UNL FACULTY SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Bender, Dawes, Joeckel, Konecky, Lee, Purcell, Reisbig, Rudy, Sollars, Steffen, Vakilzadian, Woodman

Absent: Nickerson

Date: Tuesday, February 16, 2016

Location: 203 Alexander

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
Bender called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.

2.0 Professor Rebecca Bernthal, Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee (ARRC) Chair
2.1 Possibility of Inclusion of Professor of Practice and Research Professors on the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Panel (ARRP)
Bernthal reported that the ARRC discussed the request to consider professors of practice and research professors serving as members on the ARRP. She said philosophically the ARRC members were not opposed, but there is the issue of tenure related cases. She pointed out that only tenured faculty members can serve on Academic Right and Responsibilities cases that are tenure related. She noted that the membership list for the ARRP consists of 36 elected faculty members and these are broken up into special committees of 6 faculty members. Problems may occur when members cannot serve because they have to recuse themselves from a case or they are unavailable. This narrows down the number of members who can serve on a special committee and the ARRC does not want to be in a position where they cannot form a special committee due to the lack of eligible members remaining on the Panel membership list. Lee asked if it is a rule that only tenured faculty members can make decisions on tenure related cases. Bernthal stated that it is a rule that needs to be followed.

Bernthal stated that another issue may be the longevity of the contract for non-tenured leading faculty members. Woodman pointed out that only non-tenure track faculty members who have been promoted to Associate or above would be eligible and these people typically have three to five year contracts. Bernthal noted that currently it is required to have four Associate or Full Extension Educators on the Panel membership list. She pointed out that if the Panel membership list is expanded the Board of Regents will need to approve any changes to the procedures.

Steffen asked if most complaints that are filed with the ARRC are done by Associate Professors and above. Bernthal noted that she does not have the any real figures on this
question. She pointed out that in the future this may change since it has only been recently that the positions of Professors of Practice and Research Professors were more formally created.

Griffin noted that it is very difficult to get faculty members to run for election to the Panel, probably because of the time commitment that is required if a case needs to be investigated. She wondered whether many of the non-tenure track faculty members will be able to devote the time to a case. In speaking with numerous non-tenure track faculty members, she has learned that some of them have little opportunity to participate because they are not provided the same flexibility with their schedules as tenure-track faculty members. Joeckel questioned whether we would be putting an undue burden on non-tenure track faculty members by asking them to take on the additional responsibilities of serving on the ARRP. Woodman pointed out that non-tenure track faculty members would have a choice in whether they wanted to run for election to the Panel.

Woodman noted that the ARRC procedures require that there be four Extension Educators on the Panel, although these are non-tenure track faculty members. He added that every argument that had been presented to not include non-tenure track faculty members on the ARRP would also apply to the Extension faculty who are members of the ARRP. Bernthal stated that she does not know the history regarding this requirement. Purcell noted that Extension Specialists have always been University employees, but in 1998 all Extension Educators become totally University employees, previously they were paid in part by the county. Bernthal suggested that the Extension Educators may have asked for inclusion on the ARRP when they became full University employees. Griffin stated that she will check the Senate archives to see if she can find any further information about the Extension Educators on the ARRP.

Bernthal reported that there was some concern from members of the ARRC that there could be danger of repercussion for non-tenure track faculty, since they may be more vulnerable than tenured faculty members, when serving on some special committees. She pointed out that the Panel members should be a diverse pool representing the different colleges, but there are some colleges that have little representation because the faculty are not willing to run for election to the Panel. Vakilzadian noted that when he first came here 25% of a faculty member’s responsibilities was in service work. Today it says 10% but in reality it is more like 5%. Purcell pointed out that for IANR faculty members it is down to 3%. Steffen stated that it should not be acceptable for entire units to not participate in faculty governance.

Bender stated that the Executive Committee will take under advisement the ARRC’s recommendation to add Professors of Practice and Research Professors and to increase the size of the Panel membership.

3.0 Announcements
3.1 Candidates for Chancellor
Bender reported that he sent out an email message to the Executive Committee regarding the interview time and days for the Committee to meet with the candidates for
Chancellor. A flyer was attached listing the dates and times of the candidates’ presentations to the faculty at large.

### 3.2 Meeting on Proposed Revisions to UNL Bylaws
Woodman reported that the subcommittees of the Executive Committee and the Academic Planning Committee working on the proposed revisions to the UNL Bylaws will be meeting in the next couple of weeks. He noted that there are no real significant changes being proposed at this time.

### 4.0 Approval of February 9, 2016 Minutes
Joeckel moved for approval of the revised minutes. Motion seconded by Purcell and approved by the Executive Committee.

### 5.0 Unfinished Business
#### 5.1 Committee on Diversity and Inclusiveness
Agenda item postponed due to lack of time.

#### 5.2 Committee on Academic Honesty
Agenda item postponed due to lack of time.

### 6.0 New Business
#### 6.1 Questions for Candidates for Chancellor
The Executive Committee developed a list of questions for the interviews with the Chancellor candidates.

#### 6.2 March 1st Senate Meeting
Griffin reported that the March 1st meeting will be the last meeting for Chancellor Perlman to speak to the Senate because he will be out of town both April 5 and April 26. She noted that the faculty presentation of Dr. Daniel Reed, Chancellor candidate, is scheduled for 3:00 on March 1 and asked the Executive Committee whether the Senate meeting should try to be shortened to allow the Senators to attend the presentation. She pointed out that there is work that the Senate must do because it is behind schedule due to the closing of the campus due to a snow storm on February 2. The Executive Committee agreed to try and reschedule the committee reports to the April 5 meeting.

#### 6.3 Upcoming Executive Committee Elections
Griffin noted that election of Faculty Senate officers and Executive Committee members will occur at the April 26 meeting. She stated that nominees are needed for President-Elect, Secretary, and three Executive Committee members. Any Senate member interested should contact any current member of the Executive Committee or herself.

#### 6.4 Suggested Revisions to Process for Selecting University Marshals
Bender reported that he received a request from Head Marshal Professor Gorman suggesting that the Head Marshal be allowed to find suitable candidates to serve as Marshals. When identified, a letter will be sent to the Faculty Senate office for record keeping. He stated that this will give the Head Marshall greater freedom to find people
willing to serve. He noted that the need for additional Marshals has increased because the size of the graduation classes have increased. He pointed out that currently an inquiry is made to the Deans of each college to find people willing to serve.

Rudy stated that he has served as a Marshal for several years. He estimated that only about 30 hours of time is spent for the year working as a Marshal. He stated that the Graduate and Undergraduate ceremonies occur separately in December and May, but the August graduation ceremony is a combined event.

Joeckel stated that it should be mandatory that each department and college is represented at graduation. He suggested that faculty names could be drawn on a rotating basis so that each faculty member has the opportunity to serve as a Marshal. Bender pointed out that the graduation ceremonies require a lot of organization and having people with experience makes the event function much better. Rudy noted that faculty participation and attendance as a whole at graduation ceremonies is horrible, and the Commencement and Honors Convocations Committee has been discussing how it could be made mandatory that faculty attend the events. Woodman pointed out that directors and chairs should be required to attend and represent their department. Vakilzadian stated that all of the colleges should be represented at the ceremonies.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:22 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, February 23, 2016 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 203 Alexander Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Allison Reisbig, Secretary.