

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Beck, Bolin, Flowers, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Scholz, Shea, Stock

Absent: Alexander, Fech

Date: Wednesday, August 24, 2005

Location: Academic Senate, 420 University Terrace

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

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

2.0 Professor Ron Lee, AAUP Report on the Department of Economics and Issues of Faculty Governance

Professor Lee stated that a group of faculty members from the Economics department approached the local chapter of the AAUP to talk about concerns they had with the lack of faculty governance in their department. Lee stated that the group presented documents as well as provided oral evidence of problems that were occurring in the department. Lee noted that the report written by the AAUP was based primarily on the evidence provided in the written documents.

Lee pointed out that the AAUP drew on five well established principles of faculty governance as outlined in the AAUP's "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" and "Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure" when reviewing the evidence provided. These principles are: 1) communication, 2) educational policy, 3) faculty status, 4) planning, and 5) academic freedom and protection against discrimination.

Lee stated that several areas in the report highlighted those principles that were regularly violated according to the documentation provided. He noted that the first area was in the hiring of faculty members. He stated that two searches were conducted for the Director of the Nebraska Council on Economic Education. He noted that the Council is a non-profit organization but the Director holds a tenured position in the Department of Economics.

Lee reported that during the first search the department faculty did not have the opportunity to discuss the job position and no outreach program was established to try and recruit women and minorities. Furthermore, the deadline date for submitting applications was before the national meeting. Traditionally, the national meeting is a place where faculty members can meet and interview potential candidates. The group of Economic professors felt that the early deadline date contributed to having a weak pool of candidates for the position. A job offer was made to one candidate but it was declined by the candidate.

Lee noted that the first candidate was offered an Associate Professor position in the department. Lee reported that the group of professors was concerned about the quality of the candidate. He noted that the professors are also concerned with improving the quality of the department by hiring strong candidates.

Lee reported that during the second search once again only one candidate was put forward. The faculty members of the department requested to see the reference letters of the candidates but were denied by the Chair. Lee noted that he has not heard of this happening in any other department. He stated that Richard Wood, Vice President and General Counsel, stepped in and pointed out that the state of Nebraska has a law which states that any citizen of Nebraska can review the application file.

Lee stated that the group claimed that after the first failed search there was a lot of discussion about fixing the problems of the search process but nothing happened to change it. He noted that it appears, from the evidence that was provided, that the department administration set up roadblocks for the faculty of the department to participate in the process.

Lee stated that the second principle of faculty governance that appears to have been violated is departmental planning. He stated that CBA was given permission to use the 2002 strategic plan developed by the College. However, the departmental level planning that should have been the result of the 2002 planning process did not take place in Economics as claimed by the group of Economics professors.

Lee reported that another principle that appears to have been violated is that of communication with the faculty in the department. The group of faculty members stated that there are no regularly scheduled department meetings and the Chair often ignores requests to put certain items on the agenda when department meetings are held. In particular, agenda item requests made by female faculty members are often ignored.

Lee stated that a disturbing issue that arose during the conversations regarded the use of the quality indicators list as a measure for faculty evaluations. He noted that some faculty

members may be excellent researchers but their field is highly specialized and the journals they publish in may not be the particular journals identified on the quality indicators list of leading journals for the department. He noted that in at least one annual review the evaluation claimed that the faculty member did not do well in research because his or her article was not published in one of the identified journals for that department. He pointed out that the group of professors claimed that the Economics department did not create their own list of journals. Instead, an interdepartmental committee in the College selected the journals for each department. It was reported to Lee that this committee did not have a representative from the Economics department.

Lee stated that he has seen some annual reviews where there are references to the quality indicators list. He noted that using the quality indicators list to evaluate people's research is a threat to academic freedom because it can inhibit people from doing research in more specific areas that may not have journals on the list.

Lee reported that he did receive a letter from Professor Digman, Management, who chaired the committee in the College of Business Administration that created the College's strategic plan in 2002. In his letter Professor Digman stated that the College participated in an open process that involved a great deal of faculty input. Lee stated that this was not being disputed by the group of faculty members. The plan called for more specific objectives which would result in departmental action items. The Economics faculty group claimed that no discussions were held to develop these departmental action steps. Lee noted that the College was allowed to use the 2002 plan for the 2004-05 strategic plan.

Lee pointed out that currently the Economics department has an interim chair because the current chair is on leave for this year. Lee reported that he has spoken briefly and informally with Dean Milligan about the situation and stated that she is concerned with the quality of professional life in the Economics department. He reported that Dean Milligan plans on working to improve the situation in Economics. Lee pointed out that when there is great animosity within a department it is important to follow procedures carefully.

Peterson asked whom the AAUP report was sent to. Lee stated that the AAUP was originally interested in entering into a conversation with Dean Milligan, Professor Anderson, Chair of Economics, and Senior Vice Chancellor Couture. He stated that copies of the report were sent to these people and the faculty members who visited with AAUP. He noted that the report was sent to the faculty members to review for errors. He stated that one of the faculty members then decided to send the report to all of the faculty members in the College.

Lee reported that he received an email message from Associate Dean Karels asking if the

AAUP had a statement for the faculty members of the Economics department. Lee pointed out that the AAUP's attempt was not to cause problems in the department but to see if the situation can be improved. He noted that the AAUP is neutral on substantive departmental policies but it is interested in procedures of faculty governance.

Beck noted that typically Economic departments are housed in the College of Arts and Sciences at many universities. She wondered whether there is a feeling in the Economics department here that some faculty members fit better in Arts and Sciences rather than in the Business College. She questioned whether the department is in the right place. Lee stated that it is possible that putting the department in a professional school could change the character of the discipline but he did not know if this has happened. Peterson stated that he did not think the department is more business oriented. He pointed out that Economics departments that have been put into professional schools often become the outcast of these colleges and typically are smaller in size.

Shea wondered whether having the Economics department in a professional school would change the nature of the department as new hires are made. He pointed out that if this is the case, then the hiring process becomes even more critical. He noted that if candidates are being considered for positions without faculty input it gives the administrators more control over the shaping of the department. Lee pointed out that he has never heard of a search on campus where only one candidate was put forward. He stated that if this occurred in his college a very long explanation would need to be provided to the department.

Lee noted that in general, professional colleges seem to have a different relationship between the Dean and the faculty members. He stated that in many of the smaller professional colleges they seem to want a unit similar to the Law College where there are no departments.

Rapkin stated that from the evidence provided it seems that the Dean of the College was made aware of the search practices late in the game. He asked if this was true. Lee stated that he thinks there was enough concern voiced by faculty members within the Economics department that the Dean would have been aware of what was going on. Rapkin pointed out that it seems that the Dean would have been complacent with what was happening with the searches because she would have had to give approval for bringing in candidates.

Lee stated that the group of faculty members felt that the Office of Equity, Access & Diversity Programs, was very negligent when they complained about the searches and the lack of minority candidates. Beck pointed out that the Office stated that the faculty could not see the references on the candidates but this was later over ruled by the University

Counsel.

Peterson stated that the Committee has heard rumors that the list of quality indicators is being used in CBA to declare faculty members as research inactive which could then trigger a post tenure review. He pointed out that he did not know if this is actually occurring. Lee stated that he thinks that some departments across the campus are evaluating faculty based on the quality indicator lists. The Committee discussed the differences between departments in how many journals are listed on the quality indicator list. Flowers pointed out that interdisciplinary research is greatly impacted by the quality indicators list because some professors do not want to get involved in research that cannot be published in the leading journals in their discipline. Peterson noted that the Senate might want to take action on how the quality indicator lists are being used. Flowers wondered how many faculty members are feeling pressure to publish in the listed journals and whether this is influencing what research they are conducting.

Hoffman noted that his department does not have a list of journals. He pointed out that the result is that whenever he is in a College meeting for promotion and tenure the first question is what is the quality or level of journals based on the list of quality indicators. He stated that sometimes he thinks faculty members do not know the quality of certain journals. Lee pointed out that evaluations on publications can be done independently of the lists. Stock stated that the English department accepted all of the journals that were submitted so there is no problem. Lee noted that some departments were instructed to create a small list. Peterson pointed out that some leading journals are not included in department lists even though many professors try to get published in them.

Rapkin asked if anyone is doing anything about the list of quality indicators and how they are used. Lee stated that he does not believe that using the lists to evaluate faculty is done maliciously. He noted that some people seem confused on how to assess the work of people. Peterson pointed out that using the lists to declare people research inactive is not the intent of the quality indicators. Lee stated that it is important to raise the awareness that the list of quality indicators is separate from faculty evaluations.

Peterson questioned who is making the assessments of how well departments are performing. He wondered who is collecting the data and doing something with it. Beck stated that there is a report on the quality indicators on the Academic Affairs website but she is unsure whether it contains information on assessment of departments.

Rapkin asked if the Economics department currently has any open faculty positions that they are trying to fill. He pointed out that Dean Milligan is aware of problems in the Economics department and is working on a plan to deal with it. Rapkin asked if Lee would

receive accurate reporting from the Dean since she was compliant with the violations in the other two searches. Lee noted that most of the anger from faculty members was towards the Chair, not the Dean. Lee stated that he is aware that Dean Milligan supported the Chair of the Economics department.

Rapkin asked if CBA evaluates Deans and Chairs annually. Members of the Committee did not know the answer to this question.

Peterson pointed out that the Chancellor claims that he is hearing things differently than the Senate and that the Chancellor encouraged the Senate to gather information from a broader base of faculty members. Peterson noted that the Senate is working on developing a survey mechanism that will allow them to gather information from a broader range of faculty members.

Scholz asked if there is a reason why the AAUP did not discuss the Economics department issues with Professor Anderson, Chair, Dean Milligan, and Senior Vice Chancellor Couture. Lee stated that the original plan was to send the report just to these individuals but when the report was widely disseminated it made it difficult for the AAUP to discuss the issue with the administrators.

Scholz asked if there is common knowledge from the group of Economics department professors that there will be a follow up. Lee stated that the purpose of the AAUP was to get the department to follow the principles of faculty governance. He stated that the AAUP hoped that the department would be able to straighten out the problems. Scholz asked if the department has tried to do this. Lee stated that he did not know. He noted that the Dean indicated that she was going to work on developing a plan to address the problem this summer.

Shea stated that a key factor is that the majority of the faculty members support the Chair. If they were not happy with how things were running in the department then you would think they would express their concerns with the Chair. Lee stated that the processes and procedures highlighted by the AAUP are designed to protect the minority opinions of faculty members. He stated that he does know that the Dean has talked to other faculty members in the department. He noted that some of the faculty members might support the Chair but want some of the procedures handled differently. He stated that some of the faculty members are concerned with the quality of the department, particularly the graduate program. He noted that they now have very few doctoral students where before they had many.

The Committee discussed the possibility of inviting Dean Milligan to speak with them to

see if anything has been done to improve the situation in the department.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Interview Sessions for Agricultural Research Dean and Director Candidates

Beck announced that the three candidates for Dean and Director of Agricultural Research Division will be held on the following dates: Dr. Ray Noblet, Georgia, September 1-2; Dr. Don Beermann, UNL, September 8-9; Dr. Gary Cunningham, CSREES, DC, September 20-21. She encouraged members of the committee to attend the interview sessions if they are asked because this position is important to the entire campus.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Executive Committee Election

Griffin reported that Professor Alloway, College of Journalism, has agreed to run for the open position on the Executive Committee. The Committee discussed other possible candidates for the ballot.

4.2 Executive Committee Goals

The Committee discussed revisions to the draft version of the Executive Committee goals. Peterson stated that he believes that the issue of domestic partner benefits needs to be included in the statement regarding employee benefits. Griffin pointed out that the Senate has voted at least twice in the past to support domestic partner benefits.

4.3 Regent Hergert

Beck reported that she will be meeting with the other Senate Presidents on Wednesday, August 31st to discuss, among other things, whether they want to make a statement regarding the issue. She noted that the last time she spoke with the Presidents two were not in favor of making a statement but she did not know what their reasons were for this decision. She stated that it would be best if all four campuses supported making a statement.

Shea pointed out that it does not matter if the Senates do not have jurisdiction on the matter because they would be making a statement of concern which the faculty have a right to do. He noted that oftentimes the faculty members do not speak up and in some situations this could hurt the university down the road.

Rapkin asked if there is a pro Hergert constituency. Beck stated that she believes that some people in western Nebraska who voted for him may be supporting him. Hoffman pointed out that many of the citizens in Hergert's district did not know he was breaking the law when they voted for him.

4.4 Motion to Senate on changes in Senate Rules and Bylaws

Item postponed due to lack of time.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Request from Meg Lauerma, Director, Office of University Communications

Beck stated that Lauerma sent her an email asking if the Senate would like to help sponsor a social hour before the free concert series at the Lied Center this fall. The social hour will be held at the Van Brundt Visitors' Center. She noted that the series is a number of free concerts being held in the Lied Center to encourage awareness of the arts. The Committee agreed that this would be a good thing to host.

Beck stated that the communications office is working on a program called the Power of Red. She stated that the office is interested in featuring table tents on the campus featuring information about top faculty members. Moeller asked if this was being done to make faculty members more visible. Stock stated that he liked the idea but would want more information. Moeller stated that if this happens they should equally distribute the table tents between teaching and research and service. Beck stated that she would contact Lauerma to get more information.

5.2 15th Week Policy

Griffin reported that she is receiving phone calls from faculty members who feel that the policy is unclear in parts, particularly with the third paragraph which states the deadline dates for projects, papers, and speeches.

Flowers noted that the blurb that the policy was not to take effect until the spring semester was not included in the mailing that went out to faculty members. He pointed out that the schedule of classes for the fall semester was already in print when the policy was approved by the Senate and therefore could not be included.

The Committee suggested that Griffin revise the third paragraph based on the suggestions made by the faculty members who called. Griffin stated that she would make revisions and send it to the Committee for their comments.

5.3 Academic Dishonesty

Flowers stated that he received a phone call from the Lincoln Journal Star concerning academic dishonesty. He noted that he has tested out the website available through Blackboard that checks for plagiarism. He stated that he was pleased with the results and

urged other faculty members to try it out.

5.4 Committee to Review Faculty Positions

Shea stated that he has been asked to serve on a committee that will be reviewing all academic titles. He noted that a new position, Professor of Practice, is being considered by the committee. Shea stated that he would accept the invitation to serve and would report to the Committee. The Committee agreed to put this issue on the agenda when they next meet with the administrators.

5.5 New Virus Control Program

Hoffman reported that the new virus control program adopted by UNL is not working properly. He stated that the Committee should ask the Computational Services and Facilities Committee to look into this matter.

5.6 Bike Paths

Hoffman reported that the bike paths on 19th street now suddenly dead end at Vine Street. He stated that this needs to be brought to the attention of someone on campus since many students, staff, and faculty members use these bike paths.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, August 31 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Beck, Bolin, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Scholz, Shea, Stock

Absent:

Date: August 31, 2005

Location: 201 Canfield Administration 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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

2.0 Chancellor Perlman/SVCAA Couture

2.1 Revising the General Education Program

SVCAA Couture noted that she has been speaking generally about revising the general education program for the past year and now action is being taken to begin the revision process. She pointed out that Past President Peterson has been part of an extended effort to look at other general education programs across the country and he attended a conference in May on general education. She stated that one of the purposes of this conference was to gather ideas about how to go about a review of general education.

SVCAA Couture stated that the committee that we will engage in a review of general education and have appointed committees and a chair; the committees have been asked to propose revisions in a timely manner. The review process will be one where everyone who has a stake in it is involved and has input into the process. She noted that the overall goal is to have a general education program that functions more successfully than the current one.

SVCAA Couture stated that the Chancellor will be discussing the revision of the general education program in his State of the University address. She stated that a faculty member will chair the effort to revise the program and the Deans are all comfortable with the representation that they have on the committee. She noted that the effort to revise the program will involve all appropriate constituencies including the Academic Senate.

2.2 Committee To Review Academic Titles

Beck noted that the Chancellor had mentioned briefly this past spring that he has been thinking about reviewing the different faculty positions at the University. She stated that Secretary Shea has been invited to serve on a committee that will be reviewing academic titles.

SVCAA Couture stated that the committee is an outgrowth of the situations discussed last year concerning non-tenure track faculty members. She stated that a question the committee needs to address is how the university honors and makes appropriate participants of full-time faculty members who are not tenure track. She pointed out that for a variety of reasons there might be more people in these positions in the future.

SVCAA Couture stated that she spoke with the Deans and others about creating a task force to look at academic titles, particularly Lecturer titles. She noted that positions where sole responsibility is teaching need to be considered. She stated that Associate Vice Chancellor Jacobson, Professor Joy Ritchie, Associate Dean Schmidt, Associate Dean Karels, Professor Kathryn Phillips, Professor Shea, and Associate Dean Shipley will be members of this committee. She stated that the committee will be looking at a number of documents including the Regents Bylaws and other University policies over the Labor Day weekend as well as documents from other Universities, as the first step in addressing this issue.

SVCAA Couture noted that the committee will possibly look at a position title related to what is in other universities is called Professor of Practice. She stated that Duke University currently uses this position title and the committee might, as one of its many tasks, review how will it functions at Duke. She noted that this is a rank created for temporary faculty members that would provide them with the opportunity to move through promotional ranks. She stated that many possible revisions to academic titles will need to be discussed and reviewed.

Beck asked if other titles other than the Lecturer positions will be reviewed. SVCAA Couture stated that they will. She stated that the University wants to do a better job at recognizing people's contributions to the University through their titles.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he might ask the committee to review a position of an active service modified duties faculty member. He noted that this is used at the University of California-Berkeley and is often associated with faculty members who are on maternity leave.

Alexander stated that as a full professor actively engaged in research he is often responsible for hiring assistant and associate research faculty members. He noted that currently people

in these positions receive two days a month for vacation yet he as a full-time faculty member does not receive two days a month for vacation. He pointed out that it seems strange in comparison that full professors do not receive this benefit but assistant or associate research faculty members do.

Chancellor Perlman asked if these positions are 12 month appointments. Peterson noted that he is on a 12 month appointment and gets two vacation days a year and he is a full professor. SVCAA Couture pointed out that there is no expectation for professors on nine month appointments during the summer months.

Hoffman stated that sometimes a person is hired for an assistant or associate research position and later moves up through the ranks and becomes a tenure-track faculty member. He pointed out that these people are able to fill these tenure-track positions without a formal search process. He pointed out that there is a huge gamut of rights that are violated when this occurs. SVCAA Couture stated that this might be an issue that needs to be wrestled with.

Peterson pointed out that another branch of titles that might need to be considered are the extension titles. SVCAA stated that she believes the committee will look at all academic titles.

2.3 Having Permission to Email All Faculty to Conduct Surveys

Beck stated that upon the suggestion of the Chancellor the Executive Committee has been working on developing a mechanism to survey all of the faculty members on particular issues. She noted that the Committee was given a presentation on technology that would allow the Senate to get information from the faculty in a practical way. She pointed out that currently whenever the Senate wants to send an email message out they must get permission from Associate to the Chancellor Howe but there are times when he might not be available to make that decision. She stated that the Committee would like to be able to send out a request for information without having to get permission each time. She pointed out that the Senate has no intention of abusing this privilege.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he wants to invite the Committee to think about developing a policy regarding surveying faculty members. He noted that he gets many requests from faculty members with interesting ideas that would require input from the faculty but the email system needs to be preserved so the number of surveys a faculty member receives does not get out of hand. He stated that he does not want to prohibit the Senate to get information but he urges the Committee to think about a policy for this issue.

Hoffman asked if there is a policy on general email messages. Chancellor Perlman stated

that there is no policy, that it is decided on a case to case basis. He noted that sometimes this can create awkward circumstances.

Beck stated that the Committee will work on creating a policy.

2.4 Update on Search for Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs

Chancellor Perlman stated that the members of the search committee have been approved. He noted that the advertisement is being worked on and should be out soon. He stated that he hopes to have a deadline date of October 1 for submitting applications. He noted that the search committee has been networking people to get access to those who might be interested in the position.

Chancellor Perlman stated that a pool of candidates in student affairs should be one rich in diversity and we should make strong efforts in that regard.

2.5 Enrollment Figures for Fall

Chancellor Perlman stated that Central Administration will soon be making an announcement regarding admissions this year. He noted that things do look positive. He stated that the Office of Admissions felt a lot of pressure to improve the admissions rate and have worked hard this past year to do so.

Rapkin asked if the number of international students has increased. Chancellor Perlman stated that he did not know for sure but he believes these figures are about the same. He stated that he wants to look at efforts to recruit international students. He stated that the institution needs to be strategic in order to recruit more international students.

2.6 Changes to Faculty Development Leave Policy

Beck stated that she has heard that there are to be changes to the faculty development leave policy. The changes would reflect increased scrutiny for traveling elsewhere rather than staying in Lincoln. The leaves which would require travel outside of Lincoln would have greater chances of being approved. SVCAA Couture stated that the administration has no plans to make any changes to the faculty development leave policy and that this is the first she has heard of this rumor. Furthermore there has not been any discussion about what it and is not permissible for a leave. She stated that there could be some individual that may relate to the rumor, but there are no plans for changes in the rules.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he can recall something about not favoring development leaves that did not require travel outside of Lincoln but he noted that this may go back to former SVCAA Edwards.

Beck stated that there seems to be the attitude now that faculty development leaves are not a right. Chancellor Perlman and Peterson both stated that this has always been the case. Peterson stated that the Regents Bylaws address the faculty development leave. He noted that the Bylaws indicate that these leaves must be approved, ultimately by the Board of Regents. He stated that he did not believe that individual campuses have the leeway to make changes to the policy. Chancellor Perlman stated that the campuses have some leeway but there are no plans to change any of the requirements for obtaining a faculty development leave.

Peterson stated the Regents' policies indicate that faculty development fellowships are to be awarded "on a competitive basis, under rules promulgated by the Chancellor, in consultation with the faculty." He noted that he could not find any such rules on the Academic Affairs home page and asked if any rules had been promulgated. SVCAA Couture stated that there are no processes for reviewing applications for leaves in Academic Affairs, other than reviews for conformance with university of system by laws. She stated that the process is that the leaves come from the departments through the Deans to Academic Affairs. She stated that there is not a committee at the Academic Affairs level that reviews the applications. She noted that some universities do have a committee that ranks and selects proposals. She pointed out that the University does require a report on the development leave once it has been completed. Stock noted that the English department has a committee that reviews proposals. Hoffman stated that his department has specific rules regarding faculty development leaves.

Beck asked what the policy is for evaluating faculty members who have been on leave. SVCAA Couture stated that Academic Affairs receives a report after the leave. If a report is not filed, the Office of Academic Affairs will contact the professor to remind him or her that a report must be submitted. She does not think any reports received have indicated that the intent of the leave was not fulfilled.

Beck stated that she was thinking more about annual faculty evaluations and how they are conducted when a person has been on leave. She asked whether this would be done individually by departments. SVCAA Couture stated that it is probably done at the department level because it is not done at the Academic Affairs level.

2.7 Update on Day Care Facility

Chancellor Perlman stated that he will be reporting on the day care facility at his State of the University address.

2.8 Contract with Iowa State University's Vet Program

Beck noted that an announcement was made yesterday about the contract with Iowa State being put on hold. Chancellor Perlman stated that there has been some concern whether everything could be put in place in time. He noted that Iowa State wants to make sure everything is ready before the contract is signed.

2.9 Hurricane Katrina

Chancellor Perlman reported that President Milliken will be making an announcement stating that university students caught in the difficulty of Hurricane Katrina can come to the University at in-state tuition rates. Chancellor Perlman stated that UNL will work diligently to get them into the courses they need so their college careers will not be interrupted.

Moeller stated that most of Tulane University buildings were spared but there is damage to some of them. Chancellor Perlman noted that Tulane has cancelled classes.

2.10 Semester at Sea

Chancellor Perlman stated that the Semester at Sea program is run by a not for profit corporation and it teaches liberal arts courses as the students sail around the world. He noted that the University of Pittsburgh has sponsored the program in the past but will no longer be sponsoring it.

Chancellor Perlman stated that UNL is in competition with a few other schools to sponsor the program. He stated that he believes it will be good for UNL to participate in the program. As the sponsoring institution UNL would approve the credit for courses that are taught and UNL faculty members would be eligible to participate in teaching the courses. He stated that students would be admitted to UNL as visiting students. He noted that an academic dean would need to be found to oversee the program. He stated that the dean would secure the faculty members for teaching and would sail on the boat. He stated that the boat sails three times each year. He noted that this program would make international studies more visible.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he tried to visit the Semester at Sea boat last week but Hurricane Katrina prevented him from reaching the destination where the boat was docked. He stated that representatives from Semester at Sea will be on campus next week for further discussions.

Chancellor Perlman noted that the Semester at Sea program was founded by a group of individuals who have a passion for doing this kind of program.

Fech asked why the University of Pittsburgh no longer wants to sponsor the program.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he believes that the reason has something to do with the change in the management company.

Scholz asked what the financial implications are for UNL. Chancellor Perlman stated that it would be positive for UNL. He noted that there would need to be further discussions about the actual arrangements.

Moeller noted that the program will provide UNL students with more international experience and could benefit international research as well. Chancellor Perlman stated that the program could give faculty and students a leg up on international studies.

2.11 Reality TV Show

Peterson asked if the Chancellor has been watching the Tommy Lee television show. Chancellor Perlman stated that he has. He noted that most of the comments he has received have been positive but one of the faculty members is upset after the August 30th show. He stated that the faculty member feels that the editing of the show was done in such a way as to not accurately reflect what the course is about or how Tommy Lee's book tied into the course. Chancellor Perlman stated that the professor is concerned with how her colleagues will view the program. He noted that the professor is being very responsible about her response.

Fech asked if the Chancellor has heard from any of the colleagues from faculty members that are in the show. Chancellor Perlman stated that he has talked with people from around the country, particularly alumni. He noted that the people he has spoken with feel that the show has been very positive for UNL. He stated that three things have been pointed out to him: 1) that the campus looks extraordinary, 2) that the students are engaged and serious, 3) that the professors are coming across well. SVCAA Couture noted that the students sound intelligent, serious, and engaged.

Peterson pointed out that VH-1 is also running the program and it is shown several times on that station. He noted that this will provide the campus with a lot of publicity.

Chancellor Perlman stated that Dean Cerveny, Admissions, has been tracking inquiries from out of state students who join a mailing list from admissions. Chancellor Perlman reported that there was an increase of 200 students on this list immediately after the airing of the first show.

Moeller stated that she was glad to see that Tommy Lee is the joke of the program, not the students or the university. She pointed out that the students look really good in the program.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Contacted Meg Lauerman, Director, Office of University Communications

Beck stated that she emailed Lauerman to inform her that the Senate is willing to co-sponsor the reception before the free concert series at the Lied Center. Beck stated that she will speak with Lauerman to discuss further the "Power of Big Red" communications program that Lauerman wants to get started on campus.

3.2 Interview with Candidates for Dean of Agricultural Research Division

Beck noted that the interview of the first candidate for this position will be held on September 1st. She encouraged Executive Committee members to attend the interview.

3.3 Phone Call from Regent Hergert

Beck reported that she received a phone call from Regent Hergert. She stated that he expressed a strong interest in the desire to work hard for agriculture. She noted that they spoke briefly about the violations of his campaign and whether the Senate will issue a statement regarding his position on the Board of Regents.

3.4 Meeting on Academic Dishonesty

Beck stated that she met with Dr. Hecker, Director of Student Judicial Affairs, and others to discuss academic dishonesty on campus. She noted that Hecker has gathered a lot of information from other universities on how they address the issue and how they engaged the campus in order to resolve the problem. She stated that she is going to ask the Teaching Council to look at this issue. She noted that suggestions have been made to put a workshop together on how to deal with plagiarism.

Flowers noted that the Lincoln Journal Star should be publishing an article soon about academic dishonesty. He stated that a number of faculty members will be implementing the tool on Blackboard to help detect plagiarism.

4.0 Approval of 8/24/05 Minutes

Peterson moved and Flowers seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Executive Committee Election

Griffin reported that she contacted the Senator identified as a possible candidate for the Executive Committee during the last meeting. Although the Senator was interested she had to decline due to a class conflict with the Committee meeting time. The Executive

Committee noted that there is a candidate to run for the open position.

5.2 Changes to Senate Rules and Bylaws

Griffin distributed the motions to change the Senate Bylaws document and the Senate Rules as approved by the Committee during the summer. She noted that the changes refer to the inclusion of allowing voting by e-mail and slight changes to the distribution of the Senate.

Shea stated that the Senate needs to be brought up to speed with the changes that have been made in departments and colleges on campus.

5.3 Changes to 15th Week Policy

Griffin stated that some faculty members have been calling wanting clarification on paragraph three of the 15th week policy. The Committee agreed that the wording of the third paragraph needed to be restructured to make it a little clearer. Griffin stated that faculty members have also been unclear about what week is considered the 15th week. The Committee agreed to include language indicating that the last week of class is considered the 15th week. The Committee stated that they will present the changes to the Senate at the September meeting.

Peterson stated that he had a question from a faculty member regarding oral presentations for a Monday, Wednesday, Friday class. The faculty member stated that they currently have oral presentations given every class period of the last week of class. Peterson stated that he pointed out to the instructor that he would not be in compliance with the policy if oral presentations were given on Friday of the last week of classes. Peterson noted that it was the intent of the students that all requirements must be completed by Wednesday to allow time for them to prepare for finals.

Alexander stated that he still thinks that assignments replacing a final should be due by Wednesday of the 15th week and not due at any time during finals week. Flowers asked about take home finals. Alexander stated that take home finals are self-paced. He pointed out that assignments replacing finals can still interfere with the students preparing for their final exams. Peterson noted that an instructor could state that the assignment replacing the final could be due by Friday of the 15th week.

Moeller pointed out that students are still being given two days to prepare for finals. She noted this is the intent of the policy. Peterson noted that the original intent of the students was to have two drop days but he stated that this was dropped because of the objections by faculty members.

5.3 Addressing Concerns Raised by Faculty Members of the Economics

Department

Rapkin stated that the Committee needs to address the concerns raised by some of the faculty members of the Economics Department. The Committee agreed to invite Dean Milligan to speak with them to see if she is addressing the issue. Beck stated that she will contact Dean Milligan to try to schedule her to meet with the Executive Committee.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Appointment to Pepsi Event Fund

Beck stated that the Committee needs to appoint someone to serve on this committee. She noted that the committee's responsibility is to review proposals submitted from student organizations to obtain funding for various events. She stated that the committee does not meet often and mostly communicates by email. Moeller volunteered to serve on the committee.

6.2 Committee to Review Academic Titles

Shea wanted to point out that to his understanding he was appointed to this committee as a faculty member of IANR and CASNR selected by the Dean and Vice Chancellor and not as the Senate representative as SVCAA Couture had indicated earlier. He stated that he will still keep the Executive Committee informed of the committee's work. He understands that the Chancellor wants recommendations made by the end of the semester.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, September 7 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Beck, Fech, Flowers, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Shea, Stock,

Absent: Bolin, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, September 7, 2005

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

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

2.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

3.0 Approval of 8/31/05 Minutes

Flowers moved and Alexander seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Senate Meeting Preparations

Beck reported that she received phone calls from two state senators and an email from a faculty member encouraging the Senate to make a statement regarding the election of regents. She stated that an emeriti professor contacted her and told her that he will be presenting a motion to the emeriti professors association in October regarding the situation.

Beck asked the Committee whether the motion to make a statement should be considered an emergency motion. Flowers stated that the packets to the Senators were just received and it was too early for Senators to get feedback from their colleagues on the issue. Moeller noted that she has been approached by a number of people who feel the Senate should make a statement.

Beck stated that she was surprised that the Presidents of the Faculty Senates at UNO, UNK,

and UNMC feel constrained not to sign the statement. Moeller asked Beck if she knew why. Beck stated that some of the Presidents feel that commenting on legal issues is outside the purview of the faculty and that it is up to the legal system to take resolve the matter.

Beck pointed out that the motion will be voted on in October if it is not declared as an emergency motion at the September 14th meeting. Flowers stated that he is unsure whether the motion could be classified as an emergency motion. He pointed out that the state's commission reviewing the case will not act before the October 4th Senate meeting. Hoffman pointed out that it might be a good strategy to wait until October to vote on the motion.

Rapkin asked if Beck has heard of any faculty opposition to the Senate making a statement. Stock stated that there has been no discussion on the issue in the English department yet about it. Beck reported that she has not heard of anything.

4.2 Scheduling Meeting with Dean Milligan

Beck reported that she sent an email message to Dean Milligan inviting her to speak with the Committee concerning the issues raised in the AAUP report. Beck noted that she has not received a reply yet but will report back to the Committee when she does.

4.3 Power of Red Publicity Campaign

Beck displayed the proposed table tent for the Power of Red campaign. She noted that the table tent will include a picture of a faculty member and explain how the research the faculty member is conducting applies to what the faculty member is teaching in class. She stated that currently the plan is to place the table tents in the unions but there is consideration of placing them off campus as well. She pointed out that the idea is to demonstrate how students are connected to faculty and research. Moeller asked if the idea is to show the connection between the research mission and the land grant mission of the University. Beck stated that she believes this is correct. She stated that it is hoped that this campaign will help with public relations and retaining students because they will feel that they are connected to the campus.

Beck stated that the Faculty at 5 receptions before the free concert series at the Lied Center will begin in October. She noted that for \$5 those attending the reception can receive a glass of wine or some other beverage with some snacks. Additional drinks can be purchased. Beck stated that the Communications Office would like to distribute information about the reception at the October Senate meeting.

Griffin asked if the reception will only be open to faculty members. Beck stated that she

did not know but would ask Professor Lauerman.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Develop Policy on Surveying Faculty

Peterson noted that Chancellor Perlman asked the Committee to develop a policy regarding who gets access to surveying the faculty. Peterson pointed out that before a policy can be developed the Committee needs to decide who should be able to get access to the faculty.

Beck stated that guidelines need to be developed regarding this issue.

Peterson pointed out that when the Committee brought the issue up to the Chancellor it was to only get permission for the Senate to send email messages to all faculty members without having to get permission from the Chancellor's office each time. Flowers suggested that the Committee should write up a policy for the Senate's use. Hoffman pointed out that there needs to be a policy that controls the limits of what can and cannot go out. Peterson noted that announcements of seminars and other venues should be not allowed.

Flowers stated that the policy should state that the Senate wants to assess faculty opinion on matters relating to faculty governance. Hoffman asked if the Committee wants to just ask for continual permission for Senate purposes only. Peterson noted that there might be some other times when the Committee wants to use the email list for something other than to gather information. Moeller suggested that the policy could state that the Senate wants to communicate as well as gather input from the faculty.

Shea stated that he thinks it will be important for the Senate to provide some feedback regarding results of the survey to the faculty. Rapkin asked if the Senate wants to share data that is gathered with others in the University such as the administrators. The Committee agreed that this would depend on the kind of survey that was generated. Beck stated that she thinks it will be important to provide some feedback to the respondents so that they will continue to respond to the surveys.

Beck pointed out that the Senate does not want to be a conduit for other faculty members to run surveys.

5.2 Upcoming Meetings with University Personnel

The Committee agreed that they would like to have a meeting with Vice Chancellor Paul to discuss the Conflict of Interest Committee. Peterson stated that he has heard numerous complaints from faculty members regarding how difficult it is to get proposals approved by the IRB and IACUC. He suggested that this matter should also be discussed with Vice Chancellor Paul.

The Committee agreed that they would like to meet with President Milliken again. Griffin stated that she would contact his assistant to see if a meeting can be arranged.

The Committee agreed that they would also like to meet with the officers of ASUN, Dean Cerveny to discuss recruiting efforts, and Linda Crump, Assistant to the Chancellor for Equity, Access & Diversity Programs to discuss hurdles to search committee certification.

5.3 Open Forum Discussion for October Senate Meeting

Peterson asked if there could be an open forum discussion meeting in October regarding the plans to review the General Education program. He suggested that John Janovy, chair of the committee working on revising the program, could come and speak about the plans.

The Committee agreed that this would be a good idea.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, September 14th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Beck, Bolin, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Scholz, Shea, Stock

Absent: Alexander

Date: Wednesday, September 14, 2005

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

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

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Link on Blackboard for General Education Revision Process

Peterson reported that there is a link on Blackboard that will enable faculty and students to make comments regarding the general education program. He noted that the committee working on revising general education requested the link in order to get feedback from a wide variety of people.

Flowers asked if a memo has been sent to the faculty about the link. Peterson stated that this would be a good idea. He noted that not everyone uses Blackboard on a regular basis. Hoffman pointed out that 85% of the faculty members use Blackboard at some time.

3.0 Approval of 9/7/05 Minutes

Flowers moved and Peterson seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Continue Work on Creating a Policy on Surveying Faculty

Beck stated that the Committee needed to continue working on developing a policy on surveying faculty. She noted that the Committee agreed that the Senate should not be a gatekeeper for all surveys wanting to be conducted.

Peterson suggested that the policy include language that states that the President, upon

approval of the Executive Committee, can survey or communicate to the faculty. Flowers stated that if a faculty member outside of the Senate wanted to conduct a survey it should be on an issue that the Senate or the Committee is addressing.

Rapkin pointed out that faculty members will need reassurance that the survey will not evolve into a referendum. Moeller stated that there should not be too many restrictions on how the survey will be used. Shea agreed and stated that the intent of the information will help determine how it is used. He noted that some people interpret polling as a referendum.

Peterson asked if the Committee was going to propose a policy to Chancellor Perlman. He noted that a policy should state that the purpose of the surveys is to gather information from the academic assembly. He noted that the Committee should reassure the Chancellor that surveys will only be conducted with deliberation. Hoffman pointed out that the Senate should have the right to contact the academic assembly since the Senate is the faculty governing board.

Moeller noted that conducting the surveys will provide the faculty with a mechanism that will give them direct input to the Senate and faculty governance will be a more democratic process.

Beck suggested that any surveys not from the Senate should still need approval from the Chancellor's office. Griffin suggested that the Computational Services and Facilities Committee should be charged with developing a policy regarding other kinds of campus surveys. Scholz wondered whether other universities have policies on this issue.

Beck stated that she would charge the Computational Services and Facilities Committee to work on developing a policy.

4.2 Continue Work on Developing a Faculty Survey

The Committee agreed that the first survey that they wanted to conduct would be on the quality indicators list of journals. One of the questions on the survey would ask the question whether the faculty member has been evaluated based on the list of journals. Other questions would include whether the faculty in the department had input into developing the list and whether they are aware if a list exists in their department. Beck suggested that the question should be asked whether there are any sub disciplines within their field and whether any journals from this sub discipline are included on the list.

Peterson asked if the questions would be limited to the journal list or would also pertain to the other quality indicators. Moeller suggested that the questions should be focused on the list because this seems to be where the problems are focused.

The Committee discussed whether any kind of personal information should be gathered. The Committee agreed that the college should be identified, rank, and whether tenured, untenured, tenure track, or non tenure track should be identified.

Scholz asked if there is a written policy regarding the quality indicators and whether it states that they are not to be used in annual faculty evaluations. Beck stated that she believes there is a policy and will check this out.

The Committee agreed that there might be some yes or no questions but others should use a scale. The Committee all agreed that the survey should be short.

Peterson wondered whether extension people may be evaluated differently. Fech stated that they would not be evaluated on the basis of a journal list but they are evaluated in other ways such as the number of research grants obtained and impact of their educational program. Scholz stated that the preamble should indicate that the survey is looking for faculty members who are involved in publishing their research.

Alloway asked what the reasoning is for conducting the survey. Peterson stated that some people have been complaining that their faculty evaluations have been based on whether or not they published in any of the journals on the list. He pointed out that a survey of the faculty would provide information on how widespread this problem is.

The Committee discussed whether respondents should be able to see immediate results of the responses or whether the information should be provided after all responses have been tabulated. Hoffman stated that seeing information on how people responded could have an influence on other respondents. Flowers suggested suppressing the responses until all information is gathered. He stated that the results could be posted on the Senate website.

4.3 Meeting with Dean Milligan

Beck reported that she spoke with Dean Milligan. She stated that Dean Milligan appreciated the invitation to speak with the Committee and is contemplating whether to meet with the Committee. Beck stated that Dean Milligan reported that she is working on a letter that will be sent to the local chapter of the AAUP explaining what steps have been taken on some of the issues raised in the report by the AAUP. Beck noted that Dean Milligan stated that things were moving forward in the department and she did not want to jeopardize any efforts by meeting with the Executive Committee.

Beck reported that she suggested to the Dean that she could bring the current acting chair of the Economics department with her if that would help.

Beck stated that she would keep the Committee informed of Dean Milligan's decision.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Upcoming Board of Regents Meeting

Beck reported that Common Cause and ASUN students are scheduled to make comments regarding Regent Hergert to the Board of Regents at the upcoming meeting. She asked if the Committee was comfortable with her making an announcement that the Academic Senate was presented with a statement at the September 13th meeting and will vote on the statement at the October 4th meeting. She would also state that amendments could be made to the statement. The Committee agreed but cautioned that comments should pertain only to what has been presented to the Senate.

5.2 Nebraska Cooperative Extension Association Letter to Vice Chancellor Owens

Beck reported that Professor Manning, President of the Nebraska Cooperative Extension Association, sent a letter to Vice Chancellor Owens explaining the difficulty in getting new faculty members established on email. The letter pointed out that oftentimes new faculty members cannot get email service for the entire first month that they are employed.

Flowers stated that the bureaucracy of the SAP system creates the difficulty. He noted that this problem has been raised before but nothing seems to have been done to correct the situation.

Fech wondered if the situation is more prevalent for people who do not work on campus. Flowers stated that it happens to all new employees, regardless of their location but it is possible that off campus people have even greater difficulty.

The Committee agreed to raise the issue next week when it meets with the Chancellor.

5.3 Student Absence Policy

Beck reported that she received an email message from a faculty member who received a letter from the chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee urging the faculty member to allow a student athlete to miss 17% of the classes for a particular course. Beck informed the faculty member that the Executive Committee would discuss the issue. The issue will be placed on next week's agenda after the Committee has reviewed the existing policy.

5.4 Review of Senate Meeting

The Committee discussed how to get greater discussion and participation during the Senate

meetings. Changing the room location and arrangement at the East Campus Union were discussed.

Moeller stated that she has heard from some faculty members that they do not receive a copy of the Executive Committee or Senate minutes. She suggested that a list of responsibilities of Senators should be included in the Senate packet.

The Committee discussed the responses at the Senate regarding the statement on Regent Elections. The Committee stated that they were surprised to hear that some Senators felt that the statement was not strong enough. The Committee agreed to work on amendments to the statement.

5.5 Parking on Days of Athletic Events

Rapkin reported that a faculty member was unable to park in the reserved area of the loop parking on the evening of a volleyball game. He noted that the faculty member was going to his office to work and was not allowed into the lot.

Griffin stated that there used to be alternative lots for faculty members who wanted to come to work on event days but she was unsure whether these lots were still available. Flowers pointed out that there have been a number of changes on campus and he is unsure where these lots are now.

The Committee suggested inviting Dan Carpenter, Director of University Parking Services, to come and speak at a meeting.

