

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

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

**Absent:** Anaya, Berg, Franti

**Date:** Wednesday, March 30, 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 3:00 p.m.

### 2.0 Announcements

#### 2.1 Meeting with President Milliken

Lindquist reported that he and the other Faculty Senate Presidents met with President Milliken and discussed a number of issues including LB 397 which seeks to redefine a term in the Industrial Relations Act, and how the change might impact the university. He pointed out that this issue pertains to collective bargaining with state employees and impacts UNO and UNK. He stated that this is the first comprehensive overhaul of the Industrial Relations Act since 1969. He stated that one of the proposed changes in LB 397 is to limit the Special Master's role in bargaining discussions.

Lindquist stated that the President briefly discussed the Employee Plus One Benefits and stated that there were no real changes at this time. He stated that the President urged the faculty to be patient and to see what might happen when we step into the Big Ten.

### 3.0 Minutes of 3/16/11

The minutes were approved upon revisions.

### 4.0 Unfinished Business

#### 4.1 Executive Committee Elections Update

Griffin reported that there is a candidate for President Elect and six candidates for Executive Committee members. She stated that we still need a candidate for Secretary.

Lindquist reported that Berg has not attended an Executive Committee meeting since December 1 and has not attended a Senate meeting this academic year. He noted that Griffin sent an email message to Berg inquiring whether there have been specific issues keeping him from performing his responsibilities to the Senate, but she has not received a response. Griffin stated that she checked with the History department to see if Berg was still employed and was informed that he is still with the department. Lindquist noted that the Senate Rules allows for dismissal of a Senator if they miss three or more meetings.

Shea moved to replace Berg on the Faculty Senate. Motion seconded by Flowers. Lindquist stated that the motion would also remove Berg from the Executive Committee. He noted that Berg would need to be replaced on the Executive Committee for the remainder of the term, a period of two years.

Shea stated that there should be a rule for the number of absences allowed for an Executive Committee member. He pointed out that Executive Committee members can attend a meeting via a conference call. Griffin noted that in the past an Executive Committee member was asked to step down because of too many absences and the member willingly agreed. LaCost asked if Senators are notified if they have missed three or more meetings. Griffin reported that a letter is sent to Senators informing them of the absences and that they can be removed from the Senate according to Senate policy. She stated that usually Senators respond to the letter and then attend the meetings.

Lindquist stated that the Executive Committee appears to be in agreement that there should be a policy or general rule to address attendance at Executive Committee meetings. Konecky suggested that the rule follow the Senate's existing policy, up to a third of the meetings can be missed but a member can be removed if greater than a third of the meetings are missed. Shea asked if this would allow for too many absences. Lindquist asked if there is a point when a formal inquiry to the member should be made asking for the reasons for the absence. Shea suggested that there could be a threshold number of absences and then a member is contacted and another threshold for when the member should be dismissed. He stated that it is gravely disappointing when faculty members agree to serve on committees but then don't go to the meetings. He pointed out that this puts a burden on the other committee members to do the work while the absent member receives credit for the membership. LaCost noted that we need to honor people's other commitments and realize that there are times when they cannot attend a meeting because of more pressing responsibilities.

Schubert asked for a brief review of the facts for dismissing Berg. Griffin reported that he has not attended an Executive Committee meeting since December 1 and he has missed more than three Senate meetings. Schubert pointed out that the Executive Committee can only act on him being removed from the Senate since a policy does not exist for removal from the Executive Committee. Griffin noted that removing Berg from the Senate automatically removes him from the Executive Committee because only Senators can serve on the Executive Committee. Konecky stated that in a way Berg has already self-selected to be off the Senate because he has opted not to attend any meetings.

The motion to remove Berg from the Senate was approved.

Shea moved that we adhere to the three missed meetings policy and that all Senators who miss three or more meetings should be dismissed. The motion was seconded by Stock. Lindquist suggested that any Senator who does not respond to the Coordinator once they have been notified of the absences should be dismissed. Schubert pointed out that Senators should be allowed absences if they are missing the meetings for UNL purposes. He noted that he cannot be as committed as he wants to be sometimes because he has to

go to conferences or do work that is requested by the chair or the dean. He pointed out that we need a mechanism for dismissal from the Senate, but there also needs to be protection for faculty members.

