

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

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

Absent: Zimmers

Date: Wednesday, April 2, 2008

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 3:07 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

3.0 Approval of 3/26/08 Minutes

The Committee approved the minutes as amended.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Faculty Salaries

The Committee reviewed the frequency of faculty salary increases chart provided by Institutional Research and Planning. Fech noted that the reason for getting the information is to verify what percentage of faculty members received the 4.4% increase reported by the media. Bolin pointed out that many people assume that all faculty members received this amount of increase when in actuality they did not.

Ledder pointed out that the average increase was approximately 4.4% increase, while the median increase was about 3.1%. The figure of 4.4% indicates the impact of the increase on the budget, while the 3.1% indicates the increase for the “typical” faculty member.

Prochaska Cue asked if the chart included all faculty members or just tenure line. Bradford stated that he did not know whether all faculty lines were included. Fech wondered how faculty members were defined in the chart.

Rapkin asked what the purpose is of getting the report. He asked whether we should send a copy of it to the Senate. Moeller cautioned that seeing the chart could cause some misunderstandings. She pointed out that a person’s raise is determined by his/her annual review and the rating scale within that person’s department.

Bradford noted that the information is public and anybody could get the data and construct a chart. He stated that we need to get more information from Institutional Research and Planning before releasing the chart.

Ledder stated that he was surprised to see that there were some faculty members who received over a 10% increase. Moeller pointed out that the Committee could ask about these increases because they are considered outliers. The Committee speculated about why a faculty member would receive such a large increase.

5.0 New Business

5.1 April 22nd Senate Meeting

Bradford noted that the candidates running for Regent Wilson's position on the Board of Regents are interested in speaking to the Senate at the April 22nd meeting. He stated that his inclination is to say no to them right now because of the work the Senate needs to do at that meeting. Ledder suggested that the candidates be invited to speak to the Senate in September or October.

Bradford reminded the Committee that the discussion and motion on the Diversity Committee report needs to be dealt with at the April 22nd meeting. Ledder stated that he wants to note that the section on Diversity, Curriculum and the beginning of the Inclusiveness, Harassment and Diversity Training section is good although he can see other parts of the report as being problematical.

Lindquist pointed out that what needs to be considered is that this is a report that essentially came from just two people. He noted that he appreciates the work the Diversity Committee did and the presentation made by Professor Moshman but the report is not from the committee but from two people. Moeller stated that Moshman did point out that the report was probably not representative of the majority of the committee.

Alloway asked if the Committee was in agreement with Professor Moshman's allocation that no charge was given to the Diversity Committee. Moeller noted that if the Committee recalled Past President Beck wanted a comprehensive diversity plan. As President at that time, Moeller stated that she appointed a diverse committee and asked former Professor Haller to chair the committee. She told him that a comprehensive plan was requested of the committee and provided him with website links to institutions that had a comprehensive plan. She pointed out that Professor Haller retired and Professor Poser had to step down since she became Associate to the Chancellor. Professor Moshman was then asked to chair the committee by then President Bradford.

Bradford noted that Professor Moshman asked for clarification of the charge of the committee. Bradford stated that he was informed by Professor Moshman that the committee would not be meeting during the summer. The committee was given a charge in September and told to focus first on recruitment and retention.

Moeller stated that she hopes another committee will be appointed to review the recommendations made by the Advisory Board in Washington D.C that has been hired by the Chancellor to look at best practices at other institutions.

Rapkin stated that he feels that the innuendos made at the Senate meeting about why people resigned from the Diversity Committee was an injustice to them.

The Committee discussed the motion made to not endorse the report. Bolin stated that she feels the report is disingenuous, specifically what was really being said with the information provided on opportunity hires. Ledder and Prochaska Cue agreed. Ledder stated that the report should have included different viewpoints. Bradford noted that the obligation was to report on both sides of the issue.

Bradford stated that the question is where do we go from here? Moeller stated that we need to wait until we get the report from the Advisory Board to see where our problems are and address them. Ledder stated that we may not be able to address some factors of why people leave but we need to know their reasons for leaving.

Bradford stated that in the motion to approve graduate student representatives to certain committees it is unclear whether ASUN would appoint the students. Moeller stated that it was the Committee on Committees understanding that ASUN would make the appointments but there would be specific positions for graduate students. Bradford stated that he wants to have this clarified.

5.2 IRB Survey

Bradford noted that he received an email message from Professor Harbison, Chemistry, who has a complaint about a survey being conducted by UNL's Bureau of Sociological Research. Bradford reported that he contacted Vice Chancellor Paul about Professor Harbison's concerns and the full IRB will be looking into it. He stated that he wants to wait to see how the IRB responds to the complaint.

Moeller pointed out that if someone is involved in the study you are conducting and they want to know what the study is for she would feel morally obligated to say what the purpose is of collecting the data. She stated that while the disclosure statement provides information on the survey, the investigator is not obligated to include what the data is going to be used for because it can predispose the responses to the survey.

5.3 Planning for Academic Dishonesty Committee

Bradford noted that efforts this past year were on getting the Safe Assignment policy approved and implemented. He suggested that it would be best to reappoint the committee to deal with the issue of academic dishonesty. He noted that the students who were previously on the committee might be leaving or unable to serve again and Ledder is going on leave in the fall. Bradford recommended that the charge of the committee not include re-examining the safe assignment policy. Bradford and Flowers volunteered to serve on the committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:41 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, April 9th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.