

**UNL FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES**  
**City Campus Union, Auditorium**  
**November 6, 2012**  
**Presidents Schubert, Guevara and LaCost, Presiding**

**1.0 Call to Order**

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

**2.0 Announcements**

**2.1 Passing of Former Associate to the Chancellor Herb Howe**

President Schubert reported the passing of former Associate to the Chancellor Herb Howe who was employed at the University for 38 years, the last 18 years as Associate to the Chancellor. He served four chancellors and two interim chancellors and was a good friend and advisor to the Faculty Senate. He received the Louise Pound-George Howard Distinguished Career Service Award in 2008. President Schubert reported that a memorial service will be held on December 8.

**2.2 December Faculty Senate Meeting**

President Schubert announced that Chancellor Perlman will be speaking at the December 11 Faculty Senate meeting. Other guest speakers will be Dean Cerveny, Enrollment Management Council, and Director Hunter, Admissions.

**2.3 Report on Board of Regents Meeting**

President Schubert reported that the Board approved the construction of another parking garage at 18 and R Streets which will include some housing units, some of which may be available for visiting faculty members. He noted that the Executive Committee hopes to send out a brief questionnaire on short-term housing in order to gauge the need for this kind of housing. He stated that the questionnaire will ask questions such as what the expectation price will be for the housing and how many days are typically needed.

**3.0 President Milliken**

President Milliken reported that he had just come from a meeting with the Governor and Nebraska P-16 co-chairs to discuss issues relating to P-16 alignment. He noted that more discussions are needed about the expectations related to college preparedness of high school students and he reported that he recently met with Omaha-area superintendents to discuss the expectations. He stated that there needs to be more conversations about how we align high school curriculums with the University in order to have students be more prepared for their college experience and be successful.

President Milliken reported that a primary interest for him is the change in the Legislature due to the ending of many of the leaders' terms. He noted that the University has worked successfully with Speaker Flood, Senator Heidemann, Chair of the Appropriations Committee, Senator Adams, Chair of the Education Committee, and Senator Cornett, Chair of the Revenue Committee but all of these people are either leaving the Legislature because of term limits or moving to new roles within the Legislature. He pointed out that these changes will have an impact on the University, particularly because 2013 is a budget year.

President Milliken stated that the Board of Regents will have three possibly four, new Regents this year resulting in as much as 50% of the Board being new. He pointed out that it has been some time since the Board had such a significant change in membership. He stated that there will be an orientation for the new Regents and efforts will be made to get the new Regents to visit the campuses as much as possible to get them acquainted with the University and how it operates.

President Milliken stated that nationally, the greatest concern for us is the possibility of a government-wide sequestration, which could have a significant impact in terms of research and financial aid funding to the university. He noted that this could create a very difficult environment for the university.

President Milliken reported that the Board of Regents in June approved the university's 2012-13 operating budget and 2013-15 biennial budget request. The biennial budget request was then submitted to the Governor for consideration in the upcoming legislative session. He noted that the budget request includes funding increases for Programs of Excellence but does not yet include salary increases. He pointed out that salary increases are not put forward until the collective bargaining processes with UNO and UNK are concluded. He

stated that unfortunately, he thinks UNMC and UNL will be further behind with their salaries in comparison with their peer groups. He stated that on the capital side of the budget, this is the fifth year that the University is placing a Lincoln-based nursing facility as a priority in the budget. He noted that the nursing facility was not identified for state funding in 2012 but that it continues to be a priority for the University.

President Milliken noted that Nebraska continues to have one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country and our economy has not been as difficult as elsewhere. He stated that relatively speaking, the university has done well with five years of flat state funding compared to other universities that have sustained 20-30% budget cuts. However, we cannot sustain the quality of the University without getting significant help from the state. He pointed out that two-thirds of our state-aided budget comes from state appropriations, with the rest coming from tuition revenues. He stated that we want to hold down costs and the University has made numerous efforts to provide tuition assistance. He stated that the best thing legislators can do to help keep college costs down is to maintain a reasonable investment in the University in terms of state appropriations. He noted that 80% of the University's operating budget goes toward salaries and benefits and in order for us to keep pace and be competitive with other universities we need to have reasonable increases in salaries and benefits and we need the State's support to do this.

