

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** Anaya, Bender, Guevara, Joeckel, Nickerson, Reisbig, Rinkevich, Sollars, Woodman, Zoubek

**Absent:** Ruchala, Schubert, Wysocki

**Date:** Wednesday, December 4, 2013

**Location:** Faculty Senate Office

**Note:** These are not verbatim minutes. They are a summary of the discussions at the Executive Committee meeting as corrected by those participating.

---

### 1.0 Call to Order

Guevara called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

### 2.0 Announcements

#### 2.1 No Executive Committee Meeting December 11

Guevara noted that Chancellor Perlman is unable to meet with the Executive Committee next week and as a result the Committee will not meet unless needed.

#### 2.2 VC Paul to Speak at April 1 Senate Meeting

Griffin announced that VC Paul will be speaking to the Senate at the April 1 meeting. The Executive Committee discussed inviting Executive Director of Innovation Campus Dan Duncan and Athletic Director Shawn Eichorst to speak at either the January or February Senate meeting since Chancellor Perlman will be out of the country on business.

### 3.0 Approval of 11/20/13 Minutes

The Executive Committee agreed to wait until its next meeting (January 8) to approve the November 20 minutes to allow Executive Committee members to add additional comments.

### 4.0 Unfinished Business

#### 4.1 Academic Planning Committee's Request

Guevara noted that at the November 20 joint meeting between the Executive Committee and the Academic Planning Committee, a request was made to have the Senate Office assist in finding non-tenure track faculty members who would be willing to run for election to the APC. Woodman reported that Professor Lahey, chair of APC, stated at the Faculty Senate meeting that the APC would need to get Board approval to change their membership to designate a seat specifically for non-tenure track faculty members. Griffin noted that the APC is a campus committee that is defined in the UNL Bylaws which is why Board approval would be needed.

Nickerson stated that the Biological Sciences department tries to keep junior faculty members off of the APC because it can be very time consuming. Griffin pointed out that the current APC syllabus does not restrict non-tenure track faculty members from serving. The criterion is that the faculty members have to represent the different disciplines.

Joeckel stated that he presumes that we want to pursue this issue in a formal fashion. Guevara stated that the Senate does and the APC is committed as well. Joeckel noted that it could be a lengthy process. Woodman suggested that the changes to the APC could be done at the same time that the UNL Bylaw changes are made.

Nickerson stated that the more immediate and significant concern is with the forums for non-tenure track faculty members that Professor Lahey mentioned at the Senate meeting. Guevara stated that he was approached by several Senators after the meeting who said they thought the forum was going to be conducted by the Senate, not APC. He noted that both committees agreed to work on the forums together. He stated that he will contact Professor Lahey to clarify that it will be a joint effort. Woodman stated that until recently, as a non-tenure track faculty member, he had been unaware of what committees he was eligible to serve on. Nickerson stated that he hopes that the forum will clarify this issue and other pertinent issues as well. Griffin suggested forming a small ad hoc committee of a couple of faculty members from each committee to work on the forum and identify topics that should be presented.

Nickerson asked if the APC has made a request about the forum. Guevara pointed out that no formal request has come from the APC regarding either the forum or assistance in finding non-tenure track faculty members to run for election to the APC.

#### **4.2 Report on University Curriculum Committee Meeting on ACE (Nickerson)**

Nickerson reported that the tone of the UCC meeting he attended was very promising and there was a frank exchange of views about the ACE recertification procedures and the amount of time faculty members expend to get course(s) recertified. He stated that the UCC ACE subcommittee is in the process of redesigning their requirements for recertification. He reported that in a message from Professor DeFusco, chair of the UCC ACE subcommittee, they are considering a recertification procedure that would eliminate the need to post materials on to their website. He reported that the UCC hopes to have the revisions in a final draft form by their next meeting (December 9). He noted that the revised documents will need to go to all of the eight colleges for approval as well as to the Senate.

Woodman asked how many courses get recertified annually. Nickerson stated that he did not know the total number but did know that there were approximately 30 courses up for recertification that the UCC ACE subcommittee had disputes about. Woodman wondered what percentage of the recertification requests needed further information.

Nickerson asked if the Executive Committee has any suggestions on how the ACE guidelines should be rewritten. He pointed out that it would be beneficial to the UCC

ACE subcommittee to have this information if they are going to try and redefine the guidelines.