5.6 Committee to Review Academic Titles

Correspondence from a faculty member forwarded to Fech and then to Beck noted that the members of the Committee to Review Academic Titles do not include any extension educators or specialists. He suggested that an extension educator should be on the committee since these titles will be part of the review. Shea pointed out that the committee will review all titles but some more in depth than others. He stated that in particular the committee will be looking to see if ranks can be established within non tenure track positions. He noted that the new title of Professor of Practice will be reviewed to see if it can cover other titles used in the past.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, September 21st at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Alloway, Beck, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Scholz, Shea, Stock

Absent: Bolin, Rapkin

Date: Wednesday, September 21, 2005

Location: 201 Canfield Administration 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

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

2.0 Chancellor Perlman/SVCAA Couture/VC Owens

2.1 Difficulty of Getting New Faculty Members on Email

Beck reported that this issue was raised to VC Owens in a letter from the President of the Nebraska Cooperative Extension Association. The letter expressed frustration with the delay of getting new faculty members on email. She pointed out that this is not just a problem in IANR.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he is aware of the problem and there is a small committee that is currently working on this issue. He noted that the committee will determine how this problem can be fixed and he has been assured that it will be taken care of before the next hiring season begins.

2.2 Draft Policy for Senate Surveying Faculty Members

Beck stated that the draft policy would allow the Senate to send surveys to the faculty on issues of faculty governance. She noted that the surveys would need the approval of the Academic Senate President and the Executive Committee. Any other surveys from elsewhere in the University would still need to go through Associate to the Chancellor Herb Howe for approval. She reported that she is charging the Computational Services and Facilities Committee to look at developing a policy for the campus.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he felt the policy for the Senate to survey the faculty is fine. He suggested that in one of the first surveys the faculty should be asked about what they

think about getting surveys from people within the university. He noted that he recently turned down the request of a graduate student to survey the faculty. He stated that his first instinct is to turn down requests to conduct surveys because he does not want faculty members to feel overloaded. Beck agreed.

2.3 Tuition Remissions Relative to Budget Issues

Beck noted that the Chancellor raised the issue that some of the tuition remission programs were being reviewed. She asked for an update regarding the remission programs.

Chancellor Perlman reported that he has two groups reviewing remissions policies. One group is looking at undergraduate remissions and the other at graduate remissions. He noted that the report on the undergraduate remissions is due on September 26th. He pointed out that the review will look to see if some things can be done differently with these programs for this next year but more fundamental changes would not take place until next year. He noted that some of the remission programs were originally developed to attract students to new academic programs but this is not needed now. He stated that more fundamental restructuring of the remissions will be looked at another time.

Chancellor Perlman reported that Executive Associate Dean Weissinger, along with some other people, is looking at graduate school remissions and the Senior Administrative Team has had conversations with her about graduate remissions. He noted that some of the possible changes could produce some controversy. He pointed out that one of the things that needs to be considered are those graduate students being paid by grants. He stated that the grants should cover the remission in their tuition as well. He noted that some of the changes could affect the graduate program which raises concerns.

Chancellor Perlman stated that Vice Chancellor Jackson provided him with some figures regarding the budget. He noted that the budget this year was based on the assumption that we would capture \$55 million in tuition revenue. He reported that the figures indicate that we are ahead of the tuition revenue. He noted that undergraduate tuition came in higher than anticipated but graduate tuition was slightly lower than the anticipated amount. Overall there was a total increase of 3% over the assumed amount of tuition. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that when the remission figures were included the campus came out \$45,000 above the netted budget.

Fech asked if the crux of looking at the remissions is to see how much the university is providing in remissions. Chancellor Perlman stated that this is correct. He noted that there are some peculiar things with some of the remission programs. For instance, he stated that when graduate students take summer school they are granted tuition remission. Moeller pointed out that they can receive six credit hours of tuition remission. Chancellor Perlman

noted that very few institutions provide this tuition remission.

Peterson asked what the cost is of these tuition remission programs. Chancellor Perlman stated that he wants to focus on the net gain. He noted that we want to be competitive with other institutions but some things at the margins need to be adjusted. He stated that he is more willing to experiment with some of the programs than others here at the university but he is not confident in fully understanding how the remission programs all work. He noted that this is the reason for the review and the conversations.

Fech asked at what level of scrutiny the tuition remission program for dependents of employees is being looked at. Chancellor Perlman stated that this tuition remission is not being looked at. He pointed out that this tuition program was mandated by the Board of Regents and individual campuses cannot tamper with it. He noted that he does not know of any plans on removing the tuition remission for dependents.

2.4 Revising Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee

Beck pointed out that this is a very difficult committee to get together. She noted that it appears that people who are not actual members on the committee are routinely invited in order to provide information.

Beck stated that another issue is that the current syllabus calls for the President-Elect of the Senate to serve as chair. She pointed out that the President-Elect is new to the committee and does not fully understand its function and responsibilities. She stated that it does not work well to have a new member on the Committee serve as chair. She noted that the Committee would like to propose that the Past President, President, and President-Elect serve on the Committee with the Past President serving as chair. She pointed out that this would give the Past President the experience of being on the Committee for two years before assuming the role of chair. She noted that the President and President Elect could serve as ex-officio members.

Peterson stated that the Committee discussed the changes last spring and the members present agreed with the changes. He noted that one issue that occurred was the uncertainty of whose committee it is, whether it is a Senate committee or an advisory committee to the Chancellor. Griffin reported that in the past there were two separate committees that looked at faculty salaries. She noted that former Chancellor Spanier combined these two committees into one. This was done in consultation with the Academic Senate but the committee is an advisory committee to the Chancellor.

Chancellor Perlman agreed and stated that the committee does serve as an advisory committee to him. He noted that there are two issues of confidence regarding this

committee. As the recipient of their advice he has to have the confidence in the committee and the faculty also needs to have confidence that the committee is giving advice that reflects the views of the faculty. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that he has no objection to getting continuity of issues by allowing the President and Past President to continue serving on the committee but he does not want to upset the balance of the voting members. He noted that ex-officio does not mean that a member does not get a voice in voting. Peterson suggested that the President and President Elect could serve as non-voting members. He noted that his own personal experience led him to encourage the changes because it was difficult to come on to a committee and chair it when you are a new member.

Peterson noted that there are a few other things that need to be cleaned up in the syllabus as well. He pointed out that the Associate to the Chancellor was asked to be included in the meetings but in what capacity is unknown. Chancellor Perlman stated it doesn't make a difference if the Associate to the Chancellor is a non-voting member. The important thing is that the Associate to the Chancellor provides information to the committee.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the committee creates a forum for there to be discussions between administrators and faculty members. He noted that the people on this committee need to be as informed and as engaged as they can be. He pointed out that the administrators on the committee can provide information and past history but it is important to have balance on the committee.

Peterson asked SVCAA Couture and VC Owens if they designate anyone to attend the meeting for them if they are unable to attend. Both indicated that they do not designate anyone.

Peterson pointed out that it is nearly impossible to get the entire committee together to meet face to face. He noted that the work of the committee may need to be done electronically. He noted that there are only about two meetings a year which need to occur face to face. He stated that otherwise business might be able to be conducted by email or on Blackboard.

2.5 Update on Accreditation Process

SVCAA Couture stated that there will be another steering meeting tomorrow. She noted that the process is in good shape and following the traditional pattern of conducting these types of accreditation processes. She stated that all task forces have been formed.

SVCAA Couture stated that the steering committee is working on developing a theme based on who we are and what our mission is. She stated that there will also be discussions on academic themes that cross several UNL units and what kind of information needs to be

gathered in order for cross-disciplinary academic programs to be part of the strategic planning process.

SVCAA Couture reported that there will be a meeting of a subgroup who will work on how the virtual resource room will be set up. She noted that the virtual resource room will be used by the accreditation team to review various data sets. She stated that the room will be used afterwards for people who regularly need to get information about what UNL is doing.

Chancellor Perlman stated that rather than trying to create a new mission statement the campus will use the one crafted by the Board of Regents but with some slight editing changes. Beck asked if the team will look at various things such as process and effectiveness of programs. SVCAA Couture stated that she can distribute a copy of the contract between UNL and the NCA Accreditation Team. She noted that the team will concentrate on the questions in the contract but they are free to ask any questions that they want.

Chancellor Perlman reported that he was involved in a teleconferencing call this morning on the NCAA accreditation. He noted that the NCAA accreditation is moving forward. He pointed out that this is an open process and Athletics is hoping that people across the campus will participate. He stated that he believes that Athletics genuinely wants to know what people are thinking. He reported that the NCAA accreditation will happen about the same time as the NCA accreditation process.

2.6 Update on Searches

Chancellor Perlman stated that there are no further updates on the search for a Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs. He noted that announcements are out and the campus is waiting to receive applications.

Vice Chancellor Owens reported he just completed an interview with a candidate for the chair of Food Science and Technology. He noted that there are five candidates for the position. He stated that three finalists are being interviewed for the Dean of Agricultural Research position.

Vice Chancellor Owens stated that he recently took a brief tour of Hardin Hall which is being renovated to hold the School of Natural Resources. He noted that the renovations are not moving quickly and he is unsure when the building will be ready for use.

2.7 Executive Committee of Big 12 Presidents

Chancellor Perlman reported that the Executive Committee of Big 12 Presidents recently

approved a six month plan for economic development. He noted that two consultants from Austin, Texas will be working with the group to see if they can generate funding. He noted that the Executive Committee is looking for collaborative research activities and a collaborative bank of intellectual property. He stated that this is an effort to make the Big 12 more than an athletic conference.

2.8 Semester at Sea

Chancellor Perlman reported that there will soon be a meeting of the Semester at Sea program. He stated that most, or nearly all, of the chairs have been briefed on the Semester at Sea program. He noted that he explained the possibilities and the opportunities of the program and he suggested that the chairs discuss it with the faculty. He pointed out that decisions on courses to offer will need to be made quickly if UNL is selected to participate in the program.

Hoffman asked what the timetable will be to get things ready. Chancellor Perlman stated that next month a decision will be made. He noted that the first semester at sea with UNL would be fall of 2006 if UNL is selected.

Hoffman asked what kinds of courses are typically taught during the Semester at Sea. Chancellor Perlman stated that it is usually humanities and general education courses although there has been more specific courses taught as well.

Fech asked if the Chancellor will be going on the maiden voyage if UNL participates. Chancellor Perlman stated that he would only consider going for a short period of time, not the full 100 days. He suggested that interested faculty members should look at the Semester at Sea website. He noted that the website tells where they have gone in the past, where they are currently, and where they will be next semester.

2.9 Utilities Budget

Chancellor Perlman reported that the bad news is that the administration is predicting a significant shortfall in the utilities budget this year. He noted that everyone is assuming that the cost of utilities is to go up significantly and for this campus it could create multiple millions of dollars in shortfall. He stated that he will be working with Vice Chancellor Jackson to see what dramatic steps can be taken to reduce the costs. He noted that some of these dramatic steps could include shutting the air conditioning off after 6:00 p.m. in some buildings.

Chancellor Perlman reported that 82% of the buildings on campus will be metered. He stated that if the campus has the ability to control utility uses in some of these buildings it could result in a considerable savings. He pointed out that if 30-35 buildings on campus

could have the air and/or heat shut down in the off hours it could result in a \$1.4 million savings for the campus.

Beck noted that the Animal Science building is freezing in the summer to the point where people use space heaters to adjust the temperatures. She suggested raising the temperature for air conditioning in buildings. Chancellor Perlman stated that another idea is to turn people into monitors where each college is responsible for the utility costs for their buildings. He pointed out that another issue that will need to be confronted is the cost of construction which is also rising.

Chancellor Perlman stated that IANR and Athletics are getting hit hard with the cost of gasoline prices. He stated that Business and Finance will be taking a look at whether it will be more economical for people to take a state car versus using their personal car. He noted that it may be cheaper to take a state car if a trip is over 55 miles.

Peterson reported that when he goes to his office on Sunday morning he finds lights on all over the building yet hardly anyone is there. He suggested that automatic light switches be installed to help solve this problem. Chancellor Perlman stated that they are changing out light switches to automatic switches as quickly as possible. He noted that the campus is working with the Lincoln Electric System to get savings pushed back into energy saving devices on campus.

Fech stated that he has noticed the new signage on campus and stated that they really stand out and make the campus look good. Chancellor Perlman stated that the campus is looking nicer. He reported that banners have been ordered for the street lights on R street like the ones on Holdrege street on east campus.

Hoffman asked how far down the line do the publications need to adhere to the university guidelines. He stated that a student organization he is working with is holding a regional conference and will be publishing a brochure. Chancellor Perlman stated that he would like to see even the student publications done according to standards because it represents the university. He appreciates the fact that some groups cannot afford to bring a designer in to help with the publication but they should at least try to get the N logo in the right place. He noted that for \$25 a designer can help out with the publication.

SVCAA Couture stated that she had two announcements. The first is that the general education program review is getting kicked off. She stated that she hopes the faculty will stay involved and participate in the activity. She noted that there is a website up and running and students and faculty members are participating in a running conversation regarding revising the program. She pointed out that it is interesting to hear the students'

views.

SVCAA Couture stated that there will be two guest speakers coming to campus. The first is Charlie Nutt who is a member of the National Association of Student Advisors. He will be coming on September 30th to discuss best practices in student advising. She pointed out that he will also be available to talk with faculty and staff who are writing grants to obtain funds to improve student advising. She noted that this will be helpful for anyone interested in applying for the Teaching Initiative funds.

SVCAA Couture stated on October 6th Carol Schneider, President of the AACU will come to campus to speak about new and continuing trends in liberal education across the country.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Board of Regents Meeting

Beck stated that the Board of Regents approved the revisions to the Academic Rights & Responsibilities procedures and the Senate Rules and Bylaws.

Beck noted that the main issue was about Regent Hergert and the statements that were made calling for his resignation.

4.0 Approval of 9/14/05 Minutes

Moeller moved and Flowers seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Student Absence Policy

Beck reported that she received an email message from a faculty member who was upset because the chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee wrote a letter urging the faculty member to allow the student to miss classes because of participation in athletic events. The professor noted that the student would miss 17% of the classes.

The Committee reviewed the history of the Student Absence policy. It was noted that the current Student Absence policy approved by the Senate in December 2000 encourages students and instructors to work out an arrangement but no specific cumulative number of days are excused for university sanctioned events. Griffin noted that conversations held at the Senate meetings regarding the policy were about the instructor having the final decision to allow absences. In particular, Senators stated that they highly encouraged students to take a course in the off season because the nature of the coursework would not allow many absences. Stock pointed out that a lot of professors would resent a policy that would

interfere with their courses.

Beck noted that the policy clearly states that the student needs to “request permission for the absence (preferably in writing) from that instructor and to discuss how the absence would affect her/his ability to meet the course requirements.”

Moeller asked if the professor felt that he was being vetoed by the letter received from the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee. Beck stated that this was correct.

Peterson questioned whether instructors are still under the delusion that there is a policy that exists where students can miss a specific number of classes. Moeller stated that she puts it in her syllabus that student attendance is required. Griffin pointed out that the Academic Services Handbook states that it is the student’s responsibility to adhere to the attendance policy set by the instructor.

Alloway stated that he is not sure how well some people in the Athletics department understand this policy. He noted that student video photographers are asked to miss class to photograph athletic events which would require the student missing a number of classes. He suggested that the Committee might want to meet with the Athletic Director.

Beck stated that she will speak with the Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee.

Alexander noted that another problem is with tutors who work with student athletes. He pointed out that oftentimes the tutor teaches the information to the student differently than how he, the instructor, teaches the course. He stated that it is important for the students to come to the class or they will be confused between the way the instructor teaches the class and the way the tutor is helping the student.

5.2 Amendments to Statement on Regent Elections

Beck reported that she received an amendment to the statement from Professor Bender. The Committee felt that the amended statement was good. Beck noted that additional amendments could come from the floor.

Moeller suggested that Beck have an ad hoc committee of about three senators look at the amended statement to get feedback on it. The Committee agreed to do this and discuss it at next week’s meeting.

5.3 List of Responsibilities of Senators

Beck stated that Senators should be encouraged to discuss the energy issues in their departments. Hoffman and Flowers stated that computers should be shut down at night if

they are not needed as servers. Hoffman noted that a huge amount of spam communications comes out of the university in the middle of the night because computers are left on.

Flowers suggested using the word expectations instead of responsibilities.

Beck suggested that Senators should ask the departmental staff to automatically include a report of the Senate meeting on department meeting agendas.

Hoffman suggested taking language from the Bylaws that specifically discusses the duties of a senator.

5.4 Draft of Survey on Quality Indicators

Flowers stated that the most important principle of the survey, wanting to know if the faculty member “has been subjected to an individual performance evaluation in which publication or failure to publish in journals/titles on a designated list was used as a criterion.” He stated that he believes the main question needs to be addressed first.

The Committee discussed the questions on the draft survey.

Alexander stated that he believes that it would be a difficult survey for some people to answer because their departments have no journal list. Shea asked how departments who conduct research were allowed not to have a list of journals. He pointed out that in IANR they were told that they had to develop a list. Alexander stated that his department and others in the College of Engineering and Technology do not have a list of journals.

Scholz asked if it is possible to separate doing faculty evaluations from the quality indicators list of journals. He asked if there shouldn't be references to the list. Beck pointed out that the indicators list is meant to be a measure of how the department is doing, not the individual. Moeller pointed out that the real issue is whether the quality indicators are being used as an evaluation tool which would be a misuse of the list. Hoffman pointed out that the master list of journals in the quality indicators evaluates the departments but people within the department could publish in other journals because of the specific kind of research that they do. Beck pointed out that it infringes on academic freedom if people are being told where they must publish and that there is documented abuse of this in certain departments.

The Committee agreed to continue working on the survey.

5.5 Draft Email Message to Faculty Members on Senate Conducting Surveys

Agenda item postponed due to lack of time. The item will be discussed at the next meeting.

6.0 New Business

No new business was discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, September 28th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Alloway, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Scholz, Shea, Stock

Absent: Beck, Bolin

Date: Wednesday, September 28, 2005

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Moeller called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

3.0 Approval of 9/21/05 Minutes

Flowers moved and Stock seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Statement on Regent Hergert

Moeller reported that Professor Bender, College of Journalism and Mass Communications, sent an amendment revising the motion on the Regents' elections. Flowers noted that the amendment is much stronger than the resolution before the Senate because it states Regent Hergert's name and suggests that he resign if he is found guilty. The Committee briefly discussed the amendment.

Stock moved that the Executive Committee accept the amendment and use it to replace the motion that is currently before the Senate. Flowers seconded the motion. Motion approved.

4.2 Draft Email Message to Faculty Members about Senate Surveys

The Committee discussed the draft email message that will be sent to all faculty members explaining the Senate's plan to survey faculty members on various issues of faculty governance.

4.3 Draft Preamble to Survey

Alloway noted that the advance email message about the surveys should indicate when the survey will be distributed. He pointed out that with all of the spam mail that the university receives faculty members could easily over look the survey. Flowers suggested including language that states that the email message sent on the survey will contain a link that will direct the faculty member directly to the survey. Hoffman noted that it is important that the email message should go out under the Academic Senate name.

The Committee worked on revising the language of the preamble to the survey on quality indicators.

Alexander asked if visiting professors will receive the survey as well. Peterson stated that they will probably get the survey, especially if they have been here for several years, but he did not believe there are enough visiting professors to affect the outcome of the survey.

Alexander asked if the survey would be sent to all faculty members or whether it will be separated by rank. Peterson stated that the survey will be sent to the entire academic assembly although for some the survey may not apply. He noted that the survey will be written to address this situation.

Rapkin asked if the purpose of the survey is to try to unearth if there is a significant problem with the misuse of the quality indicators. Shea stated that the survey would try to determine if there is fairness and consistent use of the quality indicators. He noted that it has come to the attention of the Committee that there may be some inconsistencies with how the quality indicators are being used.

4.4 Expectations of Senators

The Committee continued revising a list of expectations of Senators. Moeller suggested including information about substitutes at Senate meetings. She pointed out that a Senator could ask someone to attend the meeting for them if they were unable to attend. Griffin noted that substitutes can attend and speak at the meeting but no proxy vote is allowed. Shea suggested including information about Senators identifying themselves and their departments when they get up to speak at a Senate meeting.

The Committee discussed having a social reception before the Senate meeting begins.

4.5 Discussion with Professor Crawford, Chair of Intercollegiate Athletics Committee

Moeller reported that Beck spoke with Professor Crawford regarding the letter that was sent

to an instructor concerning a student athletes' need to miss a number of classes due to athletic events. Beck indicated that Professor Crawford was very clear that it is the student's responsibility to speak to the instructor and that the instructor does not have to concur with the decision to allow absences. Professor Crawford explained that the letter was meant only to be a notification and to provide credibility that the absences would be for a legitimate purpose. Professor Crawford informed Beck that the IAC is currently discussing the issue. Beck suggested that the Executive Committee have the opportunity to review the letter that is used to notify professors to possibly suggest revisions if needed. Beck reported that after her conversation with Professor Crawford she had no concerns with the IAC's perspective on the issue.

Peterson stated that the real problem is when the athletic games are scheduled. He wondered whether it would be helpful to have a discussion with the IAC about scheduling of events. Griffin pointed out that scheduling athletic events is probably done in connection with organizations outside of the university and to change these schedules would be difficult. Moeller pointed out that the Athletics department is currently going through accreditation and it might be possible to suggest that schedules be rearranged so as not to interfere with students' academic responsibilities. She noted that students should try to schedule their required courses during the off season. Alloway stated that he has learned from some student athletes that they feel that they are under scrutiny 12 months of the year because they are expected to participate in various activities and must maintain physical conditioning.

Hoffman suggested that the student athletes should be required to submit a contract that has been signed by the instructor to the Athletics department. He pointed out that currently the Athletics department might think that a professor approves of the absences when in actuality the professor does not. He noted that some professors might sign off not realizing exactly what they are signing off on. He suggested that the IAC be charged to review what kinds of forms are currently being used and whether they are sufficient. If not, the IAC should develop a form that would be required for student athletes to miss specific classes.

Peterson stated that he has not heard anything lately about the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics.

4.6 Update on Committee Reviewing Academic Titles

Shea reported that the committee met today. He noted that he has not asked about having an extension educator on the committee. He stated that he is the only person representing IANR and he wondered whether it was assumed that he would represent the extension educators as well.

Shea reported that the committee is especially focusing on the senior lecturer positions.

He noted that the committee is considering the creation of a Professor of Practice title with ranks analogous to tenure-track faculty. Hoffman pointed out that the Regents Bylaws state that senior lecturers can only be hired for a specific period of time.

5.0 New Business

5.1 General Education Revision Plans

Peterson reported that a formal plan is being put together. He stated that copies of the plan will be available at the Senate meeting on October 4th. He noted that Professor Janovy, chair of the committee working on revising the general education program, will be presenting the plan to the Senate.

Hoffman noted that the discussion on Blackboard about revising the general education program has consisted mostly of students. He stated that very few faculty members have participated in the discussion. Flowers suggested that there may need to be a separate Blackboard discussion for faculty members.

5.2 Trends in Reclassifying Positions

Stock stated that a colleague had complained to him about the tendency to change the title of positions that had been called “assistant (or associate) to the Dean” to “Assistant (Associate) Dean.” Such people are often under qualified and appointed without a search. There is also blurring of important distinctions and a cheapening of the title “Dean.”

Hoffman stated that there is a big difference in the organizational structure between an Assistant to the Dean versus an Assistant or Associate Dean. He noted that an Assistant to the Dean is usually not a faculty line but an Assistant or Associate Dean is. Stock agreed and stated that the lines seem to be getting blurred with some administrative positions.

Shea stated that he believes these reclassifications are happening more frequently at the university. Moeller noted that there can be a significant difference in the responsibilities as well as the salary between the two positions. She pointed out that changing someone from an Assistant to the Dean to an Assistant Dean is a change from a support position to an academic position.

Hoffman stated that usually a search process is conducted when an Assistant or Associate Dean is being hired.

5.3 Campus Master Plan

Alexander asked if there was more information on the campus master plans, particularly about areas designated for building. Hoffman stated that the master plan is more of a site

plan than an actual building plan. It just identifies land that can be used for building. Alloway pointed out that during the Senate presentation it was noted that land that could be used for new construction was merely identified. The Institutional Research and Planning Office does not have the jurisdiction to decide what actual buildings would go in these locations.

5.3 Eliminating Students from Class

Hoffman stated that many universities permit instructors to automatically remove a student from the class if the student has not attended class for a period of approximately five weeks. He suggested that something like this should be allowed here. The Committee noted that this issue could be raised with SVCAA Couture when it meets with her.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, October 5th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Beck, Bolin, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Moeller, Rapkin, Shea, Stock

Absent: Alloway, Peterson, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, October 5, 2005

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Interview for Director of Employee Assistance Program

Beck reported that she participated in interviews of the four candidates for the position of Director of Employee Assistance Program. She noted that it was a strong pool of candidates. She reported that the current Director is taking another position within the University.

Beck reported that she raised the question of the possibility of the office serving in some partial ombudsman capacity for the campus.

3.0 ASUN – Omaid Zabih, Lyndsey Redding, Meghan Lyons

Zabih stated that one of the issues that ASUN would like to discuss is having a syllabus policy which would require all faculty members to distribute a syllabus for a course. He noted that not having a syllabus can cause problems for students, particularly if a student tries to appeal a grade or has issues regarding coursework. Lyons stated that the ASUN looked at the UNL Bylaws and the Academic Services Handbook but was not able to find any existing policy.

Beck stated that she is unsure if there is a policy requiring a syllabus but she stated that the Senate Office would check it out. She noted that if there is not a policy the issue will be discussed by the Executive Committee.

Zabih stated that another item the ASUN is considering is on-line teaching evaluations. He

asked if anyone has used them. He noted that the teaching evaluations could be placed on Blackboard.

Hoffman reported that the College of Engineering and Technology has been using them but the results are not good. He stated that one professor reported as having received only 3 out of 20. He personally received only 1 out of 9. Stock wondered whether there was a way to require the students to fill out an on-line evaluation. Lyons stated that in a computer science class the students received numerous email reminders about filling out the evaluation on-line.

Moeller stated that teaching evaluations are an important venue for providing feedback to the instruction. She noted that the evaluations are often used as a compelling piece of evidence for annual performance evaluations. She pointed out that doing evaluations in class typically results in 100% feedback. She also noted that on-line evaluations may not be anonymous.

Beck reported that there will be a workshop about on-line teaching evaluations. She noted that the workshop will be strictly informational and will deal with how on-line evaluations can be done and how they can be made better.

Moeller stated that on-line evaluations could probably be put into a database which would allow an instructor to do an analysis of the results. An analysis could be done by department, college or even campus-wide. Beck noted that the evaluations would need to be mandatory if the analysis was to be accurate. Lyons suggested that one way of making the evaluations mandatory would be to not release the final grade until the evaluation is completed. However, the issue of anonymity is raised in doing it this way.

Zabih stated that he did not know whether on-line evaluations is an issue that students are greatly concerned with. He pointed out that students will probably need some kind of motivation in order to do the on-line evaluations. Stock stated that there should not be some kind of punitive action taken to ensure students complete on-line evaluations.

Zabih stated that the ASUN is pleased with the process of developing the campus master plan. He stated that he believes the concerns of the students were heard and incorporated into the plan. He noted that the child care center is part of the plan.

Lyons reported that she is on the committee to revise the general education program. She noted that the students have been unhappy with the ES/IS program for a long time. She stated that the committee membership is diverse and all colleges are represented on it. She noted that there are some good discussions occurring on Blackboard about revising the

program and the committee hopes to publicize the plans to the students.

Lyons noted that some students are concerned that some of the courses required in the ES/IS program do not apply to them. She stated that many students feel they are here to take courses that will get them a job. She noted that some students see the ES/IS program as more of a liberal arts education. She stated that the biggest issue on Blackboard is the purpose of the program. Students don't seem to understand what the purpose is.

Shea noted that this is a primary problem even among faculty. He stated that some faculty members believe that they are here to impart technical information to create experts in various fields. Others believe they are here for the overall educational purpose. He stated that he does not think UNL should be considered a technical school. He pointed out that students have a major and may obtain technical skills that will prepare them for a certain profession but the academic purpose of their education is much broader. Rapkin noted that both types of instructors are needed. He stated that for students it is different because they have to fulfill requirements at various levels of the academic career.

Shea stated that the faculty members need to reach an agreement about the purpose of the university. He believes all faculty members should be willing to accept the broader view of education.

Moeller stated that a question that could be asked is what constitutes an educated person. Does an educated person possess habits of mind that makes them successful at life? She stated that 70% of parents feel that their children go to college to get job training.

Shea stated that there needs to be a discussion about what education is. Some define it as learning skills but for others it is more. He noted that some people don't come to college to become educated but come here to learn skills in order to be able to compete for a job.

Stock noted that the goals of the general education revision committee are good and that there is a thorough list of goals. He pointed out that no one can really argue against the goals.

Hoffman noted that when he went to Iowa State undergraduates were required to take an exam at the end of their final year. He stated that students only graduated if they passed the exam. He noted that the exam was based on an English exam and the student had to be able to write in order to pass.

Zabih stated that efforts are underway to try to raise money to build a new cultural center. He stated that he believes students are going to have to take the initiative in order for the

center to be built. He noted that no donors have come forward to provide money for the center. He stated that the center would be built just east of the student union.

Moeller stated that the diversity issue is huge. She noted that the five largest K-12 schools in the state have a student population where the majority of the students are from a minority culture.

Shea suggested that the building of the center could be approached as a connection to enrollment. He noted that the demographics of the state are changing and minority cultures are rapidly growing. He pointed out that if the University wants to increase enrollment with students from Nebraska it would be good to have a new cultural center.

Moeller asked what a new cultural center will do for the overall campus. Zabih stated that it will make the center more visible. He noted that currently the center is located on the edge of campus and the building is not large enough. Moeller asked if the mission of the center is to provide a gathering place for minorities. Zabih stated that this is correct but it also would provide space for administrative services related to minorities. Moeller noted that a new center would help in recruiting and retaining students as well.

Zabih stated that the students will vote in the spring whether or not to approve an increase in student fees that would help to build the new center. Fech suggested that the ASUN should articulate the specific advantages of why the University would be better with a new cultural center.

Hoffman pointed out that construction costs are going up considerably and the cost of building will be more than what is currently being projected. Zabih stated that ASUN is hoping that some donors will help provide funds to cover some of the cost. Hoffman asked why people would want to give money to UNL instead of UNO since Omaha has a larger minority population. Rapkin suggested that the ASUN might want to ask former student athletes who are now professional athletes to help support the center.

Alexander stated that raising funds can be approached from a recruiting aspect as well. He noted that many companies are only going to universities with a large minority population. He stated that in order to get big companies to recruit here UNL needs a diverse population. He pointed out that diversity is good for everyone at the University. He noted that Kansas State is doing a very good job of recruiting Hispanic students.

Zabih reported that ASUN is working on two projects that are going well. Redding stated that the Big Event program deals with student relations with the surrounding neighborhoods. She stated that she is co-chairing a group that is working with community

agencies which will team students up with organizations like Community Impact. She reported that the program will begin in April. She noted that UNL is one of the last of the Big 12 schools to pick up the program. She pointed out that at other schools approximately 12,000 students participate. She noted that this is entirely a student community project. Lyons stated that ASUN is looking for faculty and staff members to help out with the program. She noted that ASUN is hoping that student organizations on campus will help out as well. Redding pointed out that participating in the program will allow faculty members to interact with students on a social level rather than just on an academic level. Fech asked what kind of service activities will be provided. Redding stated that all kinds of service activities will be done but students will not be allowed to use power tools. She noted that Texas A & M was able to get 10,000 gallons of paint donated.

4.0 Approval of 9/28/05 Minutes

Moeller moved and Rapkin seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Demonstration of Quality Indicators Survey

Flowers and Griffin demonstrated the survey on Zoomerang. The Committee reviewed and suggested some changes to the survey but overall was very pleased with it. Griffin stated that she will make the corrections to the survey and then send them out to the Committee for them to test it out.

5.2 Domestic Partner Benefits

Beck reported that she met with Professor DiBernard and Emeritus Professor Wolf to discuss what work has been done in the past regarding domestic partner benefits. She stated that they discussed various strategies for trying to get domestic partner benefits. She stated that Professor Wolf will be speaking with President Milliken to see where he stands on the issue.

Beck reported that the Montana Supreme Court recently ruled that the Montana University system must provide gay/lesbian employees with the option of getting health care benefits. She reported that she received this information from two sources (Wolf, Bradford) and that Bradford indicated in his email that he did not know what the impact here would be but she noted that the ruling does set a precedent in the country.

Hoffman asked about heterosexual domestic partners. He noted that many people live together but are not married. Beck stated that they are in the same situation as gay couples.

Moeller asked about family members. She pointed out that there are many people who have a family member living with them. She asked if they would qualify for receiving benefits. Griffin noted that Universities which provide domestic partner benefits often have a set of criteria that people must meet in order to be provided with the benefits.

Moeller asked how many University employees would be affected by the domestic partner benefits. Beck did not know. Hoffman stated that some universities allow domestic partners to participate in the health care coverage but they must pay the full price to belong to the plan.

Fech asked how many employees participated in the health care plan. Alexander stated that he believed Greg Clayton, Director of Benefits & Risk Management, reported about 5,000. Beck read from a report that in September 2001, 10,000 employees were covered.

5.3 General Education

The Committee discussed some of the problems with the general education program and the outcomes that should come out of a good general education program. Alexander pointed out that one of the criticisms of companies and corporations is that students graduating from the universities cannot write well. He stated that all students need to learn how to write better. He noted that English courses need to give more repetitive assignments where the paper has to be written over numerous times until it is written properly. Rapkin pointed out that this can be very labor intensive for the instructor, particularly those with large classes. Alexander pointed out that the University is producing an educated set of people but they don't know how to write. Shea noted that there is a lot of pressure on faculty time and it takes a lot of time to do more repetitive assignments which he feels are necessary.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Review of Senate Meeting

Beck reported that she received one phone call from a woman in western Nebraska who was upset with the Senate's approval of the resolution calling for Regent Hergert's resignation. Shea pointed out that he was glad to see that it was the Senate body that pushed for a stronger statement. He suggested in the future the Executive Committee might want to put an issue out there and then let the Senate decide how it wants to handle it.

The Committee agreed that a letter should be sent to President Milliken and the Board of Regents simply stating that a resolution has been passed and includes a copy of the resolution.

6.2 Special Fees Committee

Beck stated that a committee that reviews special fees needs to convene in December. She noted that three faculty members are needed to serve on this committee that typically just meets once. She asked that the Committee forward names of faculty members who would be interested in serving on this committee.

6.3 Faculty at 5 Reception

Beck noted that flyers about the Faculty at 5 reception were presented as a handout at the Senate meeting. Moeller stated that she sent an email message to the faculty in her department about the reception. She noted that she forwarded the email message to Griffin and if people are interested in using the email as a template they are welcomed to do so.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, September 14th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Beck, Bolin, Flowers, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Scholz, Shea, Stock

Absent: Alexander, Fech, Hoffman

Date: Wednesday, October 12, 2005

Location: 201 Canfield Administration 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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

2.0 SVCAA Couture

2.1 On-line Teaching Evaluations

Beck reported that she relayed the message to the Committee that there will be a workshop about on-line teaching evaluations. SVCAA Couture explained that the computer science and engineering department received funding from Academic Affairs to develop on-line teaching evaluations. She stated that the Music department has been working on using on-line evaluations and has recently tested them.

SVCAA Couture stated that her office approves funding for technology related projects on a case by case basis. She stated that she would like to have a more regular process of reviewing grant requests like the on-line evaluation project. She noted that funding for these kinds of projects should have a use beyond one department or unit.

SVCAA Couture stated that the on-line teaching evaluation project has been in place for about a year. She stated that she asked the people working on the project to give a demonstration workshop to faculty, students, and staff. She noted that many of the students today are computer savvy and could easily do on-line teaching evaluations. She pointed out that there could be some potential savings in conducting on-line evaluations. She stated that feedback from the campus is needed regarding this kind of evaluation. She pointed out that the campus is not being asked to adopt the on-line evaluation method at this time, but she feels that it is a project that should be explored for further development. She noted that in order for the on-line evaluations to develop further there needs to be input from other

groups.

Beck noted that the officers of ASUN raised the subject when they met with the Committee last week. She stated that there was a long discussion about the on-line evaluations including the pros and cons of them.

Beck asked when the workshops will be held. SVCAA Couture stated that she does not know if dates have been scheduled yet but she will check on this. She stated that Associate Vice Chancellor Roeber will be coordinating the demonstration and will send out notices to the campus about when the workshops will be held. She stated that she believes the Deans have been notified and that they should be informing the chairs of the workshops.

Flowers asked if the workshops will be held soon. SVCAA Couture stated that they will be held this semester. She stated that departments currently working on projects to develop on-line evaluations will continue to move forward but they should combine forces rather than work on them individually.

2.2 Quality Indicators

Beck noted that there have been previous discussions with the senior administrative team regarding quality indicators. SVCAA Couture stated that an updated report on the quality indicators will be coming out within a few weeks. She stated that she, along with Chancellor Perlman and Vice Chancellor Owens, have reviewed the final data collected for 2005. She stated that there will be an introductory message when the quality indicators are sent out. She noted that some indicators showed progress while some others remained steady.

SVCAA Couture stated that the questions about this report now are: what use we are making of the quality indicators and how do they apply to the strategic planning? She stated that she wants to put a committee together of Deans and faculty members to look at the current quality indicators to determine which data is useful to collect. She noted that some of the quality indicators are useful because they allow ways to measure the campus' efforts to reach specific goals. She pointed out that the committee would also look to see if there are some quality indicators which are not effective in measuring progress towards the goals the campus is trying to reach. She stated that a review of the quality indicators will be conducted this year.

SVCAA Couture stated that the title "quality indicators" suggests that there are goals and benchmarks with a set of actions that the campus is willing to implement in order to reach these goals. She pointed out reports such as the 20/20 report and the Everyone a Learner, Everyone a Teacher report could be used as guides to link the campus activities with the

quality indicators; this is also true of our strategic plans. She noted that the Deans will be asked more specifically what indicators they would like to use to measure their own strategic priorities and goals.

SVCAA Couture stated that another issue discussed with the Deans at a recent retreat is whether the university should provide department or college data profiles. She noted that these profiles would give statistical information about each department/unit. She pointed out that statistical information is collected at the institutional level but it is not reported annually at the department or college level. She stated that the units and departments do not automatically get reports which give descriptive information like how many faculty members are in a department, how many of them are part-time faculty or how many major and minors are credited to the department.

SVCAA Couture pointed out that some departments collect this kind of information individually but they need to be aware that when administrative decisions are being made they are not being made based on this individual information. She stated that she believes it is important that departments and faculty see the profile data that are being used when decisions are made. She stated that it will take discussions and some time in order to develop a common set of college or department data profiles, but she believes this is important to do. She pointed out that data profiles are not necessarily quality indicators, but rather descriptions of characteristics of each college and department. She noted that this kind of information could be useful university wide. She stated that annual status reports are common at many institutions and that they would have value here.

Beck stated that this makes good sense. She pointed out that members of the Executive Committee have heard a wide range comments regarding how the quality indicators are being used. She noted that some departments did not even generate a list of journals while other departments are using the quality indicators to conduct annual evaluations of faculty members. She pointed out that the quality indicators were mandated by the Board of Regents. Beck asked how the quality indicators mesh with what the SVCAA just stated.

SVCAA Couture noted that there may need to be two or three different kinds of reports produced annually that would be helpful to the institution. She pointed out that the Board of Regents is now looking at the strategic framework proposed by President Milliken. She stated that she did not know if the Board will change their approach to asking NU campuses for quality indicators based on the strategic framework but whatever they decide, the campuses will comply with what the Board mandates.

SVCAA Couture stated that she has asked Dr. Nunez, Director of Institutional Research and Planning, to work with others to help develop a score card concept for use across the

campus. She noted “scorecards” are used to show progress toward a goal. If a goal is set, such as increasing graduate enrollment, and then a number of action steps would be developed along with indicators for success that would show how the campus is going to accomplish this goal. She stated that in time, the indicators could be reviewed to see if they show that we have accomplished the goals we set. She noted that the concept of a score card could be helpful to departments/units. She pointed out that the departments and units would develop their own targets and activities to reach their goals. She noted that the quality indicators might relate to “scorecards,” but they do not now exist along with a set of action steps or goals.

Shea stated that an important part of all of this is that all colleges and units need to have a common understanding of what the purpose is for this information. He pointed out that the lists of journals included as quality indicators are a major concern for many faculty members. He noted that some units may not use the quality indicators in the way they were intended, especially when conducting annual faculty evaluations. He stated that what the SVCAA is suggesting is very different than what he understands is included in the current quality indicators.

SVCAA Couture noted that the list of journals acceptable for faculty publication used by some departments to measure the quality of faculty accomplishments does cause some faculty concern. She stated that the question needs to be asked within departments whether using such lists as an indicator of quality is valuable.

Flowers stated that there is concern that the list being used at local levels is a tool that is not being used properly. He noted that the list could be restricting faculty members from conducting research in areas that may not be represented on the list. SVCAA Couture stated that there needs to be discussions within the departments where faculty members decide on the quality measures they want to see as the basis for annual evaluations. She pointed out that she is not familiar with the quality indicators in every department, but she does not think that indicators, such as publication in certain journals, are inappropriate. She stated that they are valuable but it is important for departments to decide what goals they are trying to meet.

Peterson stated that there are some things in the quality indicators that he does not like such as the number of Fulbright Scholarships. He pointed out that this quality indicator is often used as a comparison to other institutions but those institutions are usually much larger than UNL and have a larger student population.

SVCAA Couture stated that this leads to another discussion. She asked what the overall campus goals are. She noted that how the campus is viewed by external agencies and ranks

against other universities is a factor that was taken into account in choosing the quality indicators. She stated that there has been discussion about the quality indicators that are on the AAU list of quality measures, and how our indicators compare with those collected by other Big 12 institutions. She pointed out that there are some indicators that are useful in doing these comparisons.

2.3 Revisions to General Education Program

SVCAA Couture noted that Professor Janovy is doing a great job coordinating this effort. She noted that the committee working on revising the program has created a general list of goals and they are working on developing a communications plan. She stated that the committee wants to keep the campus informed about the process and Professor Janovy will be speaking with various campus groups about it.

SVCAA Couture stated that some people have wondered whether this is a serious effort to revise the general education program. She stated that it most definitely is. She noted that the current program needs to be reviewed and reformed. She reported that some of the features of the revised program may be similar to what is currently in place but energy needs to be reinvested into the program. She stated that the issue is one of revitalization of the general education program. She pointed out that it is important that the campus be up to date with the changes that are occurring across the nation in general education programs.

Peterson noted that Professor Janovy spoke at the Senate meeting about the plan to revise the general education program but no discussion occurred. Peterson stated that he is concerned with the two year time plan. He pointed out that the subject needs to be kept in the forefront with the faculty. Stock noted that revitalization of the program is the key word that the faculty members need to hear. SVCAA Couture stated that it needs to be on the front burner as the program we invest in. She stated that the general education program does not have the appearance of being on the front burner of the campus now. She pointed out that there needs to be some readjustment and revision of our program and that we need faculty involvement to do it. She stated that the hallmark of a university providing great education is having a great general education program. She noted that it is important to understand the outcomes of the program that are expected of our students.

