

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** Bender, Joeckel, Nickerson, Rudy, Sollars

**Absent:** Anaya, Guevara, Konecky, Purcell, Rinkevich, Steffen, Woodman, Wysocki

**Date:** Wednesday, February 4, 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 Professor Hoffman, Academic Planning Committee Chair**

#### **2.1 Academic Planning Committee Goals**

Nickerson noted that in the APC's report to the Faculty Senate the Committee listed goals it wants to work on collaboratively with the Senate. He stated that one of these goals is to discuss adding one or two seats on the APC for non-tenure track faculty members. The other goal is to streamline the promotion and tenure process and the academic program reviews. Hoffman pointed out that the goal to streamline the promotion and tenure review process was suggested by a previous chair of the APC and might be an issue to address in the future.

Hoffman stated that past APC chair Lahey put a set of documents together to provide guidelines on conducting academic program reviews (APR). He noted that the APC is responsible for monitoring the APR. He stated that APR's are very important and if someone wants to learn more about what is happening across the campus they should participate in an APR. Sollars pointed out that she was involved in two APR's while she was on the APC and she thought the monitor is responsible for ensuring things progress accordingly in the Review. She noted that the two APR's were vastly different in how they were conducted, and she hopes that Lahey's guidelines have helped to make the process more uniform. Nickerson stated that he participated in three APRs and each one involved a lot of time. Hoffman noted that Lahey's guidelines clarify the APR process and help to keep the review team on a timeline.

Sollars pointed out that there were no guidelines when she did the APRs. She stated that she thought one of the main functions of the monitor is to provide continuity and structure for the review process, but she did not know if she had the authority to tell the people of the review team that they have to conduct the review process in a particular way. Hoffman stated that new APC members are encouraged to participate in an APR so they can see how it works. He stated that the monitor's job is to create the time for the review committee to meet with faculty members, graduate students, and anyone else who has an issue with a program that needs to be addressed.

Nickerson asked if a monitor can put a weighting factor on the report. Hoffman pointed out that the assessment of the team is conducted by the monitor. He noted that recently the APRs have been very good.

Hoffman stated the members of the APC feel that there should be designated positions on the Committee for non-tenure track faculty members. He noted that the importance of these faculty members to the campus has become increasingly more evident and it is believed that they should have a voice on the APC.

Bender pointed out that he chaired the APC when the last changes to its membership were made. He stated that the changes were made in part because it was felt that there should be representation from UNOPA and UAAD when budget cuts are being considered. He noted that some faculty members were concerned at the time that adding more people could dilute the power of the tenured faculty members, but he believes it is right for the APC to want to add dedicated positions for non-tenure track faculty members. Hoffman stated that he thinks there will be non-tenure track faculty members who would want to serve on the APC even though it can consume a considerable amount of time. He noted that VC Paul in particular is interested in having research professors on the APC.

Nickerson stated that the only concern he has is with research professors, who were previously post docs, serving on the APC because once these people find a permanent position they leave the university. Joeckel asked if someone with these qualifications could dilute the voice of the faculty, primarily those involved with teaching, on the Committee. He asked why VC Paul is so interested in having a research professor on the APC. Hoffman stated that he believes VC Paul wants to be as supportive as he can with these faculty members. He pointed out that there are eight other faculty members so the non-tenure track members would not be able to dilute the voting of the committee.

Nickerson stated that he believes having a designated position on the APC for a non-tenure track faculty member is a good idea and pointed out that it has worked well for the Executive Committee. Joeckel asked if a particular benefit to having a non-tenured track faculty member on the Committee has been identified. Hoffman pointed out that it comes down to the fact that there is a population of faculty members that are not represented on the Committee. He noted that these faculty members often advise undergraduate and graduate students and can confer degrees and it boils down to an academic issue. Sollars asked if these faculty members can bring something unique to the APC. Hoffman stated that typically the research non-tenure track faculty members work with other faculty members and there may be some issues that affect them that the APC needs to address.

Rudy asked if the vetting process for hiring a research professor is the same as for a permanent faculty member. Hoffman stated that in his college they have to form a search committee and conduct a national search for research professors. Rudy asked if the final approval for hiring a research professor working on a specific grant is made by the

principal investigator on the grant. Hoffman stated that the search committee would make a recommendation to the chair of a department and the dean would need to approve the appointment.

Griffin noted that the APC is a committee defined in the UNL Bylaws and changes to it must be approved by the Faculty Senate, ASUN, the Chancellor and the Board of Regents. Sollars asked if the plan to revise the membership of the APC fits into the current ongoing bylaw revision process. Hoffman stated that it would. Nickerson asked if the APC has asked the Chancellor if he supports the additional faculty members to the APC. He noted that the last time the APC increased the number of faculty members on the Committee the Chancellor was concerned that it would upset the voting power and asked that VC Paul be made a voting member of the APC. Hoffman suggested that the Executive Committee ask the Chancellor when it meets with them on February 25 because it will meet with him before the APC does.

Nickerson stated that the APC's goal to require the cost of operating and maintaining a building be included in the project initiation request was a great idea. Hoffman stated that the APC plans on pursuing this issue with Associate to the Chancellor Nunez and will check to see what changes need to be made to make this happen. He noted that the requirement would at least show what the estimated costs would be for operating and maintaining a building once it has been built. He pointed out that these are ongoing costs which impact the budget.

Rudy asked if the cost of demolishing an existing building should be included. Hoffman noted that demolition is a one-time expense. He stated, for example, that the new CBA building has been approved and the money is currently being raised to construct it, but the operating costs and maintenance costs for the building, which are significant costs, are unknown and the APC should have had this information when recommending approval.

