

UNL FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
East Campus Union, Arbor Suite
January 15, 2013
Presidents Schubert, Guevara, and LaCost, Presiding

1.0 Call to Order

President Schubert called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Report of the President

President Schubert stated that, beginning with this meeting, he will be presenting a report on the current activities of the Executive Committee. He asked that any discussions or responses on his report be held until VC Jackson has addressed the issue of parking.

President Schubert reported that the Executive Committee continues to work on the ACE concerns that have been raised by Senators regarding the unnecessary work that is being placed on faculty members while going through the recertification process and providing documentation on multiple section courses. He announced that the Executive Committee will be meeting with Professor DeFusco, chair of the University Curriculum Committee, to discuss how changes to the recertification and assessment process can be changed. He stated that the Executive Committee will report back to the Senate after the meeting with Professor DeFusco.

President Schubert stated that the Executive Committee is working on developing guidelines to assist units in determining best practices or policies relating to non-tenure track faculty members. He pointed out that this is to be done strictly on a voluntary basis by units. He noted that he sent the guidelines to some of his colleagues to get reactions and the Executive Committee will address the concerns that were raised.

President Schubert announced that the IRB on the survey of visiting faculty housing needs has been approved and the survey is ready to be launched. He noted that the survey will be sent by Coordinator Griffin to all faculty members. He asked the Senators to encourage their colleagues to participate in the survey. He pointed out that the survey does not log in any information about who is participating or has any identifiers attached to it. He stated that the purpose of the survey is to provide evidence to the administration about the need for visiting housing.

President Schubert reported that the Executive Committee continues to address concerns that have been raised with Information Technologies. He stated that Professor Hartke, chair of the Information Technologies and Services Committee, will be meeting with the Committee next week and he is hoping to have CIO Askren speak to the Senate this semester.

President Schubert announced that Associate VC Goodburn will be speaking to the Senate at the February 5 meeting to talk about retention issues. She will also talk about software programs and initiatives that are being started to help us retain more students.

President Schubert reported that the Executive Committee will be meeting with Chancellor Perlman on January 23 and stated anyone who has issues that they would like discussed with the Chancellor should notify the Executive Committee.

3.0 Vice Chancellor Jackson, Associate Vice Chancellor Phelps, Director of Parking and Transit Services Carpenter

President Schubert reported that concerns over the cost of parking and whether an income dependent model of pricing for parking permits could be established was raised by two Senators. As a result the Executive Committee asked VC Jackson to come to a Senate meeting to address the concerns.

VC Jackson stated that a brief overview of the parking situation on campus shows that we have approximately 25,000 students, 6,000 faculty and staff members, and numerous visitors on campus but only 16,000 parking spaces available. She stated that 12,000 parking permits are issued to students and 4,000 are issued to faculty and staff members. She noted that approximately 50% of students and 2/3 of faculty and staff members use the parking lots. She reported that those students, faculty and staff that are not getting permits are using other means to get to campus such as the bus or are using alternative parking (downtown

parking facilities or parking in the neighborhoods).

VC Jackson stated that one of Parking and Transit Services main responsibilities is to keep all of the parking lots well maintained. This maintenance includes snow removal, making sure the lots are safe and well lit, and repair of the surface. She noted that use of the lots continues throughout the day, night, and into the early hours of the morning, especially for students living on campus. She pointed out that students need to have parking close to the residence halls for safety issues.

VC Jackson reported that when she came to UNL in 2000 the second parking garage was being built and since then the campus has continued to build more garages, but we are land locked making it more difficult to find land for surface parking lots. She noted that it is much more expensive to build and maintain a parking garage but more parking spaces can be provided with a garage. She reported that the parking garages have been financed with debt.

VC Jackson stated that the history of parking rates over the last five years shows that in 2009 surface parking rates were \$43.50 per month and they are now \$47.00 per month. She stated that garage parking was \$48.50 per month in 2009 and they are now \$53.00 a month. She reported that the Parking Advisory Committee felt that it would be better to have gradual incremental increases in the parking rates over a period of time rather than keeping them very low and suddenly having a dramatic increase.