Guevara reported that Professor Purdum asked at the Senate meeting when the changes will be made. Woodman noted that there has been discussion about changing the guidelines since last spring and suggested that the Executive Committee give the UCC a timeline for when the revisions should be made and the documents presented to the colleges. Sollars pointed out that the recertification has been done in staggered groups of the ACE outcomes and ACE 10 is scheduled to be next. She noted that this will be a huge group of courses which involve large projects and it would be beneficial to the faculty to have the changes made prior to the recertification of these courses. Guevara stated that he will send the UCC a deadline date for making revisions to the guidelines.

## **5.0 New Business**

### **5.1 Policy on Acceptable Use of Software Systems Management & Deployment Tools (Woodman)**

Woodman noted that at the end of the spring semester the Senate reviewed a draft policy on the use of KACE, but the Information Technologies and Services Committee is suggesting some changes to the policy. The first is to use a generic term for software systems management and deployment tools (SSMD) rather than specifically identifying a program. He pointed out that the generic term would cover all of these types of software programs. He reported that another change is to allow faculty members to individually decide to opt into having this kind of program on their computer rather than having chairs/heads of departments make that decision. He noted that CIO Askren will be working with unit heads and chairs to explain this section of the policy.

Woodman asked the Executive Committee whether this should be a Senate policy. He stated that one of the protections of the policy is that faculty members would not be penalized if they decided not to have the program on their computer. He pointed out that previously the Executive Committee was told that departments/colleges would not provide support for a computer if they did not install KACE on their computer.

The Executive Committee agreed that the policy should be presented to the Faculty Senate for a vote.

### **5.2 Review of Interview with Journalism Dean's Candidate**

The Executive Committee members who attended the interview stated that it was a positive interview although the half hour allotted for the interview did not provide enough time to ask many questions to the candidate.

### **5.3 Meeting with President Milliken**

Guevara reported that he and the other Senate President had a luncheon meeting with President Milliken recently. He stated that there was discussion on MOOCs and Coursera, protection of faculty speech, enrollment growth, and the tuition freeze.

#### **5.4 Meeting with UNO Faculty Senate President Bacon Regarding Latest UNO Senate Resolution Regarding Funding of Shared Programs**

Guevara reported that he spoke with UNO Faculty Senate President Bacon regarding UNO's recent resolution requesting the Board of Regents to allocate funds to a campus that houses another campus' program (e.g., Engineering program at UNO). The UNO Senate feels that the campus incurs expenses for maintaining the buildings and should be compensated accordingly.

Nickerson wondered who divides the money from grant overheads for the engineering programs at UNO and whether any of the funds revert to UNO. Woodman noted that this is really an administrative issue.

#### **5.5 Review of Senate Meeting**

Nickerson stated that he was impressed with President Milliken's understanding of the faculty concerns with future research funding and that President Milliken has been trying to work behind the scene in Washington, DC to make people aware of the importance of continuing funding.

The Executive Committee noted that Dean Hecker did not attend the meeting to present the University Appeals and Judicial Boards' reports, but they want him to attend in January, specifically to comment on the recent racial discrimination issues that have occurred on campus.

Woodman pointed out that no decision has been made on whether or not to renew Blackboard. He stated that the reason for inviting a couple of other companies to campus to present their programs is just to see whether there could be a better product for the campus. He noted that many of the programs available these days are very similar to Blackboard and some universities are switching to these different programs. He stated that the costs between Blackboard and some other programs can be substantially different.

#### **5.6 Tax on Ancillary Programs**

Sollars reported that there is considerable concern with the upcoming tax on ancillary programs and people are asking whether the 5% tax is on the gross earnings. She stated that it is her understanding that the tax will apply to all ancillary programs including athletics. She noted that the regional programs are very concerned because 5% of their gross will decimate some of these programs. She stated that there is a strong request for clarification on what will be taxed.

Reisbig asked where the money will be going and whether it will eventually be coming back into these programs. Sollars stated that VC Green said that some funds could possibly go back to the programs.

The Executive Committee agreed to put the issue on the agenda for when it meets with the Chancellor and VC Green on January 29.

Reisbig stated that she has been requested to ask that the topic of changes with applications for fellowships from Graduate Studies be discussed with SVCAA Weissinger. The Executive Committee agreed to include this question on the agenda for the meeting on January 29.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:27 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, January 8 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Toni Anaya, Secretary.