

FACULTY SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, September 25, 2013

PRESENT: Bender, Guevara, Nickerson, Reisbig, Rinkevich, Sollars, Woodman, Wysocki, Zoubek

ABSENT: Anaya, Joeckel, Ruchala

1.0 CALL

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

2.0 Professor Lahey and Professor Hoffman, Academic Planning Committee Members

Lahey reported that the Academic Planning Committee (APC) is considering adding a seat for a professor of practice and when VC Paul heard this he suggested having a seat for a research professor as well. He stated that the reason for this is similar to what the Executive Committee has been discussing with designating a seat for a non-tenure track faculty member. He noted that there has been an increase in hiring non-tenure track faculty members and members of the APC feel there is a strong need to have these people represented in the decision making process. Hoffman pointed out that there is currently nothing in the APC syllabus that prohibits non-tenure track faculty members from being on the APC, but the idea is to designate seats for these faculty members. He noted that the UNL Bylaws will need to be changed and the idea is to try and make these changes at the same time.

Lahey stated that some people may argue why we need to have special seats identified for non-tenure track faculty members on committees. He noted that he used to be a non-tenure track faculty member and was never tremendously interested in doing service work because it was not one of the responsibilities for which he was paid. He stated that this could be an issue that the non-tenure people may raise. He stated that the non-tenure track faculty members on the APC would not have to participate in the committee work of the APC, but would have voting rights and would contribute to the discussions.

Nickerson pointed out that the Senate is considering a change in the Executive Committee syllabus to designate one of the seats for a non-tenure track faculty member, if a qualified individual is available. He reported that there are currently two non-tenure track faculty members already on the Executive Committee and the Senate agrees that hiring non-tenure track faculty members is a growing trend and that they should have some representation in faculty governance. Guevara stated that the Senate will be voting on the motion next week. He pointed out that the idea is to create a space for non-tenure track faculty members to participate, although service work may not be a part of their job responsibilities. He noted that the Executive Committee did feel that the seat should be filled if a non-tenure track faculty member is unavailable to serve. He stated that the Executive Committee wants to promote the integration of the non-tenure track faculty members.

Lahey stated that in speaking with some professors of practice he was surprised to learn that they did not even know what the APC is and what it does and he finds this a bit troubling. Nickerson noted that the APC has a reputation of doing a lot of work and some people may not want to get involved because of the workload.

Griffin asked what would happen with the seats if no non-tenure track faculty members are willing to run for election. Hoffman stated that these positions would be similar to that of the graduate student representative positions and would not have to adhere to the requirement of representing different disciplines.

Woodman noted that the subcommittees of the APC do a lot of work which is done by tenure track faculty members, but he finds it a bit patronizing to exclude the non-tenure track faculty members from participating on the subcommittees. He stated that if non-tenure track faculty members are to be included as part of the faculty they should be included on committees and their subcommittees. Hoffman stated that it would not be a requirement of the non-tenure track faculty members to be a part of the subcommittee, but they would certainly be welcomed if they wanted to serve on the subcommittee.

Nickerson noted that the Executive Committee discussed having a forum for non-tenure track faculty members to inform them of what their rights are on campus. He suggested that this might be something to do in collaboration with the APC. Woodman stated that it was suggested that an email listserv of non-tenure track faculty members be created in order to query them and inform them about issues that impact them.

Bender asked if the APC has talked to the Chancellor about the idea. Lahey reported that he spoke with Associate to the Chancellor Nunez about it and he stated that the Chancellor was non-committal. Bender noted that he chaired the APC when the committee was expanded from six to eight elected faculty members, and while the Chancellor did not have any qualms about this he did want to keep a balance with the number of administrators on the committee. Reisbig pointed out that the Senate's approval of changing the composition of the Executive Committee can be a precedent that might help the APC when they discuss the issue with the Chancellor.

Hoffman reported that the APC would like to try and get this change approved this year. Nickerson noted that the Senate will be voting on the Executive Committee motion next week. Hoffman asked if the one seat on the Executive Committee is open to either non-tenure track faculty members or research professors. Woodman noted that the two groups are very different and there might need to be some consideration about this. Lahey stated that he thinks the APC would be open to either option, of having one seat for both or a seat for each group.

Lahey stated that he looks forward to working with the Executive Committee on this issue and he is anxious to hear how the vote turns out in the Senate.

Nickerson stated that he thinks the APC and the Executive Committee should work more closely together in general. He noted that both he and Bender have served on the APC and while there was little collaboration at times between the APC and the Executive Committee there were times when both groups were working on similar issues. Nickerson suggested that the Senate President Designee to the APC should report to the Executive Committee each semester to learn what the APC is working on so efforts can be coordinated when needed. Bender noted that the APC meets on Wednesdays, every other week, which would allow time for the faculty members of the APC to meet with the Executive Committee.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Meeting with CIO Askren

Griffin reported that CIO Askren will be meeting with the Executive Committee on November 6.

3.2 Student Code of Conduct Meeting

Reisbig reported that the committee working on making changes to the Student Code of Conduct met this week and had a question for the Executive Committee. She noted that some staff members are interested in serving on the University Judicial Board. Bender noted that the committee is not pushing this but is looking to obtain information and to see what the Executive Committee thinks about this idea. He stated that he is not sure what a staff member could add to the Judicial Board although a relevant staff member could be asked to testify in some cases.

Reisbig asked if there are any other committees that have staff members on it. Griffin stated that the Parking Appeals Committee and the Parking Advisory Committee both have staff members on it.

Woodman pointed out that some judicial issues could be dorm related and having a staff member could be helpful in these situations. He noted that there is a pool of faculty members who serve on the Judicial Board, but only a few of them are required for hearing cases.

