

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Anaya, Irmak, LaCost, Lindquist, Nickerson, Rinkevich, Schubert, Shea, Struthers, Varner, Wysocki

Absent: Purdum

Date: Wednesday, August 31, 2011

Location: Faculty Senate Office

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

LaCost called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

2.0 Nancy Mitchell, Director of General Education, and Linda Major, Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

Mitchell reported that the creation of a civic engagement certificate is a good example of Student Affairs working with Academic Affairs. She stated that Major noticed a grant opportunity that would allow the campus to focus on bringing the theory learned in classrooms to practice. She reported that after a year of working with various groups including students, faculty, and staff from various parts of the campus that a proposal was written and was funded. She noted that a bonus to receiving this grant is that it allows us to connect general education with students' life experiences. She stated that while it has been helpful to have the ten ACE outcomes, the campus wanted to have the opportunity to reinforce students' learning of civic engagement throughout their education and career. She stated that this was the impetus for creating the civic engagement certificate. She reported that the Academic Planning Committee has reviewed and approved the certificate and it is scheduled to be presented to the Board of Regents on September 9. She noted that if the Board approves the certificate, final approval will be needed by the Coordinating Commission for Post Secondary Education.

Shea asked what will be required to receive a certificate in civic engagement. Mitchell reported that students will be required to take four 3-credit hour courses selected from a list of civic engagement designated courses. She noted that successful completion of ACE 8 and ACE 9 outcome courses will automatically count toward two of the required civic engagement courses. She stated that students will also need to have a series of student-designed experiences on the campus, in the community, and beyond that support the civic engagement learning values. She pointed out that the institutional objective is to help students gain an understanding of their personal and social responsibility and the civic engagement certificate takes advantage of what student and faculty are already doing. She noted that the Civic Engagement Faculty Steering Committee is making sure there is a strong academic component.

Mitchell reported that she and Major spoke with all of the academic deans, the Athletics department, the Honors Program, and the Raikes School about the certificate. She noted that ASUN passed a resolution supporting it and she has been amazed to see the momentum that is occurring to create partnerships to enhance civic engagement. She pointed out that the certificate does not ask the faculty to do any additional work.

Mitchell reported that students will come in for an orientation session about the certificate and the orientation will touch on the subjects of leadership and communication. She noted that the certificate will not interfere with the length of time for a student to graduate and there are no additional costs for the student. She stated that many businesses want students to have civic engagement experience, and some student fellowships now require some level of civic engagement. She stated that if approved, the civic engagement certificate will appear on transcripts.

Major noted that when VC Franco came to UNL he had a vision for creating a service learning certificate. Over time the certificate was broadened to include civic engagement. She noted that as work began on creating the certificate it became apparent that students would benefit in having a location where they can meet with mentors who can guide them through the process of obtaining the certificate and engaging in activities that improve community quality of life. As a result, VC Franco met with Charlie Francis, Director of the Nebraska Union, to discuss the need and there is now an office on the second floor of the city campus union. She reported that we now have accrued 50 AmeriCorps spots which offer a tuition voucher and a housing stipend in return for 300 hours of service. Mitchell stated that a website is in the process of being developed and this will provide a list of activities that students can become involved in. She noted that as a result of the work done to create a civic engagement certificate UNL has been invited as one of 20 campuses across the country that has been asked to participate in a national project to host a distributive civic engagement seminar.

Mitchell reported that this spring students, community people, and campus leaders were invited to campus to discuss what civic engagement means to the institution and the community. She stated that one of the things that arose from the discussion was utilizing the extension model that already exists as a way to distribute information about civic engagement. Varner asked if Mitchell and Major have been in touch with the 4-H Program in Extension. He suggested that they contact Associate Dean Birnstihl. Mitchell reported that they have spoken with Associate Vice Chancellor Susan Fritz about this. She noted that there are some places where it's natural to do civic engagement. She pointed out that former Dean Oliva stated that people need to spread the arts to the community and the Raikes School saw a different way of using the certificate. She noted that the program is very flexible and can be applied to many different disciplines. She stated that she believes the certificate will give an edge to students when they graduate and will allow them to make some outside connections.

Shea noted that the university will be promoting civic engagement but asked how the university will deal with students who might be engaged in political activism. He pointed out that some activities could be questioned because we are a public institution that has to

adhere to certain regulations. Major noted that there will be a delicate balance sometimes that needs to be maintained. She reported that initially Dean Kostelnik expressed a similar concern. She stated students involved in political issues could be seen as developing skills to be able to practice in the democratic process rather than being aligned with specific political groups. Civic Engagement staff will investigate adding a disclaimer to the student action plans stating that the action views expressed in the plan do not necessarily represent the views of the institution.

