

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** Bradford, Fech, Franti, Hachtmann, Jackson, LaCost, Lindquist, McCollough, Prochaska-Cue, Rapkin, Schubert, Zimmers

**Absent:** Ledder

**Date:** Wednesday, September 17, 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**

Prochaska-Cue called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

### **2.0 Announcements**

No announcements were made.

### **3.0 Approval of 3/10/08 Minutes**

The Committee approved the minutes as amended.

### **4.0 Unfinished Business**

#### **4.1 Affirmative Action Initiative Discussion**

Rapkin stated that he created a rough draft of a resolution. Bradford noted that it was well worded but wondered whether Rapkin wanted the Senate to take any kind of action regarding the amendment.

Fech reported that he has heard that ASUN is working on some kind of resolution. Prochaska-Cue wondered whether the Senate's sister campuses passed a resolution. Bradford stated that UNO and UNMC took positions on a statute that had been proposed in the legislature that was similar to the initiative but have not actually passed a resolution against the initiative.

Zimmers asked whether the new lawsuit against the amendment has any merit. Bradford stated that he is not sure but he thinks it will be difficult to prove that enough signatures are not valid. Lindquist stated that the initiative will probably be on the ballot. Bradford reported that it is his understanding that the ballot is already being printed.

McCollough pointed out that the initiative has not been very well explained to people and that most people think it is just repealing affirmative action. Bradford noted that people have so many different interpretations on what affirmative action is.

Rapkin asked if the Committee wanted to take a vote on the resolution he had formulated. Jackson stated that he thought the Committee agreed to let a resolution come from the floor of the Senate rather than the Executive Committee. Bradford agreed and stated that if Rapkin wanted to make a motion from the floor he can do so.

The Executive Committee discussed how long the guest speakers should have to talk about the initiative. The Committee agreed to 10 minutes and that Bradford will be responsible for keeping the speakers to the 10 minutes.

#### **4.2 Information Technology Survey**

Schubert stated that he is not sure what other information technology services are needed but he noted that back in the 1990's information technology was done at the local level but since then many things have been taken over by outside services. He stated that it does not make sense that faculty members have to pay for the use of the wireless network in order to do their work.

Schubert stated that he strongly opposes any kind of technology that would take away teaching courses in the traditional method. Bradford pointed out that there are some instances when distance education can be done better than if it were a straight lecture in a classroom. For instance in a distance education course he can force each student to respond to a question whereas this cannot be done in a large class. He stated that what we need now is improvement in our technology to provide distance education. He stated that he thinks it important for us to offer distance education courses--otherwise we are going to lose out to other universities.

McCullough asked about copyrights regarding class lectures. Bradford discussed the university's intellectual property policies as they apply to class lectures. McCullough asked what would happen if a student taped the class. Bradford stated that he does not allow this in his classes so he is unsure about the copyrights.

Schubert pointed out that teaching courses is very different from field to field. He stated that he believes in the old of idea of education and that if a student wants to be taught something they should take a classroom-based course. Bradford noted that distance education is much broader than just putting lectures on a tape for viewing.

Hachtmann pointed out that the use of technology has made the College of Journalism much more competitive. She noted that technology has given the College the ability to have video conferencing between the class and experts from the east or west coast. She stated that the problem is that the video conferencing connection can be lost if too many people are tied into it. She stated that this is where there needs to be better support from information technology services.

Bradford pointed out that today's students are comfortable with technology and he thinks that many more of them will want distance education—for example, parents with small children who can't easily make it to the classroom. McCullough stated that she thought

that distance education courses would be a good way to compete with community colleges for introductory level courses.

Schubert asked what would happen if taping of classes were done in all fields. McCollough pointed out that there are too many courses to tape all of them. Bradford noted that a course taped this year wouldn't be relevant in three years.

Fech pointed out that theoretically some of the distance education can be done but because of our antiquated system it can not be done well. He stated that instructors need the right tools in place to do a good job with distance education courses.

