

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Anaya, Bender, Guevara, Joeckel, Nickerson, Reisbig, Rinkevich, Ruchala, Schubert, Sollars, Woodman, Wysocki

Absent: Zoubek

Date: Wednesday, January 15, 2014

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 3:00 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

3.0 Approval of 1/8/14 Minutes

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

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Update on Forum for Non-tenure Track Faculty Members

Guevara reported that he had a visit from Professor Lahey, chair of the Academic Planning Committee regarding the forum for non-tenure track faculty members. He stated that the forum will not take place until mid-February and Woodman will be a key player in developing the forum. He noted that he and Lahey discussed speakers for the meeting including Bender, chair of the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee, someone from the Benefits Office, Professor Jacobson (former Associate VC of Academic Affairs who helped to develop the Professors of Practice positions) and possibly someone from the Academic Freedom Coalition of Nebraska. He reported that Woodman will contact Lahey to discuss the details.

4.2 Student Code of Conduct Revisions

The Executive Committee began reviewing the proposed revisions to the Student Code of Conduct. Guevara noted that the goal of the Executive Committee is to approve a document that the faculty can agree with. Joeckel wondered whether there are attempts to instill or ensure that students actually read the Code. Griffin stated that she believes the students are informed about the Code during new student orientation but does not know if there are any attempts to instill that they read it. The Executive Committee agreed to continue reviewing the revisions at its next meeting.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Draft Document on Hosting a CIC Faculty Leaders Meeting

Guevara stated that he did not think this tool kit can be very binding because the hosting institution pays for most of the event and those paying will have control over the content. He noted that last year's CIC faculty leaders meeting had very interesting presentations, but it was about what the institution is doing and not about faculty leadership. As a result this document was created in response to the Senate Presidents' concerns about the lack of actual discussions on shared governance.

Nickerson pointed out that he would like to see something in the document that states that the hosting administration and faculty will work together on the meeting. He noted that if we are designing a protocol for future meetings we should say what we think should be part of the guidelines. Ruchala pointed out that these meetings are for faculty governance and she does not think the administration needs to be involved. She stated that the agenda concepts should be developed by the faculty leaders of the hosting institution. Guevara pointed out that the faculty has a great deal of power if they band together as a faculty. Schubert agreed and stated that the faculty would have more power if they would all stand together.

The Executive Committee reviewed and proposed some additions to the document.

5.2 Review of Senate Meeting

Guevara thought the meeting went well with interesting discussions. Nickerson stated that he found it fascinating that the University Curriculum Committee is not even attempting to eliminate duplicate courses anymore. He pointed out that the faculty lives with a lot of competing courses and he liked Professor Carlson's suggestion of changing the course request form by requiring that a department have to identify related or overlapping courses.

Guevara stated that one reason the UCC may not be looking at duplication of courses is because the colleges are very independent of each other with some departments offering courses that only their students can take. He pointed out that departments cannot depend that a course will be offered by a different college that their students might need because that other college might decide to stop funding a course. Reisbig noted that this is actually one of the reasons why there needs to be some oversight of courses and no longer doing this could potentially become problematic.

Ruchala asked what motivation a department might have to teach a course that is already being taught elsewhere. Nickerson stated that new faculty hires with special areas of interest are being hired and the departments need to provide courses for these people to teach. Guevara noted that departments also want to produce their own credit hours which have become an important factor for funding in some colleges. Joeckel stated that this issue may come to a larger stage in terms of efficiency. Woodman pointed out that the Chancellor and other administrators have said this on several occasions in the past. Ruchala reported that the Business College redesigned some of their courses to better fit the needs of their students.

Guevara stated that faculty freedom needs to be protected and telling a department that they cannot develop a new course because it is a duplication limits what faculty members can do. Nickerson pointed out that having a lot of 900-level competing courses with only three students enrolled can usually result in some of these courses being cancelled.

Schubert stated that unless faculty members complain about the UCC not looking for duplicate courses there is really no need to pursue the matter. Joeckel stated that a concern was raised during the Senate meeting. Wysocki thought that the CREQ system was supposed to be able to identify duplicate courses. Guevara stated that in the end the colleges are going to get what they want in terms of courses.

Nickerson stated that he thinks the UCC will come up with good revisions for the procedures of the recertification of ACE courses and that the UCC understands where the Executive Committee stands on what changes are needed. He pointed out that 95% of the work of the UCC is with the ACE courses but only the UCC's ACE Subcommittee does the work. The subcommittee consists of a member from each of the eight undergraduate colleges, but the UCC also has a representative from the Academic Planning Committee and the Faculty Senate. He stated that he would like to explore the possibility of getting these people involved as voting members on the UCC ACE Subcommittee. He noted that the requirement of having a unanimous vote to approve an ACE course or recertification would still be needed. He stated that he might suggest this change when the UCC meets on the 27th.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, January 22 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Toni Anaya, Secretary.