

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Bender, Dawes, Hanrahan, Konecky, Lee, Leiter, Purcell, Reisbig, Rudy, Steffen, Vakilzadian, Woodman

Absent: Fech

Date: Tuesday, September 13, 2016

Location: 203 Alexander Building

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

Woodman called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 ASUN Police Advisory Committee

Woodman noted that ASUN contacted him about having a Faculty Senate representative on the newly created ASUN Police Advisory Committee. He suggested that an email message be sent to the Senate to see if anyone is interested in serving on the Committee. He believes that the Committee will meet once a month.

2.2 Inquiry on Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance

Woodman reported that he contacted Chancellor Green regarding who will replace Susan Foster in the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance. He stated that Chancellor Green informed him that Tami Strickman is now the Interim Director and she is seamlessly taking over the duties and responsibilities of Foster. He noted that the Chancellor stated that Strickman will work with the Senate to improve Title IX procedures in cases that involve faculty members. Woodman pointed out that, as far as the Executive Committee knows, the procedures that are on the web were developed without the input of faculty members.

Lee reported that recently some of the graduate students in his department have gone through the search training because they are serving on search committees. The students informed him that the training only lasted 33 minutes and consisted of 20 slides being shown and answers could not be given about visas. He wondered whether this is an indication of some kind of problem with the training. Purcell noted that when she took the training prior to serving on the search for the Vice Chancellor of IANR the training was over an hour and Susan Foster, a lawyer conducted the session. Reisbig suggested that the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance be contacted directly about these concerns.

2.3 Concerns for Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee

Woodman reported that he received an email message from a Senator regarding a faculty member's concern about the bias and results of the p values used when looking at faculty salaries. There was also concern that the retirement plans are lower at UNL than at peer institutions. The person also felt that Caremark's prescription plan was not very good and that we should negotiate for a better plan. Hanrahan and other Executive Committee members stated that they are pleased with the prescription plan.

2.4 Arts & Sciences Upcoming Meeting with Professors of Practice

Woodman stated that the College of Arts & Sciences is proposing to have an informal workshop to discuss promotion and other issues with the Professors of Practice in October. Of particular concern are Professors of Practice who hold joint appointments and the additional workload they have.

3.0 Approval of September 6, 2016 Minutes

Rudy moved for approval of the minutes from the September 6 meeting. Motion seconded by Reisbig and approved by the Executive Committee.

4.0 Unfinished Business

No unfinished business was discussed.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Agenda Items for Chancellor Green, Interim SVCAA Kostelnik, Interim VC Yoder

The Executive Committee identified the following agenda items for the administrators:

- Clarification on the Director of Institutional Equity and Compliance.
- Possible problems with search committee training.
- Capital Construction Plans: update, future plans.
- Explain your idea of shared governance.
- Enrollment numbers in context with the entire state?
- What is the state landscape for higher education?
- What is the status of the University with the Office of Civil Rights?
- Feedback from his statement on political correctness on campus?
- Academic Program Review on the Honors Program, preliminary thoughts on it. Will there be an external search for a director? What is the attrition rate for the program?
- Are non-tenure track faculty members included in the new faculty orientation session? If not, how are they informed of their rights as faculty members?
- Problems for faculty members with joint appointments.
- Have departments been notified if they are receiving help from the funds collected through the 5% tax?

5.2 Questions for Vice Chancellor Candidates

The Executive Committee worked on identifying questions to ask the candidates for the Vice Chancellors. Possible questions include: how have you dealt with joint appointments; how would you improve the Honors Program; what experience or insight

do you bring with supervising the Vice Chancellor for Research and the Vice Chancellor Students; what would your enrollment plans be; how do you see the City and East Campuses relating to each other; what do you see as the strengths and weaknesses of UNL and where can we focus our attention.

5.3 ASUN Green Fund – Cale Brodersen, ASUN Representative

Brodersen reported that the ASUN has started a new initiative called the Green Fund. A couple of years ago the students were asked if they would help support the initiative and 78% of the students who replied said they would. As a result students pay \$2 a year to go into the fund. He stated that bylaws for the fund were created after researching similar initiatives at other institutions.

Brodersen stated that the Green Fund now has \$46,000 to give to student projects that are related to sustainability. He noted that the first deadline for submitting applications for funding is in October. Applications will be reviewed and submitted to a subject expert person for her/his opinion and ASUN will have final approval. He noted that ASUN would like to have the faculty involved by providing the expert opinion. He pointed out that students could apply for the funds and use them for a course project relating to sustainability. He asked if it was possible for him to attend a Faculty Senate meeting to discuss the Green Fund. The Executive Committee agreed that he should speak to the Senate to see if faculty members would consider serving as the expert opinion and whether some of the projects could be done as a class assignment. He pointed out that ASUN is not expecting too many applications in the specific areas of sustainability. Lee noted that there are environmental studies faculty members on campus and suggested that ASUN get in touch with them.

Reisbig asked how ASUN plans to evaluate the impact of the projects. Brodersen stated that a rubric will be used. He noted that some projects might have an educational basis while others will deal with making the campus more sustainable. He stated that the plans are to evaluate the process, the commitment of those participating, and each project must have a faculty or staff member sign off on it. Reisbig asked if the students will be notified about all of the approved projects. Brodersen stated that information will be made public and the plan is to have a showcase presentation of the projects in April. He pointed out that there will be a significant education component to the projects.

Purcell commended Brodersen and the ASUN for starting the initiative. The Executive Committee recommended some names of faculty members to serve as experts for Brodersen to contact.

5.4 Uniform University Appeals Procedure

Lee reported that his department recently dealt with a grade appeal that was vigorously pursued. As a result the department reviewed the grade appeal process and realized that there was no uniform university procedure. Each college and department can have its own procedure. Steffen pointed out that the process should be the same, regardless of the class. Leiter noted that the Law College has a whole set of procedures and includes having a committee to deal with grade appeals. Woodman pointed out that the Board of

Regents Bylaws state that each college should have procedures. Reisbig noted that each college should have its own review committee for appeals. Lee agreed, but said that the procedures should be the same across the colleges.

Hanrahan stated that in his school the student goes to the appeals office and then a group of faculty. If the student is still not satisfied they can appeal further. He asked what kind of procedure Lee is suggesting. Lee stated that in his department the student should first speak to the instructor, then the chair of the department. If they want to pursue it further the appeals committee needs to consider the appeal and then on up to the dean. He stated that the steps and the requirement of evidence for appealing a grade should be the same throughout the colleges. He pointed out that if the appeal is ever challenged the university counsel could determine whether the procedures were followed. Hanrahan agreed that there should be some kind of commonality. Lee stated that at no point should a department be able to just change its procedures. Leiter pointed out that a good reason for not allowing departments to change the procedures is that they may develop one that does not work. Reisbig pointed out that there could be liabilities in having top down procedures.

Woodman suggested that research should be conducted to see if other universities have uniform procedures. Lee suggested that the issue be discussed with Interim VC Kostelnik. Bender stated that the Executive Committee should see if Interim VC Kostelnik is agreeable with having a uniform policy. If so, the Senate Grading & Examinations Committee could be asked to prepare a policy for it.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, September 20, 2016 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 203 Alexander Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Allison Reisbig, Secretary.