that permit holders still have to circle about trying to find parking.
Lindquist suggested having the chair of the Parking Advisory Committee discuss with the Executive Committee the history of these fee increases and the activities of the Parking Advisory Committee in response to them. Rapkin suggested that the new Sustainability Commission could be brought into the discussion as well.

6.3 Academic Freedom Coalition of Nebraska (AFCON) Tenure Statement
Prochaska-Cue stated Professor Moshman of Educational Psychology sent her a copy of a draft tenure policy being considered by AFCON. Ledder asked if the document is similar to the university’s policy. Bradford pointed out that the document is not a university policy so the language is different. He noted that the university policy follows the AAUP guidelines.

Bradford stated that he thinks the section about academic freedom should be first in the document rather than the section about continued employment. He noted that continued employment is not always what tenure is about.

Lindquist stated that he thinks the document could be simplified into two or three sentences. Ledder stated that the document is very wordy and the arguments are too spread out. He agreed that the issue of academic freedom should be first.

Rapkin asked if there was a previous tenure policy that this one improves upon. He wondered why they are creating the document now.

Franti asked if we are a member of AFCON or if UNL has a representative who can vote on the document. He wondered who is approving the policy. Griffin stated that the Senate has been a member in the past and Professor Lee had been the representative.

Rapkin asked if AFCON is a local organization. Bradford stated that it is an organization within the state. He stated that he is not sure who the current President is and they have monthly or bi-monthly meetings. A newsletter is also sent out. Griffin stated that the Senate Office has not received any newsletters.

Prochaska-Cue stated that she will check to see what our benefits are and why as an institution we have a $120 membership fee while individual membership fees are much lower.

6.4 Executive Committee Summer Schedule
Griffin distributed copies of the summer schedule. Prochaska-Cue noted that the Executive Committee retreat is tentatively scheduled for August 20th.

6.5 Executive Committee Priorities
Prochaska-Cue stated that she received a phone call from a Daily Nebraskan reporter who is interested in the Senate’s priorities for next year. The Committee suggested faculty salaries, to work with the administration to develop a diversity plan, academic dishonesty, and sustainability commission.
6.6 Safe Assignment
LaCost stated that she ran a set of comps and proposals through Safe Assignment recently and didn’t get many hits. She noted that she tried running a paper through that contained a lot of references that came from books and again the program did not pick them up. She stated that she was surprised that the program did not identify any of these references.

Jackson asked if the issue of academic dishonesty revolves around a concern for the current system or how we go about improving behavior. Ledder stated that the issue has changed somewhat. It was first raised with the former Regent Hergert issue and at the time the idea was that an honor code should be installed. Bradford noted that the issue was side tracked with the installation of the Safe Assignment program.

Fech stated that two of the three parties that ran for ASUN were opposed to Safe Assignment. Bradford pointed out that there were two students on the Safe Assignment Committee that looked at the policy. He stated that he did not think that it needed to be looked at again.

Ledder stated that what is needed is a clear definition of academic dishonesty. He pointed out that there are a lot of gray areas with academic dishonesty because it is a subtle issue.

Bradford pointed out that it is also an educational issue. Consideration should be made as to how people can be educated in orientations and in classes. So far the plagiarism factor has only been considered but there is much more.

Lindquist noted that the section in the Bulletin on academic dishonesty needs to be supported. He pointed out that many students don’t understand the Bulletin is their contract with the university and its’ contents, including the Code of Conduct. Ledder stated that it is not a bound contract because students do not have to sign it. Bradford stated that when a student enrolls he/she agrees to abide by the Code. Ledder stated that the difference is between agreeing to the Code before hand rather than it being imposed on you. Bradford stated that an Academic Dishonesty Committee needs to consider this and how we let people know about the policy and how it’s enforced.

Jackson stated that he has served on the University Judicial Board and the only cases the Board sees are those that people choose to report. He noted that it is completely up to the faculty member to report acts of academic dishonesty. Bradford pointed out that faculty members are required to report it. McColough stated that she was unaware of this. Ledder stated that many faculty members are likewise unaware and faculty members need to be educated about it.

Schubert pointed out that in some disciplines, such as the hard sciences, copying from books is required for homework. He stated that instructors need to have the latitude to allow students to conduct the work as the instructor requires. Ledder stated that many of
the rules for academic dishonesty are not universal. He pointed out that instructors need to make their rules clear to students.

LaCost noted that she had a Masters student who conducted a survey of faculty members about academic dishonesty. The findings were that most faculty members felt that nothing was done about it so why should they bother getting involved. Ledder pointed out that the Senate could conduct its own survey to see if the faculty is satisfied with the system for handling matters of academic dishonesty.

Rapkin noted that boilerplate of language that could be used on a syllabus would be helpful. He suggested the committee could develop some options for faculty to use.

Bradford stated that he thinks the committee should go back and look at the issue and see what other universities are doing.

6.7 State Fair Grounds
Schubert stated that faculty members have been asking him if there has been any discussion with the faculty about the purchase or planning of the state fair grounds. Ledder stated that the Chancellor has mentioned it at meetings with the Executive Committee but the issue was never fully discussed.

Lindquist stated that at the time we thought it was not our place to take a stand on the state fair issue. He stated that he is curious to know where the $21 million the university committed will come from. He noted that there is talk of selling one of the IANR farms to raise money. Fech stated that Associate VC Moeller talked about the discrepancy of selling land in order to buy land.

Bradford stated that there has not been any discussion on the operating costs of maintaining the state fair grounds land. He pointed out that much of the private side revenue that will be generated will be going to the state in the form of tax revenue, not the university.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, May 7th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and David Rapkin, Secretary.