President Milliken reported that the real strategy for increasing enrollment at the University is to increase the college-going rate in Nebraska, not for the campuses to compete against each other. He stated that he thinks today, more than at any other time, there are differentiations between the campuses with each campus defining itself. He pointed out that we need to do a better job of expanding access to education to first-generation students and under-represented and lower-income students. He noted that we also need to attract more non-resident students and we have ambitious goals to increase the number of international students. He reported that on-line education enrollments continue to increase, including a 3.5% increase this past year.

President Milliken stated that another way to increase the number of students is through retention. He pointed out that our retention rates for freshmen and sophomores are lower than at other Big Ten schools and an important objective for the campuses is to improve retention rates. He noted that the Board is very interested in seeing this and wants to hear about the campuses' strategies for increasing retention rates.

President Milliken stated that a couple of weeks ago the University announced the opening of a University-Affiliated Research Center (UARC) in conjunction with the U.S. Strategic Command. He noted that the University's UARC is now one of 14 in the nation, with other UARCs at John Hopkins, MIT, and Penn State. He reported that the National Strategic Research Institute (NSRI) will manage the UARC. He pointed out that the University had to compete nationwide in order to get UARC and the decision was determined by the Department of Defense. He stated that quite a few faculty members at UNL have met with VC Paul and Retired Lt. General Hinson, director of the NSRI, to work on some of the research proposals that will be funded. He stated that UARC will initially involve primarily UNL and UNMC, but UNK and UNO will also be involved in the research.

President Milliken reported that Dr. Samuel Meisels, a national leader in early childhood education, has been named Executive Director of the Buffett Early Childhood Institute. He noted that Dr. Meisels is highly regarded and he is looking forward to Dr. Meisels beginning at the University on June 1.

President Milliken reported that the University of Nebraska Foundation's fundraising campaign recently hit the \$1.2 billion goal, 30 months earlier than expected and the Foundation is still targeting goals. He stated that some of the funding goals are to help construct a new UNL College of Business building and to construct a cancer center at UNMC, plus a number of other projects. He noted that the campaign has supported 1,400 new student scholarship funds. He stated that he hopes that the campuses will be able to meet Brian Hastings, the new President and CEO of the Foundation. He stated that he thinks UNL's move to the Big Ten made the difference in attracting very talented people for the CEO position.

President Milliken pointed out that the Employee Plus One Benefit goes into effect in January and materials will soon be out allowing people to enroll for this benefit.

Professor Falci, Sociology, asked if the change in the members of the Board of Regents could result in the Employee Plus One Benefit and the policy on stem cell research being overturned. President Milliken stated that the Board of Regents has been quite good at working as a university governing board. He noted that the Board has dealt with issues that were controversial and highly charged, but after conducting extensive research on the issues and having lengthy discussions, the Board makes a decision and then moves on to other work. He noted that the vote maintaining the university's policy on stem cell research was a four-four tie, but he

thinks it is unlikely to come up again. He stated that he hopes that we do not have to revisit decisions that were made in the past but he cannot guarantee it.

President Milliken thanked the Senate for the opportunity to speak and thanked the faculty for all of the work that they do. He stated that he believes the University is on an impressive trajectory and while he fully understands that his name is in the paper more than the faculty, the credit really belongs to the faculty. He noted that it is because of the work of the faculty that we are able to attract the students who are enrolled and how the University is perceived across the state.

#### **4.0 Approval of October 9, 2012 Minutes**

Professor Anaya, University Libraries, moved for approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded by Professor Dahab, Civil Engineering. The motion was approved.

#### **5.0 Committee Reports**

##### **5.1 Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women (Professor Simpson)**

Professor Simpson reported that she is the chair of the Faculty Council of the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women (CCSW). She stated that the Commission provides a liaison between faculty, staff, and students to provide information to the Chancellor on the climate of the campus for women. She reported that the Commission is comprised of three councils: faculty, staff, and student. She noted that each council has eight members although the staff council has current openings. She encouraged the faculty members to recommend staff members to serve and potentially faculty members and students to serve on the Commission. She noted that each council meets independently once a month and the Commission meet once a month.