VC Jackson stated that it is difficult to make comparisons of rates with other universities because they have different circumstances, they may have more land and are able to offer more surface lots and have access to well organized mass transportation systems. As a result she did some comparisons with how UNL's permit rates compare to the city of Lincoln. She reported that garage non-reserved rates permits are \$53 a month while non-reserved permits in city lots can cost \$60 - \$69 a month. She noted that some city lots offer reserved parking spaces and these can cost \$70 - \$81 a month.

VC Jackson reported that surface lots on campus can range from \$26 a month for a perimeter lot to \$47 a month for a closer surface lot. She stated that there are some city surface lots downtown and these can range from \$33 - \$51 a month. She noted that there are some reserved parking spaces in our surface lots which cost \$87 - \$97 a month, but there is declining interest in these spaces. She stated that city reserved surface parking can cost about \$85 a month.

VC Jackson stated that 80% of Parking and Transit Services revenue comes from parking permit fees, an additional 4% comes from student fees, 5% comes from fines and penalties, and 6% comes from rentals (use of parking lots on game days). She stated that the biggest expense for Parking and Transit Services are the bond payments for the parking garages which are 38% of the expenses and 21% for operation and maintenance. She reported that only 12% of expenses are for staff salaries and benefits.

VC Jackson stated that questions have been raised about having alternative revenue for Parking and Transit Services. She noted that over the years there has been a lot of interest in reducing the parking rates and moving the operation over to the general university budget. She pointed out that if permit fees were reduced by \$10 a month, \$1.5 million would have to come from the general operating budget, and if the bond debt were to be moved to the general operating budget \$3.6 million would be needed.

VC Jackson reported that in 2007 a study was conducted to look at a sliding fee scale based on salaries; permit holders who have a higher salary would pay a higher price for parking. She noted that the committee that worked on this looked seriously at a sliding scale, but to have a sliding scale would be too challenging and those with higher salaries would have to pay such a high fee that many of them would opt out of parking on campus.

Professor Sarroub, Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education, asked how much money comes in from football Saturday and whether the faculty will ever get use of some of the parking lots on these days so they can come in and work. VC Jackson reported that football Saturdays occur only seven or eight days a year and she does not think there will be any changes as to the rental of these lots. She pointed out that use of the lots close to the stadium is critical to Athletics developing partnerships with donors. She noted that Parking and Transit services tries to accommodate individuals coming to campus to work on game days by providing some limited parking in specific lots. Director Carpenter noted that the annual rental revenue is \$400,000. Professor Sarroub asked if this money is applied to the parking permit rates. VC Jackson stated that it is included in Parking and Transit Services parking budget. Professor Grange, Theater Arts, asked how much administrators pay for their reserved parking spaces which are usually located next to the building. VC

Jackson stated that they pay \$97 a month for these reserved spaces.

Professor Grange asked when was the last time a felonious assault occurred in one of the parking lots. VC Jackson stated that she cannot recall when a felonious assault has occurred, but pointed out that we do have a number of thefts and accidents in the various lots. She stated that managing the lots includes safety issues, both personal and property.

Professor Wysocki, Computer and Electronics Engineering, noted that 5% of the revenue comes from fines and penalties. He asked what would happen if this figure was substantially reduced. VC Jackson stated that it would have a significant impact since it is 5% of the revenue. She pointed out that the goal is not to maximize on fines and penalties. The Parking and Transit Services tries to be in an educational mode, not a penalty mode of operation. She noted that usually 70% of parking fines are dismissed in the hope that this will educate people and that we will have courteous parkers on campus.

Professor Sarroub, noted that on football Saturdays it is very unsafe to bike to campus and asked if the city of Lincoln and the university has discussed having more bike paths. She stated that Lincoln is the least accommodating city she has lived in for bikers and she has witnessed students and faculty members get into accidents. VC Jackson reported that there has been an increase in bike trails coming to the campus and the City and university continue to work on improving the trail system. She agreed that biking on Lincoln city streets is troubling and difficult.