Konecky pointed out that there is already a policy in place and that we need to acknowledge that the policy exists and recommit ourselves to it. LaCost stated that we can offer people the opportunity to step down from the Senate or Executive Committee if the work becomes too burdensome.

Fech pointed out that people may have to miss meetings due to extenuating circumstances. He noted, however, that the intent of the Senators in regards to serving on the Senate is important.

Shea withdrew his motion. Stock withdrew his second of the motion.

#### **4.2 Pound Howard Award Reception**

Griffin noted that Professor DiBernard will be able to attend the April 26 meeting to accept the award from the Senate. She provided an update on the plans for the reception following the meeting.

#### **4.3 April 18 Faculty Forum**

Lindquist asked if the Executive Committee agrees that Professor Borstelmann should be asked to moderate the forum again. Lindquist asked how the forum should be advertised. The Executive Committee stated that email messages should be sent to the faculty. Flowers stated that he hopes that more people will be in attendance for this forum. He suggested that the forum might be more attractive because Penn State President Spanier will be speaking.

McCollough suggested highlighting a few of the key issues that President Spanier will be talking about at the forum. Lindquist noted that President Spanier will be talking about the impacts of moving into the Big Ten since Penn State was the last university to join the conference.

Nickerson stated that he would be happy to put up posters of the event at the Beadle Center and possible other locations. LaCost stated that she will have more posters printed.

### **5.0 New Business**

#### **5.1 Upcoming April 5 Senate Meeting**

Lindquist reported that VP Lechner has a conflict with the April 5 meeting because he will be attending the President's Council. He stated that Greg Clayton, Director of Benefits, will be speaking to the Senate to address concerns about the health care audit. Griffin stated that she suggested that VP Lechner come to the April 26 Faculty Senate meeting with President Milliken if he speaks to the Senate. That way VP Lechner can address any conditional concerns that Senators may have about the audit. The

Committee agreed to see how the April 5 meeting with Director Greg Clayton goes before inviting VP Lechner to the April 26 meeting.

## **5.2 Executive Committee Report**

The Executive Committee reviewed the draft report to the Senate on its activities and made some minor revisions. Griffin stated that the report will be sent to the Senate for the April 5 meeting.

## **5.3 April 26 Senate Meeting**

Lindquist pointed out that the April 26 meeting will be busy: the Executive Committee elections will be held, President Milliken may be speaking, the Pound Howard Award will be presented, and it is highly possible that the Academic Freedom Award will be presented, followed by a reception for the award winners.

## **5.4 Agenda Items for Chancellor Perlman, SVCAA Weissinger, and VC Green**

The Executive Committee discussed agenda items for the meeting next week with the administrators.

## **5.5 Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee (ARRC) Matters**

Lindquist reported that Professor Peterson, Chair of the ARRC, sent an email reporting on the ARRC's work of revising the ARRC Procedures to reflect the elimination of the Professional Conduct-B Procedures, inclusion of language in the Procedures to address cancellation of a guest speaker's event, and a draft of the suspension in pay policy.

Shea stated that he has some questions about the ARRC's suggested wording of the section of the Procedures relating to the cancellation of a guest speaker's visit. The Executive Committee agreed to review the changes at a future meeting.

Lindquist noted that the ARRC does not feel that a suspension of pay policy is needed because the Board of Regents Bylaws is written to deal with employees who do not do their work. He stated that the ARRC thinks the creation of a suspension of pay policy could be used to circumvent the Regents Bylaws.

Shea stated that he can understand some of the ARRC's concerns but he does not agree that a policy is not needed. He pointed out that the Chancellor specifically asked the help of the faculty in creating the document. He stated that he would rather be involved in the creation of a policy concerning this matter rather than not be involved in this and instead having to rely on a generic policy that supposedly protects the rights of the faculty. He stated that he thinks we should develop a fair and reasonable policy. McCollough agreed. The Executive Committee agreed to further review the information sent by Professor Peterson and discuss working on a suspension of pay policy at next week's meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, April 6, 2011 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.