

UNL FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
City Campus Union, Auditorium
October 4, 2011
Presidents Barbara LaCost, and John Lindquist, Presiding

1.0 Call to Order

President LaCost called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

3.0 Chancellor Perlman

Chancellor Perlman reported that the campus is looking at everything we do from the perspective of how our work will contribute to our goals. He noted that he has asked the directors of units on campus, such as records and registration, housing, and all other administrative functions, to see how their units can contribute to the goals. He stated that in any institution some things are routinely done the same simply because that is what has always been done, but this is a good time for us to determine whether changes need to be made to make things work better. He pointed out that this might mean some shifting of administrative responsibilities. For example the administration is currently looking at the International Affairs Office and Summer Sessions to see if the work of these offices can be done more efficiently and effectively. He noted that one of the questions that we need to address is how we are going to reach an enrollment of 30,000 students in a short period of time. If anyone has concerns, comments, or suggestions, he stated that he is always willing to hear what people have to say. He noted that sometimes there are some unintended consequences on the academic end and the faculty needs to keep the administration in check with this.

Chancellor Perlman reported that Assistant Dean Dan Duncan, Agricultural Research Division, has agreed to serve as the director of Innovation Campus. He noted that Assistant Dean Duncan has great credentials and strong experience working with the private sector in agriculture. He stated that Assistant Dean Duncan will be working with disciplines across the campus as they relate to Innovation Campus. He stated that over the course of time three individuals have been identified that can provide us with great leadership in trying to form public-private partnerships. He reported that Assistant Dean Duncan will be helpful in leading the interactions in this area. He stated that Ryan Anderson, Director of Industry Relations, Office of Research & Economic Development, is focusing attention on trying to find private sector companies interested in engaging in research. He stated that the third person is David Conrad, Director and CEO of NUTech Ventures, who helps to commercialize the research that comes out of our campus. He suggested that the Senate should have him come and speak about the things that are happening with NUTech Ventures.

Chancellor Perlman wanted to report on the reform that is occurring in intercollegiate athletics. He pointed out that we are fortunate not to be embroiled in many of the conflicts that are happening with intercollegiate athletics at other universities, but he is fully aware that there has been enough controversy at other schools that the carryover can have impacts on us. He noted that if we are not careful, what is happening at other universities with athletics could put our public support in jeopardy.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the NCAA is trying to address these conflicts. He stated that in August the President of the NCAA had a presidential retreat with about 50 university presidents in attendance. He noted that one of the topics was to see if there is a consensus of Division 1 schools about the direction that needs to be changed to make college sports more consistent with the values of higher education. He reported that there were some very good and passionate discussions about the issue and some strong consensus on a number of points was achieved. He noted that some things need to be done quickly but there are many channels that must be navigated in the NCAA in order for changes to occur. He stated that the intent is that a number of reform efforts are taking place and the NCAA will try to be as transparent as it can in the reform process. He stated that the hope is that within a year proposed changes will be adopted, and that by next April all package reforms will be adopted by the Board of Directors of the NCAA.

Chancellor Perlman reported that we are most interested in academic reform and how we can insure that student athletes are in fact real student athletes in that they perform their responsibilities as students. He pointed out that the academic regulations for student athletes are more burdensome than for other students. He stated that student athletes are required to make progress towards a degree so they can graduate in five years

and the progress rate not only applies for individual students, but for the entire team. He stated that the NCAA looks at how many of the students on a team are not meeting their eligibility requirements and how many get degrees. He reported that points are used to determine the status of a team with 1,000 points being the best number for a team. Currently if a team has less than 900 points the university is subject to very significant penalties which include a loss of scholarships. If a rating of less than 900 continues for more than three years a university could be denied membership in the NCAA. He stated that a score of 925 is the standard and happily all of our teams are above 925. He noted that our football team has the highest GPA it has ever had, a 3.0. He noted that originally the statistics that were set for the point scale represented a 50% graduation rate, but there will be some changes and modifications on how the points are determined and after these changes are made the standard will be 930. He stated that there will be an effort to make the 930 score a prerequisite for any post-season play. He noted that the Big Ten commissioner has suggested that all student athletes should be ineligible to play in their freshman year. He stated that the NCAA is taking a look at eligibility requirements for transfer students. He reported that a series of academic reforms will be presented

Chancellor Perlman stated that there is a committee of the NCAA that is looking at student athlete welfare. He noted that there is not much universities can do for student athletes other than providing them with scholarships and building great facilities for them to use. He reported that in the past the NCAA has often tried to provide "competitive equity" by limiting the amount that could be spent for certain athletic purposes. He stated that Nebraska's position is that it would like to pay the cost of attendance for student athletes. He noted that right now the university cannot cover the cost of other expenses beyond tuition, fees, and books associated with the cost of attending school. He stated that smaller schools do not want to have this because it is too expensive. He reported that the NCAA might let each conference decide on the rules for financial assistance for athletes because this would eliminate some of the competition between the larger schools and the smaller schools in terms of athletic budgets.

