

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Bender, Guevara, Nickerson, Reisbig, Rinkevich, Ruchala, Schubert, Wysocki

Absent: Anaya, Joeckel, Sollars, Woodman, Zoubek

Date: Wednesday, July 24, 2013

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

Guevara called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Executive Committee Retreat

Griffin announced that the annual Executive Committee retreat to determine the goals of the Faculty Senate for 2013-2014 will be held on August 14 at the Schorr Presidential Suite at the Hewitt Place.

2.2 Passing of Emeritus Professor McShane

Nickerson reported the untimely death of Emeritus Professor McShane who has been serving as the Emeriti Association representative to the Faculty Senate. He stated that McShane passed away two weeks ago as a result of a stroke he suffered while up at the Mayo Clinic for minor heart surgery. He stated that Emeritus Professor McShane funeral service was held in Minnesota, but a celebration service would be held at the Sheldon Art Gallery on July 27. He noted that McShane served as Faculty Senate President for two consecutive terms in 1989-1991 and was a member of numerous committees.

3.0 Approval of 6/26/13 Minutes

Bender moved for approval of the revised minutes of 6/26/13. Rinkevich seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Ad Hoc ACE Committee

Guevara reported that he hopes to convene the Senate Ad Hoc ACE Committee sometime in August.

4.2 Update on Changes to the Student Code of Conduct

Guevara reported that he spoke with Dean Hecker about how the process to make changes to the Student Code of Conduct can be improved so the changes can finally move forward. He noted that Dean Hecker emailed him a copy of the Code that he felt the students should use. He reported that he informed Dean Hecker that the Executive

Committee would not look at another version of the proposed changes until Dean Hecker's office has worked through the document with the students. He noted that UNK recently updated their Code and suggested that it be looked at as a reference.

Nickerson stated that he has concerns with letting students write their own Code of Conduct. He pointed out that the university should write the document with input from the students and on the academic side, from the Faculty Senate. He stated that the university should determine a suitable set of guidelines for the students and should have done this in the past. He stated that the issue should be raised with the Chancellor and SVCAA Weissinger. Guevara agreed and stated that the Code was too important a document that required the involvement of the administration, faculty, and students. He stated that the administration needs to be more proactive with this issue.

Bender asked if the Senate will need to approve the document. Griffin stated that it would and eventually the Board of Regents would have final approval. Bender pointed out that the faculty will have a say on the document when it goes to the Senate for approval.

Guevara stated that he sees the changes to the Code as a serious issue, but he does not think the students have received the support from the Office of Student Affairs to get the task done. He stated that it would be a good idea to discuss this with the Chancellor.

Schubert noted that in a previous meeting the Executive Committee recommended that the Student Code of Conducts from the other Big Ten schools be reviewed and that changes to UNL's Code be proposed that would make our document similar to the other Big Ten schools.

Guevara reported that he told Dean Hecker that there needs to be better supervision of the process to change the Code. Wysocki stated that he does not think the administration should put this task of proposing changes to the Code on the students. He stated that more input and guidance is needed from the administration. Reisbig stated that she thinks the representatives from ASUN did a good job of attempting to make changes to the Code. Wysocki pointed out that the students should be providing input on the changes but they should not be formulating the university's policy. Guevara noted that we need to have a Code that represents the kind of student behavior the university will allow.

Schubert stated that in looking at Indiana's Code it shows the history of the document and how the trustees had to approve the document. He asked why we can't have something similar at UNL. He pointed out that the officers of ASUN change every year and the students do not have the capabilities to write such an important document. He stated that any policy that governs the behavior of students should come from the administration and VC Franco's office should be driving this effort.

Nickerson suggested that there be an ad hoc committee to work on the academic portion of the document. He noted that the Faculty Senate had an ad hoc committee when the

dead weak policy was changed to the 15th week policy. Guevara noted that the academic portion of the code applies to the faculty and he sees the faculty as being the prime force in moving this portion of the document.