Professor Grange asked if the student fees pay for the transit buses. VC Jackson stated that this is correct. Professor Grange asked if people still get a free bus pass if they purchase a parking permit. VC Jackson stated that a free bus pass is available to permit holders. Professor Grange noted that he has never purchased a parking permit and parks on the street. He suggested that the policy should be to increase the cost of permits significantly to encourage people to walk more, although he acknowledged that some people may need to park close to their building at times. He asked if there was any discussion about having more street parking. VC Jackson stated that with approximately 30,000 campus community members and only 16,000 parking spaces we are not accommodating many people, and she suspects that these people may already be parking on the streets. She pointed out that in neighborhoods near either campus the streets are filled with cars owned by people who are students, faculty, or staff members who are not accommodated with parking on campus.

Professor Zlotnik, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, stated that in the campus master plan parking in the loop will disappear making parking even more difficult. VC Jackson noted that the idea of removing the loop parking has been vetted, but this is a very valuable parking area and no decisions have been made yet to remove it. Professor Zlotnik pointed out that there are a lot of faculty members who have equipment that they need to load and unload and the loop parking helps to ease the burden of this task. VC Jackson agreed and stated that this is one of the reasons why the loop parking is important. She noted that another concern is to provide parking for people with disabilities who work in the vicinity of the loop parking and parking for visitors to the museum.

Professor Ford, Architecture, stated that when we look at the better parking structures locally they seem to be hybridized facilities accommodating more than just a parking garage. He asked if there has been discussion with Sasaki on creating these kinds of structures, perhaps including academic space within garage structures and thereby spreading the debt of constructing the building to just Parking and Transit Services. VC Jackson reported that in March there will be ground breaking at the 18 and R Street parking lot to construct a parking facility that will include some housing units. She stated that this can work for us sometimes. She pointed out that the challenge we face today is that we are running out of places to even put the garages.

Professor Ruchala, School of Accountancy, stated that she lives in the Malone area and sees the effects of everyone parking in the neighborhoods. Increasing the parking rates encourages pushing the university parking problem onto the residents in the neighborhoods and this is not a real solution. She pointed out that having effective public transportation in Lincoln is the real solution. She noted that most people do not need their vehicle during the day while they are at work or have equipment that they are transporting every day. She asked what the campus is doing to extend the bus service beyond the one shuttle route that serves all of the university people in the Lincoln area. VC Jackson noted that UNL entered into an agreement with StarTran this fall to take over our transit system. She reported that she sits on the StarTran Advisory Board and there are continuing discussions relating to where faculty, staff, and students are living and as the routes are open to change, evaluations are done to see how the routes can better serve these populated areas. She pointed out that one problem with StarTran is that it is not a late evening bus system which creates a real

challenge for us since we have many evening classes. She reported that if there is increase ridership with the buses StarTran could be allowed to apply for more federal funding. Professor Ruchala stated that another problem is the infrequency between buses. She noted that the city is doing a great job of keeping the buses on time but buses come only every half hour.

President Schubert stated that at a recent Board of Regents meeting a presentation was given on energy saving goals for all four of the campuses and one presentation included information on using LED lights in parking garages which makes the garages brighter and saves money. Director Carpenter stated that the parking garage at 19th and Vine streets uses LED lights with motion sensors. He reported that once it is daylight the lights shut off but they turn back on at night. This reduces energy consumption by 50%. He stated that there are also occupancy lights installed which will turn on to 100% of their wattage when people or cars are detected, but then the light decreases when no motion is detected. He noted that the plan is to do the same for the 18th and R streets garage that will be constructed.

Secretary Woodman asked if Innovation Campus parking would be funded by increase in faculty and staff parking fees. VC Jackson stated that faculty and staff will not be paying to maintain the parking lots on Innovation Campus. She stated that Parking and Transit Services is sensitive to the fact that faculty, staff, and students will be moving back and forth from Innovation Campus to the other campuses and UNL parking permits will be honored on Innovation Campus.

VC Jackson reminded the Senate that the Parking Advisory Committee would be interested in hearing from faculty and staff members regarding parking on campus.

4.0 Approval of December 11, 2012 Minutes

Professor Wysocki moved for approval of the minutes. Professor Rinkevich, Classics & Religious Studies, seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

5.0 Committee Reports

5.1 Teaching Council (Professor Anderson)

Professor Anderson, chair of the Teaching Council, stated that the Council conducted regular sessions in which it recommends candidates for campus teaching awards including the Sorensen, OTICA, UDTA, and the ADT awards. He stated that the Council co-sponsored the UNL Parent Certificates of Recognition Award ceremony in January 2012 with the UNL Parents' Association and did the same thing for this year.

