

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Anaya, Bender, Guevara, LaCost, Reisbig, Rinkevich, Ruchala, Schubert, Woodman, Wysocki,

Absent: Nickerson, Purdum, Zoubek

Date: Wednesday, May 30, 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

2.1 Security Breach Memo

Schubert announced that a message was sent by Joshua Mauk, Information Security Officer of the university, suggesting that employees go to private credit reporting companies to sign up for fraud alerts. Wysocki stated that he thought the breach only affected students. Schubert stated that employee information was also breached. Reisbig stated that employees may sign up for a fraud alert at one of the main credit reporting agencies as this will put safeguards up against someone opening a credit card or other account in your name. She noted that it is free of charge and you only need to do this through one of the credit reporting agencies as they will notify the other two agencies. Guevara pointed out that the tone of the email is that the information has not been downloaded and there is no evidence at this time that any of the obtained information is being used. Reisbig suggested that if people are concerned that they may request to have a fraud alert for either ninety days or seven years. The Executive Committee agreed to discuss the security breach with the Chancellor.

2.2 Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Retreat

Schubert noted that he attended the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs retreat and reported that a prime focus of the Faculty Senate this year is looking into the status of non-tenured faculty members and how to raise their reputation. He pointed out that non-tenure track faculty members are beneficial to students yet some of them are not familiar with how the Student Affairs Office organizes interaction between these faculty members and the students. He stated that there needs to be improvement in student-faculty relations. He reported that those in attendance wanted to know how they can help the Senate in our endeavors. He stated that he was positively surprised to see how many different facets are covered by the Student Affairs Office but pointed out that one thing that is missing in the Engineering College is career service and students knowing what the next step will be after their college career ends. He wondered how it might be possible to strengthen the connections between faculty members and Career Services.

Woodman stated that in his department advisors usually help students with career advice. Guevara pointed out that many people associate academic advising with career advising which can cause confusion. He noted that students are interested in Career Services and suggested that there should be more advertisement about this office so people know where to go to for assistance. Schubert wondered if there should be a required course for students that offer them a different perspective on career development. Woodman suggested that such a course could have a zero hour requirement and students could be required to attend presentations of five speakers during the year that would enable them to think about their next step after graduation. He pointed out that he would not like to see such a course as a fee based course. Ruchala asked about college bias for career advising. Woodman stated that such a course could be at either the college or university level.

LaCost suggested that the Executive Committee ask Career Services to provide an overview of what they do for students. She noted that this information could then be sent to the Senators. Ruchala reported that the Business Administration College is putting together a service area for students and noted that the other Big Ten schools already have such a service in place.

LaCost suggested that the Executive Committee check the Career Services website. Schubert stated that the Committee might want to have Career Services give a presentation to the Faculty Senate.

3.0 Approval of 5/2/12 Minutes

Rinkevich moved for approval of the minutes as revised. Reisbig seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Review of Survey on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Members

Schubert noted that the Executive Committee started to review the results of the survey but wondered how much information members can share and whether the information can be removed from the Senate office. LaCost stated that all of the members of the Executive Committee can use the information gathered but it needs to be kept confidential. Reisbig pointed out that the IRB protocol does not state this information. She suggested that a change request should be filed to include the Executive Committee members being able to have access to the data. LaCost stated that she will work with Reisbig and Anaya to change the protocol and submit it to IRB.

Schubert reported that he has had more conversations with faculty members who completed the survey. He pointed out that faculty members have noticed the survey and it has received attention through the ranks of the non-tenured faculty members. He stated that the Executive Committee needs to think about what the survey's goal is and what the Committee hopes to achieve. He stated that he thinks non-tenure track faculty members should be incorporated into UNL, similar to tenure track faculty members, and that they are knowledgeable about their rights and responsibilities.

