

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Anaya, Bender, Guevara, Konecky, Nickerson, Purcell, Rinkevich, Rudy, Steffen, Woodman

Absent: Joeckel, Sollars, Wysocki

Date: Wednesday, January 14, 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 3:02 pm.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Anaya to Replace Ruchala

Nickerson welcomed back Anaya who agreed to replace Ruchala until the Senate elections on April 29. Nickerson pointed out that Ruchala resigned from the Executive Committee due to a conflict with her schedule.

2.2 February 4 Executive Committee Meeting

Nickerson reported that Professors Hoffman and Lahey from the Academic Planning Committee are scheduled to meet with the Executive Committee on February 4 to discuss joint goals between the APC and the Senate.

2.3 Athletics Director Eichorst

Nickerson stated that he has invited Athletics Director Eichorst to speak to the Senate at the March 3 meeting, although he is waiting to hear whether Eichorst will be able to attend this meeting.

2.4 Clarification on Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee Website

Nickerson reported that the ARRC is being asked to develop a short statement that can be put on the website clarifying who can file a complaint with the ARRC.

2.5 Director of Institutional Equity and Compliance Position

Woodman asked if the Director of Institutional Equity and Compliance position has been filled yet. Nickerson noted that he has not heard of anything but will check on it and report back to the Executive Committee.

3.0 Approval of January 7, 2015 Minutes

Steffen moved for approval of the minutes as revised. Motion seconded by Rinkevich. The motion was approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 ARRC Response to Charge Regarding Conflict of Interest for Extension Educators

Nickerson noted that the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee was asked to get clarification regarding extension personnel being able to serve on organizational boards and whether there could be a conflict of interest. He stated that he thought the ARRC's response was appropriate and helped to solidify the position of extension educators as faculty members.

4.2 Review Guidelines for Extension Education Professionals

Nickerson stated that a recommendation has been made that the proposed document should be extended to all faculty members. He noted that the document pertains to faculty members holding positions in non-academic organizations and having it applied to everyone would provide some kind of protection for extension educators. He suggested that the issue be discussed with the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors at the January 28th Executive Committee meeting.

Nickerson reported that the Senate discussed the proposed document at its meeting on Tuesday and the general opinion was that the document needed clarification. Steffen stated that he suggested revisions to the document. He pointed out that the information in footnote five addresses a lot of the faculty's concerns so he included the language several times within the document. He stated that he tried to be explicit and provide clarification while preserving the principle of the document.

Rudy asked the Executive Committee if they can see circumstances where a faculty member might think it is appropriate to serve on a board but your supervisor might not agree. He pointed out that his concern is not with the principle of the document, but who makes the determination of when it is appropriate to be on a board. Steffen reported that he reviewed the Regent's Conflict of Interest link and noted that faculty members should follow the existing approval routing. Rudy asked if the VC of IANR or the SVCAA should make the ultimate decision and he would like to see this included in the policy.

Rudy asked if a faculty member can make an appeal. Steffen noted that the Regents Bylaws state that there is a grievance procedure if you think the rules have not been applied to you. Bender noted that if a grievance is involved it could go to the ARRC. He noted that the problem is when there are related positions when someone is on a board because they are there to represent the university in an official manner. Steffen pointed out that if a board has policies that are being endorsed that are in conflict with the university there would be a problem. He noted that the reason for wanting an approval process for serving on an outside organization's board is to protect a faculty member from being removed for political reasons.

Nickerson asked if the approving process should be specified. Woodman noted that the ultimate decision is usually with the Board of Regents, but it should be clear who people can go to for an appeal. Steffen stated that the document could be drafted so the

cognizant Vice Chancellor is the approving body, but faculty members should talk to their immediate supervisor first and then it should continue up the approval process.