Chancellor Perlman reported that another issue being discussed by the NCAA is the lengthy time it takes to resolve NCAA cases. He stated that the idea is to streamline the process of resolving cases as much as possible, but it is important to give institutions a fair process. He also stated the Task Forces are looking at fixing more responsibility on the head coach for the conduct and integrity of his or her program.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he is sitting on a task force that is attempting to deregulate some of the NCAA rules. He noted that there is a lot of bureaucracy which is making it hard to focus on the more difficult issues. He stated that there is an effort for cost containment. He reported that everyone is concerned with the large sums of money going to athletics. He pointed out that athletics is self-supporting here, and in fact, athletics helps to support academics on campus. He stated that as Chancellor he cares about the escalating costs of intercollegiate athletics but he does not think much progress will be made in controlling the costs. He noted that there are many ideas on how to cut the costs in athletic departments but there is not much enthusiasm for restricting how much an athletic department overall can spend.

4.0 Approval of 9/13/11 Minutes

Professor Peterson, Agricultural Economics, moved for approval of the minutes. The motion was second by Professor Wysocki, Computer and Electronics Engineering. The motion was approved.

5.0 Committee Reports

5.1 Academic Standards Committee (Assistant Director, Jennifer Nelson, Division of General Studies)

Assistant Director Nelson reported that the Academic Standards Committee is the faculty group that reviews written appeals from students who have been dismissed and who are seeking reinstatement to the University. She stated that students must first start with their home college in seeking reinstatement. She noted that there are 20 faculty members on the Academic Standards Committee and between them they attend 30 meetings. She noted that usually only three faculty members are needed for a meeting. She expressed her sincere thanks to all the faculty members who are involved with the Committee.

Assistant Director Nelson reported that this past year there were 191 appeals and there is a 26% denial rate. She pointed out that if a student is denied, they can reapply. She stated that the Office of Records & Registration is in the process of transitioning their files and the form used to review the appeals is being revised. She stated that a good, concise, one-page form is now being used and the process is moving towards an electronic phase.

Secretary Shea noted that in the recommendation for action by the Senate section it says to be announced. He asked if there is something coming up that the Senate will need to take action on. Assistant Director Nelson stated that there is nothing that will require the approval of the Senate. Secretary Shea suggested that this be

corrected in the report.

Professor Reisbig, Child, Youth & Family Studies, noticed that a high percentage of appeals are accepted and she asked what this could mean. Assistant Director Nelson stated that appeal acceptances can vary with the appeals committee. She noted that three faculty members meet and review appeals. She noted that this year there was an inordinate number of medical appeals and faculty members do have sympathy for these appeals. She stated that history has shown that there is typically a 60/40% split in appeals.

Professor Reisbig asked if the dismissal appeals process is a necessary part in retaining students or do they continue to struggle even after they have been given an appeal. Assistant Director Nelson stated that those students whose GPA is close to 2.0 are usually successful. She noted that students with a lower GPA have difficulty getting off probation. She stated that she believes that we do need an appeals process and that ours is fine.

5.2 Grading and Examinations Committee

President LaCost reported that Professor Woodward was unable to attend the meeting but people with questions can email him. Secretary Shea suggested that Professor Woodward be asked to come to the November Senate meeting.

5.3 Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee (Professor Peterson)

Professor Peterson reported that he will continue to serve as chair of the ARRC for this year. He noted that the normal activities of the ARRC is to receive complaints that may arise between a faculty member and the University or involving complaints relating to academic freedom and tenure, professional conduct, and grievances. He stated that the hope is that concerns can be addressed informally by the ARRC without having to proceed to formal procedures but sometimes formal procedures are required. He noted that last year two formal written complaints were received but they were eventually withdrawn. He reported that he was contacted about a number of concerns relating to apportionment and interpersonal conflicts.

Professor Peterson stated that the ARRC was given three charges last year by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. One charge was to revise the ARRC procedures to coincide with the elimination of Professional Conduct – B procedures. He stated that another charge was to include language in the procedures relating to the cancellation of a guest speaker. He noted that a vote to change the procedures is on today's agenda.

Professor Peterson stated that the other charge was to draft a policy on suspension of pay to help guide the Chancellor's decisions on suspending pay when a faculty member has not performed assigned duties. He reported that the ARRC voted not to draft a policy because procedures were already in place in the Bylaws to deal with these situations. He stated that the Executive Committee is now grappling with the issue. President LaCost reported that the Executive Committee just recently voted to table this issue indefinitely.

Professor Peterson thanked all of the ARRC and Panel members who have worked throughout the year.

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Motion to Approve a Faculty Senate Meeting Cancellation Policy

President LaCost stated that the motion to include a faculty senate meeting postponement or cancellation policy was presented at the last meeting. She noted that the policy would be included in the Rules of Order of the Faculty Senate. She stated that previously no procedure was in place. The motion was approved.