Reisbig pointed out that one thing that the data from the survey illuminates is the power difference between tenure and non-tenure track faculty members. Guevara noted that this is how the university is structured and why there are full, associate, and assistant professors and that there are ranks in various positions. He stated that the survey indicates that people resent these ranks, but consideration needs to be given to the contract these people were hired under. He noted that there will always be some temporary workers. Schubert pointed out that some outstanding faculty members have been hired on a temporary basis. Guevara noted that some positions are designed to be temporary.

Woodman stated that this structure will not be changed but what matters is if some colleges give certain rights and responsibilities to non-tenure track faculty members and other colleges do not. He stated that unfairness is created when a non-tenure track faculty member knows people in the same position in other colleges but they have different rights. He stated that there should be common rights and they should feel secure in knowing what they can and cannot do. Wysocki pointed out that there is a possible trap in putting forward the same rights for non-tenure track faculty members because some of these faculty members might actually lose some of their current rights in order to equalize rights across the board. Woodman agreed, but said departments that treat non-tenure track faculty members less than others should be asked why they treat these people the way they do.

Ruchala agreed that there should be some consistency of rules but the survey was not designed to figure this out. Woodman pointed out that the differences emerged through comments made in the survey. Schubert stated that there should be system-wide rights and faculty members within the same college should have the same rights.

Guevara stated that the campus is too diverse and procedures can vary from college to college making it difficult to have university-wide guidelines. He stated that what is needed is for colleges and departments to have a more positive appreciation for what these employees do and not for what the position implies. Woodman stated that this sounds noble but what matters is what a person's rights are. He asked why there can't be a uniform set of rights when it comes to voting on certain issues.

Ruchala pointed out that each college should have bylaws. She noted that CBA has very defined college and department bylaws. She stated that non-tenure track faculty members have voting rights but cannot be on graduate curriculum committees or vote on promotion and tenure. Guevara noted that Arts & Sciences is the largest college on campus but he is not sure if the college has bylaws.

Reisbig suggested that a set of minimum standards could be created that would apply to all of the colleges. She noted that colleges could then raise the standards in their bylaws if they wished. Woodman stated that department bylaws should also include the minimum standards. Reisbig suggested having process-based guidelines that would be transparent about voting rights. Wysocki stated that the Executive Committee should aim for consistency in informing non-tenured faculty members about their rights and ensure

that everyone is equal, although it is possible that not everyone would have the same rights. Bender stated that there are some guidelines that should be uniform across the campus. He stated that it is a problem if non-tenure track faculty members are not being told how they are going to be evaluated. He pointed out that there could be a university-wide standard that non-tenure track faculty members have to be told what the criteria are that they need to meet for evaluations.

Ruchala stated that the Executive Committee should ask the chairs if they have policies for non-tenure track faculty members. This would allow the Executive Committee to see if there is a lack of policies or if unfair policies exist on campus. Schubert stated that the survey does show that there are some inconsistencies across campus. He pointed out that non-tenure track faculty members are our colleagues and members of the academic assembly and should be treated fairly. He noted that the Executive Committee needs to identify its goal and then decide how to accomplish it. The next step is to talk to the administration.

Ruchala pointed out that the Executive Committee needs to identify if there are colleges that do not have bylaws and whether there is a problem with implementation of the college bylaws in departments. She noted that the Executive Committee needs factual information. Woodman asked if it is possible to send a request to the deans to see the college bylaws.

Guevara pointed out that most tenured faculty members will probably say they don't know the bylaws or procedures and many of them will say they are not being treated fairly. He stated that the only people who can force the chairs to do something are the faculty. He said that the administration needs to be presented with information on how the non-tenure track faculty members are being treated. He stated that people who have a contract for a specific period of time are clearly different than people who are tenured.

Schubert asked who would be considered as faculty members. He stated that he considers anyone who teaches and has some or all of the same responsibilities as he does as a colleague and during the time they are employed he wants them to share in meetings and participate in committees. He noted that the non-tenure track faculty members need to be identified for inclusion.

