

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** Fech, Flowers, Franti, Konecky, LaCost, Lindquist, McCollough, Nickerson, Stock

**Absent:** Anaya, Berg, Schubert, Shea

**Date:** Wednesday, January 19, 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

Lindquist called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

### 2.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

### 3.0 Approval of 1/12/11 Minutes

The revised minutes were approved.

### 4.0 Unfinished Business

#### 4.1 Process to Deal with APC Changes to the BRRRC Procedures

Lindquist noted that if the APC approves its revisions to the BRRRC Procedures at its January 26 meeting, Griffin will obtain the revised document the next morning and send it to the Executive Committee. He stated that if there are no strong oppositions to the changes, the document will be sent to the Senate and introduced at the February 1 Senate meeting. The Executive Committee agreed.

Fech asked what will happen if the APC does not approve the changes. Lindquist stated that the Executive Committee will discuss at its next meeting whether to move forward with the revised document approved by the Senate last April.

#### 4.2 Recommended Changes to the Computational Services and Facilities Committee

Lindquist asked if there were any objections to the recommended changes suggested by the Computational Services and Facilities Committee. No objections were made. Lindquist stated that the motion to revise the Computational Services and Facilities Committee will be presented to the Senate. He noted that the motion will not need a second since it is being made by a Senate Committee.

Nickerson stated that he was surprised that CIO Askren did not know the exact number of IT technicians on campus. Flowers pointed out that this is not surprising since there was little campus-wide coordination of IT in the past. Konecky noted that CIO Askren more

than likely knows how many technicians work for him directly, but he probably does not know everyone at the department or college level.

### **4.3 APC Appointments**

The Executive Committee discussed possible appointments to the APC.

## **5.0 New Business**

### **5.1 Developing a Policy for Cancelling Senate Meetings**

Lindquist reported that the Senate Rules and Bylaws do not have any reference to cancelling a meeting. Fech noted that the December 2009 meeting was cancelled due to inclement weather. Griffin pointed out that the few times a Senate meeting has been cancelled is because of inclement weather.

Franti noted that all classes and non-athletic events were cancelled. He stated that he thinks if classes are cancelled, the Senate meeting should be cancelled. Konecky pointed out that the Lincoln Public Schools were closed and many faculty members were at home with their children.

Franti pointed out that cancelling the Senate meeting on days when classes have been cancelled would tie into the electronic notification system. He stated this way people would know if they receive a notification of classes being cancelled, that the Senate meeting would automatically be cancelled. LaCost stated that she believes this would be a good way to go because classes are tied directly to the faculty.

Lindquist noted that the Senate rules state that a quarter of the members must be in attendance to even be able to conduct a meeting and nothing can be voted on unless there is a quorum.

Fech stated that if a policy is adopted, the Senate could be reminded of it during each fall semester when the chances of inclement weather increase. Franti suggested that all Senators should sign up to be on the notification system so they would be alerted that the campus and/or classes are closed.

Lindquist stated that he will draft the wording of the language and Executive Committee can review it at next week's meeting.

### **5.2 Modest Proposal on Voting at the Senate Meeting**

Lindquist reported that the Senate Office received an email message from a faculty member in response to the recent message sent out calling for faculty members to serve on committees. The email suggested that the Senate change its representative structure so there would only be one representative from each department. Those departments that currently have more than one senator would have a weighted vote. The idea behind this suggestion was to free up some of the work load for some faculty members.

Flowers stated that he doubted that very many people would be freed up since not that many departments have more than one senator. Griffin reported that 21

departments/colleges have more than one senator and only 24 faculty members would be impacted by this change.

Lindquist stated that with the proposed system it would be difficult to count the votes.

Fech pointed out that the real issue is that department chairs and deans need to place more emphasis and reward faculty members for serving on committees.

Franti stated that the quorum would have to be counted on by a weighted attendance. He questioned what would happen if people were absent and voting was to take place on closely contested issues.

Konecky pointed out that having less senators could result in having less discussion at the senate meetings and this would result in the senate receiving less input from the campus on important issues.

Flowers stated that a weighted voting system would give one person control over issues that might be controversial even within departments. Stock noted that English department can have three senators and in the past when there were three senators, they did not always agree on how to vote on issues.

LaCost pointed out that having more members on the Senate raises the awareness of Senate business and raises the willingness of people to participate in shared governance.

Fech noted that the suggestion is well intended but he does not think it would work well and that it could create more problems than resolve. Nickerson stated that he would feel uncomfortable being the only person representing Biological Sciences as a unit when it has two senators.

Franti pointed out that voting on motions could be carried easily by senators with a particular viewpoint if they had weighted votes. Fech noted that absences would magnify or enhance the influence of senators' weighting on a vote.

The Executive Committee agreed that they did not think a weighted voting system would work well for the senate. Lindquist stated that he will contact the faculty member and explain the Committee's concerns.

## **5.2 Budget**

Lindquist noted that the Governor's recommendation to hold the university's budget flat will still result in some cuts because costs for the university are going up, but the cuts will not be as bad as feared. He pointed out the Executive Committee needs to talk to the Chancellor so faculty have some idea what cuts departments and units are going to have to deal with.

### **5.3 James A. Lake Academic Freedom Award and Martin Luther King Day**

McCollough reported that a faculty member suggested having the James A. Lake Academic Freedom Award tied in to Martin Luther King Day. She stated that the faculty member thought that the Lake Academic Freedom Award would get more recognition this way and maybe more people would be nominated for it. Griffin reminded the Executive Committee that the Lake Academic Freedom Award is an award from the Faculty Senate. The Senate has to vote on the nominee and the presentation of the award is presented at the last Senate meeting of the year. The Executive Committee felt that the award should be kept as a separate event.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:59 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, January 26, 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.