Shea pointed out that it will be critical for the faculty to feel they are invested in the program if they are to become involved in it. SVCAA Couture stated that as Professor Janovy presents the revisions to draft plans and proposed changes in the current program, it is hoped that discussion will be generated. Beck noted that people were originally invested in the current plan when it was first developed but it has been some time and things have changed to cause erosion of the program. SVCAA stated that in order for the program to

continue there must be a structure in place that insures that it is still running and functioning after the initial planning is done. She pointed out that the program needs to be maintained and that a committee might be needed to keep reviewing the program to assure that it is meeting our goals.

2.4 Other Issues

SVCAA Couture stated that the Chancellor has reported that the plan to reduce the cost of power by changing times when heat and air conditioning will be provided to buildings has been promoted. She reported that Ted Wiedner of Facilities Management has looked at the list of requested exceptions to the new power plan and it will be made public shortly. She stated that some buildings will be excluded from the plan because of sensitive equipment or animals. She reported that the target is to save \$1.7 million by adjusting the temperature in buildings. She noted that the major expense is in moving the air in the buildings rather than in heating and air conditioning them.

3.0 Announcement

3.1 Martin Luther King Breakfast

Beck reported that the Martin Luther King Breakfast will be held on Friday, January 13th, 2006, at the Embassy Suites. She noted that in the past the Senate has purchased enough tickets to fill a table. The Committee agreed that the Senate should sponsor the event. Beck stated that those interested in attending the breakfast should let Griffin know so she can reserve seating.

3.2 Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee

Peterson reported that the FCAC met on October 11th. He stated that it was a very good meeting and information was presented that was very informative. He noted that he will be sending the Executive Committee a copy of the minutes from the meeting.

4.0 Approval of 10/5/05 Minutes

Flowers moved and Peterson seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Test Survey on Quality Indicators

The Committee reviewed the results of the test survey that was sent to them. Griffin noted that there are a few things that need to get worked out with the Senate Office getting access to the faculty email list but once that is resolved the survey will be sent out.

5.2 Reduction in Force Procedures

Beck reported that a task force was originally created by former Senate President Wunder to review and possibly revise the existing procedures to deal with budget cuts. She noted that the task force was suspended during the budget cuts but was reinstated a year ago by Past President Peterson. She noted that the faculty members on the present committee are the same but the student members have changed.

Beck stated that the task force looked at the 1986 Academic Planning Committee document to deal with budget reductions and the revisions made to the document by a committee created by former Chancellor Spanier in 1993. She noted that the original charge to the task force was to review the two documents to see if the differences in the document could be resolved and to try and figure out where the faculty gave away their power in the decision making process.

Beck stated that the task force started out by reviewing the documents and discussing philosophically about what the procedures to deal with budget reductions should be. She noted that the task force reviewed the documents created at the University of Maryland during their recent budget cuts. She stated that the University of Maryland document was a remarkable process and they were able to make large budget cuts without firing any tenured faculty members.

Beck reported that the task force decided that it would be easier to create a new document rather than trying to revise the current document. She stated that the task force wanted to increase faculty participation in the process and make it more transparent. She noted that the task force hoped to develop a procedure that could be used for either budget reductions or budget enhancements.

Beck reported that Past President Wunder has been shown the proposal. He recommended several changes although they were not substantive. She stated that she might ask Wunder to be at the Senate meeting when it is presented.

Beck stated that the Executive Committee needs to thoroughly discuss the proposal. She noted that the ASUN Executive Committee also needs to discuss and approve the document. She stated that the Academic Planning Committee will review it as well and that the Chancellor's input will be needed.

Beck pointed out that Vice Chancellor Owens has stated that no administration can withstand a united faculty voice. Flowers noted that everyone knows that the budget cuts were a miserable time. He stated that if the suggested procedures were followed it would have looked much better.

The Committee agreed to discuss the issue further at its next meeting.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Search Committees

Shea reported that he was informed that the search committee for the Dean of the Agricultural Research Division had no opportunity to provide a group or joint recommendation on the candidates. They were only allowed individual input, the same as any other faculty member. He stated that the committee just processed and facilitated the application process but was not allowed to provide a group evaluation. Shea said he was told by a committee member that because the committee was a search advisory committee it did not automatically have the privilege to make a recommendation and essentially had no real authority in the selection process. He asked why faculty members would want to bother serving on a search committee when the committee is not allowed to make any kind of final recommendation after the interviews. Shea wondered whether most if not all UNL search committees were “advisory” committees, which he believes is not right.

The Committee agreed that this issue needs to be discussed with the administrators.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, October 19th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Beck, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Scholz, Shea, Stock

Absent: Alexander, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman

Date: Wednesday, October 19, 2005

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Meeting with Senate Presidents

Beck reported that she will be meeting with the Senate Presidents from UNK, UNO, and UNMC this evening in York. She stated that one of the items to be discussed will be strategies for obtaining domestic partner benefits.

Beck reported that the Presidents of the Senates will be meeting with President Milliken on October 27th.

2.2 Agenda for November 2nd Executive Committee Meeting

Beck stated that one of the items she wants to discuss with the administrators is why the Academic Planning Committee was not able to vote on the Programs of Excellence proposals. She noted that the APC was just given a presentation on the proposals but did not get to review the proposals as they have done in the past.

Peterson stated that there needs to be broader discussion concerning the Programs of Excellence proposals. He noted that people are making decisions on proposals in areas in which they do not have expertise.

2.3 Faculty at 5 on Friday

Beck reminded the Committee that the first Faculty at 5 reception will be held on Friday, October 21st in the Steinhardt Room of the Lied Center. She encouraged people to attend.

3.0 Approval of 10/12/05 Minutes

Peterson moved and Rapkin seconded approval of the minutes as amended, pending editing changes by SVCAA Couture. Motion approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Reduction in Force Procedures

The Committee continued working on the draft of the RIF procedures. They discussed the best way to present the draft to the Senate.

4.2 Request to Make a Statement Regarding Restricting Higher Education in Iran

Beck reported that she received a request from a faculty member to have the Senate make a statement regarding the Iranian government restricting members of the Bahai faith from attending institutions of higher education. She stated that the faculty member believes that the Iranian government might change its policy if it receives negative publicity from Western countries.

Griffin noted that this issue came before the Executive Committee a number of years ago. She stated that at that time the Committee decided not to make a statement because it felt that the purview of the Senate was to deal with faculty governance at UNL. Also, the Committee felt that it should not make a statement regarding a particular religion.

Alloway asked who the statement would be sent to. He noted that simply making a statement would not be effective if it is not sent to the appropriate parties.

Peterson suggested that a broader statement should be made regarding restrictions of academic freedom. Beck wondered whether there was a particular group or organization that is collecting statements on this issue. She noted that individual institutions would not be as effective as a list of institutions. Rapkin stated that the principle of making a statement is right but he did not think it would be effective.

Alloway stated that he did not think it was out of the purview of the Senate to represent all scholars. Stock agreed that the statement should be broadened. He pointed out that there are many religious groups throughout the world that are persecuted in some way.

Beck stated that she would check with the faculty member to see if he has information about where a statement could be sent if the Senate agrees.

4.3 Update on Senate Access to Faculty Email

Griffin reported that an email message from the Senate will need to be sent to Information

Services to be processed. She stated that she did not think that the message would be censored in any way and that going through Information Services is simply to assist in the mechanics of getting the email sent to all faculty members.

Shea stated that the Committee needs to be sure that any email messages from the Senate will be sent out to all faculty members including administrators at the same time.

Griffin stated that the email message on the first Senate survey should go out sometime next week.

4.4 Update on Parking during Athletic Events

Rapkin asked if there has been any information regarding this issue that he raised several weeks ago. Griffin stated that there are some parking lots available on campus where faculty members can park during athletic events.

Moeller reported that she is coordinating a conference on campus and she was informed that people attending the conference would have to pay \$3 a day to park on campus. She noted that this will amount to \$6 per person which will be a significant amount for her grant to cover.

The Committee agreed to invite Dan Carpenter, Director of Parking and Transit Services, to a meeting to discuss these issues further.

4.5 Letters Regarding Student Athlete Absences

Alloway stated that he received a letter from the Athletics department which referred to the student being allowed to miss 15 days from class. He noted that the Athletics department seems to believe that there is a policy that allows a student to miss up to 15 days of class. The Committee agreed to invite Professor Crawford, Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, to meet with the Committee to discuss the issue.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Evaluation Procedures for Administrators

Beck reported that she has been asked by faculty members how the Chancellor gathers information to evaluate administrators. She noted that she went to the Academic Affairs webpage and looked at the policy "Review and Reappointment of Administrative Officers" (<http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/pdfs/adminreview.pdf>) which was updated July 21, 2001. She pointed out that the policy states that an annual evaluation is supposed to be held for all administrative positions. She reported that in each case a faculty member is to coordinate the reviews.

Moeller stated that she believed that Associate Vice Chancellor Jacobson conducts the reviews for college deans.

Beck stated that she has never seen a general call for evaluations of a Vice Chancellor. She stated that all she has seen is an evaluation form from the IANR Vice Chancellor's office asking for feedback on chairs of departments/units. She noted that the form goes to a staff member in the Vice Chancellor's office. This person then synthesizes the information and it is given to the Vice Chancellor. Beck stated that any comments listed in the report are anonymous. She pointed out that the forms must be signed. She noted that there are some faculty members who are afraid to sign for fear of retaliation. She stated that there should be faculty input on upper administrators as well.

Moeller stated that she has never received forms to evaluate an upper administrator. Peterson stated that he knows about five year evaluations but was not aware that administrators are to be reviewed each year. Beck stated that the five year review is included in the policy.

Stock noted that in the College of Arts and Sciences they used to receive evaluation forms. He pointed out that faculty members should have the option of filling out a form. He stated that sometimes faculty members do not feel they have the grounds to make an evaluation of an administrator because they do not have much contact with that person.

Moeller asked if students are required to sign teaching evaluations. The Committee stated that they do not.

Peterson asked if the policy only applied to those administrators who are under Academic Affairs. Beck stated that it is a UNL policy so it applies to both Academic Affairs and IANR.

The Committee agreed to discuss this issue with the Senior Administrative Team when they meet with them on November 2nd.

5.2 Budget Reduction Scenarios in Colleges

Beck asked the members of the Committee how their departments have been asked to deal with the budget reductions.

Moeller stated that in her college they recently received a note from the Dean. A position is being eliminated in the college to help deal with the budget reduction and the allocations committee will be taking a look at the college budget. Beck asked how much the departments were asked to give up. Moeller stated that she did not know the exact amount

but it was stated in the memo.

Scholz stated that in the College of Architecture they were told to give up 2% this year and 1.66% for next year. He noted that this year's 2% had to be cash funds.

Beck reminded the Committee that Chancellor Perlman stated during a meeting with them this summer that he would be asking for a 2% reduction and they would be across the board even though he generally opposes across the board cuts.

Alloway stated that he has heard of the possibility of freezing some positions. He noted that he has heard the 2% figure used in his college.

Peterson stated that in IANR they were told to do three scenarios: 2%, 4%, and 8%. He stated that the administration in IANR has claimed that they want to have some flexibility with the budget. He pointed out that there is concern that the administration may want to cut more in some departments than in other departments. He stated that he remembers the Chancellor stating that the cuts were supposed to be across the boards this time and departments would have to argue to get funding back when the budget shortage was over.

Shea stated that by requiring departments to lay out different scenarios it allows the administrators to see how they can cut differentially in departments. He questioned why IANR administration is asking for 4% and 8% cuts when the call was for a 2% cut. He noted that by asking departments for different scenarios the administration could selectively cut programs and say the decisions were faculty driven.

The Committee agreed to discuss this with the administrators on November 2nd.

5.3 Constituency Concern

Rapkin stated that the department unit review committee in Political Science reviews research and teaching programs that deal with interactions with human subjects. He reported that recently the committee approved three proposals that went to the Institutional Review Board. He stated that the investigators of the proposals have had a difficult time with the IRB due to interminable delays and nitpicking of the proposals. He questioned whether these problems are widespread.

Peterson stated that the Committee has heard consistent complaints about the IRB. He noted that UCARE students often have difficulty getting approval for a project they are working on during a semester. He pointed out that the same complaints, length of delays and the nitpicking has been widespread.

Moeller stated that getting IRB approval here is difficult. She noted that UNL goes well beyond the federal regulations which is not always a bad thing but when it creates delays for weeks and months at a time it is a real problem. She pointed out that she has resorted to making direct phone calls in order to get the procedure moving.

The Committee agreed to invite Vice Chancellor Paul to a meeting to discuss the issue.

5.4 Problems with Telecommunications Office

Alloway stated that his college is having problems with the Telecommunications Office. He stated that there have been many delays in getting things done and there seems to be a lack of communication with Alltel. As a result it has cost the college additional money in some cases. He noted that it is difficult to speak to anyone there who is a full-time employee and who knows what is going on.

The Committee stated that this is an issue that should be addressed to Vice Chancellor Jackson.

5.5 Child Care

Moeller stated that she is being asked a lot of questions regarding child care since the announcement of the child care facility. She noted that one of the questions being asked is whether all employees for the child care service must have a bachelor's degree. She stated that there is concern that the current University child care workers will not be hired. Moeller stated that there needs to be an informational session regarding the child care. The Committee agreed to discuss this with the Chancellor.

5.6 Course Syllabus Policy

Beck reported that ASUN is pushing the Committee to develop a course syllabus policy. She noted that no University or campus course syllabus policy could be found. She stated that there might be a policy within colleges but it is unknown whether each college has such a policy.

Shea stated that he believed this was a reasonable question to raise. He stated that having a uniform policy would be helpful. He noted that it would be helpful to instructors if they knew what specific information should be included on the syllabus. He suggested asking the Senate about this issue.

Peterson suggested that a task force be set up to do the research on whether colleges have a policy and to develop a model course syllabus.

Scholz stated that the Committee might want to ask SVCAA Couture about this issue.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, October 26th 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Alloway, Beck, Bolin, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Scholz, Shea, Stock

Absent:

Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2005

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Chronicle of Higher Education Article on Tuition

Peterson noted that an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education on tuition rates for universities indicates that the University of Nebraska has a higher in-state tuition rate than neighboring states. He pointed out that this is based on a 15 credit hour semester.

2.2 Board of Regents Special Session

Shea reported that he attended a Board of Regents special session on land being purchased by UNO. He stated that the decision was passed unanimously without much discussion.

Fech asked where the property is located. Shea stated that it is adjacent to UNO and believes it will be used for building dormitories for housing. He understood that only the agreement to purchase the land has been approved at this point and further approval will be needed to construct the buildings.

Shea stated that, based on Chancellor Belck's comments, any housing available at UNO is taken very quickly. Moeller pointed out that many international students attend UNO.

Shea stated that there was some discussion about whether UNO was competing with UNL and UNK for students by being able to provide housing. He noted that while he was in attendance the issue was only discussed and nothing came out of it regarding this concern.

Alloway stated that regular meetings of the Board of Regents are broadcasted on KRNU on

90.3 FM.

3.0 Approval of 8/31/05 Minutes

Moeller moved and Peterson seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Reduction in Force Procedures

The Committee continued working on revising the draft document of the reduction in force procedures.

Beck suggested that the Committee meet with Professor Rosson who served on the ad hoc committee that created the draft. She stated that she will notify the Committee when he can meet with them.

4.2 Update on Syllabus Policy

Beck reported that in the Board of Regents Bylaws, Chapter 4.1, section F there is language that states that professors must “inform students concerning the requirements, standards, objectives, and evaluation procedures at the beginning of each course.” She pointed out that the Bylaw is not specific in how this information is to be given. Alloway noted that Associate Vice Chancellor Wilson, Academic Affairs, stated that there is nothing in the Board of Regents Bylaws that uses the word syllabus.

Rapkin noted that a syllabus denotes some kind of document. He stated that the ASUN wants a more rigorous policy that would include some kind of document. Stock questioned whether the students want to expand the Bylaw policy to stipulate that the information must be provided in written form.

Moeller asked if departments require a course syllabus. The Committee stated that this can vary greatly.

Hoffman noted that some courses are arranged in such a way that it would be difficult to list the specifics of the course in a syllabus. Stock stated that a policy should not require that the syllabus be too specific.

Rapkin noted many syllabi go beyond just listing the requirements, standards, and objectives of the course. They also list policies on attendance and academic dishonesty. Hoffman pointed out that the academic dishonesty and attendance policies are already

stated in the student handbook and the undergraduate bulletin. Rapkin stated that the student handbook is not explicit about what would happen if a student misses a certain number of classes.

Alexander pointed out that having a syllabus is actually self protection for the instructor. He noted that it lays out the requirements and standards for the course. He stated that a student cannot argue that he/she did not know what the requirements or the standards of the course are if there is a syllabus. Peterson stated that it helps with expectations with the class as well.

Beck stated that the issue will be raised at the Senate meeting.

4.3 Policy on Evaluation of Administrators

Beck noted that in looking at the existing policy it states that the Academic Senate Executive Committee is to provide feedback on the five year evaluations of administrators, particularly on the performance of the administrator. Griffin stated that this has occurred in the past.

Beck stated that there is no formal process for conducting annual evaluations of administrators. She noted that procedures for this are not uniform. She suggested that the issue should be discussed with the senior administrative team next week.

Moeller asked why this is being brought up. Beck stated that she has been approached by faculty members in IANR about the issue.

Alexander wondered how many people respond to these evaluations. He pointed out that the faculty does not receive any summarized feedback concerning the evaluations. He noted that evaluations are required to be signed but many faculty members do not want to sign their names. He stated that if a case should go to the court the court can mandate that the evaluation and the writer of the evaluation be revealed. He stated that he will not fill out another review if he has to sign it. Alloway reported that his college was informed by General Counsel Wood to just confirm if a student has worked for them but provide no further information because there is a risk of getting sued if the report is negative and the student doesn't get a job they are applying for.

Beck noted that student teaching evaluations do not require a signature so why should faculty be required to sign an evaluation. Rapkin stated that evaluations can become a tool for administrators because they can see who sent in and signed an evaluation. Hoffman noted that although he receives an evaluation form on the Dean each year he does not fill it out anymore because of the requirement of a signature.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Upcoming Executive Committee Meetings

Griffin reported that on November 9th, Professor Crawford, Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, will be meeting with the Committee to discuss student athletes' absences from classes.

On November 16th, Dan Carpenter, Director of Parking and Transit Services, will be meeting with the Committee to discuss parking issues on campus, particularly parking during athletic events.

On December 14th, Vice Chancellor Paul will be meeting with the Committee to discuss issues relating to research, particularly problems with the Institutional Review Board.

5.2 North Central Accreditation Steering Committee

Beck distributed notes from the Steering Committee's meeting on October 21st. She noted that the Steering Committee is asking for suggestions of people who could speak for the institution in "sidebars" in the self-study. Beck pointed out that the people recommended for this aspect of the NCA Accreditation should have a great deal of knowledge about higher education and have broad interests. She asked that suggestions be made to her by next week.

5.3 New Requirements for UNL Websites

Shea stated that he has heard concerns about the new requirements for UNL websites. He noted that the templates that must be used are very rigid and are not useful for some websites. He stated that he has heard that the costs for having Information Services assist with creating a new website can exceed \$1000. Fech noted that a lot of service is provided for the \$1000 fee.

Shea stated that he has heard that the fee applies to IANR but not for city campus. He noted that this is an issue that needs to be discussed. He pointed out that if the University is requiring these templates be used then the University should pay for them. Shea will try to get more information about this matter.

The Committee agreed to discuss the issue with the senior administrative team.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, November 2nd at 3:00 p.m. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield

Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Beck, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Scholz, Shea, Stock

Absent: Alexander, Bolin

Date: Wednesday, November 2, 2005

Location: 201 Canfield Administration 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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

2.0 Chancellor Perlman, VC Owens

Beck noted that once again no administrator was available to speak to the Senate at the monthly meeting. She stated that she realized that conflicts arise with the meetings but pointed out it would be helpful if one of the administrators could speak to the full Senate at each meeting. Chancellor Perlman apologized for not being at the Senate meeting on November 1st and stated that he really does want to speak to the Senate. He stated that he felt it was important for him to attend the opening of the new Kimmell Orchard/University of Nebraska Education and Research Center.

Peterson suggested that if no other administrator is available to speak to the Senate that perhaps Associate to the Chancellor Howe could speak. Peterson pointed out that Howe is well informed. Chancellor Perlman stated that this was a good idea but he would try to insure that there is an administrator available for the Senate meetings.

2.1 Budget Cuts in Colleges

Beck noted that during the July 6th Executive Committee meeting the Chancellor had stated that he would prefer not having to do across the board cuts but he wanted to avoid the ordeal of the last budget cuts. She pointed out that the Chancellor had indicated an approximately 2% budget reduction for departments/units.

Beck stated that some colleges are being asked to develop scenarios of 2, 4, and 8% budget cuts. She stated that the 8% budget cut is causing real concerns and a cut of this proportion

would result in faculty members being fired. She reported that one question that is being asked is why permanent budget reductions are being used to address a temporary situation which is a result of the tuition shortfall.

Beck asked why the University can't go to the Legislature and explain that we have a temporary budget problem and ask for the Legislature's assistance, especially since the University was hard hit with the previous cuts.

Chancellor Perlman stated that it was not his intention of insisting to the Vice Chancellors or Deans that across the board cuts had to be done. He stated that he expected the Vice Chancellors and Deans to handle the budget cuts as best as they saw fit. He noted that it does not surprise him that some units are looking at making vertical reductions because they feel this is a better strategy rather than doing across the board cuts.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he expects the Deans and Chairs to make the recommendations that they think are the best in order to manage their budgets. However, there are some lines he will not cross given the situation that we are in. He pointed out that he expects the cuts will be based on the least damage they will cause to their departments and colleges.

Beck stated that the 8% scenario is causing a lot of morale issues and people are upset. She noted that a group of IANR senators is considering writing a letter to department heads suggesting that they may want to rethink the strategy of the budget cuts, particularly the 8% scenario until more definitive information is available. She pointed out that an 8% cut is severe.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he hopes people would have a moderate understanding that developing a scenario is an exercise and not necessarily a recommendation. He pointed out that it is always a balancing act to try to assess the need to address morale issues but at the same time deal with the financial reality of the situation. He noted that nothing he stated earlier prevents administrators for asking for more than a 2% cut.

Chancellor Perlman pointed out that he does not feel the budget shortfall makes a compelling case to ask for additional funds from the State Legislature. He noted that the University received its best budget in the past 15 years. He stated that the University will be going to the Legislature with a budget deficit, mostly because of the cost of utilities which could be up to \$6 million. He noted that he would be content if this could be covered.

Fech asked about UNL being liable for the problems at Mead, particularly the water

contamination issue. Chancellor Perlman stated that there are two issues with Mead. One is contamination from us and the other is contamination from the Medical Center. He pointed out that the University is not liable for things that the army did earlier. He stated that the University is being asked to remediate the situation and the cost could be anywhere from \$2 million on up to \$10 million.

Shea asked VC Owens to comment on the request for departments/units to develop an 8% budget cut scenario. VC Owens stated that this request is to see what the system can handle in terms of budget cuts. He noted that some units will have minimal cuts while others will have greater cuts. He stated the budget cuts in IANR will not be across the board. He noted that developing these scenarios is very frustrating for all concerned and he recognizes it is an aggravating exercise.

Shea pointed out that faculty can understand the 2 or 4% budget cut scenarios but jumping to an 8% scenario is particularly upsetting. He stated that putting 8% on the table, particularly when it is unknown what will actually be required cut is very serious. He pointed out that when a unit creates the budget cut scenario it identifies what it feels is expendable. He stated that it says what the faculty is willing to sacrifice. VC Owens stated that he does not interpret the scenarios as what the department is willing to give up. He pointed out some units will not have any cuts while others might have an 8% cut.

Beck stated that the faculty will not be informed of what comprises the 8% cut. She stated that this will create a lot of finger pointing and suspicion about what is going on. VC Owens stated that he does not think only the chairs/heads will develop the scenarios. He believes that serious discussions with all of the faculty members in a department will occur.

Fech stated that in his unit an 8% cut would result in the loss of six people. VC Owens stated that IANR could be looking at a \$1.3 million cut.

2.2 Review and Reappointment of Administrative Officers Policy

Beck reported that she has received inquiries from faculty members about this policy and whether it is being used, particularly for evaluating Vice Chancellors and the Deans. She stated that she was able to get a copy of the document from the Academic Affairs website. She noted that the policy applies to department chairs on up and it is fairly uniformly written.

Chancellor Perlman asked what the issues are about the review policy. Beck stated that things are handled very differently in colleges in how faculty members are invited to evaluate Deans but rarely are they invited to evaluate Vice Chancellors. She noted that in IANR forms are distributed to the faculty members and the form does indicate that an

evaluation of the Vice Chancellor can be made.

Beck stated that another issue concerning the evaluations is that faculty members are required to sign them. She pointed out that there is no requirement for students to sign teaching evaluations. She stated that there are some faculty members who do not feel comfortable in signing an evaluation form for fear there could be some kind of retaliation if negative comments are made. She stated that she hears quite often that people do not want to sign the evaluation forms.

Peterson pointed out that Professor Alexander stated that if a case should go to court the court can mandate that the evaluation and the author of the evaluation be revealed. Peterson noted that Professor Alexander has stated that consequently he refuses to fill out evaluations that he must sign.

Beck suggested that instead of signing the form the envelope could be signed and then discarded once the evaluation is received in the appropriate office. This way the evaluation would remain anonymous.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he does not have much passion on either side of the debate. He noted that he agrees with those who feel that anonymous evaluations lack credibility. He stated that unless he receives a number of evaluations expressing the same dissatisfaction, he would not pay much attention to an anonymous evaluation. He noted that on one hand you lose credibility but on the other hand you lose confidence in the process.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he has had a committee of Deans looking at the annual review of Deans. He noted that he has asked them to focus on this question but he does not know what the responses were. He stated that SVCAA Couture would know better. He pointed out that he appreciates that the Deans should not be the only ones to evaluate other Deans and the same goes with the Vice Chancellors.

Moeller stated that the purpose of evaluations should be looked at. She noted they can be extremely helpful whether or not they are signed. She pointed out that people would probably be more honest if they did not have to sign the evaluation. She stated that evaluations should be used as a tool for making improvements. She stated that she believes more input would be made if the evaluations did not have to be signed.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he would be happy to think about the issue again.

Rapkin stated that it is not clear to him why administrators would not want to have as much

information as possible. He asked why an unsigned evaluation is not credible. Chancellor Perlman stated that a particularly critical review might be important if it is from a successful faculty member. He stated that if the review is from someone who was just denied tenure that evaluation might not be as objective. He noted that he would probably weigh the successful faculty member's evaluation higher.

Beck noted that comments made on evaluations are usually summarized by someone else so the administrator does not see the actual evaluation. VC Owens stated that in IANR the evaluations are tabulated by Linda Arnold in his office. He noted that he has never looked at the signatures on the evaluations. Beck pointed out that signing an envelope could satisfy the need for validation.

Peterson stated that in his department the promotion and tenure committee reviews the evaluations made on the chair. He stated that this committee receives a list of comments made in the evaluations and these comments are tabulated by the Vice Chancellor's office. He pointed out that the problem is that it is unknown whether the comments listed are attributed to one person or to a number of people. He stated that there needs to be further information to see if the comments are widespread or from just one individual.

Peterson noted that the policy states that a faculty member is to be appointed from the unit to coordinate the review of the incumbent administrator. He questioned whether this actually happens.

Hoffman reported that the department promotion and tenure committee has never evaluated the chair. He stated that the evaluation goes to someone in the Dean's office. Flowers stated that in Arts and Sciences they receive forms from the Dean's office to evaluate the department chairs. Stock stated that in the English department the chairs are evaluated twice. He noted that the Dean's office sends out forms and reviews the evaluations and a committee within the department reviews the evaluations.

Beck suggested that the Committee should discuss the issue with SVCAA Couture.

2.3 Programs of Excellence

Beck reported that she received an email message from a member of the Academic Planning Committee who stated that the APC did not review the proposals for the Programs of Excellence this year. She stated that a presentation was made about the proposals but the APC never reviewed the proposals. She pointed out that APC is supposed to review these kinds of proposals.

Chancellor Perlman stated that it was his impression that the APC reviewed the proposals

but some temporary decisions were made because of a deadline date being imposed by Varner Hall. He noted that there is dispute between the campus and Varner Hall in how these programs are managed. He stated that initially Central Administration allocated the funds to the campuses and then the campuses invited proposals. He pointed out that APC was directly involved in reviewing the proposals. He reported that now Central Administration wants to know about the proposals that are approved before the funding is provided. He stated that he does not want to waste faculty time in competing for funds if it is not known how much funding there is. He noted that a presentation may have been made with the theory that the proposals would be fully reviewed later. He stated that it was his assumption that the APC was directly involved in the process. Chancellor Perlman stated that he is trying to move into a system that would call for proposals in March and they would be ready for approval in July when the funding would be known.

Peterson noted that some proposals were funded for one year and others for longer. Chancellor Perlman stated that there have been a number of questions regarding the management of the Programs of Excellence. He noted that the Chancellors will be making a presentation to the Board of Regents at its next meeting about how the programs are managed. He pointed out that how UNL handles the programs is different from the other campuses because UNL is a research campus. He noted that the campus can achieve recognition through departments collaborating on research and programs.

Chancellor Perlman pointed out that the campus has gone through centers of excellence but this has not been a successful approach. He noted that some of the Programs of Excellence have received a three to five year commitment because this is the way to build excellence. He pointed out that classroom renovations have received Programs of Excellence funding because teaching is a critical part of the University's mission.

2.4 Course Syllabus Policy

Beck reported that ASUN is asking for a course syllabus policy to be developed. She pointed out that she did not know if this is a major issue because it is assumed that most instructors distribute a syllabus. She noted that the Regents Bylaws address the issue but vaguely. She stated that the Teaching Council is going to work with the students to see how large an issue this is and what can be done about it. She noted that it may be simply that the Deans need to state that a syllabus is required.

Beck stated that there are other issues regarding a course syllabus policy. She noted that there may be elements such as policies on academic dishonesty or attendance that need to be included on every syllabus.

Beck stated that this is an issue that the Committee will discuss with SVCAA Couture.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he will be interested to see how this issue is resolved.

2.5 Child Care Concerns

Beck reported that she has heard concerns about an outside company managing the child care facility. She stated that people feel that the current staff is being bypassed and questions have been asked about why these people cannot be hired for the child care facility.

Moeller noted that there are rumors that everyone employed by the outside firm will have to have a bachelor's degree. She stated that people who have children enrolled in the current University child care program are very pleased with the personnel and want to keep these people because their children feel comfortable with them.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the concerns are understandable and he realizes there are transition issues for children who are currently enrolled. He noted that he has heard from a number of people that the current director and staff are very good. He stated that VC Jackson and Associate VC Currin are working on resolving these issues. He stated that VC Jackson and Associate VC Currin recently met with the parents of the children who are enrolled in the current program to discuss their concerns.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he still believes we should outsource the child care to someone who knows how to run a child care program. He noted that there are people on campus, such as those running the Child Development Lab, who have intimate knowledge with child care but these people are not interested in running the University Child Care program. He pointed out that the current director may be good but there needs to be some supervision of this person. He stated that he thinks that ultimately we will have better service if it is outsourced with a company that is in the field.

Hoffman asked why the current staff can't get involved with the program. Chancellor Perlman stated that while we have a competent director there is really no mechanism in place that would supervise the program and how well it is working.

Moeller stated that another concern is how many spots will be available for faculty, staff, and students who want to use the program. Chancellor Perlman stated that there are a number of issues that will need to be dealt with. He noted that many of these are expected but getting all of the issues resolved will not be easy.

2.6 Requirements for UNL Websites

Beck stated that the mandate that the NebGuides must now be printed off at county extension offices or by individual citizens will cause problems. She pointed out that the

publications will not be printed in the UNL power of red color because many of these people do not have color printers. VC Owens stated that the mandate will help remove the 1972 NebGuides that still exist. He stated that he believes there should be a color printer in each county office. Beck stated that extension faculty members are upset about the mandate.

Fech reported that the mandate is causing a lot of consternation in units. He noted that the faculty members applaud getting away from the old publications but he pointed out that 90% of the horticultural teaching pieces that are used by the county offices are going to vanish come January. He pointed out that this will cause a lot of problems for the Extension Educators. He noted that nearly half of the Douglas/Sarpy budget that goes to the extension offices has been cut so these offices will not have the funding to produce the materials needed to serve 6,000 people. He stated that some of the extension offices just have one secretary and one extension member and they will not have information to hand out come January. He stated that he does not want to have to refer people to the web all of the time because he wants to recruit for UNL and focus on UNL. Hoffman agreed and relayed an experience he had of trying to get information from one University extension website, and was referred to another institution.

VC Owens stated that the University is a national leader in e-extension. He stated that the old publications need to be removed because they are outdated. Fech stated that he hopes that they can come up with something that meets the logistical needs of the everyday extension person but is a nice looking publication.

Chancellor Perlman stated that there have been concerns from some units about being forced to utilize templates for websites. He noted that the University is adopting systems that are cutting edge for web design and management and he believes we should not move away from this effort.

Chancellor Perlman pointed out that there is a major initiative with respect to websites. He noted that a wide variety of people look at our websites. He stated that the content and organization of our websites has been driven by technology instead of the other way around but efforts are under way to correct this. He pointed out that people ought to get answers quickly resolved when they go to the UNL home page. He noted that currently moving through the website is not that easy.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the people working on changing the UNL homepage want to get input from focus groups. He noted that the Admissions website was tested with prospective students and it helped to develop a site that is user friendly.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he understands that some of the technology for the new templates has caused some concerns but he believes some of the concerns are a lack of training.

Hoffman reported that he has received complaints from a number of faculty members who feel that they are receiving too many email messages from the administrators and that these messages are extremely long. Moeller noted that there is a delete button that these people can use.

2.7 Issues on the Horizon

Chancellor Perlman stated that UNL is still in the running for getting the Semester at Sea program. He noted that four other schools are in contention for the program. He stated that he believes the decision on who will get the program will be made sometime this semester. He noted that he is somewhat concerned with the transition if we should get it but he has been assured by the people at Semester at Sea that they have already been working on how to deal with the transition.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he has met with all of the offices that will directly be involved with the program and they are working on developing a budget for working with the program. He noted that so far the financial aspects for UNL are still very positive.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the Board of Regents has been holding a number of meetings to work on the strategic framework for the University. He noted that the Chancellors and President Milliken developed the framework and the Board has decided to select a few of the strategies that they want to see developed as priorities. The Board also wants to set objective measures to see if the University is successful in achieving these priorities.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the Chancellors and President have met with the Board three times to discuss the priorities. He stated that they will meet again in December to discuss administrative costs. He noted that some of the members of the Board are enthusiastic about reducing administrative costs. He stated that enrollment and graduation rates will also be discussed.

Alloway noted the changes that will be occurring at UNO with the building of more housing. He asked if it seems as if UNO is seen as competing for students. Chancellor Perlman stated that no doubt in some ways UNO is being competitive. He pointed out that they are considered a residential institution which is a prime factor for some students. He noted that currently it would be difficult to argue against them getting the housing. He pointed out that they do not have the housing that UNL has and in regards to their peer

institutions, they are low in housing space. He stated that in many ways we are not competing with them and Nebraska's situation is not that different from many other states where the main campus is not in the largest city in the state.

Fech stated that there have been many negative associations with the University taking over the property to construct the dorms. He noted that while the property may not be highly valued it is still personal property and the University using eminent domain to acquire the land is causing some problems. He pointed out that the Extension Educators are receiving comments from people about their dislike of the situation. Chancellor Perlman noted that the fact is that the University has not authorized land acquisition through eminent domain in a very long time. He stated that the University always tries to negotiate the acquisition of property.

3.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

4.0 Approval of 10/26/05 Minutes

Peterson moved and Stock seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 RIF Procedures

The Committee continued working on revising the RIF procedures. They discussed strategies on how best to present it to the Senate and who needs to approve the document so it can be put into place.

6.0 New Business

No new business was discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, November 9th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Beck, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Scholz, Shea, Stock

Absent: Alexander, Bolin

Date: Wednesday, November 9, 2005

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

2.0 Professor Sidnie Crawford, Chair, Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC)

2.1 Student Absence Policy

Beck reported that the meeting with Crawford was precipitated by a faculty member's concern about a letter he received from the IAC regarding a student athlete's absence from his classes.

Crawford stated that the instructor probably received a letter from the IAC. The letter includes the competition/travel schedule for the student athlete. She stated that the IAC's policy which follows the Academic Senate's policy on class absences, is that the student can miss six Tuesday, Thursday classes and/or nine Monday, Wednesday, Friday classes.

Crawford stated that the Associate Athletic Director sends out a letter to the coaches each year requiring the coach to fill out the schedule of competition. The schedule must be approved by the Athletic Director as well as the IAC. She noted that the Athletics department counts the number of absences for each of the competition to ensure that the University's policy is being adhered to. If the schedule goes over the number of allowed days, the coach must apply for a waiver. She noted that most schedules are approved but two waivers were received. She pointed out that women's volleyball has applied for a waiver which will be approved if they should get into the Final Four competition. She noted that volleyball is a particular problem because the Final Four competition is always held during finals week and the student athletes sometimes have to take their final exams

on the road.

Crawford stated that the IAC approves the schedule for the sport itself, not an individual student athlete's schedule. She pointed out that the IAC sends out the letter to the student to give to the instructor to inform him/her what the sport schedule is and to verify that this is the correct schedule.

Crawford stated that the letter also indicates that it is up to the instructor to approve or disapprove the absences. She noted that if the instructor disapproves of the absences the IAC will ask the instructor if he/she can work with the student and the athletic department to try and accommodate the schedule.

Crawford reported that student athlete absences are usually not a problem but occasionally there is a problem. She noted that some professors have raised concerns because a student misses too many classes. She stated that it is entirely up to the professor if he/she does not want to accept the number of absences as indicated in the Academic Senate's policy (<http://www.unl.edu/asenate/sapresolution.htm>) on student absences.

Crawford stated that an issue that needs to be looked at again by the IAC is the additional absences that teams may face if they get into post season tournaments. She stated that Professor Potuto, the NCAA faculty representative from UNL, has suggested that the IAC should address this issue because there is more pressure from outside sources like the media to have more tournaments.

Crawford stated that a point that needs to be clarified is whether a student will lose their financial aid if the student misses a game because they cannot be excused from a class. She pointed out that this is incorrect. A student will not lose their financial aid if they cannot compete in a game. She stated that any coach who tried to do this would get in serious trouble.

Beck wondered whether the instructor who made the complaint received the letter before the student spoke with him. Crawford stated that the instructor probably received the letter first. She noted that the Athletics advising department needs to make sure that students also speak to their instructors and clear their absences with that instructor.

Crawford pointed out that another thing that needs to be done is that faculty members need to be made more aware of the policy and how it works. She stated that in new faculty orientation no information is provided regarding how the Athletic department works with student athletes. She stated that the IAC is going to suggest to Athletic Director Steve Pederson that he contact Academic Affairs to see if someone from Athletics can make a

presentation to new faculty members regarding the policies of the department. Peterson suggested that a brief summary about how the policy and the Athletics department work would be helpful. He stated that it could be put on the Senate web site. Crawford stated that the overview of the IAC policy lays out clearly the policy and suggested that this could be put on the web. Beck noted that people seem to think that there are several different policies.

Stock stated that he has had a lot of student athletes and he does not recall getting a letter from the Athletics department. Moeller stated that the same is true for her. Flowers reported that he sporadically receives a letter but not for all of the student athletes. Crawford asked if the letters should all be mailed to the faculty. Stock stated that this would be helpful.

Alloway asked for clarification of the basketball waiver. Crawford stated that there is an early tournament that is held this semester so the sport overlaps both semesters.

Crawford stated that another part of the IAC policy that is not part of the Senate policy is that student athletes cannot miss more than five classes in a row. She pointed out that the outside pressure being made by television and tournaments is increasing and the IAC wants to keep checks in place to protect the students.

Beck noted that it does not seem like there are any real problems with the policy but rather there are some implementation procedures that need to be addressed. Crawford agreed and stated that some general publicity about the policy would be helpful. She stated that it is her feeling that the policy usually works fairly well.

Peterson stated that it seems like 20% of classes being missed is a fair amount of classes to miss. He wondered how people felt about students missing this amount of classes and the work that is associated with them. Stock stated that he knows of some colleagues who feel the 9/6 number is too much but he has found that most student athletes are good students who make the effort to make up any course work that they miss. Flowers stated that overall his experience has been that most student athletes are good students but sometimes students have not been as successful in a course as they could be because of the missed classes.

Alloway stated that the new grade reporting form for athletes is much better than the individual cards he used to receive.

Alloway stated that some student athletes have brought in forms from the Athletic Department requesting recommendations for specific classes for the coming semester before the printed course catalogs are available, making it harder for the instructor to

provide specifics. He wondered if student athletes have an early advising timetable. Crawford stated that she will check on this.

Hoffman pointed out that he often does not give exams in his courses until late in the semester. He stated that when he does not return the form to the Athletics department about how the student athletes stand in his class the Athletics department gets angry. He stated that an option should be put on the form that states that a grade is not available at that time.

Beck suggested that a coherent document explaining the Senate's and IAC's policies should be on the Student Affairs web site as well.

Alloway stated that he has found that most student athletes have very good time management skills and usually turn their work in ahead of time. He noted that his experience with student athletes has been positive and that most of these students are engaged in their classes. Peterson stated that he thinks most faculty members are willing to work with student athletes and support their athletic endeavors.

Crawford stated that it is becoming more of a balancing act for student athletes. She stated that there are a lot of demands coming down from the sports channels and the NCAA to have more games. She stated that universities need to resist these demands for the sake of the student athletes.

Peterson asked about the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. Crawford stated that it appears that things have died down with the Coalition. She noted that in part this could be the result of many of the universities having implemented changes that coincide with what the Coalition was trying to do.

Crawford stated that the NCAA accreditation is going on for UNL. She noted that data are being gathered and information about the accreditation will be posted on the web sometime in December.

Fech asked if there are problems with students missing classes who are involved in other university sponsored activities. Moeller stated that she finds these students to be self-starters and highly motivated and she has not had problems with them. Peterson pointed out that many of the non-athletic activities do not involve repeated absences but sometimes they can come at inconvenient times. Rapkin stated that the debate team is probably the closest to athletics in regards to missing a number of classes. Alloway pointed out that students hired by Huskervision miss a lot of classes because they cover every sport. Stock noted that members of the band also miss a number of classes due to activities. He

wondered whether letters are sent out to instructors about students involved in the band. Crawford stated that she did not think a letter is sent because it would have to come from the School of Music. She noted that it would be helpful for faculty members to have some coordination of the letters they receive for student absences. She stated that she did not believe a letter is sent by the Athletics department the students who are involved as managers for the teams. Beck suggested that the School of Music should be asked to do this for members of the band.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Departments without Senate Representation

Beck reported that she has been contacting departments that do not have a representative on the Senate. She stated that the response has been neutral but people have said that they will discuss the issue at their department meetings.

3.2 Next Faculty at 5

Beck reported that the next Faculty at 5 will be held at 5:00 on Tuesday, November 15th at the Van Brunt Visitor's Center. She reported that C.A. Waller will be performing for free at the Lied Center that evening. Peterson and Moeller stated that the first Faculty at 5 went well and was a good event.

4.0 Approval of 11/2/05 Minutes

Flowers moved, and Moeller seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 RIF Procedures

The Committee worked on making further revisions to the procedures. They hoped to present the procedures to the Senate at the December meeting.