The Committee reviewed Jackson's input on the survey. Jackson stated that his input to the survey lists tools and utility technologies that will allow the faculty to get their jobs done and that he didn't cover any philosophical issues in his responses. He did not put any philosophical aspects into his responses. Bradford noted that the input is not mandating a particular course delivery system but equipment needs to be available for those who want to use it. The question is whether it should be available at the university or the local level and whatever level it is at there needs to be support. Schubert suggested that there should be something on the server that would help people develop courses.

Jackson pointed out that a robust system with wide broadband capability is needed. Schubert stated that he would like to have a classroom where a professor can easily contact a tech person for service if it is needed. Bradford stated that the question is whether the tech person should be at the central level or at the local level. Jackson stated that he is asking for local control. He stated that everything can be centralized as long as it allows local ability to impact a person's immediate environment. Bradford pointed out that one problem is that the tech person will need to know what programs are on a particular piece of equipment in order to be helpful.

Schubert noted that control of access has to be centrally located. He pointed out that if the outcome of centralization is that technology will be so difficult to use than we don't want it. He stated that there should be single sign-in capability with one card swipe that would allow a person to have access to particular rooms.

Lindquist stated that currently in distance education there is no consistent way in which resources are handled. He pointed out that there is no incentive for him to develop a distance education course because the tuition raised by this course does not come back to his unit to help defray the cost of developing that course. LaCost stated that in some departments in the College of Education and Human Sciences this does happen. McCollough asked if the credit hour production is attributed to the department. Lindquist thinks it is but not the tuition. Bradford noted that the problem is that the department has to pay for the development of the course but yet receives no benefits from it. Lindquist pointed out that sometimes it is the instructor who bears the cost of developing the course.

Bradford stated that he thinks Jackson's comments are useful and that he has broad enough categories but he still feels strongly about the local versus centralized control issue. Jackson stated that he advocates control of selected services at the local level. Bradford stated that he thinks departments should have the option of local level control. Jackson indicated that local control and configuration flexibility is important for many research, outreach/extension and teaching tools, but that often utility functions – for example networking infrastructure and switching – is usually best managed and maintained centrally as long as such management is flexible enough to meet specialized needs.

Bradford stated that one of his concerns is that if a Chief Information Officer is hired the natural reaction is that the person will draw some functions to her/himself. He pointed out that we need to be careful with what happens with this. Lindquist stated that he thinks the Committee should make a clear statement that we do not think everything should be centralized. Prochaska-Cue stated that the survey is asking what should be centralized and what should be outsourced but it does not ask what should be localized. She pointed out that the clue is how the technology is going to be used. Jackson noted that this issue has also been raised by other groups on campus.

Prochaska-Cue stated that she liked the idea that was raised about having a trial loan center for equipment. Jackson stated that a group on campus mentioned forming a new technology evaluation group so that they can look and evaluate new equipment, software tools, and technology. Bradford stated that he thinks the trial loan center is a good idea but is not sure how economical it would be. Jackson stated that he believes that there are companies who would be interested in participating in something like this. Griffin suggested having a product trade show on campus where the vendors come in and demonstrate their newest equipment.

McCollough asked if it would be good to outsource the faculty/staff email. Jackson stated that the university, in concept at least, should at least be willing to consider outsourcing everything. Often there are privacy and other issues that would make outsourcing unwise, and that making a decision to not outsource comes very quickly. There are some services, however, that if they are wise to centralize it might be equally wise to outsource. Bradford noted that some things may be cheaper for the university to outsource although there are some tradeoffs that need to be measured against the savings. He pointed out that the savings from outsourcing could then be moved over to educational technology. He stated that one thing to consider is the possibility of accidental release of information. He stated that the biggest problems he's seen reported involving accidental release of information have involved public entities possibly because the public entities do not keep up with technology like private companies do.