Shea pointed out that some issues might be raised that were not expected. Wysocki pointed out that a component to the program should be that we teach that people have different views. Mitchell reported that some of the sessions for the students talk about culture and diversity and different points of views. She stated that students will be asked what kind of plans they want to work on and they will have to create their own action plan.

Shea asked who will oversee the program and decide when a certificate should be awarded. Mitchell reported that it will go through the General Education office. She noted that staff in the office for civic engagement will keep track of students who attend the sessions on civic engagement and in addition they will have to keep a reflection of what they are doing. She stated that her staff will get a list of the students in the classes and will verify that the work is being done both in and outside of the session. She noted that she has been asked who the advisors are going to be for the program. She pointed out that if there is something specific for a discipline a faculty member will be sought who has specialization in that area.

Lindquist noted that a total of four courses will be required in order to get the certificate, and two of those would be covered automatically by the ACE program. He asked if courses that would cover the additional two courses have been identified. Mitchell reported that about 100 courses have already been pre-identified in addition to the courses automatically included in ACE 8 and ACE 9 outcomes that will count toward the certificate requirements. She noted that they have no idea how many students will be interested in obtaining a civic engagement certificate. The idea is to do a pilot program with about 30 students. Major stated that the idea is to also accept courses by contract in a manner similar to the process used by the Honors program. She noted that the idea is to make the program flexible to the individual student's needs.

Mitchell pointed out that many colleges can be involved in the same civic activities. She noted that the on campus voluntary tax service is an example. She reported that Journalism students are involved in advertising this service, Business and Law students are involved in doing the taxes, the College of Education & Human Sciences provides day care services, and Modern Languages & Literatures provides translators. .

Nickerson asked if courses would be recorded as a CE course. He asked if any science courses are in the list of 100 pre-identified list of courses. Mitchell stated that she would need to verify if any science courses are listed. She pointed out that faculty can propose that a course be added to the list.

Varner noted that there might be a way to plant seeds ahead of time for the program. He suggested that Mitchell and Major work with high school counselors to make them aware of the program so they can talk to their students about it before they come here. He noted that Extension could also be helpful in getting the word out about the program through 4-H.

Mitchell welcomed faculty members to come to the Union to look at the new office space for the program (second floor, west side) and she stated that if faculty member have any other ideas they should contact either herself (nmitchell1@unl.edu) or Major at (lmajor1@unl.edu).

3.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

4.0 Approval of 8/24/11 Minutes

Schubert moved for approval of the minutes as revised. Anaya second the motion. The motion was approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Draft Suspension of Pay Policy

LaCost noted that the Chancellor is seeking some procedural restraints on a Chancellor when he or she has made the decision to suspend pay, similar to the existing procedures that deals with suspension of duties as found in the ARRC procedures. She pointed out that he is not seeking a policy of when pay can be suspended. She suggested putting the procedure under the duties of the Faculty Senate President or the duties of the Executive Committee found in the Bylaws. Nickerson suggested having parallel language to what already exists in the ARRC procedures.

LaCost stated that the Chancellor has said that he has the authority to suspend pay but Regents Bylaws section 4.14.2 states that pay cannot be suspended while termination procedures are under way. Schubert stated that he does not think the President's or Executive Committee's duties can include requiring the Chancellor to adhere to procedures. He pointed out that the reason the Executive Committee is having difficulty on deciding what should be done with a suspension of pay procedure is because it is not in our purview. He stated that if the administrators think there should be a policy or procedure about suspending a faculty member's pay, than the Chancellor should write a policy.

LaCost asked if the Executive Committee wants to have any say in creating the policy. Nickerson stated that he thinks the Chancellor should have to come to some kind of faculty body if there is a decision to suspend pay. Shea agreed and stated that the Chancellor should be required to consult with a faculty body. He pointed out that the Chancellor is giving the Executive Committee the opportunity to work with him on developing some restraints in matters of suspension of pay. Varner noted that requiring

the Chancellor to meet with a faculty group gives the faculty a chance to go on record regarding such cases.

Schubert stated that there needs to be a policy in the Bylaws about when suspension of pay can occur, otherwise decisions are going to be subjective. He noted that if there was a specific policy the Executive Committee could act on the Chancellor's request to create some procedural restraints.

Schubert asked, if the Chancellor suspends pay, isn't it de facto removal of tenure? He suggested concentrating on procedures to deal with tenured faculty members.

Anaya asked what an administrator would do if they needed to take disciplinary actions against a tenured faculty member. She noted that someone should not be able to hide behind their tenure if they are not performing their duties. She pointed out that suspending pay would only be used if the faculty member did something egregious.

