

**UNL FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES**  
**City Campus Union, Auditorium**  
**September 11, 2012**  
**Presidents Schubert, Guevara, and LaCost Presiding**

**1.0 Call to Order**

President called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m.

**2.0 Announcements**

President Schubert wanted to remember September 11 and give the opportunity for the Faculty Senate to remember the tragic events of this day.

**2.1 Passing of Senator Dean Yonts, Panhandle Research & Extension Center**

President Schubert reported the passing of Senator Dean Yonts from the Panhandle Research and Extension Center this summer. He noted that Professor Yonts was an Associate Professor specializing in irrigation water management. He stated that Professor Yonts began serving as a senator in 2002 and continued until his death this summer.

**2.2 How to Be an Influential Senator**

President Schubert stated that with the beginning of the academic year he wanted to remind everyone on how they can be an influential senator. He stated that senators can and should raise concerns at the meetings and the meetings offer a nice opportunity to bring up issues for discussion. He pointed out that it is important for senators to communicate with their constituents and suggested talking to colleagues and listening to them about issues or concerns they may have or let colleagues know of issues affecting the faculty. He noted that he speaks to his constituents at the departmental meetings and the faculty listens carefully when he speaks. He pointed out that the Senate will eventually be voting on motions and senators want to know what their constituents think on particular issues. He stated that senators should state their name and department when they speak at the senate meetings and he encouraged all senators to come and participate in the meetings.

**2.3 Help in Obtaining Department Bylaws**

President Schubert stated that after conducting the survey of non-tenure track faculty members, the Executive Committee felt that it would be helpful to review college and department bylaws to see how non-tenure track faculty members are defined and what rights they may have in the units. He noted that there are a few department bylaws still missing and Coordinator Griffin will be seeking the help of the senators to obtain these bylaws.

**2.4 Survey to Gauge the Need for Visiting Faculty Housing**

President Schubert reported that the Executive Committee has had discussions with the Chancellor about the need for establishing housing for visiting professors. He noted that an initial survey of some departments and centers had overwhelming responses for the need of this type of housing. He reported that the Chancellor was initially not interested in providing the housing, but recently stated that some opportunities might be available. He stated that the Executive Committee is working on making a short survey to ask departments and centers if there is a need for the housing, whether they would be willing to pay something for the housing, etc. He stated that any comments or feedback would be appreciated. He noted that he has even had the suggestion that a faculty club should be located in the housing unit.

**3.0 Campus Master Plan Open House (Jennifer Dam, Assistant Director of Institutional Research and Planning)**

Assistant Director Dam reported that there will be two open houses, one on city campus and the other on east campus. She noted that these are initial meetings, but members of the campus community will be able to provide input and she encouraged people to attend. She noted that members of the consulting team will be present and there is faculty representation on the steering committee. She reported that there is also a website that is available for people to go to and there is an interactive on-line mapping tool that can be used. She encouraged people to use the mapping tool and to visit the website at <http://irp.unl.edu/campus-planning>.

**4.0 Approval of 4/24/12 Minutes**

Professor Ruchala, School of Accountancy, moved for approval of the minutes. Professor Peterson, Agricultural Economics, seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

## **5.0 Committee Reports**

### **5.1 Commencement and Honors Convocations Committee (Professor Bolin)**

Professor Bolin stated that the CHCC keeps an eye on a very important ceremony on campus. He noted that he has worked for federal agencies for 40 years and he has never seen an event as well organized as the commencement ceremonies are at UNL. He reported that credit for this needs to go to Jennifer Verhein, Assistant Director of Registration and Records, Patrice Berger, Director of the Honors Program, Associate to the Chancellor Bill Nunez, and Special Events Coordinator Annette Wetzel. He stated that the Committee has no recommendations for the Senate.

Professor Rudy, Nutrition and Health Sciences, asked if the university is ready to share plans on the spring commencement since the Devaney Center will be under construction and not available for use. He pointed out that the spring commencement will occur the same weekend as the Lincoln marathon which could cause some problems. Professor Bolin stated that he believes the university will organize the event in January. Professor Carlson, Veterinary and Biomedical Sciences, asked if the university is waiting until January to find a venue for commencement. Professor Bolin stated that the university probably has a venue scheduled already but may not release plans until January.