5.2 Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (Professor Woody)

Professor Woody, chair of the IAC, reported that the Committee meets monthly and is comprised of a number of subcommittees which include the Subcommittee to Assess Academic Support Services, the Scheduling Oversight Subcommittee, the Transfer Appeals Committee, and the Athletic Scholarship Appeals Committee. He reported that the IAC made some minor revisions to the missed class policy for athletes. He noted that the change essentially states that if a team departs on a Friday afternoon to attend a game but no student athletes miss a class, it will not count as a half day absence. He noted that the Scheduling Oversight Subcommittee also prohibits the scheduling of athletic events during the period of final examinations.

Professor Woody reported that the Transfer Appeals Subcommittee did not receive any appeals this year and neither did the Transfer Appeals Committee. He stated that the Subcommittee to Assess Academic Support Services is charged annually to conduct a review of the Athletics Academic Support Program. The subcommittee's study this year compared the rules, policies, and procedures of the NCAA, Big Ten, and UNL. He reported that the IAC named one male and one female Student-Athletes of the Year. These two students were recognized at an annual Student-Athlete Recognition Banquet.

Professor Woody reported that Shawn Eichorst, the new Director of Athletics, attended the last meeting of the IAC. He stated that Director Eichorst is requesting to have individual meetings with the faculty members of the IAC and is very interested in faculty input in terms of academic support for athletes.

Professor Rudy, Nutrition & Health Sciences, pointed out that some athletes participate in athletic events both semesters. He asked if the missed class policy applies to the total number of days missed over both semesters or for each individual semester. Professor Woody stated that he would need to review the policy more carefully but he believes it applies just to the semester, not the entire season. He stated that he will raise this issue with the IAC.

Professor Rudy noted that one of the concerns with moving to the Big Ten conference is that there will be longer road trips for the athletic teams. He asked if this has been tracked. Professor Woody stated that the IAC did not track the road trips although it may have been done by Athletics. He pointed out that there has been no request from Athletics to change the IAC's missed class policy to accommodate longer road trips.

Secretary Woodman noted that UNL has recently started sand volleyball although there is no competing interest with the other Big Ten schools. He asked if the coach and players will be the same as for indoor volleyball. He stated that it seems strange to have a sport that is now being played over two semesters rather than just one. Professor Nickerson, School of Biological Sciences, reported that he read in the Lincoln Journal Star that the coach and players will be the same. Secretary Woodman asked who makes these decisions. Professor Woody stated that he is not sure who makes the final decision, but he can raise this question at the next IAC meeting. Secretary Woodman pointed out that he has that volleyball players typically take their more difficult courses during the spring semester when they have more time to devote to their studies.

5.3 University Curriculum Committee (Professor DeFusco)

Professor DeFusco, chair of the UCC, reported that the committee meets monthly to review curriculum matters. He noted that the UCC is in the process of changing its process for dealing with course changes as approved by the Senate this past semester. He stated that the work of the UCC mostly involves ACE courses. He reported that he has not received the exact numbers for the year yet but will send these to the Senate Office when he receives them. He stated that the UCC is looking at four new ACE proposals and approximately 40 courses are coming up for ACE recertification. He stated that he is aware that a lot of concern has been raised about the ACE recertification process and he will be meeting with the Senate Executive Committee on February 6 to revisit this issue. He stated that he thinks it is up to the faculty to decide how to approach revising the ACE process. He pointed out that the campus is finding out where the kinks are with the ACE process and will need to determine how to correct these problems.

Professor DeFusco noted that if the changes for the voting procedures of the UCC go well the Committee's syllabus will need to be changed. He stated that this will require approval from the Senate since this is a Faculty Senate committee. He stated that he will bring a revised syllabus to the Executive Committee.