Professor Simpson reported that the 2012 CCSW Award for Outstanding Contributions to the Status of Women was presented to Dr. Concetta DiRusso, Professor of Biochemistry and chair of the ADVANCE Faculty Advisory Council, and to PREVENT, a student group working to end relationship violence and acquaintance rape through peer education.

Professor Simpson stated that the staff council has been wonderful in developing lactation rooms and mapping the locations of these rooms. She noted that the staff council has been interfacing with Associate to the Chancellor Nunez to make sure these rooms are up to code, particularly since the health code for these rooms has recently been revised. She stated that the staff council is also reviewing pregnancy policies at the other Big Ten schools.

Professor Simpson reported that the student council is pushing to get safety into the next generation of students by making clear where the nearest emergency response center is located and to identify unsafe areas on campus. She noted that the staff council is using a focus group to identify peer safety issues.

Professor Simpson stated that the CCSW continues to focus on the recruitment and retention of women faculty, staff, and students. She noted that the Faculty Council is partnered with the NSF ADVANCE project which is widely successful, particularly with the dual career hiring program to assist in hires in the STEM fields. She noted that the CCSW would like to see the program expanded to other university departments.

Professor Simpson stated that the CCSW continues to investigate and promote a climate of success for women on campus. She reported that a recent survey of faculty in the STEM fields suggests that female faculty members at the associate professor level have thrived less than other faculty members with respect to formal and informal faculty development practices. She stated that the CCSW has put forward a proposal to enlist the services of the Bureau of Social Research to host a series of focus group discussions designed to identify best practices for faculty development that has been used successfully by non-STEM departments.

Professor Purdum, Animal Science, pointed out that safety issues on campus are also a concern for faculty and staff members. She stated that the faculty council needs to consider this as a priority. Professor Simpson stated that this specific concern was not addressed recently by the faculty council, but there has been discussion with the Campus Police about the issue. She stated that the CCSW has concerns for everyone's safety on campus.

Professor Peterson, Agricultural Economics, noted that there is the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee (FCAC) on campus which advises the Chancellor on salary increase distributions. He pointed out that the FCAC receives annual reports on salaries, some which look at gender discrimination in salaries. He asked if the CCSW receives a copy of these reports. If not, the faculty council might be interested in looking at these reports. Professor Simpson stated that the faculty council does not receive these reports. Past

President LaCost pointed out that she is the Chair of the FCAC and would be happy to visit with the faculty council about the salary reports.

President Schubert asked if the development of best practices for promotion and evaluation will be implemented in college or department bylaws. Professor Simpson stated that the best practices developed by ADVANCE are being reviewed and considered by the upper administration, but the goal of the CCSW is to circulate the best practices around to the campus but there has been no discussion on making this a part of the bylaws.

## **6.0 Honorary Degrees Ballot**

President Schubert noted that the Honorary Degrees Committee has put forward a nomination for an honorary degree which the Senate needs to vote on. He asked that the name of the individual nominated for the honorary degree be kept confidential because even if approved, the person's name will be put into a pool where it can remain for five years before being selected by the Board of Regents to receive an honorary degree.

## **7.0 Unfinished Business**

No unfinished business was discussed.

## **8.0 New Business**

### **8.1 Todd Jensen and Rick Haugerud, Information Services**

Mr. Jensen reported that he is the manager for the technology learning spaces on campus and he, along with five others, take care of all classroom computers. He noted that there is a collaborative effort underway called technology, teaching, transforming, or T3 for short, between Information Services and Academic Affairs. He noted that currently it is in the brainstorming stage but the goal is to provide a process conduit for faculty members to try new technology in a classroom environment. He reported that the idea is to have a five step process: explore new technologies; test these out; plan a deployment process; scale – train faculty; and analyze the full deployment. He noted that at this early stage of the process IS is looking at Academic Affairs to get faculty members to be part of the committee that will see if this effort is feasible.