Professor Eccarius, Special Education and Communication Disorders, asked if the CHCC is continuing its efforts to get more faculty members to attend graduation. Professor Bolin stated that the Committee tries sending out different messages to encourage faculty members to attend but the turnout is still poor. He pointed out that the commencement ceremony is fun and interesting and he recommends faculty members go to it. He noted that it is very meaningful to the students.

Professor Katz, Art and Art History, asked if faculty members are encouraged to participate in the ceremony for masters students. Professor Bolin stated that the masters students have their names called out as they go across the stage and the doctoral students are hooded at the ceremony. He stated that it is a nice thing for faculty members to be there to see their graduate student receive their degree. He pointed out that faculty members can socialize before and after the ceremony with the students.

Professor Carlson pointed out that there is no encouragement for faculty members to interact with the students before the ceremony. He stated that there is nothing that allows a faculty representative to seek out graduates that are from his/her department. He suggested that the CHCC figure out how the faculty can interact more with the students. Professor Bolin stated that he would be happy to mention this to the Committee.

### **5.2 Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee**

Past President LaCost reported that with the help of Associate to the Chancellor Bill Nunez, data was reviewed to look at compensation patterns of faculty members by gender, department, college, and rank over a 5 – 10 year period of time. She stated that for the five year trend, newly hired women were hired at \$66,000 but for men it was \$74,000 and fully promoted women received \$93,000 as opposed to \$96,000 for men. She noted that this analysis has not been done in the past. She noted that the Assistant Professor position for women showed the greatest significant difference.

Past President LaCost reported that the FCAC was charged last year to look at administrative salaries. She noted that the Committee compared 21 UNL administrative positions with the same or similar positions at our peer institutions. She pointed out that four UNL administrative positions exceeded the mean salary of the same position at peer institutions, but other administrative positions were below peers and the percent of increase needed to reach the mean peer salary ranged from .5% to 48.27% for 15 of the positions.

Professor Purdum, Animal Science, asked if there would still be a difference in entry level salaries between women and men if the data is broken out by college. Past President LaCost stated that the data would need to be reviewed for that information. Professor Purdum stated that she would be interested in the Executive Committee getting a follow up to this question.

Past President LaCost stated that anyone interested in receiving the specific data can email her ([blacost1@unl.edu](mailto:blacost1@unl.edu)).

### **5.3 Faculty Senate Executive Committee Summer Report**

President Schubert reported that the Executive Committee met often with the Chancellor over the summer and spent time discussing the security breach that occurred this summer. He noted that there was also discussion regarding the need for housing international visitors.

President Schubert stated that the Executive Committee focused on the survey of non-tenure track faculty members and additional changes to the Conflict of Interest policy. He noted that some changes were made over the summer to the policy because of recommendations from the General Counsel Office. He stated that the changes were to the appeals process, but the changes did not infringe on a faculty member's rights. He reported that the Executive Committee met with VC Paul and Associate VC Hamernik to discuss the changes and then voted to approve the changes to the document. He pointed out that the campus needed to be in compliance with federal regulations on the policy by August 24.

President Schubert reported that last year an effort was started to revise the Student Code of Conduct. He stated that ASUN rewrote the document rather than indicating changes in the existing document and the newly written document was sent to the Executive Committee. He pointed out that whenever an existing document is going to be revised, the changes must be made in the original text. Because this was not done, the Executive Committee sent the document back to ASUN requesting that they make the changes into the existing document.

President Schubert reported that the Executive Committee held its annual retreat this summer to determine the Senate goals for this year which were distributed in the Senate packet. He stated that the goals identify the need to improve communication with service units on campus. He pointed out that there have been complaints about housing issues, information services, and transportation services. As a result, he worked with Director of Transportation Patrick Barrett to review the vehicle rental policy. He reported that UNL's restrictions on vehicle use were not consistent with the Nebraska Legislature. As a result the policy was rewritten over the summer. He noted that now a person can take the vehicle home if they should return late in the evening from a business trip but the vehicle must be returned the next day during open business hours.

