

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Bradford, Fech, Flowers, Hachtmann, LaCost, Ledder, Lindquist, Moeller, Prochaska Cue, Rapkin, Zimmers

Absent: Bolin

Date: Wednesday, September 5, 2007

Location: Faculty Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

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

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Premier of Breaking Down Barriers

Hachtmann announced that the College of Journalism and Mass Communications' premier of the documentary film "Breaking Down Barriers" is on September 6th at 7:00 p.m. in the Mary Riepma Ross Media Arts Center.

3.0 Approval of 8/29/07 Minutes

The minutes were approved as amended.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 ACE Summary

Moeller reported that the ACE committees were beginning to look at proposals three and four again. She noted that the corrections made on proposal one were very good. Bradford wondered whether the corrections to proposal one would satisfy the faculty in Arts & Sciences. Ledder stated that he thinks a good majority of the people would be satisfied.

Bradford asked if Ledder's ACE summary needed any further changes. He noted that if Ledder did not receive any changes by the end of the week then he could distribute the summary to the Senators.

Bradford stated that if proposals three and four are ready, they will probably be discussed in October at the Senate meeting. Ledder pointed out that the official university policy is that the Faculty Senate does not have any connection with reforming general education. However, the Board of Regents Bylaws state that the Senate is to act on matters that cut across the colleges. He pointed out that the Senate does not want to make a big deal over this point but the Executive Committee feels that Senate approval is necessary. He stated that the Senate is the only faculty body that includes representatives from each of the

colleges. He noted that the Senate is the governing body that will have a debate about the proposals.

Lindquist asked if the changes that were made to proposal one were based on input from the Senate or from the fora. Ledder stated that the input came from a variety of places from faculty across the colleges.

Ledder stated that outcome two is the item that has brought about the most debates. He noted that the other big debate is whether history should be given a separate outcome. He stated that history is now included as one of the several perspectives. He reported that the latest versions of proposals three and four look at history as a tool to be applied to a broad area and this will probably satisfy most people. He stated that some of the problems arise from the fact that one course is needed for each outcome. He pointed out that if history is made a separate outcome one of the other ones would need to be removed.

Lindquist asked why changes have been made to proposal one after it was approved. Moeller stated that there has been a proviso that the proposals could be slightly changed after approval. Ledder pointed out that proposal one does not enact anything. Bradford stated that colleges will have to re-approve the entire program when proposals three and four are approved. Ledder noted that the vote to approve proposals one and two was very close in some colleges.

Moeller stated that she thinks the ACE committees really addressed things in the proposals. She pointed out that they worked on the revision for two years before anything surfaced. She noted that there is representation from the faculty from each of the colleges on the committees. Ledder pointed out that the misrepresentation is a subtle concept. He noted that while the ACE committees had representatives from each of the colleges they did not necessarily have representation from all of the different viewpoints. He stated that if all of the viewpoints had been represented similar objections would not have surfaced with the first two proposals.

Bradford stated that the ACE committee took a much better approach with proposals three and four. He noted that the ACE committee is getting input much earlier in the writing process of the proposals.

Rapkin questioned how it can be anticipated in advance how the representatives would split in the voting of the proposals. Ledder pointed out that if you hear a consistent thread of concern with the proposals then you would need to listen and deal with these concerns.

Bradford stated that at the open forums the ACE committee should hear comments by the faculty concerning the next proposals. Lindquist stated that he hopes the faculty will look into the proposals more. He stated that it would be great if the summary fosters discussion but people need to read the proposals carefully when they are presented.

4.2 Possible Reaction to Board of Regents Decision on the Belot Case

Bradford reported that the Board of Regents is to review and make a decision on the Belot case at its September 6th meeting. He stated that the Board will meet privately to take a vote but the actual written opinion will not be available for awhile. He stated that another possibility is that the Board will wait for the opinion to be written before announcing its decision. He pointed out that the media might try contacting members of the Executive Committee to get a reaction to the Board's decision.

Lindquist asked if the Board's decision would become effective immediately. Bradford stated that it would unless there is a lawsuit.