5.2 Budget Cuts

Moeller reported that she checked with her department chair regarding the budget cuts and what kind of scenarios the chairs are expected to do for her college. She reported that the chairs have been asked to come up with 1, 2, 3, and 4% budget cut scenarios.

Beck stated that a letter has been sent to the chair/heads of IANR calling for them to not present the requested 8% budget cut scenario, at least at first. She reported that one chair has stated that he did not want to propose an 8% budget cut scenario.

Moeller reported that the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women met with

Chancellor Perlman earlier. She stated that they discussed the budget cuts and Chancellor Perlman made it clear that he was letting the Deans determine how best to do the cuts in their colleges. She reported that the Chancellor stated that he feels the faculty will know best how to make the cuts.

Hoffman wondered whether departments were having discussions on the budget cuts. Flowers stated that he has heard the figure of 2% and that it was being done administratively. He reported that there have been no directives about the faculty needing to participate in discussions. Moeller questioned whether information on the budget cuts was not filtering down to the chairs.

Peterson stated that the whole budget cutting situation is lumpy (okay, folks I just couldn't resist putting this in) because funds from an open position in one department could be used to fund a position in another department so it is difficult to determine where budget cuts are actually made and where reallocations have occurred. He stated that a former Executive Committee member once stated that there is a 5% attrition rate every year of faculty leaving and these open lines can be used for budget cuts.

Fech asked if the letter to the heads/chairs of IANR has gone out. Beck stated that it has gone out. Fech asked if the Directors of the Research & Extension Centers were sent the letter. Beck stated that she assumed so. Moeller asked if the heads of the departments in IANR were going to take a leadership role in dealing with the budget cuts. Shea stated that the budget cuts is a major issue and the process being used can provide a potential mechanism to restructure the Institute without going through the process of getting approval, particularly from APC. He stated that faculty members should insist on knowing what criteria are going to be used for making budget cuts. He noted that budget scenarios that are approved by the department can then be used by the Vice Chancellor to cut programs. The Vice Chancellor can then claim that it was faculty driven. He stated that there may not be many faculty members who share these concerns. Rapkin noted that at some point people shut down and don't want to deal with issues like the budget cuts because they have had to address them year after year.

Fech asked when the letter was sent out. Beck stated that it was sent out on Tuesday, November 8th. She stated that the department heads will be discussing the letter at their next meeting and will decide as a group whether they will refuse to submit an 8% budget cut scenario.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee Syllabus Revisions

Peterson stated that the FCAC has voted to recommend changes to the committee structure

because the current listed membership requirements do not work. He pointed out that the President Elect of the Academic Senate was made chair of the committee without ever serving on it. He noted that this is difficult because the President Elect does not know how the committee functions. He reported that the proposed changes to the syllabus would include the President Elect, President, and Past President of the Academic Senate in the membership of the committee. The President would act as chair.

Griffin noted that the proposed changes should first be reviewed by the Committee on Committees before they go to the Senate.

6.2 Research Council's Mentoring Report

Due to lack of time the Committee agreed to review the report at a later meeting.

6.3 Special Fees Committee

Beck reported that the Special Fees Committee meets once in early December. She stated that this committee reviews request for fees attached to courses. Hoffman, Alloway, and Beck volunteered to serve on the committee.

Peterson stated that last year a colleague of his was on the committee and raised a concern that special fees were being put on courses for things like copying expenses. The colleague felt that there might be some abuse of the fees. Flowers noted that there was some controversy awhile ago about the fees and how they were being used. Beck stated that they will check to see if there looks to be any abuse.

6.4 Verification of Grades for Greek Houses

Alloway reported that there has been a marked increase in the number of students needing verification of grades for their Greek houses with some requests coming every two weeks. He stated that he has spoken with Linda Schwartzkopf, Director of Greek Affairs, about this issue and she will be speaking with the house leaders.

Alloway pointed out that while he is supportive of efforts to maintain Greek house academic standards, the form asking for grade verification has no disclosure statement or signature stating that the student agrees to release this information to a third party. The Committee agreed that there needs to be some verification for release of the information, otherwise the release of academic information could be a violation of a student's right under the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. Alloway stated that he would keep in touch with Linda Schwartzkopf on this issue.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, November 16th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate

Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Beck, Bolin, Flowers, Hoffman, Peterson, Rapkin, Scholz, Stock

Absent: Alloway, Fech, Moeller

Date: Wednesday, November 16, 2005

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

2.0 Dan Carpenter, Director, University Parking Services

Carpenter was unable to attend the meeting due to a scheduling conflict. The Committee will reschedule a meeting with him at a later time.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Yale University's New Diversity Plan

Beck reported that she recently read an article about Yale University implementing a new diversity plan. She noted that Yale is putting in place strategies to recruit and retain women and minority faculty members. She stated that it will be interesting to see what their strategies will be.

3.2 Nebraska County Extension Association (NCEA)

Beck reported that the NCEA met in Hastings this week. She noted that the NCEA donates \$1,000 every year to the Senate's Schwartkopf fund. She stated that she had planned to attend the meeting but the bad weather interfered. She pointed out that only faculty members can attend the meeting. She reported that she sent a letter to the NCEA thanking them for their support and for being involved with the Senate and providing input on a regular basis.

Beck noted that she is concerned with shared governance at UNL and would like to work for a system of tenure for extension educators. She pointed out that the tenure system for extension educators would be different than what is in place for teaching faculty members.

The tenure system for extension educators could consist of a three year rolling contract. She noted that the University of South Dakota has a tenure system.

3.3 Senate Goals

Beck stated that she would like to review the Senate goals at an upcoming meeting. She stated that the Committee needs to see what still needs to be worked on.

3.4 Board of Regents Meeting

Beck reported that she attended the Board of Regents meeting. She noted that some of the Regents' committees discussed streamlining some policies.

She stated that each campus gave a presentation on their Programs of Excellence. She reported that the idea of developing Programs of Excellence was first created by a committee of the Board of Regents which included a number of faculty representatives.

Beck stated that after each Chancellor presented their campus' Programs of Excellence she noted that there is a definite difference between the approaches used to identify Programs of Excellence. She stated that she was very impressed with UNO Chancellor Belck's presentation. Beck pointed out that it appears that UNO gets a lot of input from the faculty and the process is very well thought out. She suggested that the Committee should look at UNO's process.

3.5 Deans and Directors Meeting

Beck reported that she attended the Deans and Directors meeting this morning. She stated that she gave a report on the efforts being made in regards to academic dishonesty. She noted that she has charged the Teaching Council to begin campus-wide discussions on the topic. She also discussed the various compliance issues that faculty members must deal with and how they can impede a professor's work.

Beck reported that there was discussion on the strategic plans. She noted that the Deans have to define their college priorities and objectives, how they are going to involve the constituents of the college, including faculty, students, and staff, and objectives for funding. She stated that departments are to have their plans submitted by January 31st and the college plans must be submitted to the Vice Chancellors in March.

Peterson stated that he has not heard anything about the department plans needing to be submitted by January 31st. He pointed out that the semester is coming to an end and with the holiday closedown there will not be much time for the faculty members to meet and discuss their plan. Hoffman stated that he recently met with the Dean of his college and there was no mention about this. Peterson suggested that the issue should be discussed

with the Chancellor when the Committee meets with him on December 7th.

Beck reported that revising the general education program was discussed. She noted that the statement was made in the meeting that we will have a general education program that is simple and elegant and based on student outcomes.

Peterson reported that the general education planning team is meeting weekly. He noted that the general education advisory group, which is much larger than the team, meets less frequently but will ultimately make decisions on the revisions that will be put forward. He stated that four preliminary institutional objectives have been identified for student outcomes: intellectual and practical skills; knowledge of diversity, peoples, and culture and of the natural and physical world; individual and social responsibilities; and integrative learning. He pointed out that these objectives are still in the draft phase and are subject to change.

Peterson stated that reports on the progress of the revisions to the general education program will be written. He noted that the idea for the second year is to develop governance and assessment of the program.

Hoffman asked if the general education program is going to be made into a degree program. Peterson stated that it will not. He noted that the revisions are to be a replacement for the current comprehensive education program. He stated that the thesis behind the general education program is to provide undergraduate students with a breadth of general knowledge and a depth of knowledge in a major.

Hoffman noted that in his college Gallup conducts a survey of graduates every year. Peterson stated that in some colleges and departments assessment is done very well while other areas conduct very little assessment.

Beck stated that an update on the plans to revise the general education program can be found on the Academic Affairs web site (<http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/gened/>).

Beck reported that the “Power of Red” theme was discussed at the meeting. She stated that the new banners for R street were shown and a list was distributed of items that can be purchased by departments using a cost/object number. Items included coffee mugs, lapel pins, wall plaques, scarves, ties, and foil stickers. All items have the N logo on them. Hoffman pointed out that the new Faculty/Staff director that just came out has a yellow cover, not red and does not conform with the “Power of Red” theme.

Beck stated that she raised the issue of the website templates and the cost associated with

getting assistance with these. She noted that the cost is supposed to be the same for everyone. Shea stated that there could be a difference in cost if someone outside the department is actually managing the website.

Beck reported that the December Board of Regents meeting will be on strategic planning.

Beck stated that Vice Chancellor Jackson spoke about the 65 mph speed limit on University vans but noted that VC Jackson pointed out that the only place that this is an issue is on the interstate because it is the only road in Nebraska that allows speeds over 65 mph. Beck reported that the Office of Business and Finance has received complaints about the speed limit and is looking again at the policy.

Shea asked Beck to comment briefly on the letter to IANR chairs regarding the 8% budget cut scenario. Beck reported that the unit heads of IANR discussed the issue. Only two supported not submitting an 8% budget cut scenario but the other heads decided to provide the 8% scenario. She noted that timing might be part of the issue because the heads didn't feel they had enough time to counteract against the demand for the budget cutting scenarios.

Peterson stated that he has heard many complaints regarding the electronic reporting of activities for faculty members in IANR. He noted that he just went through it and it was an awful task to do. Scholz asked if the information is put on a template. Peterson stated that it is a template but more complicated than just a simple template. Beck stated that IANR decided to create an electronic means of reporting activities because faculty members were being asked to generate duplicate lists. She stated that the IANR Liaison Committee has been asked to look into the template to see if it is useful.

4.0 Approval of 11/9/05 Minutes

Peterson moved and Flowers seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 RIF Procedures

Beck stated that when the Committee is satisfied with the document she will present it to the Chancellor. She noted that afterwards it will go to the Senate, the faculty members of the Academic Planning Committee, the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee, ASUN Executive Committee, and the campus chapter of AAUP.

Beck noted that she came across a document from March 10, 2003 that was from the

Chancellor about dealing with firing tenured faculty members. She noted that this policy did not follow the existing procedures that were in place when the budget cuts were made. Rapkin asked how the Chancellor's document compared with the existing procedures. Beck stated that they were totally different than what is in the current policy. Peterson suggested verifying whether the Chancellor's document is still in effect.

5.2 Quality Indicators Survey – Preliminary Results

Flowers reported that preliminary results were based on 364 responses. He noted that a couple of colleges had very little or no responses but this could be due to the fact that their work is not typically published in scholarly publications. Peterson pointed out that the number of responses from CASNR and IANR are probably different because extension educators classify themselves under IANR and faculty members with teaching responsibilities are probably classified in CASNR.

Flowers reported that more senior faculty members responded to the questionnaire but non tenured faculty members responded as well.

The Committee agreed that a reminder should be sent to the faculty about completing the survey.

The Committee stated that the results of the survey should be presented to the Senate and discussed with the Chancellor and SVCAA.

6.0 New Business

6.1 University Vans – Speed Limits

Beck noted that some complaints have been made by faculty members regarding the 65 mph speed limit on University vans. It was pointed out that the speed limit makes lengthy trips even longer. The Committee agreed not to send a memo to VC Jackson because the argument for the lower speed limit results in safety during windy conditions and fuel economy outweighs the argument for time in traveling.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, November 30th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Beck, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Peterson, Rapkin, Scholz, Shea

Absent: Alexander, Alloway, Bolin, Moeller, Stock

Date: Wednesday, November 30, 2005

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

2.0 ASUN

2.1 Student Absence Policy – Proposed Revisions

Sarah Fech, Communications Committee Chair of the Freshman Campus Leadership, stated that the reason for the proposed changes was due to the difficulty a Jewish student had in trying to get an excused absence from an instructor for the two Jewish high holidays which occur during the fall semester. She noted that students of the Committee and ASUN felt that it is not fair for a student to be penalized for missing a class(es) to observe their religious holiday(s).

Sarah Fech stated that the proposed revisions would not allow students to abuse the policy but would give them the ability to observe their religious holidays. She pointed out that a number of other institutions, such as the Universities of Colorado, Iowa, and Minnesota have policies to address this issue. She stated that the students wanted to speak to the Senate Executive Committee first to get input on the proposed revision and to see if they should go forward with it.

Peterson pointed out that revisions need to be made to the campus Class Attendance policy and not the Senate's Student Absence Policy. He explained that the Senate's policy applies to students needing to miss class due to participation in university sponsored events. He pointed out that a religious holiday is not a university sponsored event.

Peterson suggested that the language in the proposed revisions needs to be clarified. He stated that as written it could cause difficulties. He noted that his own personal experience

has been to work with the student and he believes that most professors are willing to do this. He stated that he does not believe an additional policy is needed right now.

Sara Fech stated that the reason for the vagueness in the proposed policy is that the Committee wanted to provide a basis for students to make an appeal if they needed to. Hoffman pointed out that students in a non-traditional religion would probably have to go through a more difficult defense in order to make an appeal.

Peterson noted that the Class Attendance Policy addresses a death in the family or illness of a student. Beck stated that Student Affairs will intervene if there is an issue concerning a student's absence for extreme circumstances such as illness or death.

Rapkin suggested that the students should consult with students of different faiths to identify specific religious holidays. Shea stated that specific holidays should not be listed in the policy because the university would be discriminating against other religions that are not on the list.

Beck suggested that the students draft the revisions to the Class Attendance Policy. She stated they should check to see what channels the students must go through to change the policy. She noted that the Academic Senate will probably have to approve the document.

2.2 Reduction in Force Procedures

Beck reported that she met with members of the ASUN Executive Committee to review the proposed revisions to the procedures. She noted that the students previously involved in the revisions did not transfer information to the current ASUN members.

Zabih stated that his main concern with the procedures is defining the Academic Planning Committee's power. He pointed out that if the administration does not recognize the APC's power then there is not much value in the procedures.

Beck stated that ASUN and the Academic Senate need to approve revisions to the procedures but the Chancellor will be consulted for feedback before it goes forward for approval.

Beck stated that she will meet with the students again to go through the procedures. She noted that she will send them further information as well.

2.3 Course Syllabus Policy

Zabih stated that he thinks that only the Senate needs to approve a course syllabus policy because it is just a campus policy, not a university policy. He pointed out that students

need to know what the expectations are for courses particularly with the early withdrawal deadline. He noted that if students know what the expectations are for a course they can more easily ascertain whether they should withdraw from it or not. He stated that the ASUN has come up with a list of items that they would like to see included on each course syllabus.

Beck reported that in a recent email message SVCAA Couture suggested working on the syllabus policy next semester since we are almost at the end of this semester. Peterson noted that Associate Vice Chancellor Wilson drafted a message that would be sent to faculty stating that the Board of Regents' policy requires instructors to "inform students of the requirements, standards, objectives, and evaluation procedures at the beginning of each course." Peterson suggested that ASUN should send their list to the Executive Committee so they can discuss it.

Peterson pointed out that it would be helpful if ASUN could provide some documentation to the Senate when the policy is presented. He noted that information on how many cases there have been of students not receiving a course syllabus would be helpful.

Hoffman pointed out that on his syllabus he has projects listed with general due dates but the syllabus is not very specific because of the nature of the course. Zabih stated that a bigger issue is the quality of the syllabus. He noted that some are so vague that a student has no idea of what is expected. Hoffman questioned what people would define as quality of syllabus.

Beck asked whether students feel that putting a syllabus on Blackboard is considered a written document. Zabih stated that it does.

Shea stated that he does not understand why the faculty would object to having a syllabus policy. He noted that it is in the interest of both the students and the faculty to have one.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Letter from Dean Milligan

Beck reported that Dean Milligan sent a letter about the Committee's invitation to meet with her. Beck noted that Dean Milligan did not specifically state whether she would meet with the Committee and the letter discussed faculty governance in the College of Business Administration.

3.2 Letter from Parking Advisory Committee

Beck stated that she received a letter from Professor McLeod, Chair of the Parking Advisory Committee, reminding the faculty about parking options for visitors to UNL. The

letter states that visitors can either park in metered parking areas or in visitor designated areas. Visitors can obtain a visitor's permit from Parking and Transit Services or through a departmental guest permit. Further information can be found on the Parking and Transit Services website (<http://parking.unl.edu>).

Fech asked what faculty members are supposed to do if they need to come to campus to work but can't park in their usual parking lot because of an athletic event. Griffin stated that there are a few designated lots for these faculty members. Hoffman pointed out that these designated lots often sell parking spaces to visitors and parking may not be available for the faculty to use.

Beck stated that Dan Carpenter, Director of Parking and Transit Services, will be rescheduled to meet with the Committee in the spring semester.

4.0 Approval of 11/16/05 Minutes

Peterson moved and Flowers seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Statement to Iran Regarding Restricting Higher Education to Members of the Baha'i Faith

Beck stated that she spoke with Professor Lepard who made the request for the Senate to make a statement on this issue. Beck reported that Professor Lepard showed her copies of email messages sent by Chancellor Perlman and Dean Willborn to the United Nations about their concern on this issue. Beck suggested that she could send a letter under her signature only, voicing the same concern and disapproval of Iran's actions.

Fech questioned who would object to sending a statement. Beck stated that one of the issues that could be raised is that if the Senate makes a statement on behalf of one religion would it do so for other religions.

Fech asked if there are groups that are opposed to the Baha'i faith that would object to such a letter being sent. Rapkin stated that certain Islamic groups are opposed.

Peterson stated that if the statement is made only by Beck that it should be okay because it is not being made on behalf of the Senate.

5.2 Senate Survey

Flowers and Griffin noted that the survey will be closed on November 30th. Flowers

stated that 492 surveys have been completed. The Committee agreed to discuss the preliminary findings with the Chancellor next week.

5.3 Collective Bargaining Information

Fech reported that he has received questions about this from two different people and he wondered whether the Senate would be presenting more information on collective bargaining.

Peterson stated that the goal last year was to set up a video conference with faculty members from Rutgers University and the University of Delaware, both land grant, AAU institutions that are unionized but the differences in the schedules of the universities created conflicts. Peterson stated that he informed the Senate of the situation and stated that unless there was more desire on the part of the faculty for further information no presentation will be made. He stated that to date he has not heard of any interest. Shea reported that he has not heard any high level of interest in pursuing this matter.

Rapkin suggested that the faculty could be surveyed to see if they want a presentation made on collective bargaining.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Co-sponsored Email Message to the Faculty Regarding Expectations on Course Syllabus and the 15th Week Policy

Beck stated that she has received an email message from Associate Vice Chancellor Wilson concerning a draft message he wrote informing faculty members that the 15th Week Policy was in effect this semester. Beck stated that the idea is to send the message to all faculty members under the signature of herself, SVCAA Couture, and VC Owens.

Peterson pointed out that the Executive Committee was informed that the policy would not go into effect this semester because the Fall Schedule of Classes had already been printed when the Senate approved the 15th Week Policy. Griffin noted that Dr. Hawkey, Director of Registration and Records, stated in the April 20, 2005 meeting that he would not recommend the Final Exam and 15th Week policies be put into effect because of the printing of the fall schedule. Griffin pointed out that it was stated twice more in Executive Committee meetings and once at the September 4th Senate meeting that the 15th Week and Final Exam policies would not go into effect until the Spring semester.

The Committee agreed that Beck should advise SVCAA Couture, VC Owens, and Associate VC Wilson that the policies should not go into effect until the spring semester

since they are not printed in the Fall Schedule of Classes. The Committee pointed out that to try to enforce the policy at this late a date in the semester would cause confusion.

The Committee agreed that towards the end of the semester a reminder should be sent to all faculty members telling them that the policies will go into effect beginning with the spring 2006 semester. The policies are included in the Spring Schedule of Classes.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:37 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, December 7th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Alloway, Beck, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Moeller, Rapkin, Peterson, Scholz, Stock

Absent: Bolin, Shea

Date: Wednesday, December 7, 2005

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

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

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Special Fees Committee

Beck reported that the Special Fees Committee does not meet as a group to discuss the requests that are submitted to attach special fees to a course. She noted that individual members of the Committee review the requests and submit their opinion. She stated that she will meet with Alloway and Hoffman to discuss the requests. The Executive Committee felt that the Special Fees Committee should meet as a group to discuss the requests. Peterson noted that it may be difficult to schedule a meeting with all of the members. He suggested that a Blackboard site could be created for the members to use. Peterson also noted that Dean of Undergraduate Studies Rita Kean can provide further information on details related to special fees and the work of the Special Fees Committee. The Executive Committee agreed that after Beck, Alloway, and Hoffman review the fees next week, feedback will be provided to Dean Kean on the process.

Peterson stated that it seems that the term lab course seems to have become a generic term that is used for any course that has a special fee associated with it regardless of whether it is actually a lab course.

Alexander asked if the Committee only reviews special fees. He noted that the College of Engineering is looking into increasing the rate of tuition for engineering courses. Peterson stated that the Committee just looks into special fees attached to certain courses. Alloway pointed out that in the schedule of classes there is a note indicating a special fee is attached

to a particular course. Flowers noted that the special fees are supposed to help support special supplies or equipment that is needed for that course.

Beck asked if the College of Engineering has had a separate tuition. Alexander stated that it has not, but special fees have been attached to courses in order to provide the necessary equipment that is used in the course although he feels that over the years the original intent of the special fee seems to have been lost.

2.2 Academic Planning Committee and Academic Program Reviews

Beck reported that the APC is going to look at how they monitor academic program reviews. She noted that the APC is looking at a different model to use for the program reviews. She stated that she will be meeting with Professor Keown, the Senate President's Designee to the APC, to discuss the APC looking explicitly at faculty governance in departments when an academic program review is conducted.

Beck reported that a motion was introduced to the APC that any upcoming budget cuts must follow the procedures that are currently in place. She stated that the motion should be voted on at the next APC meeting.

2.3 Board of Regents Strategic Planning Meeting

Beck reported that there was very good discussion at the Regents meeting on strategic planning for the University. She stated that the Regents asked the Senate Presidents to respond quite a bit. She noted that one prevalent theme is that teaching is the number one priority for the University. She stated that she regrets not explaining to the Regents that in some colleges teaching is used punitively in evaluation and that teaching is not considered the number one priority. She noted that some units restrict a faculty member's access to graduate students if they are not actively involved in research. These professors are also given a heavier teaching load.

Peterson noted that faculty members can be bought out of teaching. Flowers pointed out that there is tremendous variability about teaching. He noted that it relates to a general climate issue and the question is how faculty members divide their time and how they are rewarded for it.

Rapkin pointed out that there is meaningful distinction between punitive teaching and opting for a different teaching load. He noted that there is the standard research track and there is the standard teaching track.

Stock stated that while teaching is our main function, those doing well in research should not be penalized. He noted that faculty members can reallocate their apportionment of

duties and some people are better at research than teaching and vice versa. Beck stated that this is fine but a problem occurs when evaluations do not acknowledge this difference as is the case in some colleges.

Peterson stated that in IANR people are locked into their assignments due to funding sources. He noted that it is more difficult to reapportion duties because of the funding.

Beck stated that some people are being hired to only teach and that several with no research or publications have been tenured in IANR recently. Fech noted that Extension Educators are still expected to conduct some research even though 90 – 100% of their apportionment of duties is for teaching. He stated that some faculty members may do a lot for a particular program but if they don't attain a grant the work they do is not given as much credit.

Alexander stated that merit increases need to be looked at. He questioned whether merit raises can be obtained for faculty members who have heavy teaching loads. Beck stated that she expects that it can be done although she does not know for certain how these raises would compare with those based on research. Alexander stated that it would be interesting to see if any merit raises have been given for teaching.

2.4 Greek Houses Grade Requests

Alloway reported that the form being used by the Greek houses to report grades for their members is being revised. The revision will give student's permission to the instructor to release his/her grade to the fraternity or sorority. He noted that the revisions should be completed by next fall when grade reporting is the heaviest because pledges are trying to get into the houses.

3.0 Approval of 11/301/05 Minutes

Flowers moved and Peterson seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Senate Survey – Draft of Powerpoint Presentation (Flowers)

Flowers gave his Powerpoint presentation on the results of the survey on Quality Indicators. The Committee discussed revising and shortening the presentation so it can be given to the Senate at the January meeting. The Committee noted that there was good response on the survey with 492 completed surveys submitted.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Review of Executive Committee Goals

The Committee reviewed the goals for 2005-06. Most items have or are currently being

worked on. The Committee noted that further work needs to be done on meetings with UNOPA and UAAD, exploring various UNL policies with senior administrators to ensure uniform application and appropriate interpretation, and work with ASUN to address important student issues.

Beck stated that she would like to explore the issue of having some kind of tenure system for extension educators. She noted that there are several state universities that do have a rolling contract system for extension educators. She stated that she would like to have a proposal ready in the spring to present to the Senate.

The Committee noted that although they have not been actively involved in the accreditation process yet, they expect greater involvement in the process as the accreditation visit approaches in the fall. It was pointed out that the Deans have not reported back to the departments on their strategic plans. The Committee agreed that this should be discussed with the Chancellor and SVCAA in January.

Beck stated that she thinks the Senate should look at its current structure to see if it should return to being a Faculty Senate instead of an Academic Senate. She noted that the other three campuses have Faculty Senates. She pointed out that this is not meant to be adversarial. She stated that the original intent of creating an Academic Senate was to increase dialog between the faculty and the administration but this does not seem to have worked well within the Senate context.

5.2 Administrators Serving on Committees

Beck stated that she has been corresponding with a person who is an administrator but considers himself a professor because he has had an adjunct appointment at times. She noted that this individual wants to serve on faculty committees but she is unsure whether he would qualify because his FTE is in administration, not in teaching or research. Griffin stated that she would check the Bylaws and report back to the Committee at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, December 14th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Beck, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Scholz, Shea, Stock

Absent: Alexander, Bolin

Date: Wednesday, December 14, 2005

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Article in Chronicle of Higher Education

Beck reported that there is an article in the recent issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education regarding the removal of tenure lines at the University of Arkansas for new faculty members in agriculture. She noted that a colleague from there called her concerned with what was happening.

Peterson asked if this was happening to people who are involved in teaching as well as research. Beck stated that the article states that the decision will affect those people in research and extension but not teaching. Peterson noted that some southern universities do not grant tenure to people unless they have a teaching assignment.

Beck stated that the Vice President of Agriculture is making the decision at the University of Arkansas and claims that there needs to be flexibility in who can be hired or fired. The Vice President stated in the article that people should not be hired for 30 or 40 years because topics that need to be addressed often change over time. Beck reported that the AAUP is very interested in what is happening and will be contacting the University of Arkansas.

Moeller stated that the situation could be a sign of things to come. She stated that she thinks universities are going to become more streamlined. Peterson noted that the campus has been hearing from the Board of Regents and the administration that the university

cannot be all things to all people and that the University's efforts need to be concentrated in specific areas. He wondered whether the University will eventually try outsourcing certain courses which he believes is dangerously wrong thinking.

Moeller stated that the situation at Tulane University is dire. She noted that they have a "hurricane clause" that is similar to financial exigency and as a result they are eliminating a great number of professors and academic programs. Hoffman reported that Tulane has eliminated the College of Engineering. Flowers stated that 23 faculty members with the Tulane Medical School are being released.

2.2 End of Semester Note to the Faculty

Beck asked the Committee whether they thought it would be a good idea to send a short note to the faculty thanking them for their input and wishing them a relaxing break. The Committee agreed that this should be done.

3.0 Approval of 12/7/05 Minutes

Alloway moved and Flowers seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Administrator's Serving on Committees

Beck reported that Griffin informed her that the Syllabus of Campus Wide Committees specifically states under the General Rules and Definitions, Eligibility for Membership: that "administrators in category (3) are eligible for committee membership only in cases specified in the descriptions for particular committees." Category 3 is defined as "the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, and all administrators who hold continuous appointment or appointment for a specific term."

Beck noted that the administrator inquiring about serving on a committee does not fit the eligibility requirement stated above. Peterson pointed out that the language seems pretty clear that an administrator cannot serve unless specifically stated. He asked what committee the administrator is interested in serving on. Beck reported that he wants to serve on the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee. Griffin noted that this is the most popular committee and that there have been people who qualify that have been waiting to get on this committee for several years.

The Committee agreed that Beck should notify the administrator that he does not qualify to serve on the committee.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Vice Chancellor Paul, Associate Vice Chancellor Espy, Dr. Bachman, Chair of IACUC and Dr. Hoyt, Chair of IRB

5.1.A. Research Advisory Board

VC Paul stated that he created the Board as an addition to the Research Council because he wanted to have a group of leading researchers who would challenge him and UNL in a broader way for developing research investment. He pointed out that the Council reviews proposals and does a lot of work while the Board is primarily an advisory group to him. He stated that one of the things the Board has been discussing is how to build teams to collaborate research across colleges, departments and disciplines. He noted that there has been some success in this on campus but there are more opportunities for team building. He stated that he would provide the Executive Committee with a list of the members of the Board. He noted that the Chair of the Council is also a member of the Board.

VC Paul stated that the Board is meeting tomorrow and one of the issues that will be discussed is the need to have faculty retreats on particular research topics. He noted that something similar to this occurred several years ago and it had a lot of positive aspects. Moeller asked if the Board was looking at emerging themes and issues that can help further the cause of research on campus. VC Paul stated that the Board challenges the campus and is complementary to the Council.

VC Paul reported that recently the Four Corners Research Alliance was created. He noted that this is an initiative which is in the early stages between the University of Iowa and Iowa State University, the University of Missouri, the University of Kansas and Kansas State University and UNL. He stated that the initiative was suggested at a meeting with the various Chancellors and Presidents of these institutions. He reported that the group was challenged with what kinds of research these institutions can do together to capitalize on the regional strengths. VC Paul stated that a group of members from the initiative had a retreat two weeks ago and they looked at what the grant challenges are in research that as individual institutions they could not do but collectively they could.

5.1.B. Problems with IRB and IACUC

Beck reported that in the Executive Committee meetings and at Senate meetings statements were made by faculty members who had problems with getting approval for IRB and IACUC proposals. She noted that it is her understanding that the process of getting IRB approval may have been resolved but there still seems to be some issues with IACUC approval. Beck stated that the issues that have been raised involve delays in getting protocols approved, particularly those involving UCARE

students. She noted that some UCARE students could not do their projects because it took too long to get approval.

Beck reported that another issue raised is that there is a lot of nitpicking of the protocols. She stated that on animal research there seems to be a lack of understanding in regards to agricultural animals. She noted that another issue is that inspections between east campus animal care facilities and city campus facilities often occur back to back and there needs to be greater hygiene care when this happens.

VC Paul distributed a report written for the meeting concerning IRB and IACUC protocols. He pointed out that the campus is not yet at the place where we want to be in processing protocols. He stated that he invited Professor Hoyt, Chair of IRB, and Professor Bachman, Chair of IACUC, to attend the meeting to address these concerns. VC Paul noted that there has been some progress in making improvements in the processes.

VC Paul stated that it is important to understand that the compliance business is changing and is quite different from how it used to be. He pointed out that there have been a number of institutions that have been shut down in conducting certain kinds of research because they did not meet the compliance regulations and he does not want that happening here.

VC Paul reported that there are new compliance areas that are being emphasized. As a result the campus is providing more training and is being more proactive in conducting responsible research. He pointed out that since 9/11 new compliances have to be addressed.

VC Paul stated that additional staff has been hired to help the process of both IRB and IACUC protocols. He noted that some refinements have been made in how protocols are handled and managed.

VC Paul stated that one problem with the IACUC protocols is that there is only one certified veterinarian although another one has just recently been hired. He pointed out that these veterinarians are not tenure track positions and are in high demand by other institutions and organizations.

VC Paul stated that a contentious issue that causes confusion is the standards of animal care that are required for accreditation. He noted that UNL is currently not accredited but the campus still needs to be in compliance with the animal welfare

act.

VC Paul reported that he hopes to have more on-line submission of protocols to make it easier for the faculty. He stated that his office recently looked at the data on submission of protocols and found that one of the major challenges is communicating to faculty members the need to make corrections quickly to protocols. Associate VC Espy pointed out that as of 10/31/05, 26 protocols out of 35 were awaiting a response from the principal investigator.

Professor Bachman noted that for the IACUC they are now down to two weeks in getting a response back to the principal investigator. She stated that the committee that works on these protocols is working hard to eliminate delays in the approval process and in some cases where there is an extreme rush they can be completed in a matter of days.

Professor Bachman pointed out that there are some things that must be done on the IACUC protocols. She noted that the IACUC review committee must comment on each protocol that is submitted and some need to have a full committee review. She stated that if no major corrections are needed on the protocol, it can be processed in two weeks. She pointed out that student approval can be done on line and in a few hours. She noted that an alternative to the on-line process is the student can attend a seminar session that is held once a month.

Professor Bachman stated that to avoid any nitpicking on protocols investigators should remember to write for a diverse audience. She noted that if the language of the protocol is very clear it will help get the protocol through faster.

Professor Bachman stated that the lack of expertise with agricultural animals will hopefully be resolved now that there are more veterinarians on board. She pointed out that the University also has some connections with outside veterinarians to help out when needed.

Professor Bachman agreed that if one colony of animals is being inspected another one should not be done immediately afterwards because it could have devastating effects. She pointed out that scheduling should be arranged so this does not occur. Associate VC Espy stated that it can be difficult to do inspections because sometimes they have to be done at remote facilities. Professor Bachman noted that now that there are alternate members on the committee, they will be able to go out on inspections as well.

Professor Bachman explained that recently incorporated into the committee is the use of alternate members. She noted that departments who use animals in research have a member on the committee but oftentimes all members cannot make the meetings and therefore they would not have a quorum. Now departments can have an alternate member attend the meetings and be involved in inspections.

Beck stated that last year there were several colleagues who had a three year approval granted to them on research they were conducting but recently these people were told that every time they want to do a new experiment they must submit a new request to IACUC. Professor Bachman stated that if the original protocol does not cover the new experiment then a modified protocol needs to be done. She pointed out that a modified protocol can be approved by one person. Beck asked if the research project is just a continuation of an approved protocol why the researcher must go through the process of applying for a new protocol. VC Paul stated that the University needs to be in compliance with the Animal Welfare Act and the number of animals that are used must be recorded. He noted that one of the challenges is who is keeping record of the number of animals used.

Professor Hoyt stated that these are some of the same kinds of issue with the IRB. He stated that the committee is working to find ways in which to respond quickly to the protocols. He noted that an area that needs to be addressed is the campus commitment in complying with regulations. He pointed out that protocols done by graduate students that are not reviewed well by department committees can require a lot of additional work because they contain errors. This in turn can cause a real delay in other protocols being processed. He noted that the chair of the department review committee will be called if a protocol is received that seems out of line. He pointed out that the staff of the Research Compliance Services Office is very willing to work and be proactive with the faculty on protocols.

Professor Hoyt noted that a lot of changes have been made to the IRB process. He stated that the committee sat down and critically reviewed where the bottlenecks occurred in getting IRB protocols through. He noted that expedited reviews used to be distributed to the full board at monthly meetings but this is not required now. Moeller stated that she has seen a significant difference in the past six months in the turn around time for getting protocols processed.

Professor Hoyt stated that there can be an ebb and flow on the protocols. He noted that he personally signs all continuation letters and professors can have a tendency to submit protocols at particular times during the semester. He pointed out that they typically get 15 modifications a month and each one can take up to two hours to

review. He stated that in some months they can receive as many as 120 new, modified, or changed protocols.

Professor Hoyt stated that although the basic rules have not changed much there have been a lot of additional guidelines. He noted that sometimes the parameters for protocols can be foggy and evolving. He pointed out that a regulatory agency can suddenly appear on campus to check things out and they must be dealt with immediately. He noted that if a lot of inconsistencies in protocols are found by a regulatory agency it can create a new set of concerns. He pointed out that there are a lot of things going on in the background that most people are unaware of but the office staff has worked hard to be very responsive. Moeller noted that Shirley Horstman is very helpful in the office.

Professor Hoyt stated that sometimes the IRB board does receive compliments. Moeller asked who people should talk to if they have a complaint. VC Paul stated that they should contact Associate VC Espy. He recommended that for emergency protocols a principal investigator should call and visit with the staff rather than sending an email. Professor Hoyt noted that the more lead time the more helpful it is. He pointed out that if there is a lead time constraint then the staff should be informed when the protocol is first submitted or a phone call should be made to see if the protocol can be processed quickly.

VC Paul stated that the plan is to get the Association for Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs (AHRPP) approval for IRB at UNL. He noted that this is the agency that provides a good housekeeping seal of approval for a university and it indicates that we conduct our research according to gold standards. He pointed out that getting accreditation is a fairly extensive process which includes a visit to campus. He stated that the benefits of having accreditation are that it demonstrates that UNL is on the forefront in complying with research standards for working with human subjects and it is a marker that we take the research seriously and we are a leader among our peers. He pointed out that regulatory agencies do notice that the University has accreditation.

Flowers asked if the on-site visits for accreditation will extend to visits at the department level review committee. He stated that he is thinking about communication between the Office of Research and these department review committees to insure that there is adequate time for the committees to be prepared for the visit. Associate VC Espy stated that the Office of Research is going to review the area of communication with departments and colleges. She stated that interviewing members of the department review committee will be a part of the on-campus visit.

Associate VC Espy stated that she thinks that the campus is in good shape for the accreditation but there may have to be some work to do with enhancements. She noted that there are some conflict of interest policies that need to be looked at but she did not believe that there is a lot of work to do on these. She stated that she hopes the application to AAHRPP will be submitted in three months. VC Paul noted that his office has been working for two years on getting everything ready to submit the application. Flowers asked if site visits will occur once the application is submitted. Associate VC Espy stated that it will probably be a year after the application is submitted before on-site visits will be conducted.

Flowers asked if the Office of Research will be informing the department review committees of the accreditation process. Associate VC Espy stated that the Deans of the colleges will be notified.

Professor Hoyt pointed out that some departments do not have review committees or some do not conduct the committees like they should while others have excellent review committees. He stated that the department review committees that are not operating as they should will be asked to provide more expertise in particular disciplines to facilitate the IRB review process better. Associate VC Espy noted that the members of the review board are from different disciplines and they do not have the expertise that can be found in the departments. She stated that the preliminary review of protocols should be done at the local level where the expertise is the greatest. Flowers stated that he can see the unit review committees taking a different role and more senior faculty members with research experience are needed to participate.

Associate VC Espy reported that the Office of Research hopes to have more of the process handled electronically.

VC Paul stated that he is proud of the chairs, vice chairs, and members of the review committees as well as Associate VC Espy and the staff of the Office of Research for all of the work they do. He noted that they are the first ones to receive complaints but the last ones to get thanks.

VC Paul distributed the 2004-2005 Annual Report of the Office of Research and Graduate Studies. He noted that the report includes activities of students and service by faculty as well. He stated that the document is well received when taken to agencies and donors. He pointed out that the report is only a small sample of the accomplishments of the university's work on research.

VC Paul reported that his office is trying to track on a monthly and quarterly basis the activities of research on campus. He noted that overall the effort of faculty members has been great and faculty members are getting larger grants which is the result of research being conducted by teams from across the university and with colleagues from other universities as well. He pointed out last year was a record year for research grants but this year's first quarter was better than last year's.

VC Paul stated that any faculty members with questions about research and graduate studies should contact his office.

VC Paul complimented the Senate for co-sponsoring the Faculty at 5 events. He stated that he thinks the campus needs to find more venues where faculty members can come together to get to know each other. Moeller stated that there needs to be some kind of meeting of faculty members where the work they do becomes the topic of conversation. She noted that former VC Torr held dinners for faculty members with similar disciplines so they could meet and discuss possibilities of research. VC Paul stated that he has been thinking of doing something similar. He noted that there have been some retreats and they have been very successful.

Beck asked VC Paul to comment on the mentorship report and career development proposal written by the Research Council. VC Paul stated that he has communicated with the Research Council about these and recently a research workshop for chairs was held on mentoring. He stated that SVCAA Couture is trying to set up a workshop on mentoring.

Beck asked what the status is of the University's conflict of interest policy. VC Paul stated that he has not seen a new draft of the policy. He noted that General Counsel Dick Wood is still working on the policy. Associate VC Espy stated that the Office of Research has been working on developing a very specific conflict of interest policy but it applies to research. She noted that a draft is not ready yet for distribution.

Hoffman asked about the fees that are charged for patents. VC Paul stated that on his office's website the royalty distribution policy can be found and it discusses these charges. He pointed out that his office only receives about \$150,000 in state funds to help support technology on campus and additional funds are needed to help cover the costs. He stated that if anyone has questions on this they should send him an email. The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, January 4th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by

Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Beck, Bolin, Fech, Flowers, Moeller, Peterson, Scholz, Shea, Stock

Absent: Alloway, Hoffman, Rapkin

Date: Wednesday, January 4, 2006

Location: 201 Canfield Administration 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

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

2.0 Chancellor Perlman/SVCAA Couture

2.1 Update on Budget Cuts

SVCAA Couture reported that departments have turned their budget plans into the Deans but the Deans have not submitted them to the Senior Administrative Team (SAT) yet. Chancellor Perlman stated that he will be focusing on the budget cuts soon and will report back to the Committee when information is available.

2.2 Program Review Procedures

Beck stated that the history behind this agenda item is that there are procedures that are to be invoked when there is the possibility of eliminating programs. She stated that the Senate has felt that the existing procedures are cumbersome and do not involve faculty input as much as they should. She noted that a Senate task force has been working on revising the procedures and the committee is close to sharing the draft document with appropriate groups including the SAT. She pointed out that the approach of the document is to establish procedures not only for program elimination but for program enhancements as well. She stated that the revised procedures seek to make the process better and more inclusive of faculty. She stated that she put the item on the agenda to inform the SAT that the draft document will be made available soon for discussion.

SVCAA Couture stated that the Chancellor has already made a statement about how program reductions will be handled. She pointed out that the strategic plans will help determine enhancements and reductions within colleges and departments.

Beck stated that the procedures would call for the review of programs and would include the Academic Planning Committee. SVCAA Couture pointed out that the strategic plans do not go through the APC; however, the APC is invited to strategic planning hearings and invited to comment. The APC and the Senate Executive Committee are also invited to attend the presentations. She noted that she is not sure what the proposed revisions are an alternative to. Beck pointed out that when the revisions to the procedures were first started the strategic planning process was not in place.

Beck stated that she has not heard that an elimination of programs is currently being considered. SVCAA Couture stated that the Chancellor is not invoking any procedures at this time.

Beck pointed out that the current procedures were approved by the Senate and ASUN. SVCAA Couture stated that the budget reduction procedures are not unilaterally determined by the Senate and ASUN.

Peterson stated that the revised procedures would work in both ways for eliminating programs or enhancing programs, such as the Programs of Excellence. SVCAA Couture stated that there are already procedures in place for selecting Programs of Excellence and the APC already plays a role in these procedures. She stated that she is confused about the need to revise these procedures because she has not learned of any problems with the existing procedures from the Deans or APC.