President Schubert stated that there are on-going issues with Information Services and he is continually hearing complaints about IS issues. He stated that the Executive Committee will be meeting with CIO Askren this semester to address some of the concerns.

Professor Peterson stated that he has concerns that the Conflict of Interest policy changes may have cut out the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee. He noted that the Board of Regents policy clearly states that a person could file a complaint with the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee if they feel that they have been wrongly accused. President Schubert stated that this concern was raised with VC Paul and Associate VC Hamernik. He pointed out that the change in the policy states that a representative from the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee must be a member of the committee charged with investigating a case of possible conflict of interest and a faculty member still has the right to file a complaint with the ARRC.

## **6.0 Unfinished Business**

No unfinished business was discussed.

## **7.0 New Business**

### **7.1 Ballot for Academic Planning Committee Election**

Professor Schubert stated that an emergency motion is needed to approve the ballot for election to replace an outgoing member on the Academic Planning Committee. Professor Bender, College of Journalism and Mass Communications, moved for approval of the emergency motion. Professor Carlson seconded the motion. The emergency motion was approved.

Professor Carlson moved for approval of the ballot. Professor Anaya seconded the motion. The ballot was approved. Coordinator Griffin noted that the ballot will be sent out electronically to the entire faculty.

Professor Stoltenberg, Psychology, pointed out that the link to the Academic Planning Committee page was not working in the document. Coordinator Griffin stated that it will be working when the ballot is sent out to the faculty. Professor Eccarius, Special Education and Communication Disorders, pointed out that the Senate did not have a chance to discuss the motion before the vote was taken. President Schubert stated that he will be mindful of this the next time the Senate has to vote on a motion.

Professor Joeckel, School of Natural Resources, suggested providing some brief or condensed biography on the people running for election. He stated that he wants to know why these people might be good for the job. Coordinator Griffin noted that a link to the faculty member's webpage is provided in the ballot. Professor Shea, School of Natural Resources, stated that he thinks it would be reasonable to have a statement from

candidates for positions on committees. He pointed out that he does not vote on the ballots because he does not know many of the people running for election. He stated that looking at a person's academic web page does not provide enough information and he wants to know what their views are on the committee work. He stated that people should provide one paragraph indicating why they want to be on a committee.

Professor Peterson pointed out that the Committee on Committees and the President of the Faculty Senate usually has to find people to serve on committees or run for election. He stated that we do not want to put too much of a burden on these people to run for election. He noted that we never get enough people to run for election to the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Panel which needs 24 candidates. He stated that people are almost doing the faculty a favor by running for election. Professor Zlotnik, Earth & Atmospheric Sciences, noted that for professional societies, people running for election always provide a personal statement of three or so lines.

Professor Bradford, Law, stated that as a Past President of the Faculty Senate he has talked to people trying to get them to serve on a committee and tell them they have to write a statement as to why they want to serve. He pointed out that the Committee on Committees has vetted the people running for election. He stated that if people are willing to serve and have gone through the selection process we should not have to demand more of them.

Professor Carlson stated that he would like to know what the candidates think of the committee they are running for and suggested that the candidate be given the opportunity to offer a brief statement. He pointed out that this could be completely optional.

Professor Shea asked if the Executive Committee is going to consider these suggestions. President Schubert stated that it will be discussed by the Executive Committee and reported back to the Senate at the October 9 meeting. Professor Carlson moved that the Executive Committee consider the use of personal statements for nominees for various offices that are voted on by the Senate. Professor Bradford pointed out that motion is not needed if the Executive Committee is willing to discuss the issue.

## **7.2 Summary of Survey of Non-Tenured Track Faculty Members**

President Schubert provided a Powerpoint presentation on the summary of the survey of non-tenure track faculty members. He stated that the survey indicated that non-tenure track faculty members in IANR feel that they are treated more like faculty members than in other units. He noted that the responses to the survey indicate that research faculty members and lecturers feel less valued. He reported that across the boards salary raises seem to be very unsatisfactory for non-tenure track faculty members.