Mr. Jensen reported that there are roughly three faces of communication with general purpose classrooms. These are: reporting immediate problems, providing a general update to people teaching in the classrooms, and a quarterly report of things to come. He noted that general updates on classroom computers involve refreshing the programs on the computer and every four years equipment is replaced. He stated that large scale replacement of equipment such as projectors occurs every eight years. He noted that some classroom computer updates will be conducted over the upcoming holiday break.

Professor Subbiah, Biological Systems Engineering, asked what kinds of new technology are now being explored for the classrooms. Mr. Jensen reported that currently there is no real process for looking at upcoming technology that faculty may want in the classrooms, but basic things like Google documents are being explored. He stated that some faculty members tell him about technology that they want to try and they are willing to help out with this, but currently there is not a good process in place for communicating this information. He pointed out that there is not a lot of funding to support these efforts and the question is how the classroom computers can be funded beyond basic maintenance. Professor Subbiah noted that at some universities the tablet PC is being used. He asked how faculty members can initiate the discussion about using tablet PC's. Professor Giesecke reported that Academic Affairs has a form that colleges and departments can fill out to require students to purchase equipment for their courses. Mr. Jensen noted that requiring the purchase of equipment is a positive scenario because the purchase can be covered by financial aid.

Secretary Woodman suggested that if there was a plan to update certain classrooms computers that the faculty members using these classrooms be contacted to see what they would like. Mr. Jensen stated that the four year cycle updates will be done over the holiday break, but the plans for the eight year cycle updates will happen during the summer. He stated that he wants to send out a request to the faculty teaching in the classrooms in spring or early summer to see what they need for teaching purposes.

Professor Carlson, Veterinary & Biomedical Sciences asked how instructors will be notified of classroom computer updates for specific classrooms. He asked how faculty members can be included on the list of people to contact regarding new technologies and classroom computers. Mr. Jensen reported that a targeted approach will be conducted and a list serve will be created on general classroom technology.

Mr. Jensen noted that Academic Affairs funds IS to provide support for classroom computers and he is trying to reach out to technologists on campus to provide some assistance. He noted that IS has a cordial relationship with department and college technologists and IS can make recommendations for using equipment and assisting with difficulties occasionally. He stated that IS is interested in working with all technologists on campus.

Professor Archer, School of Natural Resources, asked if any consideration has been given to having higher definition displays by going to better projection and display systems. He pointed out that some of the subject matter he teaches requires the higher definition. Mr. Jensen stated that higher definition displays have not been investigated. He noted that currently we are still at the analog level but he would like us to go to higher definition performance. However, he needs to evaluate the use of the classrooms to see if there is a pattern that would warrant purchasing this kind of equipment. He suggested that some specific rooms might be fitted with highly specialized equipment if there is a specialized need for it.

President Elect Guevara stated that he is glad to hear that there is now a process for communicating with instructors using the classrooms. He asked how long this has been occurring. Mr. Jensen noted that he took over his position in March and instructors were contacted at the beginning of the summer. He stated that he assumed that previously faculty members were being contacted about problems in the classrooms. President Elect Guevara pointed out that by chance, instructors in Oldfather Hall found out that computers in the classrooms were going to be removed within a few days before the semester began. Mr. Jensen stated that this effort was started prior to his knowledge. He assured the Senate that the concerns over the removal were heard loudly and clearly and this effort is not moving forward. He stated that he felt very concerned when he learned that the faculty was not communicated with about this plan.

Mr. Haugerud reported that IS is upgrading its plans for the future of the network. He stated that the campus will be upgrading to Internet 2 connection which will provide 100 gigabyte support for research and other academic initiatives. He noted that this will be an expensive upgrade but something that we must do because the internet is being used in larger quantities and it needs to be reliable. He reported that we have an opportunity to get optic fiber through Chicago which will allow us to connect quickly to major players such as Google, Microsoft, etc. He pointed out that we will be able to have greater capacity at a lower price because we will be having more direct links instead of going through a middleman. He noted that there are a number of services that are partnering with Internet 2 which is driving the competitive prices and there are security tools that we are interested in and hope to bring to campus.