McCollough asked if storage could become centralized. Jackson stated that this would be one approach to consider. Remote storage means you don't have a physical piece of equipment to locally house or manage, but that you could either manage storage remotely or have others perform the administrative and management functions centrally. McCollough asked if storage becomes centralized would it be possible to put firewalls up

so only a department can have access. Jackson stated that this can be done. Bradford pointed out that a building that would house all of the servers would not have to be on campus. It could be anywhere. Jackson stated that a private data center could be built.

Jackson stated that he thinks the help desk should be more localized for minor problems facing users. He stated that each unit or a group of units should have a local support person to help them out. Prochaska-Cue stated that the campus needs more support people on campus. Zimmers pointed out that for extension facilities there is only one tech person for 28 counties.

The Committee will continue working on the survey at the next meeting.

### **4.3 Office of Research Policy on Misconduct**

Prochaska-Cue stated that based on the discussion last week and an extensive review of the documents she drafted a statement for the Committee to consider. She noted that in the draft she is recommending that the Research Policy be changed to include language stating that the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Procedures for Professional Misconduct-B (PC-B) be invoked.

Prochaska-Cue pointed out that the Compliance Officer is a person appointed by the Vice Chancellor, and that the Research policy fails to mandate a review of the accused person by faculty peers. She stated that this is a major flaw from an academic freedom perspective and also from a shared governance standpoint.

Prochaska-Cue stated that the major difference between the Research Policy and the ARRC procedures is that the report from the PC-B hearing committee goes to the Chancellor, not the Vice Chancellor. The Chancellor can reject in part or all of the report but he/she must give reasons for doing this. If the report is rejected by the Chancellor the Senate Executive Committee will then look at the report. She pointed out that the Chancellor has the power to decide what, if any, sanctions should be taken but this is done only after the hearing committee has filed its report.

Jackson stated that he does not know if the Board of Regents approved the Research policy but it was approved by the federal government. Prochaska-Cue noted that the Board of Regents approved the ARRC procedures in September of 2005. She pointed out that she was on the ARRC in 2005 and the Research Policy never came to the Committee as a whole. Jackson stated that it was his understanding that Professor Works, also a member of the ARRC, reviewed the Research policy and had some interactions with Dan Vasgrid, Compliance Officer, about it.

Bradford stated that he still believes the two procedures can be reconciled. He pointed out that the only section that needs to be changed is Section X of the Research policy so that the ARRC procedures can be invoked. Lindquist stated that there should not be so much redundancy of processes. He noted that the investigative report from the Research office could be totally different from that of the PC-B hearing committee. Bradford

pointed out that federal regulations might require certain things in the policy. Lindquist stated that the problem is that there is no Faculty Senate input with the Research policy.

LaCost asked if the Research policy replaces the ARRC PC-B procedures. Bradford stated that this is what the Research Office appears to be doing and that this is where there is a problem. He noted that the PC-B procedures were approved by the Board of Regents but it is unclear whether the Research policy was approved by the Board.

Rapkin asked if there is a problem with the PC-B procedures. Prochaska-Cue stated that there is concern with the timing. The PC-B process takes longer but there are checks and balances built into the PC-B procedures that the research policy does not have. She pointed out that with the Research policy everything is vested in one person.

McCollough wondered whether there has been a misinterpretation of federal law with the Research policy.

Jackson stated that it would be useful to have a copy of the letter that was sent to UNL by the federal government stating what the problems were with the earlier process.

The Committee agreed to discuss the issue with Chancellor Perlman next week.

## **6.0 New Business**

### **6.1 University Calendar**

Prochaska-Cue reported that Chancellor Perlman has requested that the Executive Committee and the Senate to review the proposed university calendar for 2010-2020. Bradford moved to approve the proposed calendar. Rapkin seconded the motion. Motion approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:52 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, September 24th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and David Rapkin, Secretary.