President Schubert stated that in regards to faculty rights only one in five of the respondents are aware of their rights as a faculty member. He noted that the question of whether a non-tenure track faculty member can attend a departmental faculty meeting was asked, and some respondents stated that they could not attend the meetings. He pointed out that as a minimum these faculty members should at least be allowed to participate in meetings. President Schubert noted that students expect that their instructor, regardless of their rank, is first class and he believes this is all that we are aiming for, but if some of the faculty members feel that they are second class citizens it won't take long for the students to realize that we do not have a first class faculty.

President Schubert stated that many negative comments were received in regards to evaluation letters. He suspects that some of the inconsistencies with how non-tenure track faculty members are treated might be in department and college bylaws. He reported that the Executive Committee hopes to find good examples of best practices in departments so these can be recommended to the campus. He suggested that the Executive Committee is considering sending out the survey again in the future to see if things have improved on campus. Professor Carlson asked if the Senate has the authority to do this. He noted that in his letter of appointment as a lecturer it specifically stated that he could not vote on departmental and college matters, yet he can vote at the Senate meetings. He asked if there is any authority to review appointments in regards to compliance with college and department bylaws. President Schubert noted that the faculty members define and set the bylaws. He pointed out that the department faculty vote on department bylaws but they must be in compliance with the college bylaws, which must comply with the UNL Bylaws, and finally with the Board of Regents Bylaws. Professor Carlson asked if department bylaws not in compliance with Board of Regents Bylaws are considered in violation. President Schubert stated that a memo was sent out to all colleges and units from the Chancellor with the expectation that each unit would adopt bylaws accordingly when the professors of practice ranks were created. Professor Peterson suggested that the Board of Regents Bylaws be reviewed because the Bylaws are very specific on the rights of faculty members. President Schubert noted that it is up to the individual units to define the rights and responsibilities but if department bylaws do not regulate the rights and responsibilities

they would defer to college, campus and Board bylaws. Professor Ruchala reported that while serving on CBA's committee to develop the college bylaws to include the professors of practice ranks the Regents Bylaws were reviewed and they allow room for units to set different rights and voting rights for the different levels of faculty members.

Professor Shea noted that he served on the committee that developed the professors of practice ranks. He stated that the intention of that committee was that there would be some degree of equality in terms of rights for these faculty members, but the committee did not say what these rights should be. He pointed out that the committee was an advisory committee and the details of these positions were left up to the units to define. He stated that it would be nice to see that all colleges have equivalent rights in their units, but this is not the way it worked out. He noted that there seems to be more disparity at the unit levels rather than the college level.

Professor Shea stated that the Bylaws are one thing, but the Senate needs to do what is right in regards to the non-tenure track faculty members. He stated that he is floored that some colleagues would not want to give some uniform rights to non-tenure track faculty members since many of these people are carrying an enormous workload which allows many tenured and tenure-track faculty members to work on research. He pointed out that these people get paid less than tenure-track faculty members and asked why we would want to deny them some rights too. He stated that he thinks this is a shame and cannot see how we can justify it.

President Elect Guevara stated that he doesn't oppose this, but noted this is a good intention that can get turned around. He stated that having each unit come up with their own plan gives these faculty members more rights and it should be up to each unit to come up with these rights. He pointed out that it is awful that some people are treated as second class people, but administrators did not say that units needed to extend certain rights to non-tenure track faculty members. He stated that the Senate can make the units aware of the issues, but it is up to each unit to do the right thing. He noted that the administration had hoped that each college would treat non-tenure track faculty members accordingly, but if not, it needs to get fixed at the department level. He pointed out that we cannot expect the administration to fix it. Professor Shea asked who will look out for these people. President Elect Guevara stated that it should be the people in the department. He noted the questions need to be asked in the departments whether everyone should have rights, and if not, why?

Secretary Woodman, School of Biological Sciences, pointed out that the Regents give tenure track faculty members rights and asked why similar rights cannot be given by the Board of Regents for non-tenure track faculty members. He stated that the Regents Bylaws could help serve as a model for the departments. He noted that some departments have neglected to include non-tenure track faculty members and suggested that the upper administration be encouraged to lend their voice to have some minimal standard of rights for these faculty members. President Elect Guevara stated that this should be up to each unit to decide otherwise we are going to have more administrators involved in department business.