6.2 Election to the Executive Committee

President LaCost stated that a member of the Executive Committee had to resign due to conflicts with his work schedule. She reported that Professor Guevara, Modern Languages & Literature, volunteered to run for election. She asked for any further nominations from the floor. Hearing no nominations from the floor President LaCost asked for approval by acclamation of Professor Guevara to the Executive Committee. Professor Bender, College of Journalism & Mass Communications, moved for approval by acclamation. The motion was second by Professor Carlson, Veterinary & Biomedical Sciences. The motion was approved.

6.3 Motion to Revise the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee Procedures

President LaCost stated that the revisions to the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Procedures were presented at the last meeting. She asked if there were any comments or questions regarding that changes that were being offered by the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee and the Executive Committee. Professor Peterson pointed out that there is one reference in Professional Conduct-A procedures that refers to Professional Conduct B but this motion would cover removing this language from the procedures. The motion

was approved.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Lane Carr, ASUN President, ASUN Resolution to Support Employee Plus One Benefits

President LaCost welcomed ASUN President Lane Carr. She noted that the ASUN recently passed a resolution encouraging the Board of Regents to adopt Employee Plus One Benefits.

President Carr stated that this is an opportunity for the student body and the faculty to work together. He noted that the Faculty Senate initiated the issue and ASUN passed legislation asking the students to advocate for a resolution calling for the university to adopt an Employee Plus One Benefits. He stated that this is a benefit that needs to be offered and he urged the Senate to reaffirm the resolution previously approved in December. He reported that the ASUN's efforts include producing and distributing flyers about the benefit and over 1200 email messages have been sent to the Regents to urge their support of the benefit. He stated that the Regents are very approachable and they are interested in hearing all sides of the story. He encouraged faculty members to make contact with the Regents who represent their district and he encouraged faculty members to contact their colleagues at the other campuses to pass the resolution. He also asked that faculty members discuss the resolution with their departments.

President Carr stated that students care about the Employee Plus One Benefits because it will affect the quality of education at the University of Nebraska. He pointed out that we need to make sure we can retain and attract faculty members and it is a huge plus for well-being on the campus. He reported that the students will be pushing hard in the next couple of weeks in support of this benefit.

President LaCost thanked President Carr for speaking to the Senate.

7.2 Motion to Reaffirm Employee Plus One Benefits

President LaCost noted that the Faculty Senate approved a resolution supporting Employee Plus One Benefits on December 7, 2010. She stated that the Executive Committee is asking for the Senate to reaffirm support for this benefit. She stated that she is asking for this to be an emergency motion.

Professor Chouinard, Mathematics, asked what the nature of the emergency is for this motion. President LaCost stated that the Board of Regents is likely to take action at their upcoming October meeting. Professor Chouinard asked if the Board was going to consider the motion at the October meeting. President LaCost stated that there is the belief that the Board may act on the motion.

Professor Falci, Sociology, moved to approve the motion as an emergency motion. Professor Peterson seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

President LaCost noted that the original motion passed in December 2010 was included in the Senate packet. Professor Chouinard stated that he was not opposing the motion but he wanted to express concern that reaffirming a previously approved motion of the Senate was not necessary. He stated that when a Senate motion is accepted it should be the policy of the Senate until it is revoked. He stated that he would have rather seen the motion support the ASUN motion rather than reaffirming what the Senate has already approved.

7.3 Gathering Information on Professors of Practice and Lecturers

Secretary Shea noted that the Executive Committee has been having discussions revolving around professors or practice positions and disparities across campus in how these faculty members' responsibilities are apportioned, expectations of them, and how they are valued and rewarded in units. He suggested that Senators share information with the Executive Committee on how their departments handle these positions. He noted that we might want to share some of the observations at a future meeting.

President LaCost stated that this was a great idea and that the Executive Committee has been doing some research on this issue. She asked the Senate to begin thinking about professors of practice. She asked if professors of practice replace lecturers and she asked Senators to look at the policies within their units on these positions. She suggested that Senators might want to bring forth conversations to the departments about what these positions mean, especially in light of the VSIP retirements and faculty shortages in departments. She stated that having a good, clear view of professors of practice is critical for all of us and she asked that Senators email the Executive Committee and share their thoughts.

7.4 Campus Heating and Cooling Policy

Professor Willis, Anthropology, asked if the campus heating and cooling policy can be reconsidered. She

pointed out that the current policy of reducing cooling or heating on the weekends creates a problem for faculty members because they are unable to work in their office in either the summer or winter. She noted that faculty members are being pressed to conduct research and yet they cannot meet with students on the weekend and it creates problems for people needing to work out of their office to conduct research. President LaCost stated that this will be discussed by the Executive Committee to see if anything can be done about the policy.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, November 1, 2011, at 2:30 p.m. in the East Campus Union, Great Plains Room. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, and Patrick Shea, Secretary.