Moeller stated that the revised procedures would make for more inclusive decision making so decisions can be constructed between the faculty and the administration. She noted that decisions would be made through procedures that are carefully followed. She pointed out that the procedures were not carefully followed during the budget cuts two years ago and it was because of this that former Senate President Wunder appointed a task force to look at the procedures. Fech noted that there was a timeline problem in getting the procedures revised earlier because it was too difficult to try to review them in the midst of the budget crisis.

2.3 Update of Strategic Planning

2.3.A. No Feedback to Departments

Beck reported that at least some department chairs/heads have not received any feedback from Deans regarding either their college or department strategic plans. She noted that the (SAT) stated in previous meetings that feedback will be given to the Deans and they will be asked to provide feedbacks to the departments. She pointed out that it is difficult for departments to move forward on the plans if they have not received any feedback.

SVCAA Couture stated that she will indicate to the Deans at their next meeting that faculty members have been asking about receiving communications from the Deans regarding the strategic plans. She noted that she, the Chancellor, the VC of IANR, did provide feedback to each college. She stated that for those colleges that submitted department plans as well as a college plan, some comments were made on department plans as well. She noted that Chancellor, VC of IANR, and she have stated that they are working through the Deans on the strategic plans.

Beck asked if the plans are posted on the internet. SVCAA Couture stated that the college plans are listed on the Academic Affairs website. (To view the plans go to <http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/planning/components/plans/#public>)

2.4 Five Year Review of VC Owens

Beck stated that several faculty members have contacted her asking if a five year review will be conducted on Vice Chancellor Owens and what mechanism will be used to gather information from the faculty. Chancellor Perlman stated that a review will certainly be conducted this semester. He noted that it will probably follow closely the format used for reviewing Deans. He pointed out that a number of people will have five year reviews conducted and a couple more have been postponed until next year but the review of Vice Chancellor Owens will be conducted.

2.5 Results of Senate Survey on Quality Indicators

Beck stated that an abbreviated presentation will be made to the Senate on Tuesday but the Executive Committee wanted to report the results of the survey to the administrators first.

Flowers noted that the Executive Committee felt that the topic of quality indicators would be a good one to look at since the Committee has been made aware of concerns that the journal lists that are supposed to be used for assessing programs were being used to assess individuals. He noted that there was also concern with how the lists were developed and whether they are a good fit with departments.

Flowers stated that there were two themes to the survey. The first is the extent of the use of the journal lists in individual faculty evaluations and whether these lists influence a faculty member's research decisions. The second theme is the degree of knowledge of the use of the list and the faculty's input into developing the list. Also included in this theme is whether the lists reflect the faculty interests and activities within a department.

Flowers stated that the only demographics that were gathered were the college and tenure status of the faculty member. He noted that 491 fully completed questionnaires were received with the most being received from CASNR/IANR and Arts & Sciences.

Flowers stated that results of the survey indicate that overall people feel that the journal lists are not influencing their choice in conducting research. He reported that there is no indication of widespread use of the list for individual evaluations. However, when the responses were broken down by the colleges, it became clear that there was no difference between the colleges except for one college. He stated that responses from CBA indicate that the lists are being used in some cases for individual faculty evaluations and the lists are perceived as having an influence on some faculty members' decision on research.

Flowers reported that the responses indicate that there are mixed views about the degree of faculty influence in the development of the lists. Responses indicate that there is some dissatisfaction about the fit of the existing lists.

Flowers noted that 156 respondents submitted open-ended comments. He stated that the largest number of comments were critical of the lists for evaluations. He pointed out that overall the quality indicators is not a hot issue but there are local incidences where the list is causing some problems.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he has been and remains modestly skeptical of the value of using journal lists although it is important to have some matrix of quality. He noted that it has been difficult to find a way to give the humanities and social sciences a way to develop a matrix. He stated that he is surprised to hear the lack of negative comments about the lists.

Chancellor Perlman stated that some of the questions on the survey trouble him a bit. They seem to ask for the negative consequences of the list rather than any positive consequences. He wondered whether the lists may actually have increased the ambition for some people or caused some faculty members to submit articles to more highly ranked journals than they would have done before. He stated that it would be interesting to know if people thought that the quality indicators create positive incentives. Flowers noted that some of the open comments indicate that the lists were positive and important.

Chancellor Perlman stated that in some departments, such as the hard sciences, he could see the lists being used extensively for evaluations because publishing in such

journals as “Science” is regarded as a strong indication of quality. He stated that he is unsure about it being used in CBA for evaluations but the same may hold true there and it might be useful to explore this. As to apparent lack of faculty involvement in CBA, he pointed out that faculty members could be content not to be involved in determining the lists. He noted that there is some evidence that CBA has done an Executive Committee style of governance where the Executive Committee determined the lists. He pointed out that there may be some faculty members who do not like this but others may not want to be involved in faculty governance issues.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he thought the survey was interesting and noted that he has some of the same concerns as the Committee regarding the journal lists. He noted that in some areas the list works well but in others, such as English, it may not.

Chancellor Perlman pointed out that the journal lists cannot be measured against our peers. It can only be used to compare to ourselves but accumulated data is needed in order to do this. He pointed out that there is an enormous amount of administrative work that goes in to creating the quality indicators and it might be appropriate to rethink the issue in the future. He stated that the University is getting considerable pressure from the Regents and nationally to have objective measures of quality and the quality indicators is helpful in this respect but the question is how we can do this better.

Peterson pointed out that some changes should be made to the quality indicators report because it does not present the campus in the best way. He noted that some things are mislabeled in the report and comparisons are made to our peers without providing additional information which would reflect relevant differences. He cited the number of Fulbright scholars as an example: the number of Fulbright awards at UNL would be expected to be less than at some peers such as Illinois or Minnesota which have more than twice as many students. He stated that he would be happy to share some of these areas that need changing with the administrators.

SVCAA Couture stated that there are a number of concerns that she has with the quality indicators. She noted that our yearly display of quality indicators appears to pressure that we have benchmarks that we are trying to reach when in fact no benchmarks have been set. She pointed out that the Deans have been asked what their strategic priorities are and to indicate whether any of the quality indicators can be used as a benchmark for these priorities. She stated that unless we have goals and objectives the quality indicators report will likely present a flat picture, that is, little movement over time. In response to questions raised about journal lists, she pointed out that a list can establish goals for faculty members to shoot for.

SVCAA Couture stated that she was surprised there were not more negative comments about the journal lists, as reported on the Senate survey. She stated that one question that was not asked is whether having your scholarship evaluated against a preferred list has affected a faculty member's ability to progress through the normal channels for promotion and tenure. Flowers stated that this was discussed by the Committee but it was felt that the survey needed to be kept short and instead questions were specifically targeted to issues that have been raised to the Committee.

Beck pointed out that if the survey had been conducted when the lists were first being developed there probably would have been a lot of outrage but since the lists have not been used negatively the responses have been more favorable.

Moeller stated that she agreed with the comments that there should be gold standards for the faculty to aspire to. She noted that it was interesting that many people did not even know about the lists and suggested that the survey may have raised the consciousness about the list. She stated that there is one local area where the lists were being used punitively and this is a concern.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he thinks surveying the faculty is great. Beck stated that there is a lot of disparity on campus regarding the size of the lists. Some units only have 10 journals while others have 10 journals for each sub discipline in the unit.

Flowers noted that the directive was that the quality indicators were to be used to assess a program and not to be used punitively against individuals. He pointed out that in the CBA the responses suggest the lists are constraining research choices of some faculty members. Chancellor Perlman asked if this was bad or good. He noted that CBA has an elaborate strategic plan matrix which may include the lists. He pointed out that this could be useful.

Peterson stated that the individual comments are the most interesting part of the survey. Flowers stated that most of the comments were constructive and many had positive things to say.

Moeller stated that the survey is a great venue for the faculty to feel they have more of a direct voice and can present their input. She noted that the survey gives more of a database vehicle to provide input.

The Committee stated that the results of the survey will be posted on the Academic

Senate webpage.

2.6 Other Issues

Retreat of Deans and Chairs

SVCAA Couture reported that there was a retreat held on December 15th for Deans and Chairs. She stated that the retreat was to help chairs in their leadership role to become strategic leaders who can move departments forward. The retreat was designed to help departments and colleges think about what the strategic focus is for them and how to make this clear to our faculty, students, and the public. She stated that examples of several departments that have used good planning to achieve excellence were presented. She stated that the Physics department has redirected their hiring over the last several decades to focus in on specific areas in their discipline. She noted that IANR reported how they are involving external constituents in their strategic planning and the Management program discussed how they have focused their department to develop certain niches in their field. She stated that a presentation was made from Professor Hudgins, chair of the Electrical Engineering department on how they have come up with a strength analysis of the department that will assist the department in hiring. She stated that she hoped the presentations were an inspiration for chairs. She stated that more leadership workshops will be provided to help move the University forward. She noted that the retreat was well attended.

Strategic Planning Hearings

SVCAA Couture reported that hearings on the strategic plans are tentatively scheduled for April 19th and 20th.

NCA Accreditation

SVCAA Couture reported that the report for the NCA accreditation is moving forward. She stated that Professor O'Hanlon has written the first few chapters and they will soon be reviewed.

Beck asked if the accreditation team has been selected yet. SVCAA Couture stated that the campus is still waiting to hear about the team. Peterson asked if the team will be coming to campus in the fall. SVCAA Couture stated that the team will be here in November.

General Education Revision Process

SVCAA Couture reported that the general education revision process is moving forward. She stated that Professor Janovy who is chairing the committees working on revising the program, will be updating the campus soon on where things are moving towards. She pointed out that if anyone has suggestions or concerns they should contact either Professor Janovy or Associate Vice Chancellor Wilson in her office.

Beck stated that she has heard that there are now four institutional objectives. SVCAA Couture stated that this is correct. Peterson noted that the original eight objectives have been compressed into four. Beck reported that she has heard that the APC is looking at the institutional objectives and may suggest revising some of the language.

Academic Program Reviews

Beck noted that the APC is looking at the procedures for academic program reviews (APR). She stated that she would like the procedures to include a review of governance in departments.

SVCAA Couture stated that there has been a subcommittee composed of some Deans and members of the APC. This subcommittee did a revision of the program review procedures which is now being reviewed by the Deans. She stated that she would pass the draft document to the Executive Committee for comments. She noted that no revisions are set in stone. She pointed out that the object of revising the procedures is to make sure they coincide with department and college accreditation processes so there is not a duplication of work. She stated that the academic program review should also have a bearing on department and college strategic planning.

Beck pointed out that another benefit of revising the procedures is to make the APR's more accessible so program eliminations are made without knowing the matrixes. SVCAA Couture asked how they are not accessible now. Beck stated that she has spoken with APC members who have served over a period of time and they feel that when the APC reviews programs for elimination or reduction the review is not done against the background provided in the APR. SVCAA Couture stated that the APC is not reviewing any program for elimination and the APR is part of the public record that can be looked at. Beck pointed out that the APR's might be part of the public record but the actual documents are not easily obtained.

SVCAA Couture stated that the APC is trying to relate APR's to strategic planning.

ITLE Grants

Peterson asked where the process is for the ITLE grants. SVCAA Couture stated that letters will be sent out this week notifying people of the awards. She noted that there was not enough funding to cover all of the proposals. She stated that there were some proposals that were not funded but if additional money becomes available they could receive funding. She reported that several proposals were rejected.

Peterson stated that there was an interest in funding proposals pertaining to undergraduate advising. He asked if a lot of proposals to support advising were received. SCVAA Couture stated that a number of proposals were received and funded. She noted that the proposals that were rejected were those eliminated by the advisory committee.

Alexander asked for examples of what was funded. SVCAA Couture stated that this year the SAT looked at plans that related to space and equipment needs, particularly those plans that would benefit others, such as plans to improve the Libraries and general purpose classrooms. She pointed out that they have questions that need to be answered about some of the plans before they can move forward on them. She stated that space and equipment requests from colleges and departments will be evaluated on the strength of their strategic plans.

SVCAA Couture stated that there are no additional resources at this point to redistribute to colleges. She noted that classroom improvement funding is a one time event. She pointed out that some of the classroom improvement one-time funds are coming from the Programs of Excellence and some from the Office of Academic Affairs. She noted that Academic Affairs has money each year to distribute for classroom improvement but a better process needs to be developed to distribute this funding. Strategic plans will assist in this regard.

Alexander stated that part of the strategic plan for the College of Engineering is to increase classroom space so more students can be accommodated. SVCAA Couture stated that any questions about the plans will be discussed with each of the Deans. She noted that once more information is obtained, decisions can be made.

SVCAA Couture stated that the report received from the Life Sciences Coordinating Committee indicate that classroom improvement need to be made within the life sciences teaching laboratories. She noted that a task force has been developed to look at this issue and there has been a request to hire an outside consultant to take a look at the existing life sciences laboratories.

Beck asked what laboratories will be looked at. SVCAA Couture stated that about 10

or 12 people serve on the committee from all of the life sciences departments and the specific laboratories will be identified in the consultants report.

Scholz asked when the campus master plan is going to be released to the public. SVCAA Couture stated that this is being handled through Dr. Nunez's office. Scholz asked if the plan will be presented to the campus before it goes to the Board of Regents for approval. SVCAA Couture stated that she did not know but she would contact Dr. Nunez about this.

Beck asked if the faculty members are sent out invitations to respond on the five year review of Deans. SVCAA Couture stated that recently the process of five year and annual review of Deans has been revised. She noted that she met with a subcommittee of Deans and Directors to develop a new review form that would provide better feedback on the performance of Deans and Directors. She stated that the review form will be used by a designated group in each college, usually the college executive committee, for the annual review, and by all faculty members for the five-year review. The group will be invited to respond on each point on the form. In addition, for annual reviews, an open letter will be sent to each faculty member asking for feedback. She noted that comments from the faculty are not restricted to the form.

SVCAA Couture pointed out that some aspects of the five-year review are dictated by Board of Regents policies. She reported that Dean Willborn, Dean Olivia, Associate Vice Chancellor Hendrickson, and two other Deans will be reviewed this year. She noted that a few Deans will be reviewed next year because there were so many to do this year.

Beck asked whether faculty members will be required to sign the reviews. SVCAA Couture stated that faculty members can submit either a paper review or an electronic review. A signature is required, but this is entered separate from the review form. She noted that the form can be entered anonymously and she will not see the names. She stated that reviews will be checked for legitimacy and they want to insure that only one review can be submitted from each person.

Alexander wanted to point out that the process of on-line course reviews by students is wonderful but the percentage of reviews that are completed are much lower than those done on paper. He asked if anything can be done to improve the submission rate. SVCAA Couture stated that on-line course evaluations are being done now in a few departments, and that Academic Affairs is looking into whether a system could be developed for the campus. She pointed out that nothing has been endorsed at this

time and the administration wants to hear if on- line evaluations work well, and whether there is a way to reduce the decrease in submission rates for them, as opposed to maintaining a two-system approach. She noted that institutions are quickly becoming places where most work is done on-line. She stated that there is potential campus-wide use for the on-line course evaluations but it needs to be developed further.

Moeller stated that there is no reward for students to fill out a course evaluation form. She stated that having it monitored is about the only way to insure that evaluations will be submitted. Beck suggested that a faculty member could reserve a computer lab for about an hour to have students in courses fill out the evaluations. SVCAA Couture noted that these are good points. She pointed out that there have been workshops on the topic that have been well attended and there is interest on campus for exploring this option but we need to know the implications before the on-line evaluations can be adopted for the campus.

Board of Regents Strategic Framework

Chancellor Perlman reported that the Board of Regents is developing the strategic planning framework for the University. He noted that they have approved some aspects of the framework and some of these will affect us but some are for the Board.

Chancellor Perlman stated that keeping tuition increases moderate and predictable is one of the priorities of the framework. He reported that increasing enrollment about the 2004-05 rate is another priority. He noted that this priority calls for a 1.5% increase annually in student enrollment but it is written system wide so it is not clear what this means for each campus.

Chancellor Perlman reported that another priority is to improve faculty compensation through merit increases. He stated that in the future all salary increases are to be based on merit and once the mid-point of our peers has been reached, a merit pool will be provided for the campuses. He noted that there was long discussion on this topic.

Chancellor Perlman stated that increasing federal government research awards is another component of the strategic plan as well as reviewing administrative cost savings. He reported that major software applications will be reviewed to determine whether they are sufficient. He noted that some Regents want to see administrative costs reduced over time.

Chancellor Perlman noted that the Board of Regents has realized how complex an issue the graduation rate is and they have not yet formulated this into the strategic plan. He stated that it is quite reasonable for the Board to push for an increase in graduation rates but the situation is much more complex than people realize.

Chancellor Perlman stated that there will be the start of a major initiative to increase retention rates which will involve faculty and students. He stated that further information will be provided when the plan has been developed.

Chancellor Perlman stated that campus websites will be reviewed to make sure that they conform. He noted that some units may be thinking of investing funds to develop new websites but he does not want them to waste funds if the website will not adhere to the standard for the campus.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the University is optimistic on LB 605 and he hopes that it will materialize. He noted that if passed this will affect significant buildings on this campus.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the deficit request for utilities is very critical and the University will have to work hard on this bill before the legislature. He stated that if we do not get help from the legislature it will have a big impact on the campus.

Chancellor Perlman reported that initial preparations are going on for the Gallup survey this spring. He stated that he is thinking that the biggest difficulty in conducting the survey is getting people allocated to their right “neighborhood”. From the faculty perspective this is complicated because they spend their time in places other than their home department. He said he thought maybe the answer was not to try to get perfection but rather consistency and something that is easier to administer. One solution would be to focus on administrative responsibility on an assumption that even if the faculty member is not physically located within the department, his or her department chair is responsible for that faculty member’s work climate. By moving to administrative reporting as a criterion we would have a simple and consistent, but not perfect, definition of neighborhood. He noted that there will be further conversations with Gallup about it. Beck stated that the Committee can provide feedback on the survey if it would help. Chancellor Perlman noted that it is not an option to eliminate the survey completely because the campuses are under obligation to the Board to do climate evaluation.

Fech noted that Senator Schimek is proposing extending in-state tuition to children of

undocumented aliens. He stated that the federal law requires states to provide high school education but not secondary education. He asked the Chancellor what his feelings are about this. Chancellor Perlman stated that he is in favor of the legislation. He pointed out that the federal law states that the University cannot discriminate between non-residents and undocumented aliens, however, with state legislation it is believed we could provide resident tuition for many of these students. He noted that the parents of these students work here and pay taxes and they are here. He pointed out that it is a social matter as well and he asked if they are going to be here, do you want them to be here as a contributing member of our society. He noted that many of these students were born here.

Peterson stated that he was curious about the energy costs and the effort to get funding to help with it. He asked how the campus stands given the fact that the temperatures have been relatively mild and that some energy saving actions was implemented. Chancellor Perlman stated that we are not in relatively good shape. He pointed out that Business & Finance predicted we will have a \$3.6 million shortfall with average winter temperatures. He noted that the campus hopes to save \$1 million given the energy saving strategies that were employed.

Alexander asked how bad the Mead problem is and whether it is chemical or radioactive cleanup that has to be done. Chancellor Perlman stated that it is mostly chemical with significant pesticide and herbicide wastes from farm operations but there is some radioactive waste from the Med Center. He noted that the wastes were done in accordance with regulations that were in place at the time but we are now stuck like everyone else in cleaning things up. He pointed out that we are not being held responsible for what the army did. He noted that the State Department of the Environment will look at the site but the cost could be anywhere from \$2 million to \$10 million.

Beck stated that a comment made during the Board of Regents strategic planning sessions is the importance of undergraduate education. She pointed out that in some units increasing teaching loads is being used as a punitive tool. She stated that teaching loads have been increased for some professors but the evaluation of these people is not being based on teaching but on whether research was done. Chancellor Perlman stated that these people should be evaluated on teaching if they are doing more teaching. Moeller asked what happens if a person not doing research is given more of a teaching load but is not a good teacher. She stated that this is happening and it is a detriment to us. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that this is a problem associated with tenure. SVCAA Couture noted that there is an apportionment procedure that allows every faculty member to adjust his/her apportionment of

duties. She stated that it should be made clear what the faculty member's responsibilities are and what they are being evaluated on. She pointed out that if this is not happening then the person should take the problem through the line of command. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that it might not be a punitive measure but more of a lack of objective ways of measuring teaching effectiveness. He noted that research is easy to evaluate but teaching can be more difficult. He pointed out that there are some ways to measure this but some faculty members might object to this.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Martin Luther King Breakfast

Griffin reminded the Committee that the Martin Luther King Breakfast will be held on Friday, January 13th at 7:30 a.m. at the Embassy Suites. She stated that the Senate purchased 10 tickets for the event and those interested in attending it should contact her.

4.0 Approval of 12/14/05 Minutes

Flowers moved and Moeller seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

No unfinished business was discussed.

6.0 New Business

No new business was discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, January 11th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Beck, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Scholz, Shea

Absent: Alexander, Bolin, Fech, Flowers, Stock

Date: Wednesday, January 11, 2006

Location: 201 Canfield Administration 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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

2.0 Interview with Candidate for Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

The Committee met and interviewed Dr. Don Aripoli from Missouri State University who is one of the final candidates for Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Special Fees Committee

Beck reported that she, Alloway, and Hoffman went together to review the on-line requests for special fees. She stated that a handout of guidelines was distributed to each committee member and it outlines what fees can and cannot be considered. She noted that justifications for the fees must be included with the request. She reported that they denied some of the requests and this is precipitating a meeting in February of the entire committee.

Beck pointed out that she was glad to review the applications with a group of people rather than doing it individually as the committee has been operating. Hoffman stated that some questions about the applications may not have been raised if they were reviewed by an individual. Beck pointed out that some courses were charging high special fees. Alloway noted that there were some small classes that had special fees of \$250.

3.2 Letter from Professor Crawford, Chair of the Intercollegiate Committee

Alloway noted that he received a letter from Professor Crawford regarding a student athlete and his/her ability to attend class. He pointed out that the letter has been slightly revised this semester and reflects the discussion between Professor Crawford and the Executive

Committee on November 9th.

3.3 Meeting with ASUN Students

Beck reported that the Task Force on the Reductions in Force Procedures will be meeting with students from ASUN to discuss the proposed revisions to the procedures. She stated that she will report to the Committee on the meeting.

3.4 UNOPA and UAAD

Beck stated that she wants to schedule a meeting with the officers of UNOPA and UAAD. She questioned whether the Executive Committee should meet with the officers. Peterson noted that in the past only the officers have met with UNOPA and UAAD officers. Griffin stated that she will schedule a meeting with the officers of each organization.

4.0 Approval of 1/4/06 Minutes

Peterson moved and Moeller seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Quality Indicators Survey

Beck reported that she called the accreditation board of business colleges to ask them if special journal lists are used for giving accreditation to business colleges in the country. She stated that she was told that no special lists are used although they do want to see faculty members in colleges publish in high quality and legitimate journals. She noted that in particular, they do not mandate any kind of list for evaluating individual faculty members. She reported that she looked at the board's website and only formulas were given as an example for accreditation but no specific journal lists are mentioned.

Peterson noted that one of the Chancellor's comments on the survey was about the survey being biased toward negative responses. Peterson pointed out that the Committee received complaints about the lists from faculty members and the Chancellor was the one who suggested that the Senate survey the faculty on this issue. Peterson noted that one of the early concerns of faculty members were that the lists would be used for individual faculty evaluations although the Chancellor and former SVCAA Edwards assured the committee during several meetings that the lists would not be used this way. Beck pointed out that the questions were not formulated in a negative way and just asked for a response from faculty members.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Question Regarding the 15th Week Policy

Griffin reported that she received a phone call from a professor who thought he might be in violation of the 15th week policy because he gives a take home final. The Committee stated that because the professor has the due date of the take home final as the time when an in-class final would have been given and since the professor clearly states in the syllabus the final exam and the due date, there is no violation of the policy.

6.2 Senate Structure

Beck stated that she would like the Committee to review the structure of the Senate to see if it should be converted back to a Faculty Senate rather than an Academic Senate.

Hoffman asked if the main difference between an Academic Senate and a Faculty Senate is that there are no administrators on a Faculty Senate. Beck stated that this is correct.

Alloway asked if chairs would be included in a Faculty Senate. Beck stated that she believes they would be included. Hoffman asked about unit directors. Shea noted that not all unit heads have 100% FTE in administration. Peterson stated that many heads have substantial administrative appointments. He noted that this issue will need to be resolved if the structure is changed.

Shea stated that changing the name of the Senate is a good idea. He noted that there are differences that can be implied in the purview of the Senate based on the name such as some administrators may feel the need to discuss certain issues with the Senate because it is an Academic Senate. Peterson pointed out that most other institutions have a Faculty Senate, not an Academic Senate.

Due to lack of time the issue will be discussed further next week.

6.3 Review Revisions to APC's Academic Program Review Guidelines

Beck reported that the APC is working on revising the academic program review guidelines in part to coincide more with department and college accreditation processes so there is not a duplication of work.

Beck stated that she would like to have a section inserted into the procedures that relates to the governance structure within departments. She noted that the governance structure would need to be defined within units. She pointed out that the suggested insert is written generically so it will not conflict with the cultures within departments and colleges. Peterson asked if the units would have to describe their governance structure. Beck stated that this is correct. She pointed out that some departments, such as Sociology, have

excellent governance while others are not very good. She stated that there needs to be a governance process in place in units that is fair to everyone in the department. She pointed out that there are some departments where the same people are appointed to committees while other department members are ignored.

Peterson noted that currently the APRs do not address governance in the departments although he thinks they should. The Committee agreed. Beck pointed out that the faculty can raise issues privately to the chair of the APR review committee but she thinks concerns regarding department governance should be public.

Peterson asked if the APR guidelines are being revised quickly. Beck stated that the APC has been working on the guidelines for awhile and they want to get input quickly so they can get the changes made. Shea asked when the process was first started. Beck stated that she does not know but the APC has been working on it for some time. She noted that the revisions are being made in part to bring the APRs in line with the CSREES procedures used by IANR.

Beck reported that another objective of the revisions is to make the APRs more accessible for review. She pointed out that APRs conducted in the past have been filed and are rarely reviewed to see if improvements have been made within departments. Rapkin stated that some deans do refer to the APRs. He noted that in Arts & Sciences if a request to hire is made the dean will check to see if the need is consistent with recommendations made in the APR. Beck stated that APRs in the future are supposed to be posted on Blackboard which will hopefully make them more accessible. Alloway pointed out that the human and economic capital that is needed for APRs shouldn't be invested if they are not going to be used in the future. Peterson stated that there have been some bad APRs in the past but ones that are done well can be very useful.

Shea stated that one area he is concerned with in the guidelines is the language that states "The Review Team is asked to keep in mind that many recommendations that would improve a given unit might not be feasible because of the expense involved and the requirements of other units with the University. Therefore, the team is encouraged to focus their recommendation upon what can and should be done within existing resources, unless expressly asked to do otherwise." He pointed out that the review committee should not be restricted from making objective recommendations because of resources. Peterson noted that the current talk on campus is about strategic planning. He questioned how APRs fit when strategic plans are calling for more resources. Moeller noted that the guidelines do discuss this.

Beck reported that an issue came up with IANR Academic Senators regarding APR's. She

pointed out that there are now four research and extension centers. In the past it was very clear about who was leading each program but since the mergers and elimination of one of the centers things have changed. She stated that the suggestion was made by the Senators that there should be one APR for extension rather than having four separate teams to come in for each center. She noted that it makes sense to treat the extension centers as a full unit. She stated that she will draft language for the guidelines on this issue.

Scholz asked if there is a major theme to the revisions of the guidelines or whether the revisions are mostly housecleaning. Beck reported that she believes the main theme is to make the city campus APRs more inline with the CREES process in IANR. Scholz asked if the revisions were initiated by the APC. Beck stated that she believes this is correct.

6.4 Other Issues

Layman Awards

Hoffman reported that applications for Layman Awards must show how the award would apply to the strategic plan of the unit.

Future Agenda Items

Beck stated that she would like to discuss the remissions program that the Chancellor mentioned at the Senate meeting when the Executive Committee meets with him on January 25th. She noted that she would like to revisit the Museum program situation as well. She suggested that former faculty members in the Museum could be asked to attend a meeting to get an update on what is happening with the collections.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, January 18th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Alloway, Beck, Bolin, Fech, Flowers, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Shea, Stock

Absent: Hoffman, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, January 18, 2006

Location: 201 Canfield Administration 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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

2.0 Interview with Dr. Randy Hyman, Ball State University, Candidate for Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs

The Committee interviewed Dr. Hyman for the position of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.

3.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

4.0 Approval of 1/11/06 Minutes

Moeller moved, and Flowers seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 APC Revisions to the Academic Program Review (APR) Guidelines

Beck reported that she emailed SVCAA Couture stating that the Committee needed to extend the deadline for input on the revisions because of the length of the document and the fact that the Committee just received it last week. Beck stated that she will provide feedback to SVCAA Couture by the end of this week.

Beck stated that she wants to suggest that language be inserted in the document that calls for one academic program review for all of the four research and extension centers rather than each center having to conduct a separate program review. Fech pointed out that it seems redundant to do separate APRs for each center.

Shea noted that it makes a lot of sense to conduct one APR. He asked if VC Owens has indicated what he thinks about doing just one APR. Beck stated that the Committee can ask VC Owens this question when they meet with him on January 25th.

Peterson asked why there should be just one APR conducted. Beck stated that one reason is economical. She pointed out that conducting four separate APRs costs four times as much. Shea noted that the centers have a lot of shared activities now that previously they did not have. He stated that the centers are not as separate a unit as they used to be. Fech agreed and pointed out that this is especially true now with technology.

Beck questioned why the revisions are calling for a seven year cycle for conducting APRs rather than a five year cycle. Flowers pointed out that many accreditation processes are now being done every seven years.

Alexander noted that Section C discusses centers and programs within units being reviewed. He questioned how centers are being defined. He stated that centers within his college have been reviewed but the results of the reviews have not been shared with the centers. Peterson asked if the centers are part of a department. Alexander stated that they are not but they are considered centers. He stated that the University hires outside consultants to come in and review the center but there has been no feedback on the review. Peterson stated that the APC's guidelines cover reviews for independent centers as well as those within departments. Beck stated that the Committee will ask about centers being reviewed and not getting the results of the review.

Shea suggested that changes need to be made in the section about recommendations from the review team. He pointed out that the review team should not be limited in making suggestions based on available resources. The Committee agreed.

5.2 Senate Structure

Beck stated that she has thought about the Senate reverting back to a Faculty Senate rather than an Academic Senate. She noted that very few administrators attend the Senate meetings unless there is an agenda item of specific interest to them. She pointed out that when they do come to the meetings, they often do not speak. She suggested that the Senate should consider going back to the Faculty Senate structure. Beck stated that in 1988 a report was made to the Senate suggesting the change to the Academic Senate in order to facilitate better discussion between the faculty and the administration.

Moeller asked why there is a need to change the Senate structure. She pointed out that it is optimal to keep the free flow exchange of ideas between the faculty and administration.

Flowers asked what the downside is of the current structure. Beck stated that she believes that the Senate would be more visible as a Faculty Senate. She noted that most institutions, including the other four NU campuses, have a Faculty Senate.

Shea stated that he would be concerned that changing the structure would be sending a message of exclusivity. He pointed out that we do not want to make the administrators feel that they are not welcome to come to the meetings. He noted that a reason for changing the structure is that some people assume that because we are an Academic Senate there are some things that we are restricted from dealing with. He questioned where academics end and the rest of the university start. He pointed out that at universities almost anything that happens has an impact on academics. He stated that he believes that the faculty and the entire university community need to participate more in shared governance.

Stock stated that he would be in favor of the change to the structure. He noted that he was on the Senate when it was the Faculty Senate. He stated that he lost interest in the Senate in part because he was not clear what an Academic Senate was. He pointed out that when he was previously on the Faculty Senate it was his impression that the administrators attended the monthly meetings.

Shea noted that the Senate meetings are public meetings and anyone can attend them but only Senators are able to vote on issues.

Rapkin stated that he always thought of the Senate as a Faculty Senate. He pointed out that if administrators are non-voting members then they are really just observers at the meetings who can make comments.

Peterson noted that if changes are made to the Senate structure it will required the approval of the Board of Regents. He suggested that the Committee speak with the Chancellor, SVCAA, and VC to see what they think about the idea. Beck agreed. She pointed out that this is not meant as an adversarial issue. She stated that she will visit with Chancellor Perlman about the issue.

5.3 RIF/PRP (Program Review Proposal)

Beck reported that she, Shea, and Associate Dean Rosson, met with members of the ASUN to discuss the revisions to the procedures. She stated that after the meeting she sent an email message to the students including sections from the UNL Bylaws about the APC and its responsibilities to help give them a better understanding about revising the procedures.

Beck stated that she thinks the draft document should be sent out to the Senate and other groups on campus for them to review. She stated that after the document has been out on

the campus for a month or so it should be presented to the Senate as a motion. She noted that by doing this the faculty can give their reactions to the document before it is made as a motion. She stated that she will also visit with Chancellor Perlman about the revisions soon.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Resolution on Search Committee Issues

Beck distributed a draft resolution on search committee training. Flowers asked what the reason is for the resolution. He noted that there have been problems in the past but his department's very recent experience with conducting searches has shown that it is working much better. He pointed out that on-line training is not available yet but will be available very soon. He stated that there has been no problem with training people in his department for the searches. He noted that people conducting the training have come to his department to do the training and meet with the faculty members about the searches.

Moeller suggested that the Committee should ask the faculty what their recent experiences have been.

Beck reported that Flowers' experience is not uniform. She stated that at the last IANR Liaison Committee meeting the problems with the search committee training was a huge issue and that concerns raised were very similar to ones she has heard from other people including some administrators. She stated that not long ago the Office of Equity, Access & Diversity refused to conduct a meeting by teleconferencing. Instead there had to be a one hour session for training for out-state faculty members, some of whom had to drive in three hours to attend the session and the person conducting the session arrived a half hour late. The extension faculty then had to go to Norfolk at another time for another meeting. She stated that it was calculated that approximately \$4500 worth of faculty time was lost because of the refusal to conduct the session by teleconferencing.

Beck stated that another recent problem with the search committee training happened in CBA where misinformation was given to a department conducting a search. It resulted in General Counsel Wood having to write a letter explaining the legal issues regarding the search.

Rapkin stated that his department was recently informed that faculty members can be certified to conduct searches on-line very soon.

Flowers suggested that the Committee should have a conversation with the Office of Equity, Access & Diversity, to see what things are currently being done to make the process better.

Beck reported that one of the major complaints she has heard is how things are being run in large, general meetings. Flowers stated that the meeting in his department was very targeted and helpful. The Committee agreed that further information needs to be obtained before going through with a resolution.

Beck stated that another issue that has been recently raised is that search committees are being disbanded before they can give any feedback on candidates. Flowers asked if this occurs only on administrative positions. Beck reported that it happens at least at a department head level.

Peterson noted that the Committee has discussed this issue before. He stated that it seems like search committees are merely advisory committees and don't get to give an evaluation. Beck pointed out that the Bylaws specifically state that the search committee is allowed to have a deliberative process which allows for an evaluation. Peterson asked at what stage of the process. Beck stated that the Bylaws indicate that after the interviews have been conducted.

Peterson pointed out that not allowing the search committee to provide an evaluation on the candidates could make people ask why they should do the work when they don't even get the opportunity to give an opinion.

Beck reported that the IANR Liaison Committee wants this issue addressed. She noted that VC Owens stated that he would revise the directive to state that the search committee not be disbanded before an evaluation is given. She pointed out that the Bylaws also state that the person hired must be on the short list of candidates.

6.2 Tuition Remission for Dependents Policy

Beck stated that she has received a request for the Committee to ask for tuition remission for dependents of part time employees. She noted that this issue will be on the agenda when the Committee meets with Chancellor Perlman on January 25th.

Peterson noted that the Chancellor has hinted that graduate tuition remission could be eliminated. Peterson suggested that this issue needs to be raised with the Chancellor on the 25th as well.

6.3 Administrator Evaluation Resolution

Beck reported that the draft resolution is simply to ask the administration that they regularize the policy on evaluating administrators. She noted that the Board of Regents, UNL Bylaws, and Academic Affairs' policy all address evaluation of administrations but in

some cases the process is not being implemented as it should. She pointed out that the policy on the Academic Affairs webpage specifically states that “the supervisor shall invite a representative committee of faculty from the incumbent’s unit to provide a written analysis of the incumbent’s performance.”

Beck stated that the policy also states that the administrator being reviewed “shall prepare a report to the supervisor of the incumbent’s past and current objectives and the success in achieving these objectives, and the incumbent’s future objectives and proposed plan for achieving these objectives. The report or a summary of the report will be made available to the faculty, students, and staff of the unit and to such others in a position to observe, evaluate, and offer information relevant to the incumbent’s performance.” Flowers stated that he has never received such a list or summary report on an administrator. Fech stated that he has received this on a unit head but not on the Dean. Flowers pointed out that this is another policy that shows strong local discrepancies.

Beck stated that another issue in regards to evaluation of administrators is separating signatures from evaluations. She stated that progress has been made in this area but it is not been completely implemented.

Peterson questioned whether this is a resolution that should go to the Senate from the Executive Committee or should the Committee make a formal request of the administrators. Beck noted that VC Owens stated that he will move to the model that SVCAA Couture uses for evaluating administrators. Beck suggested that an outside firm should be used to validate evaluations to ensure that they are legitimate.

Beck pointed out that included in the section about providing a written analysis of the administrator, the language also states that “for administrative officers with campus-wide responsibility, the proper committee is the Academic Senate Executive Committee or a standing advisory committee in the unit.”

The Committee agreed to discuss the issue again.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, January 25th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Alloway, Bolin, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Shea, Scholz,

Absent: Beck, Stock

Date: Wednesday, January 25, 2006

Location: 201 Canfield Administration 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

Moeller called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

2.0 Interview with Dr. Juan Franco, Utah State University, Candidate for Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs

The Committee interviewed Dr. Franco. The Committee agreed to send a memo to the Chancellor indicating the Committee's two top choices for the position. Committee members will also send individual evaluations on the candidates.

3.0 Chancellor Perlman/Vice Chancellor Owens

3.1 Tuition Remission for Dependents of Part-Time Employees

Moeller asked if there has been any discussion on extending the tuition remission for dependents for part-time employees. Chancellor Perlman stated that he has not heard of any discussions on this topic. He pointed out that there is not much enthusiasm in the University for increasing automatic remissions at this time.

3.2 Changes to Remission Programs

Moeller asked if there will be any changes to remission programs in general. Chancellor Perlman reported that there will be some changes in general remission programs. Moeller asked if changes will be made on the graduate level. Chancellor Perlman stated that he has approved some changes. He reported that there will be a reduction in non-instructional graduate fellowships in the amount of \$2000 but departments will not be given a limit on the number of these fellowships that can be given. Flowers asked if this means that there will be more fellowships to distribute but the amount of the fellowships will be less. Chancellor Perlman stated that this is correct. Moeller asked if research indicates that this

kind of distribution works well. Chancellor Perlman stated that on the financial side it does work well. He noted that the additional fellowship awards can result in an increase in tuition revenue of \$70,000 - \$100,000 a year.

Chancellor Perlman reported that another change to the remission programs will be in regards to graduate students who are paid on research grants. He noted that currently the University pays tuition for summer courses for these students but instead the research grants will need to cover this remission. He noted that faculty members may not have included this expense in their application for research grants but they will need to do so in the future.

Chancellor Perlman stated that a change that is still being contemplated is departments having a remission budget that they would be responsible for managing. He stated that there is some resistance to this proposal from the Deans but it is a management issue that needs to be considered. He stated that he intends to continue pursuing this idea.

Chancellor Perlman pointed out that graduate remissions keep on going up. He noted that when departments have money available because a faculty member is on leave they often hire a couple more graduate teaching assistants. He stated that while the graduate teaching assistants are paid out of the available funds, the remissions do not come from the department but from the campus. He pointed out that nothing strange is happening with this situation but it is uncontrollable from an administrator's perspective. He stated that expenditures should be manageable. Moeller noted that chairs will have to be more qualified at handling budgets. Rapkin suggested reducing the size of the fellowships but keep the remissions intact.

Chancellor Perlman suggested the Committee may wish to speak with Executive Associate Dean Weissinger to get more information on the graduate remission plans.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the administration is exploring undergraduate remissions by limiting some remission programs to a one time amount. Once an identified amount has been given, the campus would be done with its commitment to the student. He stated that this proposal would help make rational decisions on how much is being given to residential students.

Chancellor Perlman stated that there has been some thought about tinkering with remissions for out-of-state students however, they still pay higher tuition rates. He noted that one of the candidates for Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs had an intriguing idea about pegging remissions so that the cost would be comparable to their instate rate so that high quality students are indifferent about going to a college based on finances.

Chancellor Perlman stated that there are some programs that we should not provide remissions for but it is difficult to segregate these students out.

3.2 Search Committee Training

Moeller asked what the current status is with search committee training. Chancellor Perlman reported that the Office of Equity Access & Diversity is still working on getting the training on line. He stated that it is in progress but the Office is still struggling to be comfortable with the on-line training.

VC Owens asked if update training will be available as well on-line. Chancellor Perlman stated that this is the intent of the on-line training. He noted that the Office has contracted with students from the JD Edwards program to develop the on-line training program.

Moeller asked if the training will be available by the end of the semester. Chancellor Perlman stated that he hopes it will be up and running by then.

3.4 Update on Budget

Chancellor Perlman stated that there have been no changes yet with the budget situation. He noted that he has not had the chance to review any of the submissions of budget cutting scenarios yet. He pointed out that the Vice Chancellors are still reviewing the plans.

Chancellor Perlman stated that if the legislature does not help out with the \$6 million shortfall he will have to institute the budget reduction procedures used in the previous budget crisis. He pointed out that an across the board cut to deal with a \$6 million shortfall would be devastating to the campus.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the legislature will probably not make a decision regarding the budget request until the end of March or April.

3.5 One Academic Program Review for all Research & Extension Centers

Moeller stated that a suggestion was made to unite the academic program reviews for all of the centers rather than do them individually. Vice Chancellor Owens stated that he has heard a little bit of discussion on this topic although he does not know where it originated. He noted that the academic faculty members at the centers get reviewed through the academic departments they are associated with. He stated that he presumed the idea is to conduct an academic program review for all four centers across the state.

Peterson reported that it came up at a pre-Senate lunch on east campus in January. Shea stated that a number of Senators raised the issue and the group in attendance at the

luncheon discussed it. Fech noted that it was a comment made at the luncheon suggesting that one APR could help improve things. He pointed out that with focused educators working across the state lines and across districts it was thought that a more comprehensive review might be better.

VC Owens stated that perhaps the IANR advisory board could take a look at the idea. He pointed out that it could be difficult to do one APR because of the size of the state. He noted that the centers operate in two different time zones and cover a lot of territory. He stated that a single review would take a long time to accomplish. He stated that if it becomes a serious consideration it should go to the elected faculty advisory committee to see if they want to pursue it further.

3.6 Other Issues

Chancellor Perlman noted that five candidates have now been interviewed for the position of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. He stated that he wants to move forward quickly with making a decision.