Reisbig asked what the rationale is for bringing the issue to the attention of the Chancellor and SVCAA. She pointed out that the image of the university could be impacted if we do not have a good Code of Conduct and this is an important document to not only the students, but the parents as well. Wysocki stated that the Executive Committee should point out that the Code reflects what the administration wants in terms of behavior in students. Nickerson stated that the Code should be an off shoot of the Bylaws. He noted that the Chancellor has mentioned that the UNL Bylaws has some deficiencies and needs revision.

Nickerson stated that at a previous Executive Committee meeting it was agreed to have a member work with the students on their proposed revisions. He suggested that the Executive Committee volunteer to write the academic portion of the Code, but asked who we should partner with, the administration, the students or both? Reisbig noted that she had previously volunteered to reorganize what the students wrote.

Bender stated that if the Executive Committee wants to expedite the revisions to the Code, it might be helpful to work with the students to develop a drafting committee which would include an Executive Committee representative. He stated that it would be helpful to bring in someone from the law college, either a faculty member or student. He noted that when he and other faculty members worked on revising the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee procedures that Professor Works from the Law College was also on the committee and his expertise was very helpful in terms of putting in language that would stand up to scrutiny. He pointed out that having someone with that kind of training would make for a stronger document. He stated that there are some good reasons for the students to have some primary responsibility in developing the Code and it would be a good exercise for them to be involved in, but the Executive Committee should be involved in helping to create the draft and he would be willing to assist with it. Schubert stated that it would be a good idea to get someone from the Law College involved because there are a lot of legal issues involved with the document. He suggested that a person like Associate VC Goodburn or someone who has experience would be needed to help line the Code up with those of the Big Ten schools. He noted that students coming here are thinking that it is going to be like a Big Ten school and we should have a Student Code of Conduct similar to other Big Ten universities.

The Executive Committee agreed to bring this to the attention of the Chancellor when it meets with him on August 7.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Report on Board of Regents Meeting

Guevara reported that VP Niemiec, Distance Education, gave a report on MOOC courses and Coursera. He stated that the projection of enrollment for online courses was questioned and the figures presented showed that UNL was ahead of a lot of its peers. He

noted that the figures for enrollment seemed to reflect just those people who registered for courses and that it wasn't clear whether those students who took grades of W were excluded from the count. He noted that in his experience with online teaching a larger number of students take grades of W than students in traditional classes. He pointed out that there was no discussion about how the MOOC course will affect campus and the only thing that stood out was that the units have some control over it. Nickerson stated that he is happy to hear that units are at least retaining control of what they do with the MOOC courses.

Nickerson reported that Chancellor Perlman reported to the Board how the utilities for Innovation Campus will be handled, with the high temperature water from an adjacent water treatment plant being used to both heat and cool the buildings. He stated that the presentation showed that the Campus will seek to conserve energy as much as possible and it will be a green campus.

Wysocki asked if there was discussion on the merger of UNO and UNL engineering programs. Guevara reported that there was no mention of it. Wysocki noted that recent publications in the Omaha World Herald about the Peter Kiewit Institute stated that a committee would be established by Chancellor Perlman and Chancellor Christensen to assess the future of the Institute. He stated that this should be a topic of discussion when the Executive Committee meets with the Chancellor and SVCAA Weissinger. He pointed out that faculty members need to be represented on this committee. Schubert stated that President Milliken had an external assessment by outside consultants conducted on the issue and the consultants stated that creating a separate engineering college at UNO would be a complete waste of money. He noted that the issue needs to be resolved and President Milliken has asked the Chancellors to form a committee to address the situation. Nickerson stated that the faculty should have representation on this committee. Wysocki volunteered to serve on the committee.