Lindquist asked what could be the possible reactions of the Executive Committee. Bradford pointed out that the Executive Committee members have not seen the report of the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Hearing committee yet according to the rules so they cannot react yet.

Lindquist asked what would happen if the Board's decision is to terminate. Bradford stated that if that happened then everyone on the Committee would get a copy of the report but it is not clear what the Committee can do beyond receiving the report. He noted that probably the only thing the Committee could do is to make comments about the Board's decision.

Lindquist asked what would be the Committee's response if someone on the Senate makes a resolution regarding the Board's decision. Ledder pointed out that it could not be voted on at that meeting. Bradford stated that a vote couldn't be taken until October because it would not be an emergency motion. He stated that he hoped if there was a negative decision that Belot would waive confidentiality so that the case could be discussed more freely.

Moeller asked if there was any response from the Regents regarding the letter that Bradford sent about the process of the Academic Rights and Responsibilities proceedings. Bradford stated he received a response from Regent Wilson thanking him for the thoughtful letter and stated that the Board is committed to following the rules of the university.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Senate Meeting

Bradford stated that he will make an announcement regarding Dr. Ari and will invite him to attend that meeting.

5.2 Invitation to Attend Diversity Retreat

Bradford reported that he received an invitation from VC Franco inviting the Executive Committee to attend the annual Division of Student Affairs diversity retreat. He noted that the retreat will be held on November 2nd from 8 – 2:30 at the East Campus Union. He reported that Dr. Larry Roper from Oregon State will be the guest speaker.

5.3 Pepsi Student Events Fund Committee

Bradford stated that a Faculty Senate representative was needed for the Pepsi Student Events Fund Committee. Fech volunteered to serve on the committee.

5.4 Email from Facilities Management on Thermostats

Ledder stated that a staff member in his department received an email message from Facilities Management stating that the thermostats have been desensitized and unless there is a consistent problem in a room of the temperature being above 78 degrees nothing will be done to fix a problem with the thermostat. He noted that the second sentence stated that people should be dressed appropriately if there are any problems. He pointed out that when it is hot, only so many clothes can be taken off to try to cool down. He questioned who can be talked to about this policy. Bradford stated that the person would probably be the Chancellor since he originated the policy underlying the email.

5.5 Chancellor's State of the University Address

Moeller noted that the Chancellor did an excellent job with the State of the University address. Ledder pointed out that the videos presented were great. Bradford stated that he was glad to hear that the Gallup survey is no longer a priority.

Fech stated that he had a question regarding the Chancellor's comments on the state fair grounds. He noted that the extension personnel have to deal with this issue and he asked what the official response is regarding the proposed move of the state fair grounds. Bradford stated that the Chancellor's response is not a surprise and that he has been very forthcoming with the State Fair Board about the proposal. Zimmers noted that both Sarpy County and Kearney have stated that they would take the state fair.

5.6 Safe Assignment Resolution

Fech asked if ASUN representatives will be at the September Senate meeting when a vote is taken on the Safe Assignment Resolution. Bradford stated that they have said they will be there. Ledder pointed out that he believes the policy has been revised to the students' satisfaction. He noted that the students want total free access to Safe Assignment and they want to be able to check their papers against the both the local and global databases.

Bradford pointed out that students will need to go through the library for some limited instruction on how to use the program. Ledder pointed out that students will only need to go through the instruction once. Moeller stated that there is training through Blackboard on the program.

Ledder pointed out that when an instructor submits a paper to the program it checks against both the local and global databases. If an instructor does not allow students to submit papers for a course through the program then the student has the option of going to the library to check the paper only against the local database.

Flowers pointed out that the students also felt that their paper should not be submitted to the local database unless they approve it. Alloway asked if any identifying information is revealed about the writer of a document from the local database when Safe Assignment

shows a side-by-side comparison between a student's paper and a paper from the database. Flowers stated that this information is not available. He pointed out that one problem that can occur is that if a student checks a draft paper that paper could mistakenly get submitted to the local database.

Ledder pointed out that one gray issue is that a student could not use the same paper for another class because the program does not consider it acceptable. Bradford stated that there needs to be a clear, specific rule regarding whether students can use the same paper for a different course.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, September 12th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.