Hoffman asked what the status is with the Vet program. VC Owens stated that things are moving forward with the program. He noted that Iowa State has almost all of their faculty members lined up for the program and all of the task forces have reported but one. He stated that he believes things are close to being done. He noted that there are very good candidates out there for faculty positions in the program but it is a very competitive market.

VC Owens stated that there are some challenges with the Vet program, particularly with some of the financial aspects. He noted that Iowa State is still a little hesitant about the program. He reported that he has agreed to give up a year of the students coming here which he was hesitant to do because he was hoping to capture the tuition generated from those students. He noted that the President of Iowa State is very supportive of the program.

VC Owens stated that there are some people at the state colleges who think the University is trying to steal students away from them. He pointed out that this is not the intent of the University. He noted that the University looked at the most competitive proposal and what would benefit the veterinary needs of Nebraska the best.

Chancellor Perlman stated that VC Owen's five year review is coming up. He stated that he is working on determining the process that will be used to conduct the review. He reported that procedures require a faculty member to coordinate the review in the unit. He stated that Senate President Beck has agreed to serve as the coordinator. He noted that the

procedures also require a faculty committee to write up the findings of the review. He pointed out that normally that would be done by the IANR Liaison Committee but since VC Owens has some campus wide responsibilities the Senate Executive Committee would be responsible for writing up the review. He reported that he discussed the issue with President Beck and she agreed that a joint committee be formed between selected members of the Senate Executive Committee and the IANR Liaison Committee.

Chancellor Perlman stated that there are some very good potential things occurring on campus and he hopes to be able to make an announcement about these in the next month or two.

Peterson asked about the Semester at Sea program. Chancellor Perlman reported that unfortunately we did not get it. It went to Virginia instead.

4.0 Announcements

Griffin reported that Beck emailed her to say that she did attend part of the Board of Regents meeting and will report on it at the next meeting. Beck also stated that she discussed the Senate restructuring with the Chancellor and he had no opposition to it.

5.0 Approval of 1/18/06 Minutes

Alloway moved and Peterson seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Resolution on Evaluation of Administrators

Item postponed until next week.

7.0 New Business

No new business was discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, February 1st at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Beck, Bolin, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Peterson, Scholz, Shea, Stock

Absent: Alexander, Alloway, Moeller, Rapkin

Date: Wednesday, February 15, 2006

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Report on Deans and Directors Meeting

Beck reported that at the Deans and Directors meeting earlier today the Chancellor distributed a handout summarizing the three bills in front of the Legislature, LB 605 – Deferred Maintenance Funding, Utilities Deficit Request, and Ag Research and Development Center Environmental Remedial Investigation and Removal Actions Program Deficit Request. She noted that anyone wanting a copy of the summarization should contact the Senate Office.

Beck stated that the Chancellor reported that at this point the estimated shortfall, excluding the utilities and Mead cleanup costs, is approximately \$5 million. Peterson asked if this was for the whole University or just UNL. Beck stated that she thought this was for the whole University. She noted that the shortfall is not just due to a decrease in tuition revenue but also because of some decisions that the Board of Regents made in regards to funding.

Beck stated that the Chancellor did not like the proposals that he looked at for permanent budget reductions. As a result he is going back to an assigned minus system used in the 1980's. Beck reported that the Chancellor stated that he is not going to specify to units how they have to deal with the deficit amount. Instead, the Deans will assign a minus figure to the departments and each department will have to deal with the deficit budget over the fiscal year.

Beck stated that the Chancellor does not see these cuts as permanent cuts in most cases although it could be permanent cuts for some departments. She stated that the Chancellor indicated that some money will be given back to units if things improve. She pointed out that getting funding back will be determined by the department's strategic plans, not by programs of excellence. Peterson stated that the budget plan sounds like an across-the-boards cut and if money comes back departments will be rebuilt based on their strategic plans.

Peterson noted that in earlier discussions VC Owens stated that some departments would be cut more than others. Peterson asked if that will still be done. Beck stated that she thinks this could happen and that the cuts could be done unevenly in some colleges.

Beck reported that she did not feel that the cuts are about cutting any programs, however. She noted that the Chancellor stated that these were not vertical cuts in the sense of his identifying programs for elimination.

Hoffman asked if a Dean has the power to cut a program. Beck stated that they cannot make the decision on their own to simply do away with an existing program and fire faculty members. She noted that programs cuts are supposed to go through the reduction in force procedures and would have to be approved by the Academic Planning Committee. She stated that the Dean could not make the decision to fire tenured faculty members without going through all of the procedures. Peterson pointed out that some programs cuts may even have to be approved by the Regents.

Beck reported that the Chancellor indicated that if things eventually become more stable with the budgets he will not penalize Deans if they do make some significant cuts within their units now.

Beck reported that the Chancellor stated that he had to face this kind of budget scenario when he was Dean but the difference now is that it is a temporary situation whereas previously it was a permanent strategy for managing finances at the University. The Chancellor stated that if there were salary increases due to promotions it really messed up the budget on the assigned minus plan because the deficit just gets bigger. Beck stated that VC Griesen pointed out that it was not a good strategy as a permanent way to operate and the campus really needs to do everything that we can to reduce costs and look for increasing revenues.

Beck reported that a report on undergraduate admissions of freshmen students was distributed at the meeting. She noted that the report indicates that entering freshmen enrollment is up for this year and that we are increasing our recruiting success in

metropolitan Omaha, Kansas City, Minneapolis, and Chicago.

Beck stated that information was also distributed on transfer students. She noted that the situation is interesting because these students have a problem in getting into introductory classes that are already filled because upperclassmen are taking these classes. She stated that a list of classes in high demand was distributed. Hoffman pointed out that some schools hold spaces open for transfer students. Beck stated that this should be suggested to the administration on New Student Enrollment staff. Hoffman noted that some of the transfer students are forced to take classes at Southeast Community College because they can't get into courses here. Beck reported that this was discussed at the meeting.

Beck reported that the Gallup survey will be conducted in early April. She stated that the Chancellor reported that the survey has not done a good job of elevating issues beyond the department level. Peterson pointed out that this is because of the way the survey is set up. He stated that it has never been clear from the survey how the elevation of issues is to work. Beck stated that this should be looked at in the survey instead of after the fact. She noted that there are issues beyond a department's control that affect the morale of the employees.

Peterson stated that presumably the departments receive their report from the survey and may hold discussions on it but he questioned whether elevating the issues beyond the departments is ever discussed. Flowers pointed out that a lot of departments think the survey is a waste of time because it is not a good survey. Beck stated that the committee might want to suggest to the Chancellor that the survey include some kind of question that indicates that there are problems outside of the department. Griffin stated that the survey should just include a question that asks if there are issues beyond the department's control that affects the morale of the employee.

Hoffman asked how an issue can be addressed if the problem identified is with the department chair or the college dean. He stated that another problem with the survey is that if fewer than 10 people participate in the survey your department doesn't get much information back. He pointed out that Gallup should consider lowering the number of responses that are needed from units.

Peterson stated that the Committee should remind the Chancellor that the main conclusion that came out of the last survey is that by and large the faculty and staff do not feel engaged but the administrators do. He pointed out that many of the issues that the Senate has been asked to look at are beyond local level issues such as child care, retention and recruiting of women and minorities, and parking to name a few.

Beck reported that SVCAA Couture's recent email message to the faculty is asking for feedback from the faculty on the general education revisions. Beck stated that faculty members should encourage their colleagues to provide feedback. Hoffman pointed out that the recent pink information sheet that was sent out does not include a name or phone number of people to contact. Peterson noted that Professor Janovy who is chairing the revision efforts sent out an email message and comments can be made to Janovy, Associate Vice Chancellor Wilson, or to himself. He stated that he will mention this concern to the committee revising the program.

Peterson noted that people on the larger general education revision committee have been speaking with people in their colleges. He stated that each college has a representative on the committee and comments can also be directed to the representative. He pointed out that everyone needs to be involved in the general education revision process.

Beck stated that she gave a report to the Deans and Directors on the activities of the Senate which included reviewing the Senate structure, overhauling the committees by possibly merging or eliminating some of them, and the release of the draft of the reduction in force procedures. She stated that the underlining theme of these projects is to encourage faculty participation in governance.

Beck stated that she would like to work on the Senate website perhaps including pictures of the Executive Committee members.

Beck reported that the Athletics department is holding a Faculty at 5:30 event at the Devaney Center. For \$5 faculty members and administrative staff can get pizza and Pepsi before the Nebraska-Colorado basketball game and the first 50 people get free tickets to the game.

Peterson stated that he has heard people at the Faculty at 5 events talking about having a Faculty Club. He suggested that the Committee might want to consider doing a survey to see how much interest there would be in having a Faculty Club. He pointed out that UNL is one of the few major universities that does not have one. Beck noted that there was supposed to be one in the basement of the Wick Alumni Center when it was remodeled (there had been one there previously) but the space was promised away. Stock noted that there was a Faculty Club when he first came here that was fairly active. He stated that people might be willing to join if the club was close to campus and didn't cost much to join.

Beck stated that she could speak with Dr. Nunez, Director of Institutional Research and Planning, to see if he could give some scenarios of possible locations.

2.2 The Big Event

Beck reported that ASUN is scheduling “The Big Event” for April 8, 2006. The event is a one-day, school-wide service project which will give UNL students, faculty, and staff the opportunity to say thank you to the Lincoln community for its support of the University. She stated that anyone interested should check out ASUN’s website for the event (<http://bigevent.unl.edu>).

3.0 Approval of 8/31/05 Minutes

Peterson moved and Flowers seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Letter to Committee Chairs asking for Committee Reports to the Senate

Beck reminded the Committee that they discussed last week possibly eliminating the reports or changing what information should be presented to the Senate. She noted that the letter that is sent to the committee chair does outline what they should discuss at the meeting but this does not always happen.

Peterson stated that overall most reports given are okay although sometimes the chair can speak for too long. Stock agreed. Beck suggested that the presiding officer should state at the Senate meeting that they have a copy of the report and if there are any questions or specific issues that need to be addressed the chair of the committee is available to discuss them. Stock suggested that the letter could state that the chair should be at the meeting to answer any possible questions but there is not the need for them to stand up and give a formal presentation if they feel it is not needed.

Hoffman suggested that the report include information on the responsibilities of the committee. He noted that he has learned things such as the availability of funds for guest speakers from the reports. Scholz noted that the topics are helpful but he wondered if the written reports should follow some kind of template so there is a consistency in how they are given. Fech agreed and stated that an outline would be nice.

4.2 Committee Restructuring

Beck stated that she reviewed some of the committees a little further. She questioned why the Academic Standards Committee needed to have such a large panel of faculty members to choose from. She noted that the committee only meets at the end of each semester and only three members need to be present. Hoffman stated that he served on the committee and it can take some time to review the appeals that are submitted. He suggested that each college could have a representative to the committee instead of having a panel of 22 faculty

members.

Beck wondered whether the Academic Standards and Grading & Examination Committees could be combined. She noted that this would reduce the number of faculty members needed for committees.

Beck suggested that the Commencement, Honors Convocations, and Honorary Degrees Committee could be combined. Griffin pointed out that the work of the Honorary Degrees Committee is quite different from the Commencement and Honors Convocations Committee. Beck stated that the Honorary Degrees could be a subcommittee of the other two.

Peterson stated that it would be useful to look at each committee's syllabus to review the responsibilities. He stated that it would be helpful to interact with the people who are or have been on the committees.

Beck asked if we need to have a Teaching Council. Griffin pointed out that some of these committees are not Senate committees and the Senate does not have the authority to eliminate them. Peterson stated that he does think the Teaching Council is needed.

Beck suggested that the Parking Advisory and Parking Appeals Committees could be combined. She stated that the Committee will discuss this with Dan Carpenter, Director of Parking & Transit Services, when he meets with the Committee on February 22nd. She noted that most appeals are now handled on-line and the appeals committee may not be necessary.

Beck stated that she would like to have two new committees considered. One would be a Budget Committee. She noted that there used to be a Budget Committee and it was useful in getting salaries increased. She pointed out that it would be important to have people on the Committee who knew and understood budgets. She stated that this Committee would be helpful in times of budget cuts. Peterson suggested that the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee could be made more active. He asked what kind of power the Budget Committee would have since it would probably be just advisory. Beck indicated she didn't envision its having any power per se, but that its role would be to provide information to the Senate and Executive Committee.

Beck stated that the other committee is a Human Rights Committee. Peterson stated that it would need to be made very clear about what a Human Rights Committee would do.

Griffin pointed out that both the Budget Committee and the Human Rights Committee were

recently eliminated by the Senate because they have not been functioning for a number of years. Shea stated that the Human Rights Committee could give people a place to go if there is an issue that needs to be dealt with when there is not an adequate mechanism available. Stock noted that this was debated on at the Senate meeting and the vote was to eliminate the Committee.

Hoffman stated that ad hoc committees can always be set up if particular issues come up that need to be dealt with. Beck indicated that all of these ideas are just part of a discussion at this point and should not be cause for alarm.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Report on Academic Titles

Shea reported that the committee working on the academic titles submitted recommendations to the Chancellor on December 22nd. He noted that he recently received word from Associate VC Jacobson that he could share the recommendations with the Senate. He stated that the Associate VC is asking for a response back from the Senate by March 2nd. Peterson asked why the faculty is being given such a short time frame to respond when the recommendations were made back in December. Beck stated that the Senate may want to vote on the issue. Shea stated that he will contact Associate VC Jacobson to let her know that the Committee wants to bring this to the attention of the Senate at the March 7th meeting.

Shea stated that the reasons for looking into the academic titles are to bring the lecturer/senior lecturer positions into a more parallel structure with the rest of the faculty. He noted that one of the recommendations of the committee is to eliminate the position of senior lecturer and those currently holding that title would be reassigned to an appropriate rank within the Professor of Practice category that is being created. He noted that recommendations also include that the criteria for the Lecturer/T position be changed.

Shea stated that the rational for the changes is that the current structure devalues the non-tenure track instructional faculty members compared to the tenure track and research faculty members. He stated that the recommendations are an attempt to make the non-tenure track positions more equivalent. He pointed out that the new category provides a promotion track for instructional faculty members that would acknowledge their teaching contributions.

Shea noted that there was a lot of discussion about the title "Professor of Practice." He pointed out that it is a title that is being used at other institutions. He noted that other suggestions were made but the committee decided that the "Professor of Practice" title would be flexible enough to cover all of the units at UNL. Beck asked if this title only

applies to teaching positions and not research. Shea stated that at this time it only applies to teaching. He noted that the committee agreed that further study would need to be conducted to see if changing the titles of research positions would be workable.

Beck suggested that the title of Professor of Instruction should be considered, particularly if the research non-tenure track position titles do not get changed to fit into this category. Shea pointed out that he would like to think that the research titles will also change eventually but this might be more difficult to do. He stated that basically there would be four groups: Lecture/T, tenured/tenure track, non-tenure teaching, non-tenure research, and extension educators. He noted that there was some slight discussion about changing the extension titles but the committee agreed that this would be a huge hurdle and may not be workable.

Beck pointed out that there are currently only 45 senior lecturers and most instructional, non-tenure track people will not be affected by this change. She stated that the number of lecturers has increased by nearly 300% in recent years. Shea stated that the goal was to make improvements over what we have had before.

Beck asked if there are any violations of the Regents Bylaws with these titles. Shea was not certain but believed changes in the Bylaws would be recommended if necessary.

Hoffman asked who hires the non-tenure track people. He noted that research professors are usually hired by the principal investigator of a grant. He asked if there was any discussion on hiring, such as who hires these people and how many can departments have. Beck stated that in her department a national search is conducted for lecturers. Stock stated that in English there is a pool of these people who are eligible to teach and they are typically hired from year to year.

Stock noted that one of the recommendations is for departments and other units to revise their bylaws to reflect non-tenure track faculty member's rights, including voting rights and responsibilities in the units. He stated that some of this is already occurring in English. Shea stated that there was a lot of discussion on this topic. He stated that the committee felt that there should be some UNL-wide uniformity in the rights of faculty holding these positions. He noted that how non-tenure track faculty members are treated in units varies tremendously across the campus.

Beck asked if the pool of non-tenured faculty members in English is composed of full-time employees. Stock stated not necessarily. He pointed out that it can be a balancing act depending on what courses need to be covered from semester to semester. He stated that a committee within the department determines how many people are needed and review the

applications of the people in the pool to see who will fit the best.

Shea noted that under each academic title category recommendations have been made on the process that should be used to fill these positions.

Fech asked if some of these positions are filled by opportunity hires or trailing spouses. Shea and Beck stated that they could be.

The Committee agreed that the report was well done. Shea mentioned that the committee volunteered to look at policies associated with these positions including family/friendly policies. He noted that the Chancellor requested that the committee also make recommendations on these policies. Shea stated that the Council of Deans has received the report and are being asked to respond to the recommendations. He noted that the committee recommended that compensation for promotion within this category should parallel that given to tenure-track faculty. Flowers asked if there were specific guidelines now. Peterson stated that there were not and there is no current way of promoting these people.

Beck asked if the non-tenure track faculty (i.e., senior lecturers) have been polled to see how they feel about a Professor of Practice title. Shea stated that he did not think they were polled. He noted that the Senior Lecturer on the committee supported the proposed title.

Beck asked what notice the non tenure-track faculty must be given if their position is terminated. Hoffman stated that most people know that if they do not receive a contract by September 15th, they are not hired for that year. Shea stated that specific guidelines are already in place or should be provided.

The Committee agreed that this should be an open forum discussion at the March Senate meeting and that the Academic titles Ad Hoc Committee should be invited to attend the meeting to address any questions.

5.2 Post Tenure Review Statistics

Beck stated that she would like to put on the agenda for a future meeting statistics on post tenure review. How many have been conducted, has it been successful, and has anyone left the University because of a post tenure review.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, February 22nd at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Beck, Bolin, Flowers, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Shea, Stock

Absent: Alexander, Fech, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, February 1, 2006

Location: 201 Canfield Administration 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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

2.0 SVCAA Couture

2.1 Revisions to Academic Program Review Guidelines

SVCAA Couture reported that the APC subcommittee working on revising the APR guidelines has addressed the corrections suggested by the Executive Committee. She noted that additions include reviewing faculty governance and an outline of how this should be done will be included in the appendix.

SVCAA Couture stated that the subcommittee did consider the suggestions for the paragraph dealing with recommendations made by outside reviewers. She stated that she and the Chancellor agreed that an external committee's recommendations should not be restricted to improvements within existing resources but they do need to consider what can be done with the resources that are currently available and how additional resources can help a department move forward. She pointed out that the guidelines should ask the external committee to make suggestions that are within the available resources. She noted that she is looking at ways to modify the paragraph in order to get both of these concepts stated.

SVCAA Couture reported that she recently came back from a national meeting of the council that oversees accreditation agencies for universities. She pointed out the council just changed their guidelines to reflect attention to the current available resources that a university has when making recommendations related to accreditation. She stated that there have been some real concerns about accreditation teams acting as advocates for units

rather than dealing with the quality of education that is required for accreditation. An example is if an accreditation team makes recommendations that are not required to maintain accreditation, and are out of touch with what can be done at the campus level. She pointed out that this can cause some problems for colleges and universities.

Beck stated that she thought the subcommittee misunderstood part of the faculty governance addition. She noted that the subcommittee thought that the Executive Committee was calling for individual evaluations to be submitted as part of the faculty governance evidence but this is not the case. She stated that what is being asked for is an explanation of the process that is used to conduct evaluations. SVCAA Couture stated that she will report this to the subcommittee and explain it to them. She stated that the next step will be to take the revised document to the full APC for approval. She thanked the Committee for its suggestions to the document and stated that they were helpful.

2.2 Update on the General Education Program Revisions

SVCAA Couture reported that Professor Janovy and Associate Vice Chancellor Wilson have been meeting with various groups on campus to discuss the general education revisions. She distributed a draft document providing information on the recent efforts to reform general education, the institutional objectives for general education at UNL, and the key characteristics of the next general education program.

SVCAA Couture noted that a general announcement was sent by Professor Janovy regarding the efforts to date on the revisions and she included information on the efforts in her recent letter to the campus as well. She pointed out that interaction on this issue needs to occur early and often in the revision process.

SVCAA Couture stated that structural characteristics need to be met in order for general education to work for undergraduate students. She stated that it is hoped that these key characteristics will help make the program more sustainable.

SVCAA Couture reported that a list of the groups that have been consulted with to date will be put on the general education website (<http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/gened>). She noted that approximately 30 groups and individuals have been met with to date. She stated that faculty can review the list and let the general education revision team know whether there are other groups that should be consulted.

SVCAA Couture stated that another group of faculty members and administrators will be sent to the national general education conference this summer.

Beck asked what the projected further timeline is for the revision process. SVCAA

Couture stated that another speaker, Dr. Peggy Maki, will be coming to campus on February 21st to discuss Assessing for Learning. SVCAA Couture stated that the revision team is drafting learning objectives for the students which she hopes will soon be reviewed by the colleges. She pointed out that there will be other components of the revision that will need to be reviewed by the colleges as well.

SVCAA Couture stated that in the fall semester the Chancellor will update the campus on where things are with the revisions.

Beck asked if there is any specific process that will be used to get the colleges to approve the revisions. SVCAA Couture stated that there has been discussion about coordinating with the bodies in the colleges that approve general changes in curriculum. She stated that the objectives, structural criteria and outcomes will be identified by the general education planning team and advisory committee first and then they will go to the colleges.

SVCAA Couture stated that part of the plan is to keep the campus informed of what is going on by discussing the process with the Deans. She noted that she is hoping that the Deans are discussing what is occurring during this revision process with their college committees so that the faculty members are better informed before the documents are put before college committees for approval. She pointed out that there will be some conflicts because the issues are so important. She stated that she hopes the Senate can help get the faculty members engaged in discussions.

Hoffman asked what the final objectives are for the general education program and as a teacher, how is it going to effect him. SVCAA Couture stated that the effects on individual faculty members will in part be determined by what the instructor teaches. She pointed out that she expects contributions to the program to vary across the campus. She noted that contributions may be in actual courses that meet certain learning outcomes, and this may affect some departments and not others. She stated that the revision teams are assuming that some of the objectives will be met through the students' majors. She noted that she is assuming that departments will be proposing certain areas/courses in their curriculum to meet the objectives of the program. She stated that departments will be asked to identify what educational experiences in their units will meet the objectives, once they are approved.

SVCAA Couture stated that students will likely have the opportunity to demonstrate that they have already mastered specific objectives. She noted that some structural issues will have to be addressed as colleges and departments start making proposals to nominate courses/experiences to meet program objectives.

SVCAA Couture pointed out that there is no way now of anticipating what the changes to our general education program will be. She noted that some changes may not involve individual courses, but rather other kinds of student experiences. She stated that some students may have some program objectives completed before they even get here. Hoffman pointed out that some reporting and assessment will need to be done to determine if students have met some of the objectives. SVCAA Couture stated that in some instances the students may be responsible for providing this information.

SVCAA Couture stated that another issue being looked at by other universities, as well as UNL, is the College Learning Assessment exam. She pointed out that this new battery of tests assesses student learning by sampling them to see if they are meeting the overall objectives of the college educational program. She noted that assessment is something that we have to do and are doing now to monitor learning in the majors. She pointed out that assessments does not necessarily need to be delegated to individual faculty members, but can be accomplished in other ways such as a student portfolio assessment at the end of the student's college career.

Peterson stated that the assessment and basic proposal will all have to through the approval process. He reported that the teams are working hard to get the work accomplished. He noted that having the general education program revision as a priority for the Chancellor and SVCAA is helping to get it accomplished.

Peterson pointed out that Professor Ledder, a Senate representative from Mathematics, is very enthusiastic about the learning objectives that have been identified. Peterson stated that Professor Ledder has considered bringing a proposal to the Senate saying the Senate supports the objectives and recommends that they be included in each course syllabus. Peterson stated that he suggested that this idea be brought up to the Senate in an open forum discussion.

SVCAA Couture stated that it is important to keep the dialogue open on the subject. She noted that there will be opportunities for the colleges to comment on the revisions. She stated that as things develop other objectives might be added.

Peterson reported that the specific outcomes will be discussed with the larger revision team. He noted that the objectives are not outcomes yet and there needs to be further discussion on the issue. Moeller pointed out that there are global goals now but more discipline specific goals need to be addressed. She stated that this will be a good task for faculty to figure out. Peterson asked how general outcomes get assessed. Moeller noted that when students have to assess themselves their learning skills increase significantly. SVCAA Couture stated that when students are responsible for tracking their progress it

creates a great learning system for the student. She pointed out that there will need to be a structural support system in place to help them, if we go this route.

2.3 Update on Strategic Planning

SVCAA Couture reported that her office is working on keeping the strategic planning website up to date on what is occurring with the strategic plan (<http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/planning/>). She urged faculty members to check the website for the latest information.

SVCAA Couture stated that department strategic plans were due on January 31st. She noted that the colleges are handling the planning differently and the administration has received a lot of department plans to date. She pointed out that IANR is running its own process so she is not aware of how the plans from east campus are coming along. She stated that at this point she will not be looking at the department plans but a mechanism is being created that will provide information back to the Deans so they can interact with their departments' plans.

Hoffman asked if the departments were given guidelines to follow when they developed their strategic plan. SVCAA Couture stated that a number of templates had to be filled out and one of these included strategic priorities. She stated that enrollment management plans and constituency involvement plans were also required. She noted that all of the templates can be found on the website and have been there since mid-fall.

Shea asked if the SVCAA has received good compliance from everyone on the plans. SVCAA Couture stated that college plans are due on March 15th. She stated that colleges are organizing their plans in different ways. Two of the colleges are having departments do individual plans and then will aggregate these plans into a college plan. Other colleges are having a lot of discussion in developing the college plan. She pointed out that now is the time for faculty members to ask about how the plans are being done in their college. She noted that, as part of the planning process, colleges and departments are asked where was the opportunity for faculty input? Was it at the department or college level?

Shea stated that the Executive Committee needs to make sure that all colleges are functioning properly and that the various colleges are progressing on the strategic planning. SVCAA Couture stated that she has heard from every Dean and they have been asking questions about the templates and how the process is being handled. She noted that only one college was not very clear on how they are handling the process. She stated that the enrollment management issue is being discussed a lot. She noted that she wanted to provide department-based data for departments to use to complete their enrollment management templates, but providing that data was a far more complex task than originally thought, and so the enrollment management templates that were distributed do not provide

department data.

Peterson stated that the Committee has asked about the feedback being provided to the units. He noted that both the SVCAA and the Chancellor stated that this would be done and they reported that the Deans received the feedback but some departments still have not received any feedback from the Deans. SVCAA Couture stated that she has met with the Deans and asked them to send examples of how they have used the feedback provided by the Chancellor and herself to inform the departments. She noted that the Deans are scheduled to provide these examples by the next Deans meeting. Peterson stated that faculty members should ask department chairs and heads if they have heard anything yet.

SVCAA Couture stated that next year the same time schedule will probably be followed for the planning process.

2.4 Update on the Deans Evaluation Process

Beck reported that the Committee has talked about a draft resolution on the evaluation process. She noted that this resolution is just to have a statement out there so there can be a uniform process of conducting evaluations. SVCAA Couture stated that she is unsure what Beck means about a uniform process. SVCAA Couture noted that she met with a subcommittee of the Deans last year to work on revising the administrator's evaluation form. She pointed out that IANR's form is different. She stated that some areas of the IANR form did not have relevance to Academic Affairs areas, but the revised Academic Affairs form has been modified to include some things that are now on the IANR form. She noted that there is a fairly similar process and form now for both city and east campuses.

SVCAA Couture stated that college advisory committees/executive committees are asked to respond to the form for the annual review. She stated that in annual evaluation of the Deans, faculty members are asked to give open ended comments which are tabulated anonymously and later given to the Dean. For the five-year review, all faculty members receive the evaluation form; all responses to the evaluation form are tabulated to maintain anonymity. She pointed out that two or three Deans are now being evaluated.

Beck reported that faculty members in IANR get a form every year. SVCAA Couture stated that all faculty members are sent a letter each year saying that they can make comments on the Dean's performance but a standard form for evaluation is not given to all faculty members annually. Beck stated that some faculty members have felt that they have not had the opportunity to respond. Peterson pointed out that it now sounds like new procedures are in place now. SVCAA Couture stated that in the case of the five year review, letters are sent to all faculty members calling for evaluation of the Dean and

inviting them to complete the form. She pointed out that she does not get a lot of responses back from the faculty. Beck stated that it is important that faculty members know they have the opportunity to comment on a Dean's performance.

Hoffman asked if faculty members have to sign their name to their comments. SVCAA Couture stated that they do need to sign the evaluation form for the five-year review, but the comments are separated from the signature. She pointed out that she has read some comments for this year's reviews, but she has no idea who they are from. She noted that the signatures are asked for to ensure that each evaluation form represents the comments of a single, distinct faculty member.

Moeller asked how many comments are typically received. SVCAA Couture stated that very few are received. Moeller asked if it was less than 10. SVCAA Couture stated that in some cases it is less than 10.

Beck stated that VC Owens reported that IANR will be using a similar process to the one being used by Academic Affairs. She stated that a faculty member suggested that comments should go to an outside source in order to ensure anonymity. Shea stated that this suggestion was made at the IANR Liaison committee meeting. He pointed out that currently the comments go to the Vice Chancellor's office. He stated that anything that can be done to remove the uneasiness that faculty members feel about being candid in their comments would be helpful. He stated that creating a mechanism that removes the doubt from most people would help. SVCAA Couture stated that she thinks a process has been created to do this. She stated that she gets a computer print out of the summaries of the questions that are asked on the evaluation form and then gets a list of comments. She noted that the forms are summarized by the executive committee of the college and then the summary goes to the Dean. She noted that she meets with the Dean and goes over their evaluations including her own evaluation of the Dean each year.

Beck stated that parts of the resolution include excerpts from the UNL Bylaws. She noted that cumulative accomplishments and goals of the Dean are to be provided to faculty members for them to use in evaluating the Dean. SVCAA Couture stated that this is correct and that the information on the Dean being evaluated for a five-year review can be found at the site where the electronic evaluation is completed. She noted that this website is listed in the letter that is sent to the faculty for the five-year review.

Hoffman pointed out that he receives approximately 300 emails a day and it is hard to separate out ones that may come under an employee of Academic Affairs. He suggested that the email message come from the Academic Affairs Office email address. SVCAA Couture suggested that a message could be included in the subject line indicating it is from

her office and that she will follow up to correct this situation.

2.5 Other Issues

SVCAA Couture reported that she has received the report of the committee working on reviewing academic titles. She noted that the report included recommendations. She stated that the report is being shared with the Deans and a subcommittee of the Deans is reviewing the report. She stated that the goal is to have final recommendations on academic titles reviewed by the Academic Planning Committee by March and afterwards it will be presented to the Senate. She noted that any changes in our current academic title system will probably have to go to the Board of Regents for approval. She stated that she hopes to get some more issues clarified by the Deans' subcommittee before the recommendations are made public.

Hoffman asked who is in charge of getting the academic calendar posted on the web. SVCAA Couture stated that she did not think her office was responsible for this. Hoffman reported that the Board of Regents has approved the academic calendars for 10 years but he was told that it cannot be put on the web. Griffin stated that she will contact Varner Hall to check this out. (Griffin contacted Varner Hall and found that the academic calendars through 2009-2010 can be found at http://www.nebraska.edu/students/students_cal.shtml).

SVCAA Couture stated that she thinks the Chancellor will be discussing the budget with the Deans at the next Deans and Directors meeting. She noted that there has been no general discussion yet about the budget decisions.

SVCAA Couture stated that the Chancellor has met with the search committee for the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and he has made a recommendation. She reported that the process of hiring a new Vice Chancellor is moving along.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Discussion with the Chancellor of Senate Restructuring

Beck reported that she spoke with the Chancellor at the Board of Regents meeting regarding the idea of restructuring the Senate back to a Faculty Senate. She reported that she felt that the Chancellor's initial reaction was that he was quite receptive about it but he would probably want to think it over more. She pointed out to the Chancellor that the change is not meant to be adversarial. She stated that at some point there needs to be further discussion on the issue.

3.2 ASUN and the Reduction in Force Procedures

Beck reported that she has not heard back yet from the ASUN officers regarding the email she recently sent explaining the proposed changes to the reduction in force procedures. She

stated that she mentioned the proposed changes to the Chancellor and stated that she will be sending him a full explanation and presentation, as well as the document, to him shortly.

3.3 Issues Regarding Academic Senate Office

Beck reported that she sent an email message to Bill Nunez, Director of Institutional Research & Planning, explaining the proposed move of advisers from the International Affairs Office to the second floor of 420 University Terrace. She pointed out that she has concerns that the volume of students that would come to the second floor would be disruptive to the Senate office. Of particular concern are confidentiality issues with the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee and Panel meetings.

Beck stated that Nunez came and looked at the physical space of the building and spoke with Dr. Turner, Director of International Affairs, who agreed that the student traffic would need to be kept on the first floor. Beck stated that if anyone is moved to the second floor it will be the administrators of International Affairs which will result in little student traffic.

3.4 Meeting with UNOPA and UAAD

Moeller reported that she and Secretary Shea met with officers from UNOPA and UAAD to discuss emerging issues on campus that concerns all employees. She stated that one major issue is the cost of child care. She reported that some of the staff has heard that the price for child care was going to be so costly that it would be prohibitive to most staff. She noted that there has also been talk that the child care facility would be open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. She stated that she will contact Professor Buck to get information regarding the child care facility. Shea noted that it is uncertain whether only national bids are being taken for management of the child care facility or whether local bids are being accepted as well.

Moeller stated that another issue that was discussed is the cost of parking on campus. She pointed out that the staff makes a lot less money and paying the same fees as those who get paid significantly higher seems unjust. She stated that there was the suggestion to have the parking on a sliding scale. Shea pointed out that this suggestion has been made before and there was not a good reception for a sliding fee scale. He stated that he did not think the faculty was solidly behind the idea. He pointed out that the Senate Office received an email that was strongly against the proposal. He noted that some people feel that they are being penalized if they have to pay a higher price. He stated that he believes it is an issue though that should be revisited again. He pointed out that it is an especially critical issue for the staff.

Moeller questioned why parking is not part of the infrastructure of the campus. She questioned why it has to be a self-supporting entity.

Moeller stated that another issue that was discussed was medical benefits. She pointed out that the mid range of benefits only covers 70% of expenses after the deductible has been met. She noted that for many staff members the 30% is very costly. She asked what the benefits are for staff to work here.

Shea reported that another issue is that there are no mandates for staff to get salary increases if they have a job reclassification. He noted that there is a family of positions that fall within certain salary ranges and if a staff member is reclassified into a different position within the family of positions, there is not necessarily a salary increase even though there may be an increase in responsibilities. He stated that it depends on whether there are resources within the department.

Beck noted that this issue was raised at a senate meeting by Professor Hodges. She stated that Professor Hodges pointed out that there were some uniform standards that were met when reclassifications were handled in Human Resources. Peterson pointed out that departments should have control over their budgets and should decide whether increases can be given.

Shea pointed out that there is great variance in how these position reclassifications are handled within departments. He noted that two people can be reclassified and one receives an increase but the other, who is in a different department, does not. He pointed out that this kind of thing contributes to low morale. Moeller noted that the morale level appears to be very low and that generally staff members are not very happy.

The Committee agreed to have Roshan Pajnigar, Director of Compensation and Employment, come to speak about the reclassification issues.

4.0 Approval of 1/26/06 Minutes

Moeller moved and Flowers seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Resolution on Evaluation of Administrators

See section 2.4 above.

5.2 Report on Meeting of Special Fees Committee

Alloway stated that he and Hoffman met with Dean Rita Kean and discussed concerns with the process of reviewing special fees. He stated that she will look into these concerns. He noted that the Chancellor and SVCAA have to review the fees before they are approved.

6.0 New Business

6.1 IRB Letter to Faculty Member

Rapkin asked if the letter that was sent to a faculty member is in the normal range for identifying corrections that need to be made on a research proposal. Flowers and Moeller stated that this is typical. Flowers stated that a department review committee should have caught these errors before the proposal went forward.

Hoffman stated that there should be a template to help faculty members or graduate students identify these minor corrections that need to be made. Flowers stated that there is a book of rules that explains this kind of information. He noted that it can be obtained through the IRB office. He pointed out that it is important for departments to have an internal review committee to look at these kinds of proposals before they go forward. Moeller noted that graduate students in her department are trained on how to do this and can usually catch many of these types of corrections. Hoffman pointed out that not all departments have review committees.

6.2 Software to Detect Plagiarism

Flowers reported that he received a phone call from a faculty member who is trying to get information about the software program that the campus now has that can be used to detect plagiarism. He stated that he thought the Libraries was taking the lead on getting the software but there has been little communication about the program.

Hoffman stated that he used the software program last semester and it was great. He noted that Information Services' help desk does not have much information on the program.

Flowers suggested that the Committee have someone from the Libraries come in to talk about it. He suggested that the Senate webpage can have a link to an information page on the software and how to use it. Bolin stated that she will check to see who from the Libraries can meet with the Committee on the subject.

6.3 Pregnancy Policy for Graduate Students

Hoffman noted that the University now has the ability to stop the tenure clock for pregnant faculty members. He asked if there is a policy that would stop the clock for female graduate students obtaining their Ph.D. if they become pregnant. He pointed out that Stanford and other universities are starting to do this and it is attracting more female graduate students to their doctoral programs. He suggested that this be discussed with Executive Associate Dean Weissinger when the Committee meets with her. Beck stated that the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women should look into this.

6.4 Structure of Committees

Beck stated that she will be sending a matrix of the committees on campus to the Executive Committee. She noted that there are approximately 27 committees on campus and that it is getting exceedingly more difficult to get people to serve on them. She pointed out that at other universities, such as Iowa State, there are six committees although she pointed out that they have a very different structure.

Hoffman noted that years ago in the College of Engineering a faculty member's work load consisted of 50% teaching, 25% research, and 25% service. Now it is 50% teaching and advising, 40% research, and 10% service. He stated that the promotion and tenure process does not count service unless it comes with a grant.

The item will be placed on an upcoming agenda.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, September 14th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Alloway, Beck, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Scholz, Shea, Stock

Absent: Bolin

Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2006

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

2.0 Vice Chancellor Owens

2.1 Update on Budget Cuts in IANR

VC Owens stated that he does not have any new information to provide since the Chancellor made his announcement about the budget cuts. VC Owens stated that IANR will probably cash flow many open positions for awhile and will use money from those lines to help deal with the budget cuts. He noted that some small permanent cuts might be made here and there but nothing major. Beck stated that this seems like the appropriate way to handle the budget since the cuts could be temporary. VC Owens agreed.

VC Owens stated that he will have to do some major cash flowing for the new Vet program. He pointed out that the next two to four years will be particularly difficult to deal with. He noted that once all the current Nebraska students studying veterinary medicine at Kansas State and Iowa State and all of the classes are in place at UNL, it will not be a problem. He stated that faculty members at Iowa State University were voting today on whether or not they want to participate in a 2+2 program. He pointed out that the 2+2 program is that students will take their first two years of courses at Iowa State and the other two years at UNL. He stated that he is optimistic that the program will be approved by Iowa State. (VC Owens reported in a later email message that Iowa State faculty did approve the program.)

Beck reported that she spoke with the Iowa State Senate President who is also a Veterinary Medicine professor. Beck noted that the professor had some questions and some concerns.

One of the concerns is with the size of the classes and the other is what would happen in the future, for example, if Iowa State decided they wanted to add a special course but UNL does not have the faculty in place to teach it. Beck told her that these issues can be worked through if they come up.

VC Owens stated that each of the Universities will have a member on the other's Veterinary program's curriculum committee. He noted that the Associate Deans of each program will manage the teaching portion of the program and there is agreement that the teaching courses between the two campuses will match up. He stated that in the interim, if Iowa State has a specialty course that UNL cannot currently teach, than Iowa State will teach the course through some kind of delivery system. He pointed out that Ames is not that far and he can envision some commuting between the campuses.

VC Owens noted that the Board of Regents felt that the joint program should be pursued and two of the Regents who are medical doctors are familiar with 2+2 programs.

2.2 Tenure Consideration for Extension Educators

Beck noted that the VC has experience in working at an institution that had tenure for their extension educators and the Committee wanted to get his opinion on such a system. She stated that she recently saw a table which showed that land grant institutions are about split even on how many offer tenure or a rolling contract and those that don't.

She noted that she is appointing a task force to look into the issue and to develop a proposal for providing a rolling contract similar to that being proposed for the Professor of Practice category for teaching faculty.

VC Owens stated that at New Mexico State the extension educator positions were tenure track. He noted that this allowed for progression through the system and the ability to get tenure. He noted that this worked fine although he believes the system here also works well. He suggested that the task force should probably work with the Extension Advisory Committee on the issue. He pointed out that this committee is representational of the extension faculty. Peterson suggested that it might be helpful to have someone from that committee serve as a liaison to the task force.

Beck stated that the task force will be small and will include an extension educator and an extension specialist as well. She noted the Professor Hoffman of the Executive Committee will serve as chair of the task force.

Beck stated that she does not think that the system here works as well. She pointed out that the extension educators can be terminated on 90 days notice which she does not think is humane. She pointed out that there are times people in the public may disagree with the

information being provided by the extension educator and these people may put pressure on the Extension Center to have the extension educator fired. VC Owens stated that he has also seen the current system protect extension educators in this kind of situation.

Beck stated that she will keep the Vice Chancellor informed of the progress of the task force.

2.3 Administrator Evaluation Resolution

Beck stated that a faculty member in IANR asked the Executive Committee address the issue of having a uniform policy on the process used to evaluate administrators. VC Owens stated that the IANR Deans Council recently adopted a method similar to the one being used in the College of Education and Human Sciences. He noted that the comment page is separate from the signature page and once the authenticity of the form is validated, the signature is removed. He stated that Dean Kostelnik has used the system the last few years and said that it has worked well.

Beck noted that SVCAA Couture indicated in a previous meeting that the same process is being used by Academic Affairs. Beck stated that as a result it does not seem like a resolution is needed. The Committee agreed to drop the resolution.

2.4 Vet School Update

See section 2.1 above.

2.5 Issues on the Horizon

VC Owens stated that the suggestion to conduct one academic program review for all four of the extension centers was discussed by the Extension Advisory Committee. He stated that the consensus of the EAC was that having individual reviews was appropriate because of the unique geographical needs of each district. He noted that he agrees with the EAC. Beck pointed out that the Academic Planning Committee will need to know about the report made by the EAC.

VC Owens stated that he is close to making an offer to one of the candidates for the head of Entomology. He noted that two finalists were brought back for further interviews and each had very good reputations and were good candidates. He stated that he hopes to make an offer by the end of the week.

VC Owens reported that the search is continuing for a new director of the School of Natural Resources. He stated that he has heard that about a dozen candidates are being looked at. VC Owens indicated that most candidate pools for administrative positions have been small in recent years, regardless of the academic discipline.

Moeller asked why the pool of candidates for many positions is so small. VC Owens stated that he is unsure but this is happening at other universities as well. He noted that Biological Systems Engineering has been rated as one of the top ten programs in the nation for a long time but there was a small pool of candidates for the head of that unit. He stated that the tide of small pools may be linked to the fiscal climate that state universities are currently facing. He noted that people do not want to deal with possible budget cuts and it is difficult to make an administrative job attractive with these cuts.