Nickerson reported that the Executive Committee met with Professor Potuto, Faculty Athletics Representative, Dennis Leblanc, Senior Associate Athletic Director, and others to discuss academic issues and student athletes. He noted that Professor Potuto wanted to make sure that UNL never has the recent embarrassment similar to the University of North Carolina where an academic program was heavily populated by student-athletes because there were no requirements for the program.

Nickerson asked if the APC has oversight on the academic programs. Hoffman pointed out that if courses or a program are deleted they would need to be approved by the University Curriculum Committee. Any new program has to go through and receive approval from the APC. He stated that Athletics should be able to see what majors student-athletes are taking and can determine if there is a particular major that many student-athletes are taking. Griffin noted that the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee has reviewed this information and it was recently presented to the Senate Executive Committee. Rudy pointed out that it is the faculty's fault if there is a major that is too easy that students flock to it. He noted that the distribution provided by the IAC showed

that the student-athletes had a wide distribution of majors. Bender noted that the control of the programs is within the individual colleges. Hoffman suggested that an audit be conducted periodically to review the distribution of majors of student-athletes.

### **3.0 Announcements**

#### **3.1 Interim Chair of IAC**

Nickerson reported that Professor Swenseth is now serving as interim chair of the IAC. He noted that Swenseth was the previous chair of the committee. He stated that at this time the IAC is not requesting a replacement for the Committee.

#### **3.2 CIC Academic Leadership Development Program**

Nickerson noted that the CIC hosts an Academic Leadership Development Program and each of the member institutions selects five people from its campus to participate. He stated that anyone interested in participating will need to submit an application.

#### **3.3 Report on Academic Scheduling and Planning Advisory Group (ASPAG) Meeting**

Sollars noted the ASPAG met and primarily discussed the university wide policies regarding undergraduate academic program minors, dual enrollment, and dual degrees. She pointed out that currently there is a wide disparity among colleges of what the requirements are for the minors and dual majors. She reported that the first effort is to determine what the issues and problems are and what the objectives will be for resolving the problems. She noted that once the final draft is completed the committee members will take it to their respective colleges for review.

Sollars reported that the ASPAG also discussed senior surveys. She stated that currently there are several different surveys that seniors are asked to take and the Group is considering consolidating them.

#### **3.4 Breakfast Meeting with President Bounds**

Nickerson reported that he and the other Senate Presidents met with President Bounds and discussed the future of the university. He noted President Bounds discussed how he plans to spend a great deal of time in Washington, DC to try to increase Nebraska's grant funding. He stated that he will give a more complete report of the meeting next week.

### **4.0 Approval of January 28, 2015 Minutes**

Approval of the minutes was postponed due to the lack of a quorum.

### **5.0 Unfinished Business**

#### **5.1 Executive Committee Nominee for Chancellor's Commission on the Status of People of Color**

The Executive Committee discussed possible faculty members to serve on the faculty council of the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of People of Color.

## **6.0 New Business**

### **6.1 ASUN Resolution on Requiring the Incorporation of a Sexual Misconduct Policy and Resource Statement on All Syllabi**

Bender stated that Guevara had suggested at the Senate meeting the idea of putting the proposed language on Blackboard so it would be on each student's Blackboard page. Rudy stated that he understands the importance of the issue and the need for a safe, fair, equitable environment, but he does not think it belongs on a course syllabus. He stated that while this is important language it does not have anything to do with the intent of the syllabus. He suggested that a link could be included providing all of the available resources. Nickerson stated that the motion could be revised so that instructors could use it on Blackboard or in their printed syllabus.

Nickerson noted that he asked Woodman his views on the subject because he teaches large classes and Woodman felt that while the proposal was straight forward, it is really a university policy and would be one more piece of overloading on a syllabus which already has many other things on it. Joeckel pointed out that all of the current links required in the syllabus relate to the course. He stated that he thinks in the School of Natural Resources instructors are told to have a statement on the syllabus of what to do in case of an emergency. He wondered if individual departments can dictate what additional pieces of information should be on a syllabus, and if this is the case, he does not see why the information on sexual misconduct should not be included on course syllabi.

Nickerson wondered if the university has a resource page which can provide information on issues such as sexual misconduct. Rudy stated that the university bulletin has information, but suggested having an easy website link would be useful.

Rudy wondered if including the information on course syllabi would make a change in the percentage of students who report incidents of sexual misconduct. Joeckel stated that he can conceive that having the information so readily available could make a difference and this is an important issue that needs to be addressed, although he agreed that providing a link would be acceptable.

Sollars stated that there needs to be a clear statement that is extremely apparent, not only about what is inappropriate behavior, but to enable the victims as well. Rudy noted that having a mentoring relationship with students is important because they may feel comfortable enough to speak about a problem they may have and the instructor could direct them to the appropriate people. Sollars stated that she believes that the idea of putting the information on the syllabus would allow students to feel that they could address a faculty member. She stated that faculty members should be aware that sexual misconduct is a real issue at universities that needs to be addressed. Joeckel stated that he is in favor of having some kind of statement on a syllabus and the instructor can also mention it in the first day of class.

Bender stated that the question is where is the best location to provide this information so the greatest number of people can see it. He pointed out that this is a question that the

students can better answer, and the effort should be to identify the medium that is most likely to reach the students.

Joeckel stated that students often listen to faculty members as the figure of authority in the classroom. He stated that if the faculty are committed to the policy and there is a line in a syllabus linking information about sexual misconduct in could be a powerful tool.

The Executive Committee agreed to see if ASUN passes the resolution and to discuss the issue further at next week's meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:54 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, February 11, 2015 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.