Mr. Haugerud reported that a wireless roaming program called Eduroam will allow faculty and staff members to log into the Big Ten credentials through UNL. He stated that he believes that some activity on this availability should occur in the spring and more information will be coming out about it.

Professor Eskridge, Statistics, reported that he has heard complaints about the difficulty of purchasing computer equipment through eShop and wondered if IS has experienced similar problems. Mr. Haugerud stated that eShop is an effort to pull all of the purchasing of technology equipment and supplies together so they can be measured which will allow procurement contracts to be developed that will help reduce costs for the University. He suggested that people having problems with eShop should communicate with Bradley Logan, Senior IT Sourcing Specialist of Procurement Services, who can provide assistance in purchasing computer equipment. He pointed out that Procurement Services is working hard to make the use of eShop as easy and friendly as possible. Secretary Woodman stated that previous to eShop a faculty member could use the purchasing card to download software immediately but now it takes 10 days to acquire the download.

Secretary Woodman noted that there was a security breach this summer on sensitive information pertaining to students, staff, and faculty members. He asked if there have been any updates about the breach. Mr. Haugerud reported that IS expected something to happen prior to now, but the Federal government is investigating the breach which is making the process longer. He reported that IS is responding to the breach and is making the data more secure.

Secretary Woodman noted that recently Mr. Jensen assisted him through remote desktop but he heard a rumor that this is going to stop because it requires a VPN client connection. He asked if this will stop remote access to classroom computers. Mr. Haugerud stated that IS can help configure classroom computers so there are no blocks.

## **8.2 Discussion on Assessment and Recertification Process for ACE Courses**

President Schubert stated that this issue started when the Executive Committee began receiving negative

comments regarding the ACE assessment and recertification process. He reported that the Executive Committee met with Director Mitchell, Undergraduate Education, to discuss the concerns and came to the conclusion that a more open discussion needed to occur with the Senate.

Professor Katz, Art & Art History, thanked the Executive Committee and the Senate for its willingness to discuss the problems with the ACE assessment and recertification. She pointed out that the issue is not with the intent of the ACE program or with the initial certification of the ACE courses. She stated that the problem is with everything else. She stated that there is no evidence that documenting the outcome assessments helps students to learn. She stated that requiring documentation is not cost effective and can consume an enormous amount of faculty time. She pointed out that with general education classes there can be 100 or more students taking the course each semester and the course(s) can have several sections with numerous instructors. She noted that not only is a copy of the course syllabus required for assessment and recertification, faculty members are required to upload examples of student work which can result in 100's of PDF files being uploaded. She noted that the department ACE administrator has to open each of the files and then has to write a report. She stated that college administrators are supposed to read these reports, but part of the problem is that people who are removed from the discipline are being asked to review the evidence of outcomes. She stated that another problem is that the faculty has a sense that no one will ever read much of the evidence and reports and that this is an exercise in futility. She pointed out that if the faculty felt that it the effort was improving teaching and student learning they would do it, but no evidence has been provided to show that these efforts improve learning. She reported that another major problem is the use of the Pearl software which is a badly designed program.

Professor Peterson reported that he teaches an ACE course but is the only instructor for the course and he thinks providing the required documentation is quite simple. He noted that problems could occur with multiple section courses, but he thinks it is important for faculty members to understand the ACE governance document. He stated that he was a member of ACE founding committee and he thinks the ACE program is clearly superior to the ES/IS program that existed prior to ACE. He stated that the recertification process in ACE is a result of the ES/IS program evolving into a meaningless program and the university attempting to avoid this happening with the ACE program.

Professor Peterson stated that it is important to understand the distinction between program assessment and Pearl. He noted that assessment is associated with the ACE program which was created by the faculty, but Pearl was introduced by the university and departments are required to use it. He pointed out that Pearl is about the department, not ACE courses. He stated that the idea with ACE assessment is to get faculty members to learn about what and how they are teaching. He stated that the goal of the assessment is to make sure that the ACE courses are still meeting the outcomes they were designed to do. He noted that the idea is to make the ACE courses accountable to the public since accountability is being required more from universities.

