

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

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

**Absent:** Anaya, Berg, Fech, Franti, Stock

**Date:** Wednesday, March 9, 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 3:01 p.m.

### 2.0 Announcements

#### 2.1 Luncheon with President Milliken

Lindquist reported that President Milliken is inviting the Presidents of the Faculty Senates to another luncheon this semester. He noted that the luncheon will be held at the end of March.

#### 2.2 April 6 Deans and Directors Meeting

Lindquist reported that the Chancellor will be discussing the budget framework at the April 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. He stated that the members of the Executive Committee are invited to this meeting.

#### 2.3 Faculty Forum

Nickerson reported that everything is set up for streaming the March 17<sup>th</sup> faculty forum. He noted that people can go to [http://real.unl.edu/live\\_2](http://real.unl.edu/live_2) on March 17<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 to view the forum. During the forum, you can comment or ask questions by emailing them to [facultyforum@unl.edu](mailto:facultyforum@unl.edu).

### 3.0 Approval of 3/2/11Minutes

The revised minutes were approved.

### 4.0 Unfinished Business

#### 4.1 Faculty Evaluations and Ranking Journals

Shea stated that he still has concerns with how journals are being ranked and used in faculty evaluations. He pointed out that this is an issue that should be discussed with the administration. He reported that he has been informed that this is the way evaluations will be conducted when we move to the Big Ten.

Lindquist stated that impact factors have little to do with the quality of an article. A better indicator of quality is the number of times each article is cited. Shea noted that

journals use impact factors. Schubert pointed out that citations can be bothersome but he prefers this system. He stated that an article might be cited often but this does not mean that the article has quality, but if you go to any granting agency, the number of citations and citation impacts will be counted. He pointed out that he is aware that there are some articles that are very important, but they do not get cited as often.

Shea stated that he is looking for some evaluation guidelines that can be used across the campus. He pointed out that the starting point for creating these guidelines is to identify what standards and objectives departments have in common in the evaluation process.

McCollough pointed out that some audiences are smaller and they might not have as many citations as other disciplines, but this does not mean the articles are not relevant to a specific discipline. Schubert noted that different criteria are used by the departments.

Shea said he was told that department heads are being pressured to use journal rankings to determine how much credit faculty should receive for refereed publications. Schubert stated that research administrators evaluate faculty for their research by the number of their publications.

The Executive Committee agreed to discuss this issue with Chancellor Perlman and SVCAA Weissinger next week.

#### **4.2 Update on Faculty Forum Preparations**

The Executive Committee discussed final preparations for the March 17<sup>th</sup> Faculty Forum.

#### **4.3 Reception for Pound Howard Award Winner**

The Executive Committee decided to hold a reception for the recipient of the Pound Howard Award and the winner of the James A. Lake Academic Freedom Award at the April 26<sup>th</sup> Faculty Senate meeting.

#### **4.4 Additional Faculty Members for the APC**

Lindquist reported that the Chancellor has sent a letter to Corporation Secretary Donal Burns asking him to place the changes to the APC operating procedures on the Board of Regents agenda. He noted that these changes include increasing the number of faculty members on the APC from six to eight. He reminded the Executive Committee that it is to appoint the two new faculty members. The Executive Committee moved to select Professor Harbison, Chemistry, to serve a two-year term as a physical science representative and Professor McCollough, Anthropology, to a one-year term as a social sciences representative. Motion approved.

#### **4.5 Professor of Practice and Voting Rights**

Griffin reported that the Faculty Senate did not vote on the Professor of Practice positions but former VC Jacobson did make a presentation to the Senate at the March 7, 2006 meeting.

Flowers stated that the Psychology department bylaws and procedures specifically states that professors of practice have voting rights in the department except on personnel matters involving tenure. He believed that most departments in the College of Arts & Sciences have similar bylaws. He noted that hiring decisions in his department requires two-thirds vote of approval to move names forward.

Shea noted that it is interesting to hear that Psychology search committees vote on candidates. He pointed out that his unit has been told not to rank candidates for positions within the unit. Konecky stated that she recalls when the change occurred that departmental search advisory committees were only providing input on the candidates rather than making hiring recommendations. She noted that this change came down from upper administration and was campus-wide.

McCullough asked if professors of practice have access to research money. Schubert stated that it depends on the funding. Lindquist pointed out that most professors of practice are for teaching positions, not research. Shea reported that the ad hoc committee that worked on creating the professors of practice positions did not create a similar position for non-tenure track research faculty, but it did make a recommendation to the Office of Research that it create these similar positions. Schubert stated that he recalls seeing a document that declared the responsibilities and expectations and voting rights for research personnel. He noted that the document implies that people in these positions are paid with soft money.

Lindquist stated that professors of practice are on a specific term appointment. All research and courtesy appointments are considered special appointments. He reported that he looked at the bylaws of some colleges and they all include a definition of who is considered faculty, although the requirement for faculty membership varies among colleges. He stated that in most cases the professors of practice are included in the faculty membership. He reported that he was unable to obtain the bylaws for several colleges: Architecture, Engineering, and Business, but in the rest of the bylaws the professors of practice are considered faculty members.

Shea noted that the important part of this is that the decision on voting rights is being left up to the colleges or departments. He said he did not believe this was the intent of the ad hoc committee that created the positions. He stated that the ad hoc committee recommended that all professors of practice be treated equally.

Lindquist stated that the Executive Committee needs to discuss this with SVCAA Weissinger.

LaCost asked if professors of practice can negotiate higher salaries once their contract comes up for renewal. Lindquist stated that they go through an annual evaluation process and receive increases the same way tenure track faculty members do.

Schubert noted that the Senior Vice Chancellor's guidelines for research professors do not lay out voting rights. It just discusses the length of term for the appointment.

Shea he doesn't think all departments have bylaws. McCollough stated that she believes that all departments are required to have bylaws.

Schubert stated that he does not believe that all faculty members have voting rights. Lindquist pointed out that voting rights are not uniform across the campus and this is something that needs to be discussed with SVCAA Weissinger.

McCollough wondered how standardized voting rights are handled by the Big Ten universities. Shea stated that this is something that the Executive Committee should investigate. Schubert suggested that the faculty members of the Executive Committee should contact their peers at the other Big Ten schools to get an idea of what the CIC looks like. He suggested communicating with the Faculty Senates at the Big Ten schools.

LaCost stated that one of the team members from the CIC who came to campus stated that a meeting space can be used at the CIC headquarters to bring groups in from the various Big Ten universities. Schubert suggested that the Executive Committee could video stream conversations with Faculty Senates from the other Big Ten schools. Lindquist stated that the CIC team member he spoke with reported that a small group of Faculty Senate members from each CIC institution get together each year to discuss common faculty issues. He reported that the group hosting the meeting puts the agenda together and the CIC facilitates the meeting. He reported that the next meeting of the Big Ten Faculty Senates is in October.

## **5.0 New Business**

### **5.1 Agenda Items for Meeting with Chancellor Perlman and SVCAA Weissinger**

The Executive Committee discussed agenda items for the Chancellor and SVCAA.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:36 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, March 16, 2011 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.