

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: **Guevara, LaCost, Purdum, Reisbig, Rinkevich, Schubert, Woodman, Wysocki, Zoubek**

Absent: **Anaya, Bender, Ruchala, Wysocki**

Date: **Wednesday, June 27, 2012**

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

Schubert called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

3.0 Approval of 6/13/12 Minutes

Rinkevich moved for approval of the revised minutes. The motion was seconded by Zoubek. The revised minutes were approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Changes to University Curriculum Committee Procedures

Schubert noted that Professor Moore, outgoing chair of the UCC, sent a formal request to the Executive Committee to suspend the UCC's procedures for a year in order for the Committee to test new procedures that would eliminate the need for the Committee to review and approve curricular requests that are editorial and/or administrative. Guevara asked if the reason for this request is because the majority of the work they do is editorial. Reisbig stated that changes to courses will still need to go through the college curriculum procedures. Woodman pointed out that Keith Dawson, Assistant Director of Registration and Records would enter all of the changes he receives from the colleges into the undergraduate bulletin. He stated that the ACE subcommittee of the UCC will still meet to handle the work associated with the ACE courses. Guevara stated that he can understand not wanting to do unnecessary work but if the UCC is required to do the work than it needs to be done.

Reisbig pointed out that Professor Moore never explained what happens with the final approval or course changes, additions, or deletions. Woodman stated that the CREQ software is supposed to detect if a course being changed or deleted is needed for other courses or programs. He noted that having the UCC members review these changes provides a level of supervision for each of the colleges as the college representative could detect if a course deletion could impact other courses or programs within his/her college.

He stated that his concern is that there is the inability to prevent courses from accidentally being deleted that might pertain to another discipline in the proposed system.

Schubert stated that after the discussion with the UCC members he spoke with Past President LaCost about whether this is a matter that should go to the full Senate because it affects every department curriculum committee on campus. He stated that the suggestions being made by the UCC might be good or bad, but he feels it is out of his judgment to decide this and thinks the Executive Committee should not have to make the decision. He suggested that the request to suspend the UCC's responsibilities for a year be presented to the full Senate at the September meeting so this can be brought to the attention of every department and unit chair on campus.

Woodman stated that there are certain aspects of the process that needs to be tweaked. He suggested that a compilation of the editorial and administrative course changes (like title and description) could be given to the UCC for a mass review, but adding or deleting courses should be reviewed by the UCC in greater detail with an all-university perspective. Reisbig pointed out that the additional features to the CREQ system will not be up and running until fall. She stated that she agrees with bringing this matter to the Senate and pointed out that most likely no course changes are going to be made during the summer.

Guevara sated that he is getting the feeling that the reason the UCC is trying to change its work is because the Committee is being overwhelmed with ACE courses. Reisbig stated that the information provided showed that the UCC had to approve 206 course requests last year, most of which required just rubber stamping approval from the UCC.

Schubert stated that the proposed changes have morphed considerably since the initial request was sent to the Executive Committee and noted that there could be further changes to what is being proposed. He suggested that Professors DeFusco, Moore, and Mitchell from the UCC be invited to speak at the September Senate meeting about the proposed changes.

Guevara moved to present the request for suspension of the UCC's responsibilities to the Senate at the September meeting. Schubert noted that the direct request to the Senate and accompanying material should be sent to the Senators for the September meeting. Reisbig pointed out that the motion to the Senate should state that it is a request to suspend the UCC's operation procedures for handling editorial and administrative changes for a year. She noted that the motion should be specific so that it does not provide the UCC with permission to suspend other duties of the committee. Rinkevich seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

4.2 Updating on Memo to SVCAA Weissinger about the Survey

Schubert reported that he is finishing work on the memo and will be sending it to SVCAA Weissinger soon.

4.3 Update on Memo to ASUN about the Student Bereavement Policy

Schubert reported that the memo is being worked on and noted that ASUN will not be working on the proposed policy until the fall semester begins.

4.4 Update on Protocol Changes to IRB

Reisbig asked if the protocol changes on the survey of non-tenure track faculty members have been approved. LaCost reported that she has not received written notice of the approval yet, but was informed by IRB that the changes have been approved.