Professor Shea, School of Natural Resources, pointed out that there has been a lot of discussion and concerns raised about ACE. He noted that President-Elect Guevara's report from the CIC Faculty Leadership Conference stated that some of the Big Ten schools have to meet specific outcomes for their general education program, but no one outside of the department reviews the courses and recertifies them. He stated that there are a considerable number of faculty members who feel that the process is better handled within the departments. Professor DeFusco stated that the UCC is just following the ACE process which was voted on and approved by the faculty in each of the colleges. He stated that changes to the process can be discussed and he will bring this up to the UCC after his meeting with the Senate Executive Committee. He pointed out that the Senate will need to provide input into how the process is to be changed.

Professor Archer, School of Natural Resources, asked if the software program being used for ACE recertification works well or whether there are glitches in it. He stated that he is having difficulty with submitting material for recertification and he wondered if this may be contributing to the difficulties that people are experiencing with the recertification process. Professor DeFusco noted that two different systems are being used by UCC, the CREQ program and Blackboard. He stated that there needs to be one system that is used to make it less cumbersome for faculty members. He stated that CREQ is easy to use but finding the program in Blackboard can be difficult.

Professor DeFusco stated that he thinks the UCC will be recommending changes to the ACE process because of the concerns that have been raised.

6.0 Unfinished Business

No unfinished business was discussed.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Student Bereavement Policy Motion

President Schubert reported that at the end of the spring semester the Senate approved to table a motion indefinitely to have a standalone student bereavement policy. He noted that the separate policy caused a lot of discussion and it was felt that a bereavement policy should be included in the existing class attendance policy. He stated that ASUN was notified and suggestions were made for the students to incorporate the bereavement section in the existing policy. He stated that he met with Eric Kamler, President of ASUN, to explain the

details and concerns that were raised and suggested that the students amend their policy to include a bereavement section in the class attendance policy. He reported that the students did this and the motion was now being presented from the Executive Committee to the Senate. He noted that voting on it will take place at the February 5 Senate meeting.

Professor Ford stated that he had no objections with the spirit of the motion but he questioned some of the language and term choices in the class attendance policy. He suggested that we need to integrate the policy and the need for attendance in the syllabus that is provided on the first day of the course. President Schubert pointed out that the motion is to deal with the student bereavement section however, if the Senate wishes to review the entire policy it can do so under New Business.

Professor Sarroub stated that as a faculty member she sets what the attendance policy is for her courses in the class syllabus. She stated that she does not want, or is interested in requiring students to provide evidence of the loss of a loved one. She stated that she would like to take the word of the student. She pointed out that students are not required to provide a slip if they have to see a doctor. She stated that she feels she has an intellectual contract with her students and she does not want to police why they are not in attendance. She noted that if a student is late for class it is not of intellectual importance. She stated that faculty members should set out the rules of communication and attendance for their courses but should not have to police student absences. President Schubert pointed out that the student bereavement policy was written and requested by the students. He stated that faculty members do not have to require that the students attend their class and neither does a faculty member have to implement the need to provide evidence of the death of a loved one. Professor Sarroub said that she felt that there was an enforcement issue embedded in the policy.

Professor Carlson, Veterinary & Biomedical Sciences, stated that he has similar concerns with the policy and asked what constitutes as evidence. He pointed out that no policy that is written is going to be perfect and some students will abuse the policy. He stated that if faculty members get the sense that a student is not being honest it would be good to have a policy to fall back on, but he does not want to have to demand proof that a loved one has passed away. He stated that this is an issue between him and the student.

Professor Ford pointed out that in cases of grievance where a student is unable to complete the coursework they can receive a grade of incomplete. Professor Sarroub stated that she does not want to enforce or police what happens in another class and feels that she would be doing this by agreeing to the proposed policy.

Professor Joeckel, School of Natural Resources, stated that the policy is a dense, monolithic slab of prose that needs to be simplified. He suggested that some of the verbiage be reduced. President Schubert asked Senators to send suggested changes to the policy to the Executive Committee so it can review the recommended changes. He pointed out that ASUN voted and approved the language that is before the Senate after consulting with the Executive Committee. He stated that it would be difficult to tell the students that they once again need to rewrite the policy. Professor Joeckel asked if it is not the case that most faculty members make exceptions to attendance in their classes and asked if this is not part of the issue.