Professor Peterson stated that one of the misconceptions about the ACE assessment is that people say that examples of students' work should come from poor, middle, and good students but he believes that the samples should be random. He stated that he hopes that this idea will be considered.

Professor Peterson noted that the English department asked that a sample from a reasonable number of their course sections be admissible as evidence. He stated that there is nothing in the ACE Governance documents that say that every section has to upload a sample of work. He pointed out that this may be a requirement within a department and this is where the problem could exist. He noted that each department should have a coordinator to deal with the ACE assessments.

Professor Wysocki, Computer and Electronics Engineering, asked Professor Peterson how many times he has received feedback on his ACE courses. Professor Peterson stated that he has not received feedback from the ACE Subcommittee of the UCC but his department has reviewed it.

Professor Joeckel, School of Natural Resources, stated that he appreciates Professor Katz having the courage to stand up and voice her opinion so passionately about this issue. He noted that she obviously cares greatly about teaching. He reported that he queried his colleagues in his department about the assessment and recertification process and he received no positive comments about it. He noted that the processes are culturally inappropriate. He stated that some comments he received from other faculty members included that submission of several students' work as examples is a joke because judgments cannot be made on three samples. He stated that the ACE program has morphed into a complex creation consuming faculty time and resources. President-Elect Guevara agreed.

Professor Weissling, Special Education and Communication Disorders, stated that she received an impassioned response from the faculty members in her department. She reported that one of the faculty members in her department, who specializes in program evaluation, had some insightful comments including that the program evaluation needs revamping. She stated that other comments included concerns on the amount of time that was involved for assessment and recertification. She pointed out that if the process is different in departments than the guidelines for the process may need to be revised so that faculty members are all on the same playing field.

Professor Abel, English, reported that he spoke with three people who are involved with ACE assessment. He noted that they had nothing good to say about the recertification process and hate it. He stated that the English department received permission to be more selective in obtaining evidence of student work in the different sections due to the large volume of multiple section courses. However, as it turns out each of the sections are providing evidence. He stated that he thinks the process should either be completely eliminated or reconsidered.

Professor Ford, Architecture, stated that he recognizes the frustration that comes with the amount of work that is being required for the processes. He suggested, after hearing the comments from the other Senators, that the Senate consider having a summit on the assessment and recertification procedures. This would provide faculty members an opportunity to have an exchange about the procedures.

Professor Carlson reported that he teaches an old inherited IS course and does not have ACE experience but he does have experience with the Pearl program. He pointed out that we need to know what the standards are that we want to achieve with the ACE program, otherwise how can an assessment be made on a course, particularly if there are three different people teaching sections of a course. He stated that assessment is a standard that we are trying to achieve. He noted that if an instructor gave all students an A+ in a course they should have to prove that all of the students met that standard. He asked how the university would know that the standards of a course are met. Professor Peterson stated that this is done through rubrics. Professor Carlson asked whose rubrics. Professor Peterson stated that the department sets the rubric. He stated that he does not know if there is a rubric for the ACE program but there is a university-wide assessment committee which should give a report back to a faculty member. He noted that Pearl is a bizarre system and guesses that we are using it to be in compliance, but we do not know how much comes back to the department as feedback.

Professor Reisbig, Child, Youth & Family Studies, suggested that it would be helpful for further discussions to have everyone read the ACE Governing Document Number Four. She pointed out that if there are going to be requests to make any changes in procedures they will need to be made in the governing document.

Professor Clark, School of Natural Resources, suggested surveying the instructors who are having courses evaluated to see what they are experiencing with the processes. He noted that one of the problems is how the ACE documents describe how to link an assignment to a particular course and that a sample is required for every assignment in the course.

President Schubert stated that the Executive Committee will discuss this issue further at its meeting tomorrow and will probably come forward with ideas for further discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:16 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, December 11, 2:30 p.m. in the East Campus Union, Arbor Suite. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, and David Woodman, Secretary.