# EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** **Bolin, Fech, Flowers, Konecky, LaCost, Lindquist, McCollough, Prochaska-Cue, Rapkin, Shea, Stock**

**Absent:** **Franti, Schubert**

**Date:** **October 14, 2009**

**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**
Fech called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

**2.0** **Dean Rita Kean, Office of Undergraduate Studies and Meg Lauerman, Office of University Communications**
**2.1** **Undergraduate Bulletin**
Lauerman stated that the current printed undergraduate bulletin costs approximately $22,000 to $25,000 a year to produce. She pointed out that the campus could do a better job in a more economical way by putting the bulletin on line. She noted that the Code of Conduct and Student Rights and Responsibilities information are located in the back of the printed bulletin. She stated that putting the bulletin on-line would be a great delivery mechanism and a great way to notify students and make them aware of the Code of Conduct.

Lauerman reported that the effort to put the bulletin on the web began about a year and a half ago and the plan is to create an on-line interactive link that is very easy for people to use. She noted that most universities have very robust websites.

Lauerman pointed out that there are inconsistencies throughout the current bulletin, but having an on-line interactive site would provide more accurate and up-to-date information because any changes that are made would automatically be made to any other linked sites.

Lauerman stated that she and Kean have consulted widely with people on campus and they want to get feedback from the Senate. She stated that they are trying to assess what the students, faculty, and advisors want and need from the on-line undergraduate bulletin.

Kean noted that the University Curriculum Committee began an on-line approval process for course changes in 2003 and it has been very successful. She stated that this process has saved a lot of time and reduced costs and would tie in well with an on-line bulletin.

Kean stated that a prototype of the bulletin is being created and there is a template with standard information. She stated that if a college wants to put something in the website there will be a link to accomplish this task. She noted that available scholarships can be listed on the site as along with other pertinent information.

Lindquist stated that he has concerns with the accessibility of the Student Code of Conduct. He reported that he informs students that they need the bulletin because it is their contract with the university and it tells the students what they need to do in order to obtain a degree. He pointed out that all of this information needs to be readily available on the website in a format that still makes the Code part of a contract between the student and the university. Kean stated that she has been told by General Counsel Joel Pederson that the Code can be a standalone contract on the website and will be given to students at New Student Enrollment. Lauerman pointed out that the contract will have a date that can be archived when the student first enters the university. The archive will allow students to view the bulletin they first used when they enrolled into the university. They will be able to refer back to this bulletin at any time.

Lauerman reported that the anticipation is to have a June 1st launch date but efforts are in place to move this back to March 1st. She pointed out that a March 1st date would provide transfer students starting in the fall semester access to a current bulletin.

Konecky noted that the Student Code of Conduct is currently an accessory to the bulletin that many people may not be aware of because of its location in the bulletin. She pointed out that making sure that the website links are tightly bound to the Code could address concerns of students not being aware of the Code. Both Kean and Lauerman agreed that this was a good idea as well as handing the students a printed copy of the Code. Rapkin stated that everyone could provide a link on their syllabus to the Code of Conduct. Konecky suggested that the new Blackboard changes could be used to provide a link to the code.

McCollough pointed out that moving the deadline date up to March 1st would require the Curriculum Committee to conduct its work more quickly. Kean stated that the on-line course approval process allows the Curriculum Committee to complete its work much faster, especially for those courses that just have some technical changes. She reported that the ACE program approval process is moving quickly and the ACE program should be less complicated to navigate through than the ES/IS program.

Lauerman stated that the proposed date for launching the bulletin is 2011 if all changes are approved. She stated that the plan is to have the distribution date of March 1.

McCollough asked if DARS would interface with the bulletin. Kean stated that she has met with people involved with the DARS system to discuss what will happen with the on-line bulletin. She stated that from the discussions, it is her understanding that the goal is for all of the systems to work together. Lauerman pointed out that the programmers working on this project are aware of the DARS interface.

Lindquist stated that the faculty in CASNR was informed that DARS will be the final word on whether a student graduates so it will be critical to have DARS interact with the system. Lauerman stated that metatags can be placed in each course description that would refer the course back to each college that it applies to. She noted that the same can be done with scholarships and financial aid.

McCollough asked if the ES/IS program will still be in the bulletin. Kean and Lauerman both stated that it would be in the on-line bulletin because there are still students who are under that program.

Griffin asked if the prototype can be sent to the Executive Committee. Lauerman stated that an email with a link to the prototype can be sent out so the Committee can see what the bulletin will look and act like.

McCollough asked if someone can simply type in the name of a discipline and pull up all the information on it. Kean and Lauerman stated that all of the course information and a link to the department home page will come up.

Lauerman noted that this is an on-going dialogue with the campus and that those working on this project need all the help and thoughts they can get in order to make the on-line bulletin work correctly. She stated that she welcomes any questions or feedback that people may have. She stated that the idea is to make this a totally open and collaborative effort.

Lauerman stated that she will send the Executive Committee an email with the link to the prototype.