5.2 Agenda Items for Chancellor Perlman and SVCAA Weissinger

The Executive Committee identified the following agenda items for discussion:

- Engineering Situation between UNL and UNO
- Enrollment Figures for this Summer and Preliminary Figures for Fall
- MOOC and Coursera at UNL
- Update on Student Success Center
 - o Tutoring Services?
- Update on Renovations to the Student Union
- University Budget in Light of Tuition Freeze – Impacts on the Second Year of the Biennium
- Fabricated Equipment Policy Issue
- Efforts to Update UNL Bylaws
- What Criteria are Used in Determining Whether a Dean's Search is Internal or External?
- Delays Occurring in Transfer of Credits for Students
- Health Center Plans

5.3 Interview for Dean of Libraries

Nickerson reported that three Executive Committee members met with Interim Dean Busch to interview her for the Dean of Libraries position. He stated that it was a great meeting with many questions being asked and in the end he and the other members in attendance agreed that she would be a good candidate.

5.4 Fabricated Equipment Policy Issue

Schubert reported that the fabricated equipment policy was enforced in March to coincide with a similar policy at other Big Ten schools. He stated that the policy concerns external grant funding that is received for developing or purchasing equipment. He noted that funding agencies provide money for the purchase of equipment and the university is applying an overhead charge on equipment purchases. He pointed out that one of the problems with this policy is that researchers who received grants prior to the policy did not factor in the overhead which is 48.5% of the equipment cost. As a result several principal investigators cannot continue their research because their funds were depleted by the Accounting office.

Schubert stated that he met with the head of Accounting and one of the Accounting staff members to discuss the issue of changing the categorization of equipment that the overcharge would be applied to. He stated that during the conversation it was revealed the Accounting put in its own policy which is more stringent than the Big Ten policy. He pointed out that Accounting officers are making decisions about scientific equipment without consulting with the researchers to see if the equipment falls into the fabricated equipment category. He noted that fabricated equipment is equipment that is put together by a scientist for a particular research purpose and it can be built from other equipment parts. Wysocki pointed out that up until recently there had not been an overhead charge on equipment purchased for research.

Schubert reported that in his meeting with Accounting it became clear that the decision whether equipment qualified for charging overhead was made by one person. He stated that he wrote an email suggesting that there be communications between a principal investigator and the Accounting office when a proposal is submitted which requires the purchase of equipment so the Accounting officer can be educated on whether the equipment is non-fabricated or fabricated equipment. He pointed out that the decision should be up to the faculty member, not the Accounting officer. He stated that an Accounting officer does not know the difference between constructing and developing equipment. He pointed out that this policy has the potential to threaten NSF funding on some proposals. Nickerson noted that charging overhead on equipment that is purchased for research is a real problem. He pointed out that the amount of money faculty members will receive for doing research will be much less from grants. Schubert stated that NSF will have to be charged considerably more money now than just a few years ago because of this policy.

Wysocki questioned how the 48.5% of the overhead money on equipment is being used. Schubert stated that part of it will probably go towards the expense of operating the equipment.

Nickerson stated that he believes there are some other accounting changes that have recently been made. He noted that funding for graduate student tuition and insurance has recently increased and this cost needs to be factored into some grants, thus reducing the amount of money available for actual research.

Ruchala pointed out that a policy regarding the overhead charge on equipment should be determined before a grant is accepted so faculty members know what to expect. Schubert stated that it is particularly disturbing that no grants were grandfathered into the policy.

Bender stated that there is considerable concern with adopting a policy that is not consistent with NSF policies. Schubert stated that Accounting claims to be following this policy for audit purposes.

Schubert reported that he was writing a proposal and a day before he was going to submit the proposal Accounting stated that the proposal had to be readjusted to include overhead on equipment. He pointed out that NSF grants are already extremely competitive and placing this kind of overhead on equipment could result in researchers not receiving grants. Ruchala stated that she would think the Office of Economic Development and Research would be on top of this issue. Schubert stated that his first call about this problem was to Sponsored Programs and he was informed that they could not do anything about the matter that it is up to Accounting. He noted that he wrote to VC Paul and VC Jackson about the issues but has not had a response back from either.

The Executive Committee agreed to discuss the issue with Chancellor Perlman.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, August 7 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Toni Anaya, Secretary.