Professor Sarroub, Teaching, Learning, and Teacher Education, stated that she is worried and wary about making recommendations based on the survey and she suggested that the issue needs to be looked at more carefully. She noted that research professors often get hired as part of large grants and when the grant is completed they leave. She pointed out that she does not see the survey measuring what is being considered, although she acknowledged that it does indicate that there are problems that need to be addressed. She noted that her department worked hard on their bylaws to determine who the faculty members are and what rights they should have. She stated that we need to be careful about the claims we make based on this survey.

Professor Joeckel stated that the speculation is well taken. He acknowledged that we are relying more on non-tenure track faculty members, but asked if there is a suggested problem that needs to be addressed. He questioned whether the survey can be tackled more rigorously. President Schubert reported that the Executive Committee reviewed the responses that were submitted. He noted that some units may not even have bylaws and some bylaws may not define research professors and lecturers as faculty members.

Professor Shea stated that if departments do not address the issue in their bylaws it indicates that there is a problem. He questioned whether it is acceptable for units not to have any guidelines. Past President LaCost noted that the survey has prompted the requests for a copy of the department bylaws and she knows in her college it is being required that all departments review and possibly revise their bylaws. She stated that this was not what was expected from the bylaws but it could be an outgrowth from it.

Professor Zlotnik asked who the recommendations would be for. President Schubert stated that the survey is still a work in progress and the Executive Committee will be deciding what next to do with the information that was obtained. He noted that the administration is aware of the survey and is interested in hearing about

the results. He stated that the question is whether we want to show the outcome or make recommendations to departments. Professor Zlotnik pointed out that recommending changes to department bylaws is another question and he suggested that the Executive Committee solicit feedback from the units.

Professor Carlson asked how many surveys were sent out. Coordinator Griffin stated that approximately 800 non-tenure track faculty members were sent an email with the survey. President Schubert noted that the actual data from the survey cannot be shared because of IRB restrictions. LaCost reported that IRB approval was obtained to gather the data. She pointed out that college and department identification were excluded so as not to identify any individuals responding to the survey.

Professor Willis, Anthropology, stated that tenured professors would probably give the same answers to many of the questions asked in the survey because we do not have good guidelines for promotion and tenure. President Schubert stated that the Executive Committee had the same thought. Professor Willis pointed out that if tenure track faculty members are not treated well, how other faculty members can be treated well. Professor Wysocki, Computers and Electronics Engineering, noted that there was 50% participation in the survey and the Executive Committee expected that the results would be skewed due to unhappy people responding.

Professor Shea asked if senators could share the summary with others. Past President LaCost stated that a change in protocol was sent in that allowed the summary of information to be shared with the Senate, but she is unsure whether it can be shared with anyone outside of the Senate. Past President LaCost stated that she will check on this and report back about it.

### **7.3 Proposed Changes to University Curriculum Committee Procedures**

Professor DeFusco, chair of the UCC, reported that conversations were held with the Executive Committee and the Committee thought it would be best to bring the proposed changes to the Senate. He stated that currently there is an on-line system for when departments want to change a course, but the UCC does not see the proposed changes until the end of the process which makes it difficult to step in and begin to comment on the course changes. He pointed out that most of the course changes are relatively minor (course number changes, change in course description, etc). He reported that currently 47 proposed course changes are in the cue and 18 of these are minor changes. He pointed out that the UCC members need to click and review everyone on of these proposals which takes considerable time and detracts from other important work that the Committee needs to do.

Professor DeFusco reported that there is an initiative underway that would allow departments to query two university databases to see if the course change would have impacts on other courses when the request for change is entered into the CREQ system. Colleges would be able to discuss the impacts and possibly act on them before the request reaches the UCC. He stated that if the change does not affect any other programs, the college curriculum committee could approve the change eliminating the unnecessary review by all of the UCC members. He stated that there would be a subcommittee of the UCC that would monitor proposals that have campus-wide impact and any substantial changes would still need to be reviewed and voted on by the full UCC. He stated that the UCC would like to try this process out for a year on a trial basis to see how it would work and whether the process would need to be tweaked. He stated that the UCC is asking the Senate to suspend the current voting process.