Ruchala pointed out that the colleges should have made this definition. She stated that her college has very clear guidelines in the rights of each category of faculty members. Schubert suggested that the goal might be to present the deans with a request to do something in regards to having the non-tenure track faculty members more actively involved in shared governance. Ruchala pointed out that this would not apply to all colleges since some colleges have already done this.

LaCost moved that Griffin obtain the college and department bylaws to see what the rights are of non-tenure track faculty members. Ruchala seconded the motion. Guevara suggested checking when the last update was made to each of the bylaws. He noted that the information could be compiled and presented to the administration. He pointed out

that it is not the Senate's responsibility to go for a top down administration. LaCost pointed out that we have a system in place at UNL where we have a top down administration but bottom up implementation of policies.

Ruchala stated that it might be useful to form a Senate committee to see if there could be a set of standards for non-tenure track faculty members if we find that there is great diversity in how these people are treated. Reisbig wondered if the problem may be that non-tenure track faculty members are unaware of their rights. She stated that the Executive Committee needs to identify the impact of the problem and determine the benefits of fixing the problem. Schubert noted that non-tenure track faculty members could reach their full potential as a faculty member if they are made to feel fully valued. This could result in a more productive person. Woodman stated that there are benefits to the students as well. Griffin pointed out that it could help in retention of faculty members too.

The Executive Committee approved the motion to obtain college and department bylaws.

4.2 Agenda Items for Chancellor Perlman

Discussion items for Chancellor Perlman:

- Update on International Housing Issue
- Breach in Internet Security
- Budget and Faculty Salary Increase
- Student Enrollment
 - o Impacts if subsidized student loans are removed
 - o Possible conversations with other Big Ten schools to find other ways to finance students' education process
- Deans Search Processes
 - o Failure of searches
 - o Internal vs. external hires
- Conflict of Interest with Using the Same Consultant for Parking System and Transportation System
- Email Migration Update
 - o Affiliates having email access

4.3 Update on Memo to SVCAA Weissinger about the Survey

Schubert and LaCost will work on drafting the memo to SVCAA Weissinger.

4.4 Update on Memo to ASUN President Kamler

Schubert stated that he drafted a memo to Kamler and is waiting for a response from LaCost on it. He noted that he spoke with Kamler at the commencement ceremonies and Kamler reported that ASUN will not be working on the issue this summer. Schubert stated that he and LaCost will also work on finishing the memo.

4.5 Update on Classroom Computers

Woodman noted that the Executive Committee discussed the need for updating classroom computers with more up-to-date software and CIO Askren stated that he will have his

staff look into this but there has been no word on whether the updating is occurring. Schubert stated that he has not received any information. Woodman stated that he would be happy to contact CIO Askren about the issue.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Faculty Senate Representative for Campus Master Plan Steering Committee

Griffin reported that a Senate representative is needed for the campus master plan steering committee. The Executive Committee suggested Professor Hind from Architecture. Griffin stated that she will contact him to see if he is willing to serve on the committee.

5.2 Outlook Calendar

Griffin asked if the Executive Committee wants her to have access to their Outlook calendar in order to add the Executive Committee meetings. The Executive Committee agreed to allow her access.

5.3 Changes to University Curriculum Committee Operating Procedures

Schubert reported that he received an email message from the chair of the Academic Planning Committee stating that the APC approved the University Curriculum Committee's operating procedures to change the process of approving and reviewing course requests. He noted that Griffin received an email stating that the UCC will cease to review undergraduate courses, but will still meet for ACE courses. He pointed out that the UCC is a Faculty Senate committee and yet neither the President of the Senate or any Executive Committee member has been contacted about any of the proposed changes.

The Executive Committee agreed that Professor Moore, current chair of UCC and Professor Mitchell, Director of Undergraduate Education, should meet with the Executive Committee to provide a rationale for the proposed changes.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, June 13 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and David Woodman, Secretary.