Peterson pointed out that many people that are highly qualified for being chairs/heads are happy where they are at and do not want to make a move. He stated that a job has to be attractive in order to entice these people to come here. VC Owens noted that it is frustrating because in the past they were able to promise an incoming chair/head that they could hire people to build the kind of department that they would like and the recent budget situation has made that difficult or impossible.

Hoffman stated that he spoke with someone serving on a search committee for a Vice Chancellor position and this person stated that they had a small pool of candidates even when a headhunter was used. VC Owens stated that he has considered using a headhunter.

VC Owens stated that he is hoping that the School of Natural Resources will be able to move into the newly renovated Hardin Center on June 1st. He noted that there will be an auditorium and some teaching laboratories but most of the building will be used for faculty offices and laboratories. He pointed out that the faculty of the School of Natural Resources has been located across many different buildings on campus and the renovated building will bring most of them together in one building.

3.0 Dan Carpenter, Director, Parking and Transit Services

3.1 Parking on Campus During Athletic Events

Moeller stated that even though she has a reserved parking permit she is unable to use her designated lot for parking in the evening when a volleyball game is going on. She stated that it is not right for someone who has to pay \$912 a year for a reserved permit to not be able to use it at night when they are going back to their office to work.

Carpenter stated that he became aware of the problem and has since told the special events coordinator that lot 17B cannot be used for special events. He noted that lot 17C will still be used.

Carpenter reported that people were particularly rude to the attendants at the lots for special events this year. He stated that he has informed the donor groups that if this kind of abuse

continues the donor group would not be using the parking lot.

Carpenter noted that the original intent of the reserve lots was to keep them reserved during the main part of the day and open the area for night classes.

Carpenter stated that he spoke with Professor Forsythe after the Daily Nebraskan article about the parking problem during special events. Carpenter noted that people coming from outside the campus area oftentimes are unsure where they are going and frequently park in the wrong area. He stated that he informed Professor Forsythe that lot 17D was available for reserved parking permit holders to use in the evening during special events.

Moeller stated that she recently had a grant to bring in a guest speaker and attendance for the event would be primarily public school teachers. She stated that she had to pay \$8 (\$4 per day) for 78 people to park on campus even though one of the days was a Saturday. She noted that many of these people were potential graduate students and she does not feel that it is right to have to pay for parking for a recruitment effort.

Carpenter stated that the cost of permits started to really increase when the garages were built. He pointed out that the burden of funding Parking and Transportation Services fell on the fee users. He noted that UNOPA and UAAD have raised the same issue.

Carpenter reported that parking and transit services is completely an auxiliary unit. He stated that out of the \$7.5 million which the unit has to spend, \$3 million must go to paying for the garages. The other money goes to funding the operation of the offices and the transportation system. Any remaining funds go to maintenance. He stated that any money left over from fees and special events helps the budget but the unit is in a situation where they need any additional funds they can get. He pointed out that the transportation system is expensive to operate and even though fees were added for students using the transit system, the transit system rarely pays for itself.

Beck asked if it is typical at other universities for parking to be self supporting. Carpenter stated that it is typical. He noted that parking started out under the University Police but several years ago it split and is now under Business and Finance. He pointed out that the Nebraska State Legislature feels that permit users should pay for parking and therefore funding is not appropriated for parking at the University.

Carpenter stated that building on campus in years past would take away parking lots without compensating for the lost lots. He stated that this is now beginning to change but this is an internal policy that has been set because permit holders can no longer bear the cost of replacing the lost parking lots. He noted that Facilities has been operating under the

policy that if a parking lot is lost due to construction the cost of the project must include costs to recover the lost parking.

Carpenter stated that the campus master plans shows parking being moved to the perimeters but the users of parking want to park close to campus. Beck pointed out that the plan does not match what the users want thus creating a difficult situation.

Beck asked about the possibility of having a sliding fee scale because the cost of parking is a big issue for the staff. Carpenter stated that a sliding fee scale would create higher fees for those who are at the higher end of the pay scale. He stated that only campuses that are unionized seem to be able to accomplish getting a sliding fee scale. He noted that he has looked at several models but has not seen one that would work here. Beck stated that she realizes that not all faculty members would be in favor of a sliding fee scale but many faculty members are concerned for the hardship the parking costs put on staff. Moeller stated that the cost creates a climate issue for the staff and it would be helpful if the staff could get some kind of break. Shea noted that the third shift was eliminated for custodial workers and they were forced to work during the day. Not only did they get a reduction in pay for this change but they had to pay higher parking costs to park on campus during the day. He stated that it is not right to take this out on people who are at the lowest end of the pay scale. Carpenter stated that he is open to any suggestions on how the rates can be reduced.

Hoffman asked if other universities have student parking on campus. Carpenter stated that some do and some don't. He noted that 60% of the garage parking goes to the Housing department for students. He noted that students only pay about \$7 less a month for parking than faculty and staff.

Beck asked how the rates are decided. Carpenter stated that the Parking Advisory Committee has helped to define the costs and open forums have been held on campus to discuss the issue with faculty, staff, and students. He noted that the cost of permits for garages was raised because they became their own permit type. He stated that the amount that is needed to pay debts has been a factor in determining costs. He noted that reserved permit prices increased first but it reached its peak and the number of reserved permits sold decreased because of the high cost. He stated that the cost of the other permits increased in order to raise the necessary revenue.

Peterson asked how much revenue is raised from special events parking. Carpenter stated that special events parking raises 6 – 7% of the budget. Peterson suggested that parking for special events be raised because most people will be willing to pay for parking in order to attend the special event. Carpenter stated that he does not have a problem in doing that.

He noted that donor parking for athletic special events is \$10 per space. He pointed out that the Athletics Departments gets \$5 of that payment. Griffin asked why Athletics gets \$5 for parking. Carpenter noted that the Athletics department pays \$200,000 a year for the Athletic offices in the Stadium garage.

Moeller asked if freshmen can have cars on campus. She noted that at the University of New Hampshire student parking was removed from campus and the reasoning was that it helped to cut down emissions. Carpenter stated that this issue has been raised before and Vice Chancellor Griesen stated that prohibiting freshmen from bringing cars to campus would effect recruiting. Carpenter pointed out that 30-40% of students are from the Lincoln/Omaha area but the other 60-70% are from out state and these students frequently go back home on the weekends. Carpenter noted that although enrollment has gone down, the number of permits issued has not. He stated that students will not give up their cars. He pointed out that universities that restrict parking on campus have been doing it for a long time.

Carpenter stated that he is working on creating a user agreement for students to sign when they get a parking permit. He noted that the user agreement will state that the student accepts the responsibility of adhering to parking policies on campus.

Hoffman asked if parking off campus has been looked at. He stated that it might be cheaper for students and faculty to park at a remote location and come in on one of the transit buses. Carpenter stated that this was looked into. He noted that the closest remote parking lot was two miles further north and most commuters come from the south. He stated that the geographic location makes it too difficult to have remote lots. He noted that the perimeter lots out by the Devaney Center are now sitting empty.

Alexander stated that there is a number of university vehicles parked in the lots by the Walter Scott Engineering building. He pointed out that these spaces should not be used for storing vehicles. He stated that if a convenient ride is provided for people who need these vehicles they should be placed in a remote lot. Carpenter noted that these are vehicles probably being used by Telecommunications or the School of Natural Resources. He stated that he does not have a problem with moving these cars and suggested that Beck contact Professor McLeod, chair of the Parking Advisory Committee, to suggest having these vehicles moved. Beck noted that on east campus there is a centralized space for the state vehicles. Carpenter noted that parking should get a little easier by Engineering when the faculty members move from the School of Natural Resources move over to east campus.

Moeller asked if the Executive Committee could get a breakdown of the revenue and expenses for Parking and Transit Services and how the costs are formulated. She pointed

out that this information would be helpful to get to people.

Hoffman asked about purchasing the commercial space under the 9th street viaduct for additional parking. Carpenter stated that the university had the opportunity to purchase the land in the mid-1990's but decided against it. He noted that it could have been purchased for much less back then. He stated that parking is leased there for \$2 a day. He pointed out that there is a real safety issue though with people crossing 9th and 10th street.

Alloway asked about enforcement. He noted that at Anderson Hall the lot may be full but many people parking there at night do not have a university hang tag. He asked who enforces the lot after dark. Carpenter stated that university lots require permits 24 hours a day/7 days a week. He stated that after hours parking is enforced by the campus police but tickets will only be written if there is a problem such as parking in a handicap parking stall. He reported that a pilot test is going to be done with the lot being closed after 11:00 at night. He stated that the entrance to the lot will be chained. He noted that the faculty will be consulted with to see if this works for them. He pointed out that the lot is being used as an after hours party spot when the bars close and there is often a lot of broken glass in the lot. He stated that Dean Norton will be contacting him to let him know how well chaining the lot works.

Alloway asked what the cost is for a gate with a swipe card. Carpenter stated that it costs approximately \$7000 for a gate and then there is the software needed to manage it. Alloway asked if the NCard can be used. Carpenter stated that presently it could not. Beck suggested that the hang tag could be used as a swipe card. Carpenter stated that another issue with the gates is that they are often broken.

3.2 Possible Merger of Parking Advisory and Parking Appeals Committee

Beck noted that parking appeals are now done on line and that the number of people who show up to appeal tickets in person is very low. She asked if the Appeals Committee still meets to discuss the on-line appeals. She wondered whether the Parking Advisory Committee and the Appeals Committee can be merged. Carpenter stated that he has some issues about combining the two committees. He noted that the Parking Advisory Committee still have a lot of work to do and is a recommendation committee. He stated that the review of appeals should be done by people not employed by Parking and Transit Services since they are the ones that write the ticket. He stated that there needs to be a due process for people to appeal tickets.

Beck stated that the Executive Committee is just reviewing committees to see if the number of them can be reduced. She noted that there are three faculty members, three UNOPA, and three UAAD members on the Parking Appeals Committee. Carpenter suggested that

the number of representatives from each group might be able to be reduced. Peterson suggested that Beck should discuss this with UNOPA and UAAD first to see how they feel about it.

Alexander asked if tickets still need to be written during the holiday break. Carpenter stated that if tickets are not given during this and other times when the university is closed people will start thinking they can park on campus. He noted that regulations need to be kept otherwise it can get confusing about when it is okay to park on campus.

Alexander asked if administrators use departmental funds to pay for specialized parking spaces. Carpenter says they cannot. He pointed out that Parking and Transit Services do not accept any grant funding or departmental funding to purchase permits for individuals. He noted that the Chancellor actually pays more each month for his parking space next to the administration building.

The Committee thanked Carpenter for meeting with them and stated that the information he provided was very helpful.

4.0 Announcements

4.1 Meeting with the Chancellor

Beck reported that she and Moeller will be meeting with the Chancellor on February 28th to discuss the proposed revisions to the Reduction in Force Procedures. She stated that she will be sending the Chancellor a printed copy of the document along with copies of the articles on the University of Maryland.

4.2 Meeting with Executive Associate Dean Weissinger

Beck reported that the Executive Committee will be meeting with Weissinger on March 29th to discuss the proposed revisions to the graduate remission programs.

5.0 Approval of 2/15/06 Minutes

Alexander moved and Flowers seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Update on Child Care

Beck reported that she met with Professor Buck who has been a faculty representative on the committee working on child care. Beck stated that there appears to be some frustration with the process of getting the child care facility up and running.

Moeller stated that the search for a management company to oversee the operations of the

child care facility has been narrowed down to two companies.

Beck stated that it was suggested that the Executive Committee meet with Vice Chancellor Jackson to discuss what is going on with the process. Beck noted that there is real concern that it will be exceptionally costly to send your child there, particularly since the vendor will be given a building that should offset some of the costs.

Peterson asked whether renovations have begun on the building yet. Moeller stated that the building needs major renovations and these won't begin until at the fall at the very earliest. She noted that the Chancellor met with the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women and said that private funding is being sought for the renovation project.

The Committee agreed to schedule a meeting with Vice Chancellor Jackson.

6.2 Resolution on Evaluation of Administrators

See section 2.3 above.

6.3 Review of Committee Structure

Beck stated that she spoke with Professor Hitchcock, chair of the Honorary Degrees Committee. She reported that he said that the size of the committee was good and the committee only meets twice a year but the length of the meeting can vary depending on the number of nominations that are submitted. She stated that he had no problems with making the committee a subcommittee of the Commencement and Honors Convocation Committee.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Ad Hoc Committee on Maternity Leave for Graduate Students

Beck reported that Executive Associate Dean Weissinger is putting together a small committee to look into this issue. She asked if anyone is interested in being on the committee otherwise she will send an email message to the Senators to see if anyone from the Senate is interested. Hoffman volunteered to serve.

Beck stated that one of the main issues is how the graduate student will get paid while on leave. Hoffman pointed out that most universities will not pay a graduate student while on leave. The policy would just stop the clock in their master's or doctoral program.

7.2 Medical Reimbursement Account

Alloway reported that a faculty member complained to him about the additional documentation that is now being required this year for people to get reimbursement from their account. He noted that this is people's money that they have set aside in an account

and they have to now justify why they want the money. The Committee agreed to invite Greg Clayton, Director of Benefits and Risk Management, to meet with the Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, March 1st at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Beck, Fech, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Scholz, Stock

Absent: Alloway, Bolin, Flowers, Shea

Date: Wednesday, February 8, 2006

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

2.0 ASUN – Absence Policy Amendment

Student Sarah Fech reported that the ASUN passed a more succinct resolution on student absences for observance of religious holidays on January 25th. She noted that the ASUN is seeking discourse and discussion with the Senate Executive Committee on the resolution to see if it could be presented to the full Senate as a motion. She stated that she will be meeting with Dr. Hawkey, Director of Registration and Records, to discuss whether the resolution could become part of the student attendance policy.

Peterson questioned who the governing body is that would approve the student absence policy. He stated that he believes Dr. Hawkey would have to make a decision on the matter.

Stock noted that the first sentence in the resolution states that “the University permits absences from class for participation in religious observances.” He pointed out that this is stated as a fact but he does not think this is true. Griffin stated that she believes that the Board of Regents would have to make such a statement or policy and she has been unable to find anything relating to this statement in either the Regents Bylaws or Policies. She noted that she spoke with Dr. Hawkey who informed her that similar statements regarding observance of religious holidays at other universities are only advisory statements and do not require faculty members to approve an absence for religious observances.

Moeller stated that she likes the Senate’s student absence policy which puts the

responsibility on the student to contact the instructor about absences from a course. Stock pointed out that the instructor needs to have protection for their course and should determine whether the course can be completed satisfactorily if the student is going to be absent from a number of classes. Peterson noted that student athletes need to contact the instructor about their absences due to their athletic schedule. Stock noted that he had a star athlete in one of his classes who met with him well ahead of when the course began to make arrangements to make up for the classes he would miss due to competition.

Moeller noted that the ASUN resolution does state that it is the student's responsibility to request permission for the absence by the second week of classes. Hoffman asked why the second week was identified by ASUN. Sarha Fech stated that the ASUN discussed other weeks but decided to make it the second week so it will not conflict with the ASUN's proposal to change the withdrawal policy.

Moeller suggested that the language of the resolution be changed to state that "the students may request absences from a class for participation in religious observances."

Beck noted that when this issue was previously discussed she received an email message from a faculty member who was not in favor of such a resolution. The email message pointed out that the only reason that the University is closed for Christmas is because it happens to fall during the winter break between semesters.

Rapkin asked what would be accomplished by approving the resolution. Beck pointed out that it would make a statement acknowledging the issue. Rapkin noted that it would not be a binding policy. Peterson stated that the resolution would let students take matters into their own hands. If a student found that an instructor would not agree to an absence due to religious observance then the student could drop the course early enough in the semester.

Hoffman asked if the ASUN would have to approve the changes recommended by the Senate Executive Committee. Sarah Fech stated that she thinks it will have to be resubmitted to the ASUN but she did not think there would be any problems with getting it approved. She stated that she would let the Senate Office know if ASUN approves the changes. Moeller stated that once ASUN approves the changes it can be presented to the Senate for discussion.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Legislative Bills

Beck stated that at an IANR Senators' luncheon the other day Assistant VC of IANR Alan Moeller stated that he is not optimistic about the legislature passing bills to help fund the cleanup of Mead or the utilities deficit. She stated that Assistant VC Moeller did state that

he believed LB 605, which is the deferred maintenance bill, will probably be funded.

Beck noted that the Governor has asked the Environmental Trust Fund for \$3 million to help with the cleanup at Mead which would help but is also not entirely good because the University has some staff funded by grants from the Trust. Hoffman stated that he heard that the area at Mead that needs to be cleaned up is not very big, 10 feet wide by 50 feet long, and he wondered why there would be such a high cost to cleaning up a relatively small area. Beck agreed that the area is not that large but the cost will be high if the wastes in that area have leached out. Alexander noted that the radioactive part of the wastes is minor but the chemical wastes are the problems. Beck pointed out that \$6.1 million might be the high estimate for the clean up. Fech stated that some of the chemicals may have broken down already but others have a half life that could be much longer and will need to be dealt with.

Fech noted that the federal budget that was announced has some good things about it as well as a few challenges for the University. Peterson pointed out that a lot of cuts were being made in Pell grants which would have a negative impact for IANR.

Beck reported that LB 1228 is a bill in front of the legislature which proposes giving \$500,000 a year for three years, to be matched with private funds, to fund hiring professors in research and teaching in Animal Science, Agricultural Economics, and Agronomy and Horticulture. She stated that the problem with this is when the funding period ends those departments and the University will have to come up with the money to fund those salaries.

Peterson asked what happens on both city and east campus when a professor retires. He asked if the money from that line goes back to the Vice Chancellors. He stated that he has the impression that the administration is not releasing many positions back to the departments after someone leaves or retires. Moeller stated that in her college departments have to compete for some positions and have to make an argument to obtain a position.

Alexander stated that there needs to be clarification regarding the possible changes in graduate student tuition remission. He pointed out that the Chancellor indicated that only graduate students who receive funding from grants will need to have their summer tuition paid by the grant. He noted that graduate students on state funding will still have their summer tuition paid by the University. Beck pointed out that some grants will not pay for tuition.

Moeller stated that she would like to see a recent history of the number of available fellowships from the past five years to the present. She noted that there seem to be fewer

fellowships available now. Beck stated that the Senate Office is trying to arrange a meeting with Executive Associate Dean Weissinger to discuss graduate fellowships and remissions.

Rapkin asked why there is such concern with departments being given responsibility of their graduate remission budgets. Stock stated that one of the concerns is how large a pool of money will be available and whether departments will have to compete for that money. Hoffman noted that at one time the University tried doing that with funding for computing but it wound up not working and budgets had to be cut.

4.0 Approval of 8/31/05 Minutes

Peterson moved, and Moeller seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Resolution on Evaluation of Administrators

Item postponed.

5.2 RIF Procedures

Beck stated that she will be meeting with the officers from ASUN tomorrow to discuss the proposed changes to the RIF procedures. She stated that she hopes to be able to release the draft procedures jointly with ASUN. She noted that she would like to have copies of the proposed procedures sent to Chancellor Perlman, SVCAA Couture, VC Owens, the Academic Senate, the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee, and the Academic Planning Committee for discussion. She stated that she wants to get the procedures out so people can think about them for discussion. Beck stated that she plans on sending the two articles about the University of Maryland's process of dealing with budget cuts along with the proposed procedures. She stated that the procedures would possibly come forward as a motion to the Senate at the March meeting.

Moeller noted that the proposed procedures would take the onerous responsibility of making the sole decisions of budget cuts off of the Chancellor. She stated that the proposed procedures would make budget cutting decisions more of a community decision rather than putting the burden on one person.

Peterson suggested that the Chancellor be given a copy of the proposed procedures first before it is distributed to the campus community. Moeller suggested that Beck meet with the Chancellor and give it to him in person.

The Committee agreed that the Chancellor should be given the proposed procedures first and distribute it to the various identified groups afterwards.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Senate Committees

Beck stated that she reviewed the current Senate committees and looked at regrouping them into themes. She stated that the reason for the review is to see if some committees can be combined or eliminated in order to reduce the number of committees that faculty members need to serve on. For instance, she suggested that the Commencement Committee and Honors Convocation Committee could be combined. She pointed out that many of the staff serving on these committees already do the work each year.

Beck stated that she looked at the number of faculty members on committees and how often the committees meet.

The Committee discussed some of the committees and how active they are. Beck noted that the Committee will need to decide whether to charge the Committee on Committees with revising the current committee structure.

Peterson noted that faculty members are asked to serve on departmental and college committees as well as campus committees. He pointed out that this might be one of the reasons why people are not volunteering to serve on some of these committees. Hoffman stated that his recent experience as chair of the Committee on Committees is that people feel they get more credit for doing outside service work, such as being involved in national associations. Moeller noted that there are a lot more part-time faculty members who may not feel it is part of their responsibility to get involved in doing committee work. Beck noted that many of the recently hired full professors with named professorships refuse to serve at all; former Senate President Wunder had difficulty getting these professors to agree to serve and was unable to identify any for a search committee list requested by the Chancellor.

Alexander wondered whether the committee reports given to the Senate can be eliminated or changed. He asked if they are required to report to the Senate. Beck stated that the syllabus of each committee states that they will make a report to the Senate. Moeller pointed out that people may not read the reports provided in the Senate packets and having an oral report given will provide information on the work of the committees. Peterson stated that giving a report at the Senate meeting also provides an opportunity for people to ask questions concerning the committees.

Beck suggested that committee chairs could be asked if they have anything specific they

want to report to the Senate or if they have a motion to bring to the Senate. If not, they would not necessarily have to give a report.

Beck and Moeller stated that they will review the letter that is sent to committee chairs asking for their annual report. The Committee suggested that asking the chair to present more specific information to the Senate may help.

6.2 Extension Educators Tenure Consideration

Beck reported that she received an email message from a faculty member which provided web links to other institutions that have extension educators. She noted that 19 land grant universities offer tenure to extension educators, 22 do not, but 6 have a rolling contract and one has a “career ladder.”

Beck stated that she believes extension educators should be given some kind of protection. Hoffman asked what is done here. Beck stated there is no protection and an extension educator can be terminated with just 90 days notice. She pointed out that the educators are out working with the public and bring research based information to the public. She stated that she would like to have a task force look into developing a proposal for creating a rolling contract for extension educators.

Moeller pointed out that the purpose of tenure is to protect academic freedom so faculty members can present a viewpoint that is based on factual research. She asked how this interfaces with extension educators. Beck stated that it is also an academic freedom issue for the educators. She stated that sometimes the public, or specific interest groups, do not like the findings of particular research based information that is being provided by the educators. As a result, some interest groups could put pressure to have certain extension educators removed.

Scholz asked if extension educators are paid through grants from the USDA. Beck stated that they are mostly paid by the state. Fech noted that some of the educators may have 10% of their salaries may come from USDA.

Beck stated that there are still county boards and while they do not provide funding any longer for the extension educators, they are still part of an extension educator’s evaluation process. She noted that New Mexico State University has a tenure system for extension educators and VC Owens has had experience with this.

Scholz asked how many extension educators there are. Fech reported that there are 160. Scholz asked if any of these educators have split appointments with teaching. Fech stated that most do not but some do. He noted that extension educators usually teach short

courses for the public. Beck pointed out that they are considered faculty members of the University.

Beck stated that she could ask for volunteers to serve on the task force. Peterson noted that the members of the task force should not be drawn exclusively from IANR.

Fech stated that he is not sure that all extension educators would want to be involved in a tenure system or rolling contract. He suggested that perhaps the system can be set up to do on a voluntary basis. He pointed out that the extension educators work closely with departments and some educators may not want to be perceived as receiving tenure based on the same standards as teaching professors.

6.3 Access to University Buildings on the Weekends

Peterson reported that he recently had a conversation with a faculty member who complained that he had difficulty with the campus police giving him access to a room he was scheduled to hold an exam in on Saturdays. The professor had been approved to give exams on Saturdays. The professor complained that the campus police were very uncooperative.

Moeller stated that she has experienced and heard of other faculty members experiencing similar problems. She noted that it seems to be more of a problem because of the theft of so much equipment on campus.

The Committee agreed to invite Chief of Police Owen Yardley to meet with them.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, February 15th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Beck, Bolin, Fech, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Shea, Stock

Absent: Alexander, Alloway, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, March 1, 2006

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

2.0 Roshan Pajnigar, Director, Compensation & Employment, Human Resources

Beck stated that concern was raised during a Senate meeting about equity in salaries across campus since promotion and compensation of staff no longer has to go through Human Resources. This could create inequities in salaries for the same jobs. Pajnigar stated that she would be happy to speak individually with the professor who raised the issue.

Pajnigar reported that in the 1990's an outside consultant was hired by the University system to look at the job classification system. She noted that the consultant pointed out that the system being used was rigid and gave little or no opportunities for promotion for staff and managerial/professional people. She reported that there are approximately 3500 staff and managerial/professional employees at UNL. She stated that back then a person could typically get a raise only when they moved to a different department that had more funding. She pointed out that there was a time when employees did not want to have a grant-funded position because the funding could run out after a specific period of time. She noted that this is no longer the case because grants are where the money is available.

Pajnigar stated that based on the study committees were formed to develop a new system. She pointed out that the previous system was from the 1970's and a new system was needed but half way through the project the funding for it expired. She stated that the new system developed is called NU Values and it involves all four campuses as well as Central Administration.

Pajniger noted that the old system had pay grades but this system was inflexible in reclassifying positions or promoting staff. She stated that in the old system different jobs were placed in the same pay grades although they were different and required different skills. She noted that the old system made it easier to maintain pay equity but it had limitations and would not necessarily allow the best person to be hired because the pay had to be kept within a certain scale. She pointed out that the University can only hire the best if it pays more and the new system allows the University to keep up with the market.

Pajnigar stated that even under the old system pay discrepancies happened and there is nothing that can really be done with those departments that have the money to pay higher salaries and those that do not. She noted that for the new system common professions were grouped together to come up with 15 job families. She stated that the pay ranges for these job families are based on the market for that field. She reported that within each job family there is a salary band and each band is broken into four zones. She pointed out that the zones are fairly large which allows for greater flexibility. She noted that requests to reclassify positions within the job families do not have to get Human Resources approval but a form does need to be submitted to make sure they are in compliance with Human Resources guidelines.

Beck stated that a department can add on a lot of new responsibilities to employees and not increase the salary. Pajnigar stated that this occurred in the old system as well. She stated that Human Resources will step in and look at the job and inform the department if it needs to pay the employee more. She pointed out that employees have the right to ask Human Resources to look at this kind of situation if the department will not adjust the salary accordingly although she noted that some departments simply do not have the money to be able to increase the salary.

Pajnigar stated that one of the criticisms that some people may have of the new system is that there is now a range for starting pay. She pointed out that Human Resources is here for the employees but it needs to make sure that the Institution adheres to federal and state guidelines. She stated that the Department of Human Resources works hard to maintain equity on campus. She noted that if there is a manager on campus who is showing favoritism than Human Resources wants to hear about it.

Pajnigar stated that Human Resources has tried to get the information out about the new system and she has gone to departments and has spoken to UNOPA and UAAD to discuss it. She stated that an orientation of the NU Values system can be found on the web at <http://hr.unl.edu/general/nuvalues.shtml>

Moeller noted that the new system appears to allow room for managers to decide on salary

increases. Pajniger stated that this is correct and that merit raises can still be given out on January 1st and July 1st.

Shea asked what process was used to decide that a new system was needed. Pajnigar stated that Human Resources went to Central Administration informing them that the old system was not working well and needed to be replaced. She stated that consultants were brought in and helped develop the new system. She noted that competencies needed for jobs were created at each different job level and criteria were developed that enables the creation of the zones. She pointed out that key behaviors were also identified.

Pajnigar stated that in the future there will probably not be recommendations for across the boards pay increases. She noted that recommendations for higher increases may be made for job families that are below the market. She stated that Human Resources will work with the departments to see if people need to be reclassified into different job zones. She noted that she has seen a lot of increases in salaries since the implementation of the new system. For example, she stated that the staff of the Libraries was considerably underpaid and the new system allowed for an increase in the staff salaries although they are still paid below market.

Beck asked whose responsibility it is to reclassify a position when a job changes and more work and greater responsibilities are given to an employee. Pajnigar stated that it should be the manager but the employee can make the request for Human Resources to look at the job to see if it should be reclassified.

As Pajnigar was leaving she thanked the committee for giving her the opportunity to discuss the new compensation system.

Shea stated that he has some issues with the new system. He pointed out that while it may give more flexibility he is concerned about fairness. He stated that under the new system people may be taken advantage of in ways that may not be as obvious in the old system. Beck pointed out that the old system was very rigid and it was very difficult to get staff reclassified. Shea stated that he did not think there were any open discussions about the need for a new system. Peterson pointed out that Central Administration often does things that the campuses do not hear about until after the fact. Shea stated that there should have been some kind of forum on this and it would have been better if it could be part of the normal process.

Shea indicated that this issue is one that some may not consider as the purview of an “Academic” Senate, which is the reason why he is in favor of removing “academic” from the Senate name. Fech noted that the quality of the staff enhances the effectiveness of what

faculty members do. Moeller pointed out that work environment is the number one factor in productivity and having staff members that are satisfied with their environment has a direct impact on departments and faculty. Shea agreed and feels these issues should be within the purview of the Senate. Moeller stated that the new system is flexible so it provides a career ladder for employees although there is still some room within the system to misuse it. Rapkin pointed out that adequacy of public resources that are available are critical because any system's weaknesses will be exposed when there are budget problems.

3.0 Owen Yardley, Chief of Police

3.1 Faculty Access to Teaching Rooms on the Weekend

Beck reported that a faculty member had difficulty getting into a classroom on Saturday even though he had a class scheduled for exams during that time. She stated that faculty members understand security issues but they need to have access to classrooms they are scheduled to teaching in during the off hours. Peterson stated that the faculty member who informed him of the situation also stated that he felt there was a lack of recognition by the police for the academic activities that occur on campus even on the weekends. The faculty member stated that the officer who responded did not do so in a friendly manner.

Moeller stated that she has had similar problems. She noted that she went through the entire process to get approval to have access to a room on the weekend but had difficulty getting into the room when it was needed. She pointed out that in the past police would stop by a faculty member's office if they were working late at night to see if they are okay but this does not seem to happen anymore.

Yardley stated that the campus police do understand the academic mission of the campus and they try to support it as much as possible. He pointed out that these are not isolated incidences. He stated that there is a difference between access to general purpose classrooms and department classrooms. He noted that the duties of the police are primarily with exterior building securities including the outside doors of the building. He pointed out that the police are not supposed to open classroom doors and Registration and Records is supposed to be in charge of general purpose classrooms.

Yardley stated that the root of the problem appears to be that there is no clear focus on who is responsible for making sure that general purpose classrooms are open for classes during the off hours. He pointed out that access to department classrooms is to be worked out between the department who owns the classroom and those using it.

Yardley reported that late last fall there was a more concerted effort by the police to do what they are responsible for and there is a clear separation of duties that includes not opening general purpose classrooms and department classrooms. He noted that the police

will open the exterior doors to buildings. He stated that the facilities department and police have a schedule for opening up buildings on weekends and after hours. He noted that it was determined a long time ago that only certain exterior doors of buildings are to be open on the weekends so the entire building is not open to the public.

Yardley stated that he recently met with Registration and Records to discuss the problem of the closed classrooms. He reported that Registration now has keys to all general purpose classrooms so when a faculty member has a class during the off hours, they can contact Registration and Records to get the key for that room. He stated that the key will need to be dropped off to Registration at the end of the work day or sometime soon thereafter. He noted that access to department classrooms must still be arranged through the controlling department.

Yardley stated that there are some mechanical issues with card access buildings. He noted that Facilities has put through card access on some buildings but someone within the building needs to take responsibility for managing the system. He stated that the issues surrounding the card access mechanisms are being worked on.

Yardley stated that a new key policy will be coming from Facilities. He stated that under the new policy SAP will be used to procure keys. He reported that the Senior Administrative Team and the Deans are reviewing the proposed new policy.

Peterson noted that it is more difficult for east campus faculty members to get keys for general purpose classrooms. He stated that the faculty member has to get the key taxied out and then returned. Yardley stated that the plan is that in the future when general purpose classrooms are renovated the doors will be controlled on a timer so keys will not be needed.

Hoffman asked how the key pad doors are coordinated. Yardley stated that he is trying to work with Facilities to get a centralized system for the card access doors. He pointed out that when he first arrived on campus there were a dozen different systems operating. Peterson noted that Filley Hall has the card access doors and he asked if there is a central control for opening the building. Yardley stated that this is controlled by Facilities. Peterson asked if the card access mechanism can be programmed from a central place. Yardley stated that it is programmed and police dispatch can open it if needed.

Hoffman noted that in some public buildings there is a plaque on the wall indicating who should be contacted in case of difficulty of an operating system. He stated that it would be good to have a similar thing here at the University. Yardley stated that there is a sign in the general purpose classrooms and Facilities has a central number to call. He pointed out that

he does not think such a sign can be posted on the exteriors of the buildings.

Yardley reported that a dilemma for the police is determining who has access to get into buildings and classrooms. He stated that the police get phone calls, faxes, and emails from people requesting to get into buildings but people need to be authorized to get into these buildings during off hours. He pointed out that faculty will often complain if buildings are left open. He stated that this is a problem that needs to be resolved. He noted that having a central coordinator for each building would help. He pointed out that ten different buildings will be opened on the weekend to teach one class in each building. He stated that these classes should be consolidated into one or two buildings if possible.

Hoffman stated that in the past students left to work in labs were given a note authorizing their access to the lab. He asked if this still works. Yardley stated that it used to be that cards could be filled out for them to authorize access but this was not a very efficient process. He stated that if the student has their NU Card on them this is usually acceptable but this is only to allow them to remain in the building, not to gain access to it.

Shea noted that Police time is not being used efficiently if they have to deal with opening doors to buildings and classrooms. Yardley pointed out that there is no one in the Police Department whose only responsibility is to deal with building issues.

Hoffman asked who should be contacted if a door is locked that is supposed to be open. Yardley stated that for the time being if it is needed right away they can call the police but people should know that the police may not be able to respond immediately. He stated that when business hours resume the faculty member needs to contact Registration and Records to resolve the issue. He noted that the police can open card access doors but not individual department doors.

Yardley stated that a major component to the issue is communications. He noted that Facilities, the Police, and the faculty all have different perspectives on the issue that need to be considered. He stated that he would like to see the current system improved so it works better for everyone.

4.0 Announcements

4.1 Omaha World Herald Upcoming Article

Beck reported that she received a phone call from Bill Hord who is writing an article comparing the campaign violations between Regent Drew Miller and Regent David Hergert. She stated that he asked if the Senate took action when Regent Miller was fined. She reported that she did not think the Senate took action at that time but she pointed out that the violations were different transgressions.

4.2 Meeting with the Chancellor to Discuss the Proposed Reduction in Force Procedures

Beck stated that she and Moeller met with the Chancellor to discuss the proposed document. She noted that overall the meeting went quite well even though the Chancellor is opposed to some aspects of the proposed procedures. She stated that he acknowledged that the language of the existing procedures is very convoluted although once you wade through it, the process is fairly clear.

Beck reported that the Chancellor does not think the majority of the faculty would be comfortable in participating in budget cutting decisions to the extent proposed and that the proposed process would not be efficient in making decisions about reductions in programs and having a 2/3 majority vote built into the process will prevent any recommendations from being made. She noted that the Chancellor stated that one of the things he would likely do differently if the situation ever occurred again is to not send the termination letters out so quickly to faculty. Moeller pointed out that the Chancellor stated that he sent the letters out early to give the affected faculty members the longest time to search for a new position.

Beck reported that the Chancellor has no problem with formalizing the process for the Vice Chancellors to remove them from making decisions on the budget cuts.

Beck stated that overall she felt the door was open to make changes to the procedures. She noted that the Chancellor indicated that he is willing to work with the Senate on making changes.

Beck reported that they also discussed changing the Academic Senate back to the Faculty Senate and the two parts of this issue: membership by administrators and a simple name change. She pointed out that this is not an adversarial situation but rather an attempt to regularize current practice which is out of compliance with UNL Bylaw 3.3.1, and to provide a better identify of the Senate for the faculty. She noted that Bylaw 3.3.2 allows anyone to address the Senate and participate in discussions. She noted that the Chancellor has no concerns over the change per se. She stated that she will send him a note asking that he discuss this issue with SVCAA Couture, VC Owens, and the Deans to get their opinion on the membership issue.

Shea stated that he feels that the name Academic Senate leads people to feel that the domain of the Academic Senate is strictly academics but he pointed out that many things that happen on campus affects academics. He stated that he advocates changing the name back to the Faculty Senate or another name without the word "academic" in it.

Stock stated that he thinks the name Academic Senate is more inclusive and that it gives us more credibility. Beck pointed out that many people do not understand what the Academic Senate is because the majority of institutions have a Faculty Senate.

Rapkin pointed out that the issue appears to be an identity issue more than anything else.

Beck stated that the issue will be brought to the Senate in April to see what they think.

5.0 Approval of 2/22/06 Minutes

Peterson moved and Rapkin seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 ASUN Student Absence Resolution

Griffin pointed out that the Executive Committee did not formally vote to approve the ASUN Student Absence Resolution. She noted that non-voting members of the Senate can request items to be placed on the Senate agenda. The Committee agreed to put the item on the agenda as a request from ASUN but it would not be a formal resolution that is endorsed by the Executive Committee.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Article on Professor Ari of Bolivia in the Chronicle of Higher Education

Moeller stated that she received a summary of events that happened in the History department regarding the hiring of Professor Ari and the current difficulty in getting him a visa. Beck noted that Professor Garza, a Senator from the History department, may ask to make a statement and perhaps ask for an endorsement at the March Senate meeting. Moeller stated that she believes the endorsement would be to show support and to ask why there is a hold up on the visa. Beck noted that Senator Hagel is going to the State Department to ask for clarification on the situation.

Shea noted that the University, including the Chancellor, has voiced concerns over the issue but the matter is really out of our hands. He pointed out that the State Department may have information on Professor Ari that we do not have that may be restricting the visa. However, he would not object to a statement from the Senate asking for resolution or an explanation for the delay on this matter.

Beck noted that individual faculty members have also added their names to a list calling for an explanation for the delay.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, March 8th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Alloway, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Scholz

Absent: Beck, Bolin, Rapkin, Shea, Stock

Date: Wednesday, March 22, 2006

Location: 201 Canfield Administration 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

Moeller called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

2.0 Chancellor Perlman/SVCAA Couture

2.1 Professor of Practice Positions – Implementation

Moeller stated that one of the questions raised in discussions on the positions is what the timeline will be for implementing them. Chancellor Perlman stated that there is no rush to implement the titles. He noted that SVCAA Couture is at a Council of Academic Officers meeting this afternoon and will present the proposal to see what the other campuses think of it but they do not have to adopt it. He stated that he hopes that it will be ready by the fall semester.

Moeller stated that another concern raised is that research professors are hired on soft money without input from the faculty who often do not have knowledge that these people are being hired. Chancellor Perlman stated that currently the Professor of Practice positions are dealing only with teaching instructors. He noted that there has been some reference to using these positions as an option for research professors but no conclusions on this have been made yet. He pointed out that research professors are a little different and are hired for particular expertise and when the grant runs out the position is terminated. He stated that he does not know how much faculty involvement is needed to hire research professors who are on soft money.

Peterson stated that most people thought the report made sense but there was concern with why the Executive Committee needed to respond so quickly when the report was written back in December. Chancellor Perlman stated that there was some delay in getting the

report out because the administration felt that the Deans should be consulted first to see if there were any problems with it.

Chancellor Perlman noted that the Professor of Practice positions are an option for the departments and colleges to use for non-tenure track faculty members. He stated that the administration will be vigilant that these positions are not used as an alternative for someone who cannot make tenure. He pointed out that this is not the intent of these positions and some evidence of scholarly activity is needed in order for a person to obtain any of these positions.

Hoffman asked if the details for these positions are defined at the department level or the university level. Chancellor Perlman stated that initially they are defined at the department level. Hoffman asked if these people can be promoted and whether their promotion would go through the department promotion and tenure committee. Chancellor Perlman stated that this is the intent of the positions. He noted that the recommendations clearly state that people in these positions should have voting rights on things in the department except on tenure. If an Assistant Professor of Practice is being promoted to a full Professor of Practice then the senior Professors of Practice in the department should be involved in the evaluation process. Moeller stated that in departments with a large number of these people voting could change. Chancellor Perlman stated that he would be surprised if there are a large number of people in these positions.

2.2 Audit Request on Post Tenure Review

Moeller stated that President Beck sent an email message to SVCAA Couture and VC Owens asking them for an audit on the post tenure review policy to see if it has been effective but there has been no response yet. Chancellor Perlman stated that he has not heard anything about it but he will ask about it.

2.3 Senate Restructuring – Discussion with Deans?

Chancellor Perlman stated that he has not interacted with the Deans on this subject but SVCAA Couture has and she reported that there are no strong objections from the Deans on this.

2.4 Budget Update

Chancellor Perlman reported that admissions are looking up for next year and if they hold it will look more promising for the budget. He pointed out that definite figures will not be known for awhile yet in part because Varner Hall uses a complicated mathematical formula to distribute the tuition that is generated. He stated that extra tuition funds that come in are not given directly to the campuses. He noted that some one time funds will come back to the campuses to help with urgent needs but these funds will not be built into the budget

until the following year. He pointed out that the Regents' priorities come off the top of the budget before the funds are allocated to the campuses.

Chancellor Perlman stated that if the State Legislature helps with the Mead and utilities deficit the University will be in reasonably good shape and we should be able to take care of the priorities. However, next year there could be some financial challenges because of some costs that are accumulating. He noted that health care costs seem stable for now and there will be a major effort at the system level to continue looking at these costs.

Fech stated that the \$30 per credit hour sale is an incredible deal for students. He thought that these courses would be helpful for freshmen students. Chancellor Perlman stated that one of the concerns is to make sure that the incoming freshmen get the courses they need. He stated that the sale is an experiment to see if monetary incentives could be used to make shifts in enrollment. He noted that this could help with some courses that have a backlog of students trying to enroll. He pointed out that the Deans have been good in trying to provide instructional classes that students might need to finish their degree. Hoffman noted that other universities have done similar things and they usually try attracting non-traditional students this way. Chancellor Perlman stated that this is being explored as well.

Peterson stated that he has heard that there is a problem with upper level students taking 100 level classes which prohibits freshmen from taking the class. He stated that if the upper level students took these courses during the summer it might help. Chancellor Perlman stated that this is the first opportunity to address this backlog of students. He noted that the next step might be to enforce a policy where upper level students might have an increase in cost if they wait to take these 100 level classes in the fall semester when they can do it in the summer instead.

Alloway asked what predictions might be for the University with the term limits taking affect in the State Legislature and the governor's race. Chancellor Perlman stated that it is totally unpredictable at this point.

2.5 Issues on the Horizon

Chancellor Perlman reported that the NCA Accreditation process and the NCAA Accreditation process are moving forward well. He noted that these accreditation processes will consume a lot of time in the fall.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he has not had many comments concerning the email message he sent out on the core values. He noted that everyone seems to have one or two values that they would like to see added but he is trying to stick with the ones that the campus has adopted.