Griffin reported that she did some preliminary checking on college and department bylaws and found that an initial search showed that only four colleges have their bylaws on the web and only three department bylaws are on the web. She stated that the four college bylaws provide voting privileges to non-tenure track faculty members provided that they meet criteria established by the college. She reported that two of the three department bylaws she found provide voting rights to non-tenure track faculty members, but the other department did not. She noted that the Regents Bylaws supercede campus bylaws, and assumed that campus bylaws supercede college bylaws, but asked if college bylaws supercede department bylaws. Guevara stated that college bylaws require departments to establish their own operating procedures and the department bylaws are how the department operates. Reisbig pointed out that a department's bylaws can provide more specifics, but they cannot contradict college bylaws. Guevara stated that there is a gray area between department and college bylaws. He noted that if you talk to the dean's office about the bylaws they refer you back to department bylaws. He pointed out that appointments vary widely which is the reason why universal procedures often do not work. Woodman stated that if a college grants voting rights, than departments within the college should also grant voting rights. Guevara stated that even small issues, such as who is supposed to put the bylaws on the web and how the bylaws should appear can arise in some departments and that is why some departments have them nicely done while others none at all.

Purdum stated that the deans sent out notices to the departments after the professor of practice positions were established asking them to delineate voting rights of non-tenure track faculty members. She pointed out that some departments did this, but she suspects that there are departments that did not. She stated that the departments were to decide what the criteria is for promotion within the professors or practice positions. Schubert noted that the Chancellor sent out an email message to the deans and departments stating that they should do this and the email suggested that these faculty members be given privileges similar to tenure track faculty members. He pointed out that this was a suggestion, but not a requirement.

Guevara stated that there are other things, beyond the department's control that can impact promotions or salary increases. Available funding and the need for temporary teaching are two factors that have an impact on non-tenure track faculty members, most of who are on a temporary contract.

Schubert stated that the Executive Committee needs to determine if it wants to do something that would improve the status of the non-tenure track faculty members. He noted that the overall impression from the results of the survey is that these faculty members do not feel valued and are not as involved as they should or could be. He suggested the Executive Committee develop a set of recommendations that would be sent to the units that would seek to improve the value of the non-tenure track faculty members and promote their involvement within the university. He noted that the Executive Committee could make a request to the administrators that the recommendations be incorporated into department operations.

Reisbig suggested that the Executive Committee could come up with major themes identified by the survey. Schubert agreed and stated that LaCost could still provide a quantitative summary of the report. He stated that the Executive Committee needs to start compiling a list of recommendations.

Purdum pointed out that departments could adhere to the recommendations, but the Executive Committee needs to determine how we can achieve a more positive attitude towards all faculty members. She noted that the Senate needs to have some follow up and conclusions to the survey.

Guevara stated that the recommendations will not cost the departments anything, but could create a lot of good will. He pointed out that the department chairs work on the will of the dean and administration, not the faculty and their take on this matter will be slightly different. He noted that the chairs are required to follow procedures. Purdum pointed out that if the procedures are not published there will be someone who thinks they know the procedures and will try telling the chair what the procedures are when in fact they are not correct. Guevara stated that while you want your colleagues to feel they are part of the team, there are other factors that need to be considered.

Woodman suggested that statistical data from the survey be used in any reports of the survey. He noted that once you get into the responses there are all kinds of ambiguity and it is difficult to interpret and score each of the responses. He pointed out that SVCAA Weissinger and VC Green have more power to do something to address the major issues raised by the survey. Purdum stated that this could be a two-prong approach: from the top down and from within. She noted that collegiality comes from within the departments.

Woodman recalled once hearing a former faculty member saying that having non-tenured faculty members was the worst thing that could happen to the university, but he believes there has been an evolution in thinking towards non-tenure track faculty members. He pointed out that as tenure track faculty members are required to be more research oriented, having non-tenured faculty members to teach courses frees up time for the tenure track faculty members to do research instead of having to teach courses.

Reisbig noted that there was recently a university-wide survey that she believes was conducted by Sociology on work place satisfaction. She wondered if the results were

available and if it would be helpful to interface with this survey. Guevara stated that surveys can be done that will provide the results you want or you can get irrelevant data. Reisbig stated that she thought the Sociology survey was well written but it did not provide anonymity.

Schubert suggested looking at the non-tenure track faculty survey questions and making recommendations based on the responses to the questions. Recommendations could include providing voting rights, except on tenure decisions, and provide them with promotions. He stated that promotional curves should be factored into the beginning when a non-tenure track faculty member is hired. He noted that when you apply for a grant you need to indicate salary increases for those who will be working on the grant. Reisbig stated that if people are being paid out of a grant but are not given the promotion indicated in the grant, this could be a fraudulent concern. Schubert stated that any research faculty member hire goes through Human Resources but at the end of the day the contract is handed out by the unit. Consequently, the unit can say in the beginning what the salary will be for people working on these grants.

Guevara pointed out that consideration needs to be given if people are not doing their job. He noted that everyone has a contract and receives salary notification but someone has to tell them to do their jobs. He stated that faculty members need to make sure the administration follows the procedures, particularly if there is failure in informing new hires of their rights. He noted that some of the non-tenure track faculty members feel that they are not part of the system because they are not receiving any information from their immediate supervisor. Schubert pointed out that this could also be a tenure track faculty issue. He stated that research faculty members are not being asked if they are getting a raise when most of the other faculty members are receiving raises. Guevara noted that salaries are public because we are a state institution, but they are considered by many as a private matter. Zoubek stated that part of the problem is a lack of communication. He noted that when there is a change in administration, people are not necessarily informed if the expectations of their work have changed.