Professor Zlotnik suggested that the student not have to inform the instructor and noted that it should be sufficient to inform the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs' Office of the reason for the absence. Professor Neal, Art & Art History, pointed out that a student may be out of town and may not be able to contact all of their instructors. Professor Carlson disagreed on deleting the language requiring students to contact the instructor. He pointed out that it is still the student's responsibility to contact the instructor when they can.

Professor Sarroub stated that notifying the faculty member is a courtesy, but different students mitigate different reasons for not being able to notify a faculty member of an absence due to bereavement. She stated that she thinks of students as responsible adults who can choose when to attend class. She considers students as being part of an intellectual community and makes an intellectual contractual agreement with them.

Secretary Woodman noted that instructors can make the decision to not require evidence for bereavement absences. He pointed out that this policy is to protect the student. He noted that instructors have very good and solid reasons to have attendance requirements, but this policy allows the student to have some direction if an instructor does not work with them during times of bereavement. Professor Lee, Communication Studies, stated that the only protection for the students is if they go through the grievance process. She stated that she does not think the policy protects the students very much.

Professor Abel, English, stated that he agrees with Professor Sarroub's concerns. He stated that it was confusing to some extent whether this addition is to supplement the class attendance policy that is already in

place. He noted that in English if you miss 20% of classes it is an automatic F for the course. He stated that in his classes students are allowed to have two absences before their grade drops, but he asked how he is to consider absences due to bereavement. Professor Bender, College of Journalism & Mass Communications, pointed out that the policy does not impose any obligations on the faculty in anyway. He stated that if a student wastes his/her two free absences in a class, than it is up to the instructor to deal with the other absences.

Professor Dahab, Civil Engineering, stated that he appreciates the discussion but hasn't had the opportunity to thoroughly look at the policy. He asked if the Executive Committee has studied the proposed language and made a recommendation. President Schubert stated that the Executive Committee reviewed and approved the addition to the class attendance policy and is now presenting it to the Senate for a vote. He stated that if the Senate should reject the motion, we need to make sure that we have good reasons for sending it back to ASUN. Past President LaCost noted that we will vote on the motion next month and if it is turned down we will need to explain to the students why it was rejected. Professor Dahab noted that there is already an existing class attendance policy and asked what the point is of having an additional policy. President Schubert pointed out that it is an addition to the existing policy and the Senate suggested last spring to not have a separate policy which is why it is being requested to add this to the current policy.

Professor Peterson, Agricultural Economics, stated that the original class attendance policy did not have point four; it was added by the Senate. He noted that it is not clear whether the original policy was created by the Senate or the administration but it was argued some time ago that the Senate should take possession of it and that we should control the language of it. He pointed out that it is not the right of the students to insert whatever language they want in the policy, it must be approved by the Senate. President Elect Guevara agreed and stated that at the end of the day this is to protect the students.

President Schubert stated that the text that is before the Senate is based primarily on the recommendations made by the Executive Committee to ASUN. He pointed out that the original bereavement policy from the students was two pages long and this is an excerpt of what we wanted from that policy. He asked that any suggestions for amendments or modifications be sent to the Executive Committee. Any suggestions that are made will be collected and reviewed by the Executive Committee and presented to the Senate at the next meeting.

Professor Carlson asked why the policy is needed. President Schubert noted that some students have had difficulties with some instructors not excusing them for the loss of a family member. Professor Crews, Textiles, Clothing, Design & Fashion Merchandising, suggested that the language "death of a family member" simply be included in point two of the existing policy. She stated that the rest of the suggested paragraph is not needed.

Professor Sarroub stated that one of the ways that we have modeled faculty governance issues is to actually act on issues and not worry about credibility. She noted that there is a process in place for students to suggest changes to existing policies and the Senate making changes to what is being proposed shows that we are engaged in conversation with the students and she believes this is a good thing.

7.2 Suggested Agenda Item

Professor Shea reported that he read with interest President-Elect Guevara's detailed report on the CIC Faculty Leadership conference this fall. He was particularly interested in how the other Big Ten schools' Faculty Senate is more engaged in shared governance. He noted that he attended the conference in 2011 and had a similar observation. He suggested that the topic for increased shared governance be put on an upcoming agenda.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, February 5, 2:30 p.m. in the East Campus Union, Arbor Suite. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, and David Woodman, Secretary.