Professor Carlson noted that the query system is great and he fully supports it. He stated that the query needs to begin at the initial level of the process in the colleges. Professor DeFusco pointed out that every college handles curriculum changes differently, but he agrees that it would be helpful to have discussions with the colleges to see if the process could be more uniform.

Professor Kranz, Northeast Research & Extension Center, asked how much institutional memory plays a part in the process. He noted that when processes change and new faculty members come on to curriculum committees, people may not follow the same procedures. Professor Mitchell, Director of General Education, stated that the long term history of changes will not matter because the system will be able to identify the courses that a curriculum change will impact. She noted that when a request to change a course is entered into the system, this will be the point where a department can see if there is duplication of a course.

Professor DeFusco reported that there are two aspects going on here: one is that the CREQ system has the courses listed and the other is that there is the bulletin which lists the programs. The problem is that currently CREQ can be queried but the bulletin cannot. He stated that the CREQ will show what other courses might be impacted by a change in a course but not what programs it affects. He noted that the UCC is asking the Senate

to trust them on what is considered minor changes. LaCost asked if the UCC was going to establish a rubric for what is considered a minor change. Professor DeFusco noted that there are many different components with the computing aspect of the process. He stated that Professor Moore, previous chair of the UCC, will continue to work with the UCC during this probationary period and he is very familiar with the CREQ system. President Elect Guevara pointed out that even changes in the course descriptions can be more complicated than anticipated. Professor DeFusco stated that this is one of the reasons the UCC wants to conduct a trial period of the system, to see how it would work and whether there are issues that need to be addressed. Professor Mitchell pointed out that something like a credit hour change is considered a major change and would not get automatically approved.

Professor Eccarius stated that changes in course numbers will need to be reflected for any other program or department where the course is listed. She pointed out that these departments will still need to be informed of the changes. Professor DeFusco stated that from the standpoint of the UCC voting on course number changes is considered minor, but there may still be instances where errors are made. He noted that Registration and Records will play a key role in helping with these kinds of changes.

Professor DeFusco stated that the UCC is scheduled to report to the Senate in January and he will provide an update on how the process is working should the Senate approve suspending the voting procedures for a year. He noted that no changes to the UCC syllabus are being proposed now. He stated that these changes will more than likely be proposed to the Senate at the end of the spring semester.

Professor DeFusco suggested that anyone with additional questions or concerns should contact him at rdefusco1@unl.edu.

#### **7.4 Executive Committee Goals for 2012-2013**

President Schubert reported that the Executive Committee's goals for the 2012-2013 were included in the packet and is being presented to the Senate. He asked for discussion on the goals. He suggested that anyone with questions or comments can contact him or the Senate Office.

#### **7.5 Parking Fee Structure**

Professor Willis stated that last year she brought up the issue of the parking fee structure. She noted that the issue was not resolved satisfactorily and she wants the Senate to address this issue again. She pointed out that it is not fair for a secretary who makes considerably less money than most faculty members should have to pay the same amount for parking. She stated that there should be further discussions on this issue and she believes that having a parking fee based on a portion of your salary would be fairer than our current system. She suggested that there be a campus-wide vote on the parking fee.

President Schubert pointed out that this has been a continuing issue, but personally he does not think anything can be done about it unless you can convince all of the faculty members to pay more. He stated that he does not see any easy solution to this problem. Professor Willis noted that the majority of the people on campus feel that this is an issue that needs to be dealt with. She suggested that the fee could be based on salary.

Professor LaCost pointed out that the Parking Advisory Committee only gives advice and most suggestions are only listened to and then the Committee moves on with its work. President Schubert suggested that the Parking Advisory Committee should be invited to the Senate to have a discussion. Coordinator Griffin suggested having VC Jackson address the parking issue to the Senate.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, October 9, 2:30 p.m. in the East Campus Union, Arbor Suite. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, and David Woodman, Secretary.