Schubert stated that the higher administration can require college and department bylaws to update and publish their bylaws. He stated that the Executive Committee needs to review the results of the survey and start developing recommendations.

4.5 Report on Meeting with IT Personnel on Computer Issues (Woodman)

Woodman reported that he met with Heath Tuttle and Todd Jensen from Information Technologies to follow up on discussions the Executive Committee previously had with CIO Askren regarding educational computer support. He noted that computer support in the classrooms is becoming increasingly more important, yet IT acts more as an independent contractor rather than consulting with faculty members about software programs or other updates that are needed in classrooms. He pointed out that faculty members do not have administrative rights on classroom computers and that they need these to best use these for teaching and maintenance of the computers in the classrooms.

Woodman reported that IT is trying to develop a mechanism that can be installed in classroom computers that provides an active directory sign-in for faculty members. He noted that IT is also trying to develop a process that will allow IT to communicate with faculty members. He suggested having IT come to speak to the Senate to discuss what changes are being planned and implemented for classroom computers. He noted that sometimes the classroom equipment is changed and the instructor is not aware of the changes until the first day of classes.

Woodman stated that he made a suggestion to IT to have an information page on the web that will inform faculty members of changes to particular classroom computers with information on how to use the new software. He pointed out that it is frustrating for faculty members if a computer is not working properly in classrooms and this could have impacts on retaining students. He noted that a lot of money is being put into instructional technology and this is a good time for the faculty to become involved with it. Purdum noted that a lot of student fees are going towards instructional technology and proper equipment is needed.

Guevara stated that communication with the faculty is crucial. He noted that classroom computers were going to be removed in Oldfather because many people were given laptops to use. However, it was determined at the last minute before the removal of the computers that a number of faculty members using the classrooms did not have laptops and the computers were left in the classrooms.

Woodman stated that telestrating needs to be considered because more things are being done on line. He stated that if lectures can be captured on line automatically this would be very helpful. He noted that this is done in the large lecture hall in Love Library.

Schubert asked if there is anything the Executive Committee can do to make sure the concerns of the faculty are being heard. Woodman stated that it is important for the faculty to stay on top of this issue. Purdum stated that the chair of the Information Technologies and Services Committee should be actively involved in these communications. Schubert stated that the Executive Committee should meet with CIO Askren during the fall semester.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Request for Guidance in Changing Student Code of Conduct

Schubert reported that he received an email message from Matt Hecker, Dean of Students, asking for guidance in making changes to the Student Code of Conduct, particularly with the academic honor and integrity system. He noted that the academic honor system is not widely known or consistent. He stated that ASUN has reviewed and made suggested changes. The next steps will be for the Faculty Senate to approve the changes, then the Chancellor, and finally the Board of Regents.

Woodman stated that the Executive Committee needs to see the changes being proposed by ASUN and it would be helpful to have information on Title IX which is to be included in the Code of Conduct.

Griffin noted that there was a Faculty Senate Committee several years ago that wrote a report and made suggestions for an academic honesty code of conduct. She stated that she will get a copy of the report to the Executive Committee.

5.2 Proposed Policy on Youth Camps at UNL

Schubert reported that he received a request from VC Jackson to have the Senate Executive Committee review and assess a policy on youth camps/activities safety policy. Reisbig noted that the policy defines youth as any person under the age of 18, but it should read 18 and younger because the state defines youth this way.

Schubert asked the Executive Committee to send him an email if they have specific suggestions.

5.3 Executive Committee Retreat

Griffin stated that the Executive Committee has an annual retreat, typically at the end of summer, to determine the goals for the Faculty Senate for the new academic year. She stated that she will send out an email message asking the Executive Committee members for dates they are available to meet.

5.4 Agenda Items for SVCAA Weissinger and VC Green

The Executive Committee identified the following agenda items for discussion with the SVCAA and VC:

- Provide an Update on the Survey of Non-tenured Faculty Members
- Dean of Journalism Search
- Proposed Changes to Curriculum Committee Procedures
- Future Handling of Visas for Students and New Faculty Members

5.5 CPR Presentation to Faculty Senate

Schubert stated that Vicki Highstreet, Assistant Director of Campus Recreation, asked if she could give a brief presentation to the Faculty Senate on the importance and need for CPR training. The Executive Committee agreed to have a presentation at a meeting in the fall.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, July 11 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and David Woodman, Secretary.