

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Anaya, Fech, Franti, Konecky, LaCost, Lindquist, Nickerson, Shea, Stock

Absent: Berg, Flowers, McCollough, Schubert

Date: Wednesday, January 5, 2010

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 3:01 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Update on Efforts for Campus-wide Discussions on a Faculty Driven Future for the University

Franti reported that the group has met twice and intends to meet again soon to identify what steps can be done to have the campus-wide discussions. He noted that the group has discussed how to get the faculty involved and the intent is to get something done this semester because these discussions need to be held.

3.0 Approval of 12/8/10 Minutes

The minutes of 12/8/10 were approved with revisions.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 COIA Conference Update

Lindquist reported that he contacted Professor Potuto, UNL's Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA, to obtain her opinion about sending someone to the COIA conference. He stated that Professor Potuto responded with a voice message but did not express an opinion about whether or not it was necessary to have a faculty member from UNL attend the conference. Lindquist indicated that since he was the only one who seemed to be pursuing this, he opted to let it be. Shea pointed out that anyone attending from UNL would just be an observer since UNL is no longer a member of COIA.

4.2 Update on APC's Revision to the Procedures to Be Invoked for Significant Budget Reductions and Reallocations

Shea noted that Professor Brand, chair of the APC, stated at the December Senate meeting that the APC would be approving its revisions to the budget cutting procedures. He asked if the APC has approved the revised document. Lindquist reported that he has not heard anything yet from Professor Brand.

Shea stated that he is concerned that the likelihood of these revised procedures being in place for the upcoming budget cuts is rapidly decreasing. He stated that he is

disappointed in how the APC has handled this matter. He pointed out that the Senate and ASUN both approved revisions to the procedures last April.

Lindquist stated that he will contact Professor Brand to see what the status is of the document. He suggested that the Executive Committee discuss next week what action to take if the APC still hasn't acted on the procedures. He stated that the Executive Committee might need to forward the document that was revised and approved last April to the Chancellor for consideration.

Shea stated that the APC needs to act on the newly revised document since it will need to go back to the Senate and ASUN for a vote. Fech stated that the appearance being given by the APC is that they are not in support of the earlier revisions to the document.

5.0 New Business

5.1 APC Appointments

Lindquist noted that the Chancellor stated at the Senate meeting that he would support adding two additional faculty members to the Academic Planning Committee. The Committee discussed possible faculty members to appoint to the APC. Griffin suggested that Lindquist make an announcement at next week's Senate meeting stating that the Executive Committee is seeking faculty members to serve on the APC.

5.2 Executive Committee Elections

Griffin reported that there will be eight openings that will need to be filled on the Executive Committee this year: the President-Elect, Secretary, and six members. She noted that six faculty member's terms are ending and two faculty members are taking advantage of the VSIP. Lindquist stated that he will make an announcement at the Senate meeting about these openings and will ask Senators to consider nominees.

5.3 Requested Changes to the Computational Services and Facilities Committee

Lindquist reported that he received an email message from Professor Brooks, chair of the Computational Services and Facilities Committee, requesting that the CSFC name be changed as well as the responsibilities. He noted that Professor Brooks also requested that two additional faculty members be added to the Committee. He asked if the Executive Committee wanted to accept the recommended changes and bring them to the Senate. Shea stated that the request seems reasonable and does not see any problems with it.

Konecky asked what the justification is for expanding the size of the committee.

Lindquist stated that the new charges and name of the committee would expand the focus of the committee to include different kinds of technologies, not just computers.

Griffin pointed out that the Executive Committee will be meeting with CIO Askren next week. Konecky stated that she would like to hear CIO Askren's view of these changes before taking it to the Senate.

Griffin asked if the committee should include a representative from UAAD or UNOPA since these groups also heavily use computers and other technologies. Anaya pointed out that if there are student representatives on the committee there should be staff representation. Lindquist stated that the Executive Committee will discuss this with CIO Askren next week and he will ask Professor Brooks about this as well.

Fech noted that he received an email message from Professor Randall who pointed out that the EdMedia department can assist faculty members with developing on line courses. He stated that the email should be passed on to the Computational Services & Facilities Committee so they can be aware of EdMedia's service.

5.4 Sabbaticals

Nickerson stated that he is concerned about other states pressing universities to eliminate sabbaticals. He stated that he would like to get some reassurance from the administration that they understand the value of sabbaticals. Stock pointed out that sabbaticals are now called faculty development leaves and faculty members can apply for them every seven years.

Lindquist asked where the resources are for these leaves. LaCost stated that faculty members receive half a year's salary for a leave, but the leave must be approved at the department and college level.

Lindquist stated that he understands that UNO has a pool for dealing with development leaves that has been reduced in recent years to cover part of the UNO budget reductions. He asked if there is such a pool at UNL. Stock stated that he believes funding for leaves are unit based. He noted that his department has resources to provide funding for development leaves but does not know if other departments have the same thing.

Nickerson stated that he does not believe anyone in Biological Sciences has taken a leave in over ten years and that junior faculty members aren't even aware of developmental leaves. Konecky pointed out that allowing development leaves appears to be a cultural issue in that some departments actively use leaves while others do not. She noted that the length of the leave can vary from department to department.

Nickerson stated that he wants to discuss the issue with the administrators. He noted that some people perceive sabbaticals as paid vacation time. He noted that Notre Dame offers pre-tenure sabbaticals. Konecky pointed out that Notre Dame may have more resources that would enable them to offer these sabbaticals.

5.5 Upcoming Meeting with VC Jackson

Anaya noted that the Executive Committee will be meeting with VC Jackson at the end of the month and an additional item to discuss with the VC is a recent notice stating that UNL faculty members cannot carpool with someone from a different university if a UNL rental vehicle is being used. Fech pointed out that there are also some restrictions with taking students on trips. Lindquist pointed out that we will need to address the concerns on our list sent over to the VC first but could add this concern if there is time.

5.6 Professors of Practice and Voting Rights

Shea reported that he received a call from a professor expressing concerns with professors of practice and voting rights within colleges. He stated that apparently the Board of Regents Bylaw does not explicitly state that professors of practice have voting rights. Nickerson noted that in his department they have voting rights.

Shea pointed out that this is a policy issue and wondered whether there needs to be a policy to clarify the voting issue. He reported that he was on the committee that worked on creating the professor of practice positions and he believes that the intent was that people in these positions have voting rights.

Griffin stated that she was recently asked by a department chair about this issue and she had a copy of a memo in the files that was sent out by the Chancellor encouraging departments to give professors of practice voting rights on all issues except those regarding tenure and evaluation of tenured professors.

Fech noted that the issue also impacts other professors who are not tenured. Lindquist suggested that this issue be followed up with the professor that initially expressed concern.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:24 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, January 12, 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.