Nickerson noted that Professor Reisbig asked in the Senate meeting if we are going to put in a specific process which a faculty member should follow. Steffen noted that section two under Guidance for Extension Professionals provides some information on the process. He pointed out that people need to define whether their position on a board is a voting position. Rudy noted that in section six in the proposed revisions it states that service on these boards should be included on a faculty member's annual activities report, although the original document specifies the Activity Insight report. He suggested that the generic version of annual reporting be used, particularly if the guidelines apply to all faculty members because not all colleges use Activity Insight. Nickerson stated that he would like to see that the disclosures are reviewed once a year to see if anything has changed.

Nickerson stated that he thinks the proposed changes would be acceptable to Dean Hibberd and ultimately the idea is to protect the academic freedom of the extension faculty. Woodman pointed out that the critical part is ensuring that there is an appeal process because it provides an avenue should there be a disagreement between a faculty member and an administrator.

Nickerson stated that he would incorporate the suggested changes and send a draft to the Executive Committee for review before sending it back to Dean Hibberd.

4.3 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Members Survey Timeline

Woodman stated that he and Rudy will look at the data first and summarize the findings for the Executive Committee. Rudy asked what the Executive Committee wants to do with the data from the survey. Woodman asked whether there should be another forum for non-tenure track faculty members. Nickerson pointed out that whatever is done with the data is unlikely to be controversial, but the Committee needs to discuss more specifically what should be done with the data. He stated that the Committee should inform Chancellor Perlman, VC Green, and SVCAA Weissinger that the Committee is reviewing the results of the survey.

Woodman noted that one area of concern that was identified in the first survey is concern over the lack of yearly evaluations of non-tenure track faculty members. Steffen pointed out that for the university's reaccreditation he would think that faculty evaluations would be important.

Woodman stated that he and Rudy should have a report ready for the Executive Committee in mid-February.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Recommendations for the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of People of Color

Nickerson reported that the Executive Committee has been asked to review the eight recommended faculty names who have been suggested to serve on the faculty council of the CCSPC as stipulated in the CCSPC guidelines. He noted that there is still one position that is open. The Executive Committee approved all of the faculty members listed. Anaya suggested that if the Commission is to be truly diverse it should have representations from all groups on campus. Guevara agreed and stated that this should be suggested to the Chancellor. Nickerson stated that he will notify the Chancellor of the Committee's suggestion.

5.2 Review of January Senate Meeting

Guevara noted that the presentation given by Associate to the Chancellor Nunez and Assistant VC Currin on the TIPS Prevention was the same information provided to the TIPS committee. He pointed out that the TIPS programs is an evolving process and adjustments may need to be made at some point.

Woodman asked if a case is considered closed once it has been investigated. Guevara stated that it is in the sense that the case has been resolved. Woodman asked how long the case will be retained once it is closed. Guevara stated that currently only two people in administration can see details of the cases. He stated that if anyone is able to locate a case in TIPS it would be listed without any context. Steffen noted that it was explained at the meeting that currently they want to keep the cases on file so they have data that can be used to see if there is a pattern of a problem. Konecky pointed out that a time frame is needed for how long the case will be retained on file. Steffen noted that the statistical data can be kept and the names removed. Nickerson suggested that the data be removed once a year. Guevara stated that once a case is dealt with it should be removed.

Woodman stated that faculty members should have the right to put a response in their file if a complaint is made against them. He noted that there should be an obvious way to show that a case has been resolved. Konecky stated that a simple notation could be made to state that the issue has been resolved. Woodman stated that he is worried that the information could show up somewhere in social media. Rudy stated that there should be an expiration date on some cases. He wondered legally how long these cases can be kept on file. Griffin pointed out that there is information on the university's website on retention of records regarding how long different types of documentation are to be kept on file, although she does not think there is anything on there about these types of files.

Nickerson stated that the Senate should continue insisting that incidents be removed after a period of time. Guevara suggested that the Senate Past President should monitor the situation.

Bender noted that there were only five or six TIPS that could not be acted on due to lack of information. Rudy stated that there were five meaningful incidents that needed to be

taken care of. Konecky pointed out that there is still not widespread knowledge of TIPS and once there is a deeper presence it will be interesting to see what happens.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:29 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, January 21 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.