**3.0    Announcements**
   **3.1    Resolution on University's Policy on Stem Cell Research**
   Fech reported that there will probably just be a discussion about the university's current policy on stem cell research when the Board of Regents meets on October 23rd. He noted that Central Administration's Corporation Secretary Donal Burns contacted him and stated that he will gather the resolutions from each of the campuses and then present them to the Board in one package. Fech reported that UNK approved the resolution along with a petition in support of the resolution.

   **3.2    UNL Membership with the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA)**
   Fech reported that he received an email message from Professor Gaussoin, Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC), stating that the IAC is recommending that UNL withdraw its membership to COIA. Konecky recalled that the reason we decided to participate in COIA was to keep an eye on what was going on with it. Fech stated that Professor Gaussoin's email indicated that there seems to be no use in being members of it anymore. Fech suggested that either Professor Gaussoin or Professor Potuto could explain the reason for the request to withdraw membership at the Senate meeting.

**4.0    Minutes of 10/7/09**

Shea referred to a comment made by Lindquist about SVCAA Couture's website listing that at least three external letters are required for promotion and tenure files. He wondered whether the site previously listed this number. He stated that he has concerns with the number of external letters getting out of control and stated that he would like to see a cap put on the number of required letters. He noted that it is not always the faculty who make this decision. Stock noted that his department is getting pressured to have more external letters. McCollough reported that she has been involved in the promotion and tenure process in Arts & Sciences and has seen some files with eight external letters and another with five. She stated that what seems to be happening is that more requests for external letters are being sent. This is probably being done in order to ensure that at least three letters will be received.

**5.0    Unfinished Business**
**5.1    Recommendations from Report of Committee on the Cancellation of Dr. Ayers' Visit**
The Committee debated whether the report should be formally accepted or approved by the Senate. Fech stated that he will check with Professor Chouinard on Roberts Rules of Order about handling reports from committees. He noted that he wants to specifically thank the committee for all of their work and wants to focus on the recommendations.

Shea stated that the complicating part is to decide whether the report should be posted on the Senate website. He pointed out that we need to be consistent with how we handle reports and putting them on-line. He wondered whether accepting a report means that we should automatically put it on the website. He stated that we need to be consistent with what we do with reports in the future.

Konecky stated that accepting a report means that a group receives the report. She suggested that items received by the Senate be posted on the website. Lindquist suggested that items sent out to the Senate be posted and archived on the website and anything else the Senate does could be added as well.

Shea asked if a report is sent out to the Senate, can it be shared with others outside the Senate. Griffin noted that the Senate meetings are open to the public and it is her understanding that information can be made public unless it is specifically identified as being confidential. Shea asked if letters sent by the Executive Committee are public information. LaCost noted that when the Committee meets with the Chancellor or other administrators, the Committee is asked to keep some things confidential. Fech suggested that this issue be addressed when a letter is sent.

The Committee debated whether all products from the Executive Committee should be made public. Rapkin suggested that documents should be kept confidential unless their release is explicitly approved by the Committee.

Lindquist moved that recommendation number one (to include language in the Academic Rights & Responsibilities procedures relating to the cancelation of a presentation from a properly invited speaker) be referred to the Academic Rights & Responsibilities

Committee for their review and recommendation. Motion seconded by Shea. The motion was approved.

Prochaska-Cue suggested that recommendation number two (requiring each college administration to establish clear means of consulting with faculty in the college if a faculty sponsored event is to be canceled) and recommendation five (having the Chancellor's office and Varner Hall improve communication systems that provide protocols and procedures for how staff should respond to a heavy volume of external protests) be discussed with the Chancellor.

Lindquist stated that recommendation number five could be done by inviting Chief Yardley and Professor Scalora to speak to the Senate about the Threat Assessment Group. LaCost moved that the Senate invite someone from the Threat Assessment Group to meet with the Senate. Motion seconded by Konecky. Shea suggested that the university community should be kept informed on this issue and suggested that they speak to the Senate on a regular basis. Konecky suggested that they could speak to the Senate every other year. Motion approved.

The Committee felt that recommendation number six (the Senate work with the administration to develop clear ways to provide academic units the protection and security resources for controversial events) be discussed with the Chancellor to make sure there is funding available for sufficient security.

Prochaska-Cue moved that recommendation seven (the Faculty Senate plan a conference for students, faculty, administrators, citizens, journalists, and politicians on academic freedom) be followed. Motion seconded by Konecky. Lindquist asked who will do all of the planning and arranging for the conference and where the funding will come from. He suggested that the Committee ask the Chancellor if he would be willing to help fund the conference. Flowers stated that a committee needs to look into developing a conference.

The Committee agreed that recommendation eight (Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate provide an annual update to the Senate about the condition of academic freedom at UNL) needs further consideration of how this task can be accomplished.

The Committee agreed to create a spreadsheet with the recommendations and actions for implementation.

**6.0    New Business**
**6.1    Agenda Items for Meeting with Chancellor Perlman and SVCAA Couture**
The Committee discussed topics to discuss with the Chancellor and Senior Vice Chancellor next week.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, October 21, 2009 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.