Griffin asked if UNOPA and UAAD were seeking representation on the Judicial Board. Reisbig stated that she is not sure but will ask Dean Hecker where the inquiry has come from.

4.0 Approval of September 11, 2013 and September 18, 2013 Minutes

Nickerson moved for approval of the September 11 minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Bender. The motion was approved.

Bender moved for approval of the September 18 minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Wsocki. The motion was approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Motion to Revise the Executive Committee Syllabus

Guevara noted that previously the Executive Committee approved amending the motion to designate one of the seats on the Committee for non-tenure track faculty members, if a qualified individual is available. He pointed out that the Committee is creating two specific spots for non-tenure track faculty members with the assumption that the rest of the seats will be filled by tenure track faculty members, but there is nothing in the syllabus that guarantees that there will be tenure track people on the Committee. Wysocki stated that this was the point that he tried to raise in a previous meeting and suggested that there be a designated seat for tenure track faculty members as well.

Woodman pointed out that the majority of the people on the Senate are tenure track faculty members so it is a natural assumption that the rest of the members on the Executive Committee will be tenure track faculty members. He noted that the syllabus can be changed in the future should the composition of the Senate change.

Reisbig stated that she sees nothing wrong with wanting to add the language but does not think it is necessary. She pointed out that when you have underrepresented groups you designate a seat or position for them so you can try to insure that they will have representation. Wysocki stated that with so many non-tenure track faculty members being hired these days it might be wise to have a spot reserved for a tenure track faculty member. Guevara pointed out that currently there is nothing in the syllabus that guarantees a spot for a tenured professor.

Reisbig asked what the argument is that is going to compel Senators to vote for this amendment. Wysocki stated that the argument is to keep equal representation on the Committee. He noted that this is creating a policy for the future when the makeup of the faculty could be very different than it is today. Reisbig stated that she understands the point, but we don't want to overshadow the message of wanting to support non-tenured faculty members. She pointed out that if the composition of the Senate should change so dramatically in the future then a change could be made.

Sollars noted that adding language that provides a designated seat for a tenure track faculty member does make everyone more equal.

Wysocki moved that the language "and at least one member must be a tenure/tenure track faculty member" be added to the amended motion. Rinkevich seconded the motion.

Nickerson stated that he is concerned that the statement comes off as being paranoid. Woodman agreed and stated that the goal of the initial change is to have more inclusion of the underrepresented faculty members and there is really no need to designate a

specific seat for a tenure track faculty member when the vast majority of the faculty members are tenure track.

Guevara pointed out that nowhere in the syllabus does it state that a tenure track faculty member must be part of the Executive Committee. Zoubek pointed out that it is an assumption. Reisbig stated that it is assumed because the majority of the people are tenure/tenure track. Guevara stated that it would be more equal to designate a seat for a tenure/tenure track faculty member. Zoubek suggested putting the phrase after the language designating seats for an extension educator and a non-tenure track faculty member.

Nickerson asked if the change will make the Executive Committee look inclusive. Guevara stated that he does not feel that adding the language makes us look paranoid and if making a policy, it needs to be more up to date. Griffin noted that when the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was first formed many years ago she believes that there were only assistant, associate, and full professors that were all tenure track, but the university has changed over the years and now there are many more categories of faculty members.

Bender stated that he understands the concern over paranoia and he can see why a non-tenure track faculty member might see this addition as being paranoid. He stated that his concern is about the administrator we might have 3-5 years from now and the possibility that they may look at the expansion of non-tenure track faculty members as a less costly way to increase the number of faculty members. He pointed out that in the long run our best guarantee is that we have policies in place so non-tenure track faculty members cannot be exploited, but also to make sure that committees like the Executive Committee include everyone. He stated that he thinks this will be important in the future.

Woodman asked how this change would protect the faculty from administrators hiring too many non-tenured faculty members. Bender pointed out that the more that we all see ourselves as a single body, the stronger the faculty will be, and the better it will be able to deal with any kind of change in administrative philosophy that might be down the road. Nickerson questioned whether we are helped by including the new language in the document. Wysocki stated that the syllabus should include all groups.

The Executive Committee voted five in favor and four against the amendment to the motion. The motion was approved.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Report on Board of Regents Meeting

Guevara reported that SVCAA Weissinger and SVC Reed of UNO were charged with making the merger of the Engineering departments work. He stated that they presented strategies to the Board along with target dates and figures. While they made a good impression with the Board, there were Board members who were still skeptical and gave a strong warning that if the plan didn't work well efforts will be taken to create a separate Engineering program at UNO. Nickerson noted that a significant amount of money is being put into the joint program. Wysocki reported that several new faculty members will be hired for both the UNL and UNO campus. He noted that with the approval of the joint program there will be a change in that the Director of PKI will now be reporting to the SVCAA of both campuses instead of President Milliken.

Guevara stated that the Board's decision to not allow the creation of a mall east of the stadium was due concerns for the loss of revenue from tailgaters. Nickerson pointed out that many of these tailgaters are major donors of the university and donate not only to athletics but to the university in general. Guevara noted that it was disconcerting that the Board did not show any concern for the loss of parking for faculty and staff if this space had become a mall.

6.2 Update on Effort to Revise Bylaws to Protect Faculty Speaking Critically about the Administration

Guevara reported that he spoke with the other Senate Presidents regarding efforts to have language included into the Bylaws that would protect faculty members. He noted UNO Faculty Senate President Bacon has charged a committee, which includes a faculty member who is a lawyer specializing in law and education, to look into the issue further. He noted that all of the Senate Presidents were supportive and believed that this is a possible concern because Nebraska is in a different judicial district that is more conservative than where the original case occurred. He noted that President Bacon has agreed to share the report with the other Presidents when it is completed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, October 2 at 3:00 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Toni Anaya, Secretary.