LaCost noted that the Chancellor believes that technically he has the right to suspend someone's pay. Schubert stated that it is difficult to accuse a professor of not doing their work. He believes that the Executive Committee should ask the Chancellor for a change in the Bylaws to include language of when suspension of pay for a faculty member can be invoked.

Wysocki stated that another issue that needs to be carefully considered is the legal implications if faculty members are part of the process of suspending pay. He stated that the Executive Committee should ask the Chancellor to specify the rules for suspension of pay. He pointed out that there should be a long, thorough procedure before pay is suspended for a faculty member.

Lindquist pointed out that the Board of Regents gives authority to assess these situations to the faculty governing body (see BOR Bylaws 4.13, 4.14 and 4.15). He stated that the only logical place that any new policy would fit is in the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee procedures because this is the committee established by the Faculty Senate to receive and evaluate grievances, potential violations of academic freedom and tenure, and allegations of professional misconduct. Shea agreed and noted that if the ARRC needs to act on suspension of duties, it makes sense to also have them act on suspension of pay. Lindquist suggested that LaCost send a revised version of the original charge to the ARRC asking them to review the issue to see if a procedure can be put into place into the ARRC procedures.

Irmak asked if there is a suspension of pay case whether it will automatically go to the ARRC. Lindquist stated that there is nothing in the current ARRC procedures that states that the Chancellor must consult with a faculty group before he can suspend pay and this is what the Chancellor is asking the Executive Committee to do. He pointed out that if a tenured faculty member is going to be fired, the ARRC automatically forms a special committee to conduct hearings and evaluate the complaint. Schubert suggested that the Chancellor should call an immediate post tenure review if a suspension of pay is to occur.

Shea pointed out that not only tenured people, but other faculty as well can have their pay suspended.

Anaya stated that she likes Lindquist's idea of bringing the issue to the ARRC again in light of the clarification of what the Chancellor is seeking. Shea suggested that the Executive Committee members keep in mind that if they want to participate in faculty governance there will be some responsibility in sharing the burden of decisions. He stated that he does not see how we can have true faculty governance if we are unwilling to share or shoulder some of the responsibility of making decisions. Irmak pointed out that he needs to feel that he has some expertise in order to participate in some of these kinds of decisions. He noted that if the ARRC has the expertise to deal with issues of suspension of pay or duties, than it should go to them.

Schubert moved that the President send a request to the ARRC to review their procedures to see if a new procedure can be formulated as requested by the Chancellor in his email message to President LaCost. Wsocki second the motion. The motion was approved.

LaCost stated that she will draft a message to the chair of the ARRC asking them if they can formulate a procedure.

5.2 Senate Goals

The Executive Committee reviewed the goals for the 2011-2012 Faculty Senate. Schubert noted that the goals show a more active participation in the replacement of faculty who retired via VSIP than was discussed with the Chancellor and SVCAA during the August 24 Executive Committee meeting. He pointed out that calling for more active participation in this process will change the conversation with the administration. He stated that the faculty should be able to take part in the plans to replace the retired faculty members.

Anaya moved to accept the Senate goals. Nickerson second the motion. The motion was approved.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Replacing Executive Committee Member

LaCost reported that Anderson had to resign from the Executive Committee due to conflicts with his teaching schedule and heavy workload. Griffin noted that colleges with no representation on the Executive Committee are: Fine Arts, Law, Business, Architecture. She stated that a call for nominations to serve on the Executive Committee needs to be sent to the Senate. The Executive Committee stated that the colleges with no representation should be specifically asked to have someone nominated for the election. Lindquist moved that an email message be sent to the Senate calling for nominations to the Executive Committee. Nickerson second the motion. The Motion was approved.

6.2 Senate Agenda

The Executive Committee reviewed the agenda for the September 13 Faculty Senate meeting. Varner suggested that LaCost do an introduction for the new senators

explaining what the roll of the senator is, what the Executive Committee does, and how it fits with faculty governance. Nickerson suggested emphasizing how often the Executive Committee meets with administrators. Shea suggested explaining the importance of the senators getting the minutes out to their colleagues. Varner stated that it is particularly helpful if senators indicate specific areas of interest in the minutes. Shea stated that senators should also be encouraged to share their thoughts and views on issues being discussed and to let their colleagues know to make sure they have good representation.

6.3 Summer Executive Committee Report

The Executive Committee reviewed and revised the draft Summer Executive Committee report. Griffin noted that the report will be sent to the Senate.

6.4 Streaming Senate Meetings

Griffin reported that she met with John Gillam and Donald Robertson from the Collaborate office of Information Services to discuss streaming the Faculty Senate meetings. She stated that a dry run for conducting the streaming will occur during the September 13 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, September 7, 2011 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.