FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

DATE:       Wednesday, September 18, 2013
PRESENT:   Bender, Guevara, Nickerson, Reisbig, Rinkevich, Ruchala, Woodman, Wysocki
ABSENT:    Anaya, Joeckel, Schubert, Sollars, Zoubek
LOCATION: Faculty Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

1.0 CALL
Guevara called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

2.0 Announcements
2.1 Meeting on Student Code of Conduct Changes
Reisbig reported that the committee working on changing the Student Code of Conduct met last Thursday and will be meeting every two weeks during the semester. Woodman asked who is chairing the Committee. Reisbig reported that VC Franco is the chair. Bender reported that model code of conduct documents have been circulated for the committee to review and possibly use.

Guevara asked if VC Franco was able to get a Law faculty member on the committee. Bender said no and reported that he suggested getting a third year Law College student if a faculty member cannot be found.

Reisbig stated that the Committee seems to be moving along well and she thinks it is reasonable that the work can be done by the end of the semester.

Woodman asked if the UNK Student Code of Conduct was going to be used as a model. Bender stated that the committee was informed that UNK is waiting on adopting their new Code until UNL has made its changes. Reisbig noted that the UNK Code needs to include Title IX language and wants to see what UNL writes in the Code.

3.0 Approval of September 11, 2013 Minutes
Ruchala moved for approval of the revised minutes. Reisbig seconded the motion. Griffin reported that she has not received SVCAA Weissinger’s edits to the minutes yet. Ruchala amended her motion by stating that the approval of the minutes be done at next week’s meeting to allow SVCAA Weissinger the opportunity to make her changes. Reisbig seconded the motion. The motion was approved.
4.0  Unfinished Business

4.1  Amendment to Motion to Change the Executive Committee Syllabus

Guevara noted that a handout was being provided with three suggested changes to
the Executive Committee syllabus which will provide a seat on the Executive
Committee for a non-tenure track faculty member.

Woodman stated that in order to keep things symmetrical he thinks the same
language, “if no member of the Faculty Senate qualifies or is willing to serve on the
Executive Committee,” should be used for both the Extension Educator seat and the
non-tenure track faculty member seat because both seats are identified for a
particular faculty group.  He agreed that the number of Executive Committee
members should not be reduced if either an Extension Educator or a non-tenure
track faculty member is unable to serve on the Senate.  He stated that the candidate
with the next highest vote could be elected to the Executive Committee.  Wysocki
agreed that members should continue to be elected for three years rather than
having a member serve for only one year to fill the non-tenure track seat as
suggested in a previous meeting.  He pointed out that having people serve for only
one year could leave the Executive Committee with people with little experience.

Nickerson stated that he liked the suggestion made by Professor Bradford of the
Law College.  Reisbig stated that she particularly liked Bradford’s phrase “if a
qualified nominee is available” because it does not make the non-tenure track
faculty member seat seem like it is a lesser position.  Guevara suggested that this
language be included after the Extension Educator language.

Woodman asked how the elections would occur if a non-tenure track faculty
member would put the total of faculty members from the same college over the limit
of four.  Griffin stated that elections are held every year and efforts are made to
recruit Senators from colleges that are either not represented or under represented
on the Committee.  She stated that if two faculty members from the same college are
running but only one can be elected, they would run opposite each other on the
ballot.  She noted that if there is already four members from a college on the
committee people will need to be recruited from the other colleges to run for
election.

Reisbig moved to revise the Executive Committee original motion by adopting
Bradford’s suggestion with a slight amendment to read “at least one member must
be an Extension Education and one member must be a non-tenure track faculty
member, if qualified nominees are available.”  Ruchala seconded the motion.  The
motion was approved.

5.0  New Business

5.1  Chancellor’s State of the University Address

Nickerson noted that most of the Chancellor’s address was on topics that the
Chancellor has already discussed with the Executive Committee and the Senate.
Guevara stated that he has one concern in particular. He noted that the Chancellor stated that there will be new tenure track faculty hires for UNL’s highest reputation and research priorities. He stated that he questioned whether any of these new hires will go to existing programs that carry the weight of credit hours in a college. He stated that he has heard from faculty members concerns over the Chancellor’s definition of these programs. The Committee agreed to ask the Chancellor for clarification of his statement when they meet with the Chancellor on October 9.

Woodman stated that he was glad to hear acknowledgement that the infrastructure for instructional purposes needs to be improved if we are going to be increasing the number of students to 30,000.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:54 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, September 25 at 3:00 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Toni Anaya, Secretary.