Peterson stated that he is bothered by the use of the word “uncompromising” in the core values. He pointed out that compromises have to be made all of the time. Chancellor Perlman stated that the phrase comes from the 20/20 report. Peterson stated that he has contacted the general education committee asking if what they are working on can be incorporated with the “Leaders” suggestion made by the Chancellor. Chancellor Perlman stated that he is not inclined to promote the “Leaders” thing as the key to the program but it might help people to remember what the program should accomplish.

Hoffman stated that he received an email message about the Semester at Sea program but he could not locate any information about the cost of it. Chancellor Perlman stated that it is probably around \$9200 which covers tuition and meals on the ship for the summer and Semester at Sea is offering \$5000 off this price for this summer.

Hoffman stated that the Safe Assignment program on Blackboard which checks for plagiarism has two major advantages. He noted that it only costs \$9000 a year and gives instructors a significant tool to use for their courses.

Flowers stated that instructors did not know that Safe Assignment was only for a trial period and was to be discontinued at the end of the fall semester but he thinks the Executive Committee has called attention to it so that the program is being continued through this semester. He stated that in order for the program to be evaluated faculty members need to use it and provide feedback. He pointed out that there would be better response to the program if it was communicated better to the faculty. Hoffman stated that with just a few clicks on Blackboard the program can be used and it works very well.

Chancellor Perlman asked who runs the program. Flowers stated that he believes the Libraries were to evaluate the use of it. He noted that an advantage to the program is that it can keep a database of local papers so a student could not use the same paper as their friend’s here at UNL. He stated that the database does not extend to other universities. He pointed out that the program is seamless and instructive and does more than just catch people cheating. He stated that the University needs to adopt some kind of product for the purpose of identifying academic dishonesty.

Peterson reported that Professor Rupnow contacted him about the difficulties he had in getting access to a classroom he was scheduled to hold an exam in on a Saturday. Peterson stated that he does not think Professor Rupnow is satisfied with the situation yet but he did appreciate the Chancellor’s quick response about working on the problem. Peterson noted that the Committee met with Chief Yardley and it is a more complicated situation than people realize.

Moeller stated that the problem is not all under the jurisdiction of the Police. Chancellor Perlman noted that there have been some miscommunications as well. He stated that the University is trying to get a system where one call can be placed and someone will be allowed access to get into classrooms. He stated that eventually things will become easier as card access becomes more commonplace. He pointed out that this is not easily done and it is expensive. He noted that some faculty members may be resistant to a card access system but the campus needs more security.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Revisions to Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee

Griffin reported that Chancellor Perlman has agreed to the revisions approved by the Senate to the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee.

4.0 Approval of 3/8/06 Minutes

Alloway moved and Peterson seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Executive Committee Elections

Moeller noted that there is a candidate for the Secretary of the Senate, one candidate for the Executive Committee, and a possible candidate for President-Elect. She noted that there is no candidate yet for the Extension Educator position and one additional member is needed. The Committee discussed what colleges do not have representation on the Committee.

6.2 RIF Procedures

Moeller stated that she reviewed the old procedures and pointed out that the charts included in the document give a clearer path of the procedures to be followed than does the narrative. She stated that Mary Beck may want to chair an ad hoc committee to work with her on revising the draft proposal to revise the procedures. She stated that she wants to know where the process was not followed the last time.

Peterson suggested that Beck should be consulted with about this. He noted that the Chancellor seems to be receptive to having a conversation on the procedures. He pointed out that the recently suggested procedures would give faculty more input into the procedures. He noted that during the budget cuts the only faculty input was through the Academic Planning Committee but this is not just a faculty group. He stated that faculty members on the APC were very frustrated with the current procedures because they were not shown all of the options for making budget cuts.

7.0 New Business

No new business was discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:22 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, March 29th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Beck, Bolin, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Shea, Stock

Absent: Alloway, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, March 29, 2006

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

2.0 Vice Chancellor Jackson/Assistant Vice Chancellor Currin

2.1 Child Care

Beck stated that the Senate has been hearing concerns about the length of time it is taking to create the child care facility, the possible costs for using it, and some faculty members originally involved with the committee feel they are no longer included in the discussions.

VC Jackson stated that last fall a request for proposals was issued. She stated that a committee of faculty, staff, and students reviewed the proposals and made recommendations to the administration before the winter break. She pointed out that the campus was invited to meet both vendors and provide feedback to the committee.

VC Jackson stated that Assistant VC Currin is currently spearheading the process of negotiating with one of the vendors. She noted that the process is taking longer than anticipated but this is, in part due to the University wanting more information from the vendor in order to ensure that we have a more workable solution for child care. She pointed out that there are challenges in what we are trying to do and what we can afford.

VC Jackson reported that we are beginning the process of planning the renovation of the north side of the Whittier building. She stated that there is a total of 19,000 square feet but we will use about 75% of this space. Included will be a small parking lot and an outside area for a playground. She stated that hopefully the facility will open in summer 2007.

VC Jackson stated that the committee working on the child care developed a list of criteria for the center including a requirement to have the center eligible for accreditation. She noted that centers are not automatically given accreditation when they open and usually have to apply after 12-18 months.

VC Jackson stated that one of the challenges is in having some kind of flexible schedule for day care which is part of the negotiations. She pointed out that the University is trying to balance out flexibility of hours with the cost. She noted that the current center is open 10 ½ hours a day, from 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. She stated that the goal would be to have the center open later in the evenings, but is financially challenging to do so. She pointed out that most people will use the center for just 9 hours but funding would have to cover 12 or more hours of operation.

VC Jackson stated that negotiations include trying to develop a tiered approach for the cost of using the program. She noted that this sliding scale would be based on family salary. She stated that the center will expand from 100 children to 148 which will give some flexibility with the costs.

VC Jackson stated that there have been some issues regarding drop-in day care. She noted that this would be used for people who need child care on an emergency basis only. She stated that the University and the vendor are trying to find a balance to meet this need while providing a high quality program.

VC Jackson reported that Assistant VC Currin has communicated with the child care committee to let them know negotiations are taking place. She pointed out that she hopes that the negotiations will be finished in four weeks.

Assistant VC Currin stated that one issue is with the Title XX program which helps support low income students and employees. He stated that there are currently 20 people participating in the program and he noted that the preference is to keep these 20 program slots. He stated that with the Title XX program the University is reimbursed from the state for the child care but at a much lower rate than what people pay. He pointed out that this low payment needs to be subsidized by other users and this can have an effect on rates.

Beck asked how the rates are being affected by the University providing the actual facility. VC Jackson noted that this was one of the first things discussed with the provider. She pointed out that having an accredited program and provider has some costs and some of these costs involve getting good people to work at the facility. She noted that the University wants a company who has a limited staff turnover rate. She stated that the current child care program has many student workers and UNL has been discussing with

the provider the possibility of continuing to use the students.

Peterson asked how the renovation of the Whittier building is being paid for. VC Jackson stated that it is being paid through a gift to the University.

Hoffman stated that he saw figures on the cost of renovating the building. He asked if the scenario of building a new building was considered. VC Jackson stated that it was considered. She noted that there were challenges with this. She stated that several different sites on campus were considered but none of them worked due to a variety of reasons. She pointed out that in order for the facility to be accredited it must have parking and a playground. She noted that the Whittier building is partially gutted. Peterson asked if there is an asbestos problem with the building. VC Jackson stated that asbestos was removed earlier.

Moeller stated that one of the concerns that arose in the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women is that students felt strongly that they will be priced out of using the facility. She noted that staff members also have the same concern and some are very happy with the staff that is already in place with child care. She stated that the students and staff members feel that the faculty will be the only ones who can afford the child care services. VC Jackson acknowledged these concerns and stated that UNL is trying to be sensitive by providing some kind of limited version of a sliding scale fee. She noted that we are moving in the direction we are going because recruiting and retaining faculty members is a primary focus of the campus. She pointed out that this is not a faculty/staff issue but an issue for all lower paid employees who want to use child care. Moeller noted that some faculty members want a high level of education at the center because they feel it is not available in Lincoln. She pointed out that the University is trying to satisfy three different populations who want child care.

VC Jackson stated that we are trying to have a child care center that will take in more infants. She noted that infants require the most expensive care and that there is a very limited number of child care facilities in Lincoln that accept infants.

Assistant VC Currin stated that we will probably have child care center that will appeal to most people. He noted that both providers have indicated that they would like to have the existing staff come over to work for them so there is little disruption for the customers. He stated that he checked with universities across the company that use these providers and they verified that the companies did use those people already working in the existing child care program. He pointed out that many of the teachers in UNL's current child care program have college degrees.

Hoffman asked what the typical costs are for child care in Lincoln. Assistant VC Currin stated that rates can run from \$155 - \$200 for infants per week and \$135 for toddlers. He stated that the child care program will focus on children from 6 weeks to 5 years of age and UNL's RFP provided for after school care for children up to age 12. He noted that it is not anticipated that there will be much need for after school care because there is a lot going on in Lincoln already in this area.

Alexander stated that it is not clear what the level of quality will be for the program. VC Jackson stated that it will be a quality program that is eligible for accreditation. She noted that several people, including Dean Kostelnik, Michelle Rupiper, Director of UNL's Ruth Staples Child Care Center, and Professor Buck, evaluated the curriculum offered by the two companies and provided excellent input into the evaluation of the two providers.

2.2 Faculty Access to Classrooms on the Weekends

Beck stated that the Committee met with Chief Yardley to discuss the problem and learned that access to building and rooms is a complex issue. Moeller noted that the Chancellor indicated in the meeting last week that the University is working to alleviate the problems. Moeller stated that the Chancellor explained that the classrooms are not to be opened by the police and that eventually most of the campus will be controlled by card access.

VC Jackson noted that general purpose classrooms, of which there are about 167 on campus, are controlled through Registration and Records and they recently established a process where an instructor can obtain a key to a classroom if it is used during off hours. She stated that Dr. Hawkey, Director of Registration and Records, will notify the police to open the external doors of the building and then it is the responsibility of the instructor to open the classroom door.

VC Jackson reported that there are departmental classrooms that are sometimes used for other events. She noted that it is the department's responsibility to send a request to the police to have them open the exterior doors but the room will need to be opened by the department.

VC Jackson stated that the campus is moving to card access on exterior doors. She noted that this is being done with new or renovated buildings. She pointed out that it is very expensive to put the card access system into place. The first door on a building costs at least \$5000 providing that the door itself does not have to be replaced. Additional doors are a bit cheaper but are still expensive. She noted that buildings with high sensitivity for security purposes are having the card access system installed first.

VC Jackson stated that after the recent problem of 400 students being locked out of a classroom. She pointed out that there are two separate issues of security and access. She noted that some doors are still being propped open with rocks making buildings more accessible, but unsecure. She noted that most classrooms have equipment installed in them and the campus has had equipment stolen.

Peterson noted that Professor Rupnow who was the instructor locked out of the classroom is pleased that there has been acknowledgement about the problem and that the officer involved in the incident sent a letter of apology for the way he acted. Peterson noted that the Committee had no idea how complex an issue this is until they spoke with Chief Yardley. VC Jackson stated that it is a problem and there is not enough staff to deal with all of the requests made to open classrooms. She noted that a better process is needed to deal with the issue.

Moeller asked if the residence halls have card access. VC Jackson stated that they do and when students move out the doors are re-keyed. Peterson noted that the card access to Filley Hall works well.

Hoffman asked how long it will take before all buildings have card access. VC Jackson stated that it will take some time because it can only be done when funds are available.

2.3 Pepsi Fund

Beck asked for clarification on how the fund works. VC Jackson stated that the fund was established in 1997 when UNL signed pouring rights with Pepsi. She noted that \$11 million was set aside in a quasi endowment fund. She pointed out that we are one of the very few universities who received such a lucrative contract but she noted that the fund is not generating as much in interest as it previously did.

VC Jackson stated that two committees were formed to govern the use of the funds, the Pepsi Quasi-Endowment Committee which allocates the net income and/or principal of the fund upon approval of the Chancellor, and the Pepsi-Quasi Endowment Advisory Committee recommends the amount of money that can be spent by the Pepsi Quasi-Endowment Committee.

VC Jackson reported that the money is currently being used to support the Pepsi scholarships, the Pepsi UCARE program and some student events. She noted that the earned interest has not been enough in the last few years to be able to fund other new programs.

VC Jackson reported that the Advisory Committee met last Friday and recommended that

an additional \$200,000 be set aside for one time use of funds. She pointed out that there are limitations per the quasi-endowment agreement on what the money can be used for. She stated that the opportunity to solicit these funds will be made but the final recommendations will be approved by the Chancellor.

Peterson asked how the Pepsi UCARE program is doing. VC Jackson stated that it has been doing well and that it has garnered a lot of support. She noted that it has been a huge recruiting tool for the University and recently the program was augmented with additional funds. Moeller pointed out that the Pepsi UCARE program is used as a guideline for measuring the undergraduate experience.

Beck asked when the agreement is up for renewal. VC Jackson stated that it will not be until 2009. She stated that the campus could extend the contract, but, the campus will probably go out for other bids. She noted that pouring rights at other universities are being studied to see what they are being offered.

Alexander asked what Pepsi earns from the contract. VC Jackson stated that the University is not privy to that information. She noted that some vending machines on campus can now accept the NCard and she believes this has helped with sales.

3.0 Executive Associate Dean Weissinger

3.1 Proposed Changes to Graduate Remission Programs

Weissinger reported that graduate applications are up by 17% overall and that we have 820 more applications now than at the same time last year. She noted that applications from graduate international students are up 43%. She pointed out that the National Council of Graduate Schools recently issued a report which stated that nationally, graduate applications were up by 11%. Hoffman asked what countries the graduate applications are coming from. Weissinger stated that primarily from India and China. She stated that we are up about 27% in doctoral applications, 25% in masters and 6% in domestic applications.

Weissinger stated that the only area we are down in is in the non-degree seeking applications. She stated that there are currently about 1300 of these graduate students on campus. She pointed out that we are down about 500 of these students from previous years.

Weissinger reported that she believes that some of the reasons for the application increase are due to the work being done in departments to recruit students and the work being done by Michelle Howell, Director of Graduate Recruitment, and her staff in Graduate Studies.

Weissinger stated that about a year ago she, Mike Zeleny, Greg Gunderson, and Mark Chauche were asked to look at remission costs at the graduate level because the campus realized that tuition income was declining while remission costs were increasing. She noted that just cutting remissions is not a simple thing to do, and that the best focus is on increasing net tuition revenue.

Weissinger stated that the committee put together several proposals that addressed net graduate tuition. These were shown to several Deans and chairs and they had concerns about the proposals even after they were revised. She stated that eventually the Senior Administrative Team looked at the proposals and the Chancellor made some preliminary decisions that are designed to increase tuition revenue.

Weissinger stated the Edgren Tuition Fellowships were created which exempted non-resident graduate students, of U.S. citizenry, from paying the full graduate tuition rate. She noted that this program attracts graduate students that are not funded through assistantships. Peterson asked if there is a limit per department that can be given. Weissinger stated that departments can give up to 15 of these scholarships but this is a resource that needs to be managed carefully. Weissinger pointed out that over a period of time the savings could amount to \$1000's for these graduate students but would also mean increased tuition for UNL. Moeller asked when the program was started. Weissinger stated that it started in January 2006. Hoffman asked if the fellowship is for only one year. Weissinger stated that it stays with the student if they remain in their UNL graduate program. She pointed out that the Edgren Fellowships is a good gateway for graduate students because it can often lead into a full assistantship. Hoffman asked if an out of state undergraduate student entering a graduate program can still get the Edgren Fellowship. Weissinger stated that the student must qualify for non-resident tuition.

Weissinger stated that the policy has been that all graduate assistantships pay tuition at the resident rate. She noted that for state funded assistantships the tuition is a cost to the university's budget but for external assistantships the external source actually pays the resident tuition. She stated that because of the complexities between the UNL accounting system and the registration system the external funds were never charged for summer tuition for these graduate students. She noted that the differences in the two systems will be worked out so the external funds will be charged for the summer tuition. She stated that she understands this puts an additional burden on the principal investigators but she believes it is only fair that the grants should cover the summer tuition.

Moeller noted that she has a grant which is paying two graduate assistants. She asked if their tuition is being paid from the grant. Weissinger stated that this is correct. Flowers noted that faculty members need to receive communication that they need to include the

amount of the summer tuition in their requests for grants. Weissinger stated that this new policy will only affect new grants, not existing ones.

Beck asked how many credit hours a graduate student needs to take in the summer. Weissinger stated that they must take at least one credit hour in the summer session that they are appointed in. She noted that she had long discussions with the Agriculture Research Division advisory group about this. She pointed out that the tuition will typically not be much money - \$199.50 per graduate credit hour.

Flowers asked if the state funded assistantships will change. Weissinger stated that they will not for 2006-07. She pointed out that faculty members have always thought of tuition remission as funny money. She noted that they would create a graduate assistantship without thinking about the tuition remission costs that are associated with this position. She stated the tuition costs are real and amount to approximately \$13 million in remission for UNL graduate level courses.

Alexander stated that he thought the graduate remission was included in the current 26% charged for research assistantships. Weissinger stated that the rate currently is 32% of the stipend amount for external funding and the percent will need to be higher when the summer tuition is included in the grant request.

Weissinger stated that some proposals have been created relating to the graduate assistant tuition remission with an eye toward reducing the \$13 million. She noted that the Chancellor has agreed not to change graduate assistantships remission for 2006-07, but wants more proposals to explore. She stated that she will work with Greg Gunderson, some Deans, and some chairs to see if better proposals can be created. She agreed that the committee could have a Senate representative on it.

Weissinger pointed out that currently departments do not know how much tuition remission money is spent each year. She stated that she believes departments and colleges should be given a graduate remission budget that they will need to monitor. She noted that creating a new graduate assistantship position will need to be reported just as a new employee position needs to be reported. She stated that she hopes that departments can increase the number of tuition paying graduate students to increase tuition revenue, but she suspects that some proposals will have to be made to reduce the graduate remissions.

Flowers noted that his department has benefited a lot from the graduate fellowships that we have, particularly the minority fellowships. He stated that he noticed the Larson fellowships have been cut back significantly as well as some other fellowships. He asked what happened to these. Weissinger stated that during the time when graduate application

numbers were down reserve funds were made available to help bring in more and better graduate students. She noted that the amount of the fellowships is now down to more normal levels. She reported that Vice Chancellor Paul has made a strong proposal for a new major fellowship program similar to the size of the Othmer fund and she is hoping that the University Foundation will work on this. She suggested that faculty members should maximize the use of fellowship money that is available at the department and college levels.

Rapkin stated that the discussion so far is largely taking place like UNL is a closed economy but it is actually competing with other universities. He stated that weakening what we now offer will make it more difficult to recruit quality graduate students. He noted that we are already being out priced by other schools. He pointed out that many of the teaching assistants bear a larger burden of the teaching responsibilities on campus. Weissinger agreed and stated that these are the two arguments that she has repeated vigorously to the administration. She stated that she believes that the campus is not in the position to move backwards in any way on graduate stipends and remission. She pointed out that the issue is complicated though because budget cuts are the alternative if we can't increase tuition revenue.

Alexander stated that a growing issue is that more international graduate students are being attracted to come here but then his college loses them after two years when they go to another institution that they think is more prestigious. He noted that this is a major growing concern for faculty and he wondered whether something can be written into the graduate student's contract to state that they must repay the institution if they leave before finishing the program. He stated that the same thing is happening in Michigan and they are trying to word their contract to fix the situation. Weissinger stated that it would be difficult to reword the contract and it could hurt recruiting efforts. She noted that part of the problem is that we are competing with a better stratum of graduate schools which puts us in a new market for graduate students. Moeller noted that mentoring is a big factor in recruiting and retaining students, especially international students.

Weissinger reported that the State Department is doing a better job of processing visas. She noted that students in Asia are starting to realize that alternative schools in other countries are not as good as the institutions in the U.S. She stated that national recruiting efforts are encouraging and her office is working on recruiting non degree students as well.

Moeller pointed out that it can be very difficult to get non degree students registered. She stated that it can take months to get them registered with the University. Weissinger stated that this is very surprising to her because they should be able to do this within 24 hours or so. [Weissinger followed up with data that showed that in the last three terms, 59% of non-

degree applicants who requested immediate admission were admitted within 48 hours, 95% were admitted within one week and only 5% took more than one week. Admission delays were due to the applicant not completing the on-line application fully, or not paying the required fee.]

4.0 Announcements

Due to the lateness of time, Beck stated that she would send the Committee an email about the announcements.

5.0 Approval of 3/22/06 Minutes

Moeller moved and Flowers seconded approval of the minutes.

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Motion on Senate Restructuring

Beck stated that there are two separate issues with the restructuring. One is the change of name and the other is removing the administrators as non-voting members. She pointed out that the Deans are fine with not being members of the Senate. She noted that the sister campuses are all called Faculty Senates. She stated that since most of the administrators are not coming to the meetings it would be a good opportunity to make the changes.

Griffin distributed the proposed revisions to the Senate Bylaws on restructuring the Senate. She pointed out that changing the name of the Senate would result in changes to many things including, but not limited, to all Senate documents, publications on campus, university websites, building signs, etc. Moeller suggested that the issue be postponed so the Committee can examine all of the effects of the changes. Beck explained that the issue has been discussed for several months and that bringing the motion forward at the April 4 meeting still gives three weeks to consider it further and the option of voting on it this year or not.

The Committee voted to bring the motion to the Senate at the April 4th meeting.

6.2 Motion on Merging of Commencement, Honors Convocations, and Honorary Degrees Committee

Beck stated that she met with Associate to the Chancellor Howe to discuss the concerns he has on the revised syllabus. She noted that Howe suggested that the students should not be members of the committee because there has been no participation from them for several years. She stated that she will discuss this with ASUN. She noted that the Chancellor's designee has been added to the membership for the Honorary Degrees subcommittee because that person is responsible for the functioning of the committee.

Hoffman pointed out that he has received several responses from members of the Committee on Committees with some questions. He noted that the Committee on Committees has not seen this latest version. He asked that Beck send this to him so he can send it to the Committee for their input.

Moeller suggested that the motion to revise the committee not be presented at the April 4th meeting until all parties involved have had a chance to review the revisions. Griffin pointed out that there is no rush to make the changes and the Committee on Committees has not even had a chance to vote on the revisions. She suggested that all of the members of the Commencement Committee, Honors Convocation Committee and the Honorary Degrees Committee should be given the opportunity to review the proposed revisions to see if any further corrections are needed.

Beck stated that she wants the Committee to consider reinstating the Human Rights Committee because there have been a number of cases in the past in which reports and actions by the Human Rights Committee provided information that has kept the university out of the court. She stated that in years past the committee did reports on rapes on campus and did a gender equity study in the 1970's regarding staff compensation. She stated that she thinks it is worth considering having this committee again because they could look at domestic partner benefits, for example.

Beck stated that she also wants the Committee to consider reinstating the Budget Committee so it can provide information on the budget to the Senate. She stated that the Budget Committee could get reports on how the Programs of Excellence money is being used and where money is saved when colleges are merged, as examples of information that would empower the Senate to make informed evaluations. She pointed out that the Senate should know what happens to the resources.

Beck stated that she thinks the Past President should rotate onto the Committee on Committees (as the designee of the President) so there is continuity in reviewing committees. Hoffman stated that he thought this was a good idea because the Past President might have ideas on who can serve on committees.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:11 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, April 5th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Alloway, Beck, Fech, Hoffman, Peterson, Rapkin, Shea, Stock

Absent: Bolin, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, March 8, 2006

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

2.0 ASUN (Meghan Lyons, Omaid Zabih)

2.1 Syllabus Policy

Zabih stated that the syllabus policy proposal was developed by some of the ASUN senators to ensure that every class will have a syllabus. Peterson asked if this is a university wide policy as stated in the proposal. Zabih stated that it would only apply to UNL.

Zabih stated that ASUN would like to see professors utilize Blackboard more heavily. He noted that the syllabus could be placed on Blackboard and students could look at it rather than the instructor going over the syllabus the first day of class.

Beck pointed out that SVCAA Couture sent an email message out to all faculty members asking them to provide students with a syllabus. Shea stated that there should be a syllabus for every course and certain information should be provided on each syllabus.

Peterson stated that he would like to hear from professors the reason why they do not provide a syllabus. Lyons pointed out that some professors like to have a more fluid class style. She noted that the professor may want to see how the first class project goes and make adjustments from there. She stated that some visiting professors are not aware that they should provide students with a syllabus.

Beck asked if the proposal is meant to provide students with basic information about the

course without spelling out a specific, day-by-day schedule. Lyons stated that this is correct and that basic information such as the instructor's name, office location, office phone number, office hours, and email address should be provided. In addition, any prerequisites to the course, the required texts, the attendance policy and grading policy of the instructor, the time and location of the final and its basic scope and a statement of the University's policy on academic dishonesty should be added to the syllabus.

Shea stated that he did not understand why an instructor would object to having a syllabus for a course. Zabih pointed out that instructors teaching courses for one credit might not want to do a syllabus. Shea stated that whatever applies to the course should be put on a syllabus. Beck stated that, at a minimum, instructors should be expected to inform students of when tests are to be held or when papers and/or projects are due. Lyons agreed. She noted that she has had instructors who have stated that they will have an updated syllabus handed out but then don't so students may be unaware of what the due dates are for projects and exams.

Rapkin stated that the syllabus should be explicit with what the course requirements are whether they are quizzes, tests, papers, class participation or projects. He noted that the syllabus should give some indication to the student of the proportion of the grade these requirements represent.

Stock noted that sometimes it is not possible to provide the time and location of the final. He pointed out that instructors should be allowed the flexibility to determine if the final is going to be a take home exam. Shea suggested that the syllabus could provide information on the nature and logistics of the final without specifying a date. Lyons noted that an instructor could say that due to the nature of the course the kind of final exam and the date of it will be determined later.

Alexander stated that one of the problems with the ES/IS courses is that some of them have no requirements in terms of what the course is. Peterson noted that the Deans proposed some changes with the ES/IS courses and one of the changes was to instruct the faculty that they need to put on the syllabus whether the course is an ES or IS course and what the expectations of the course are. Lyons stated that when the general education program is refurbished it would be great if the learning outcomes mention that a course syllabus is required.

Beck stated that the proposal will be put on the April 4th Senate agenda.

3.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

4.0 Approval of 3/1/08 Minutes

Stock moved and Rapkin seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Committee Report Letter

The Committee discussed and approved revisions to the letter sent to committee chairs calling for the annual report that is presented to the Senate.

5.2 Committee Proposal

Beck distributed a draft proposal to combine the Commencement, Honors Convocations, and Honorary Degrees Committees. She noted that she spoke with Professors Berger and Hitchcock, and Associate to the Chancellor Howe about the possible merger and they all agreed that they saw no problems in merging the Commencement and Honors Convocations committees. She pointed out that staff members handle the work of Commencement and Honors Convocations. She stated that the faculty members appointed to the combined committee would constitute the Honorary Degrees subcommittee. She pointed out that the Honorary Degrees Committee meets only twice a year. She stated that the subcommittee could be expanded when there are policy changes to Commencement or Honors Convocation that need approval by the faculty.

Shea noted that the proposal would mean that not all members would participate in the work of the committee. Stock pointed out that it is not unusual for subcommittees to exist and as long as people know where they are going to fit on a committee there should not be a problem.

Hoffman stated that there are a number of committees that meet only once a semester. He pointed out that there are two approaches that can be taken. The first is to allow committee members to serve consecutive terms on a committee. He pointed out that this will not only help in filling vacant positions on committees but it will provide consistency to the committee.

Hoffman stated that the second idea is to have a pool of committee members who are not assigned to a specific committee but who can fill in on a committee when a member is needed. He noted that a significant number of people who sent in committee service preference forms indicated they were willing to serve on any committee. He stated that both of these ideas would require rewriting the syllabus for committees.

Beck stated that she will make revisions to the proposal and send it to Hoffman for the Committee on Committees to review.

Alexander asked how Honorary Degrees are nominated. He noted that he has several former students who have become very successful in their fields that he would like to see considered for Honorary Degrees. Beck stated that an email message is sent to the faculty calling for nominations for the Honorary Degrees. Alexander asked what the criteria are for people to receive an Honorary Degree. Beck stated that they usually have had some association with UNL and have been successful in their field. Rapkin suggested that Alexander's former students might qualify for Masters Week.

5.3 Professor of Practice

Beck asked if there is any more feedback on the proposal to create the Professor of Practice positions. Peterson noted that departments have not had a chance to look at the proposals and voice their concerns. Shea pointed out that the administration wants to move quickly on the proposal.

Shea stated that the document sent to the Senate was the committee's recommendations. He noted that since then the Deans have made recommendations as reported to the Senate by Associate VC Jacobson but the revised recommendations have not been seen by the Executive Committee. He stated that one of the recommendations is the gradual phase in process. He stated that the general feeling in the committee is that this gradual change to the new system will more likely be approved and accepted by the colleges.

Shea noted that the spirit behind the proposal to create the Professor of Practice positions is to give more recognition to non-tenure track faculty members. He pointed out that it puts these people on a parallel track with tenure-track faculty members. He stated that people on non-tenure track lines are working hard and need to be fully assimilated into the system.

Shea stated that one concern is how fast the new titles will be implemented. Hoffman pointed out that this proposal has real financial implications and the entire faculty should have a chance to review it.

The Committee agreed to discuss the issue with the Chancellor and for Beck to send a letter to Associate VC Jacobson requesting that the faculty be sent a copy of the revised proposal.

Alexander asked if the evaluation process is delineated in the proposal. He pointed out that in some departments people are being hired by department chairs without the faculty's input and there are some cases where there could be a conflict of interest. He stated that the evaluation process of these people is not clearly delineated and oftentimes the evaluation is being conducted by a person who might have a vested interest in the employee. Beck

pointed out that a lot of research professors are hired by principal investigators who have a grant and that she knows of cases in which scientists hired this way have been converted to tenure track positions without faculty discussion. Alexander stated that he is not opposed to these titles but there needs to be clear rules on how these people are evaluated. Shea suggested that this should be discussed with Associate VC Jacobson. The committee was hesitant to spell out in too much detail how non-tenure track faculty must be treated because departments and colleges do not like being told what to do. Beck pointed out that the Guidelines for Annual Evaluation, Promotion & Tenure spells out clearly that non-tenure track faculty members must be evaluated like everyone else including specifics about notice for non-renewal.

Shea reported that the Deans felt that the proposal should not be overly prescribed because they felt that the positions were too close to tenure track positions. He stated that these positions are most likely to be used if the person's main purpose is teaching. Beck noted that there are people in IANR with high teaching apportionments (up to 100%) who are tenure track.

The Committee agreed to discuss the issue with Chancellor Perlman.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Review of Senate Meeting

Beck reported that VC Griesen is working with ASUN to make minor revisions to the proposed ASUN student absence policy.

The Committee discussed the possibility of changing the starting time of the Senate meetings to see if that will help keep people from leaving the meeting early.

Hoffman stated that he does not understand why the University does not go with Plan D for retirees. He noted that with this plan the government pays for 75% of the costs. Instead the retirees are paying the additional costs. Peterson pointed out that it was a special committee set up by the President that made the proposed recommendations. Beck stated that President Milliken appointed the members of the special committee, most of whom have experience with health insurance.

Beck stated that she does not know why the retirees were cut off from the rest of the University pool. Hoffman stated that in the late '80's or early 90's the University was allowed to take people out of the insurance pool. The advantage to doing this was because it lowered the cost to employees, but the cost of health care was not such a problem as it is now.

Beck reported that at the Board of Regents meeting information on the health care insurance was presented. She noted that 200 retirees are not eligible for Medicare but 1200 are. She stated that one of the figures presented showed that pharmacy costs for just six retirees amounted to over \$940,000 last year.

Rapkin noted that the entire health care system across the country is a mess. Beck stated that it is particularly bad for the retirees but apparently putting them back in the pool would greatly increase the cost for everyone else. Alloway stated that he knows of retirees who have left the university health care insurance and found other insurance on the open market that is more favorable to them at less cost.

6.2 Executive Committee Elections

The Committees noted that a call for nominations from the Committee on Committees was sent to the Senate and only one nomination has been made. The Committee discussed possible candidates for the Executive Committee.

6.3 Discussion with Roshan Pajnigar

Alexander stated that in principle the new NU Values system might be good but in reality he does not think it is working. He noted that even though a department has the authority to change a position and has the money to pay a person more Human Resources is not allowing it because they said it would affect the other positions in that group. He pointed out that Human Resources is still controlling the hiring process. Griffin stated that she will ask Pajnigar to contact Alexander directly to discuss the issue. Shea noted that the officers of UNOPA and UAAD expressed concern that the new system is not equitable.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, March 22nd at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Alloway, Beck, Bolin, Fech, Flowers, Hoffman, Scholz, Stock

Absent: Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Shea

Date: Wednesday, April 12, 2006

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Meeting Cancelled

Beck pointed out that the Committee was supposed to meet with Chancellor Perlman and SVCAA Couture today but the Senate Office received a phone call about an hour and a half before the meeting canceling it. She noted that Griffin emailed SVCAA Couture to say that the schedule is set up before the semester and the dates that are selected for meetings with the administrators is based on their schedules. Beck pointed out that a copy of the agenda is usually faxed over one to two days before the meeting and it would be helpful if we were informed earlier so that we could make arrangements to possibly meet with someone else.

Beck stated that the next meeting with the Chancellor will not be until May 31st because he has canceled the May 3rd meeting as well. She noted that the Committee has not met with SVCAA Couture since February 1st.

Beck stated that she will arrange a meeting with the Chancellor before the April 25th Senate meeting because we need to get some input from him on some things before the meeting.

3.0 Approval of 4/5/06 Minutes

Alloway moved, and Flowers seconded, approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Committee Restructuring

Beck stated that she started thinking again about the proposal to merge the Commencement, Honors Convocation, and Honorary Degrees Committees and thought it should be presented to the Senate at the April 25th meeting as an emergency motion. She noted that if the proposal is approved it would decrease the number of faculty members needed to serve on committees by 12. She stated that she emailed Associate to the Chancellor Howe who serves on these committees to get his feedback on the draft proposal. She noted that he is in agreement with making this an emergency motion. She stated that another alternative is to not appoint anyone until the Senate votes on the proposal in September.

Hoffman stated that he received a majority of votes from the Committee on Committees to approve the draft proposal and to present it to the Senate.

The Committee agreed that it was fine to present it to the Senate.

Beck stated that another possible change to committees would be to have the faculty members of the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee serve on the UNL Employees Benefits Committee as well and thus decrease the number of faculty members needed by six.

Beck reported that she will sit in on some of the Academic Standards Committee meetings this summer to see how the meetings work. She noted that only three faculty members are needed at a meeting but the panel has 22 faculty members on it. Hoffman stated that the committee needs to meet often over a short period of time to review appeals by students because the students cannot register for courses until the appeal is decided. Beck wondered if having a Dean of Undergraduate Studies might make the process less faculty intensive.

4.2 Evaluation Process of Vice Chancellor Owens

Beck reported that the evaluation process is moving along. She noted that the committee to review the evaluations will include Peterson, Scholz, Hoffman, and Flowers. She pointed out that she felt it is important to get people outside of IANR on the committee to get some outside perspective.

Fech asked if the IANR Liaison Committee makes up the majority of the members of the review committee. Beck stated that there will be 7 members from the Liaison Committee and 5 members from the Senate Executive Committee.

Beck stated that she has received a copy of VC Owens' report of his activities and this will be posted on the Chancellor's website. She noted that the response form will be posted at

the end of the report.

Beck stated that the process will follow the evaluation process used by Academic Affairs. She noted that the committee will oversee the data that is collected. She stated that an announcement about the evaluation process will go out on Monday and there will be a month response time.

Beck stated that according to the evaluation guidelines she will pull all of the information together and then share it with the committee. She noted that at the beginning of the fall semester the Chancellor will go over the evaluation with VC Owens.

Scholz asked if the committee will be meeting over the summer. Beck stated that the committee will probably not meet until August and there might be a couple of meetings. She pointed out that the Chancellor wants to get feedback quickly before people leave for the summer but once that information is collected there is no rush.

4.3 Professor Ari

Fech asked if the visa situation for Professor Ari has been resolved yet or if the University has received any word from the State Department. The other Committee members stated that they have not heard anything about the situation.

4.4 Professor of Practice Position

Hoffman stated that nothing has been sent to all of the faculty members about the professor of practice positions that are being proposed. He stated that faculty members need to be made aware of this because it can have some significant impacts in some departments.

Beck stated that she wanted to discuss this issue with the Chancellor and SVCAA if they had met with the Committee. She wondered whether the administration was going to get any more input on the proposal. She stated that a question had been raised about the apportionment statements since this is primarily a teaching position; having apportionment statements in the description made this position too closely resemble tenure track positions.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Post Tenure Review Report

Beck stated that she received a report from Associate VC Jacobson on post tenure review. Beck noted that UNL academic units invoked post-tenure review in 18 instances. Of these 18 instances:

- 3 faculty members were given an improvement plan and deficiencies were corrected before a formal post tenure review was needed.

- 10 faculty members retired before a formal post tenure review was initiated
- 2 faculty members underwent a formal post tenure review
- 2 post tenure reviews are still in progress
- 1 faculty member received a first notification of chronic deficiencies that need to be corrected before the next annual evaluation

Beck reported that in her response to Associate VC Jacobson she asked if it is thought that the post tenure review process is helpful or could it be made better. Beck stated that she was told that the Deans believe that the post tenure reviews are helpful. She stated that she would like to present this information at the April 25th Senate meeting.

Flowers noted that this does not seem to be occurring with any kind of frequency. Beck agreed and stated that she would be concerned if the numbers were higher. Alloway questioned how the term “working well” is defined. Beck noted that the process is supposed to be for developmental purposes as opposed to punitive. She wondered whether the three faculty members that had an improvement plan developed found the process to be helpful. Flowers noted that the 10 faculty members who retired could have been people who were at the sunset of their career. Beck stated that she knows about one of those cases and she did not think the review or the retirement was warranted. Stock wondered whether people may have been harassed into retirement.

Stock stated that when the possibility of having a post tenure review process was first raised it was a fairly controversial issue. Griffin pointed out that Senate meetings over the issue would last for three hours or more as debate about the issue continued. Beck noted that the fears of the faculty may have been relieved with such low numbers.

Alloway questioned whether the 18 cases were distinct individual cases or if there were some people who were showing up several times. Flowers noted that 3 of the cases corrected the situation.

Griffin noted that some departments may not want to invoke the procedure for fear of losing a faculty line. Stock stated that since many people were opposed to post tenure reviews, department heads might be reluctant to conduct one because of the opposition. Beck wondered if the cases were looked at carefully whether culpability in the failure to mentor or address the deficiency at some point would be detected.

Alloway asked if the post tenure review information would go into the personnel file of an individual and whether this could have an effect on whether it would be invoked. Beck stated that there has to be two years of unsatisfactory performance before the review can be invoked.

5.2 Tuition Costs

Fech reported that he is concerned with the price of tuition. He noted that the tuition for the next academic year has gone up by 8%. He stated that in addition to the tuition increase there has been a \$400 increase for room and board. He reported that there is a \$700 increase for new students for the year which is a substantial amount for some students.

Hoffman noted that those students who cannot afford the increase will not come or will leave the University. Fech pointed out that it will get worse next year with another 9% increase in tuition rates.

Alloway stated that how he and other faculty members in his college hear about the difficulties students have with the tuition is that they can no longer participate in many of the college's sponsored activities because they have to work more. Stock agreed and stated that many students are saying the same thing to him. Alloway stated that students are also starting to have to go to school part time and/or may take a year off to earn enough money to continue their education.

5.3 Search Committee

Beck stated that a faculty member on the search committee for the Vice Chancellor for Students Affairs was very pleased with how the Chancellor conducted the search. The faculty member indicated that the process was very open and the committee members not only were able to give written evaluation of the candidates but met with the Chancellor to provide input as well. The faculty member stated that the committee had a fallback plan should none of the candidates qualify or accept the position and although the Chancellor did not accept the plan, he met with the committee to explain why. Overall the committee was very complimentary on how the search process was handled.

5.4 Evaluation of Dean

Alexander stated that the faculty members in the College of Engineering received an announcement from SVCAA Couture about the evaluation of the Dean. He noted that there is no mention in the announcement about the confidentiality of the information that is provided in the feedback. He stated that the announcement indicates that the Dean can request to see and respond to all of the comments that are made. Alexander stated that due to the lack of information about confidentiality many faculty members that he has spoken with have stated that they will not participate in the evaluation. Hoffman agreed and stated that he has heard from people that they will not make an evaluation for fear of confidentiality and concern that the Dean can figure out who the person was based on

previous statements that may have been made by an individual.

Beck stated that anyone evaluated can see the comments but they are compiled into a list with no names associated to them. She stated that it is her understanding that when comments are made a number is recorded to verify the authenticity of who wrote the evaluation but then the number and the comment are separated. Hoffman pointed out that the way the announcement was written there is no indication that there is confidentiality.

Alexander stated that the announcement does not give any indication whether the evaluation needs to be signed.

Beck asked if the problem is that the specific comments are shared with the Dean. Alexander stated that it is worded in the announcement that the Dean can see and respond to any comments that are made. Hoffman stated that comments would need to be generic so that the Dean cannot identify who wrote them.

Alexander noted that if serious allegations are made and someone put them into a file it would be possible for the Dean to later access them through possible court action. He stated that the University has gone through this before and the University was forced by the courts to turn over the evaluation and thus revealed the identity of the evaluator. Alexander stated that if the comments are shredded after the evaluation process then this problem would be alleviated.

Bolin stated that the five year review of the Dean of Libraries has been a different process. She stated that a link to the report made by Dean Giesecke was provided in the announcement. Flowers stated that he is serving on the committee to review the feedback and he noted that the comments were quite anonymous. He wondered whether part of the university is conducting evaluations differently than they should be doing.

Beck noted that in the evaluation of VC Owens there is a list of the faculty members who have been asked to submit an evaluation. Once the evaluation is received, the faculty members' name is removed from the list so that they cannot submit another evaluation. She pointed out that while she understands there is a need to verify the authenticity of evaluations, it is not good to have people scared to send an evaluation in.

Beck stated that this issue needs to be raised with SVCAA Couture and that she will do so when she meets with the SVCAA. There may be a difference in the College of Engineering (annual evaluation) and the format shared through the Chancellor's office (five year review) and that it will be clarified.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:38 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, April 19th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Beck, Flowers, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Shea

Absent: Alexander, Bolin, Fech, Hoffman, Scholz, Stock

Date: Wednesday, April 19, 2006

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:09 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Strategic Planning Hearings

Beck reported that she attended the first hearing on the strategic plans for the colleges. She noted that each Dean has 10 minutes to present their plan and that the plans seem to be better developed than last year. She noted that linkages are beginning to form between some colleges and programs. She pointed out that the interaction within some colleges is still not going well.

Flowers noted that the Gallup survey has questions regarding the strategic planning process and there is a section that allows for comments on the process. He pointed out that the feedback from Deans to departments is still not happening in some colleges.

Beck stated that at the hearings the Chancellor reported that there has been some discussion about creating a College of Public Health between UNMC and UNL. Beck noted that the Chancellor wants to seriously think about creating such a college, in part because of the amount of money (\$20 million) that would be needed to start it. She stated that the Chancellor wants to think about the implications this kind of college would have for UNL faculty. Beck noted that there are no Colleges of Public Health in the country between Missouri and California.

Alloway asked if UNMC would administer the college. Beck stated that she did not think this has been decided and discussions are only in the preliminary stages.

3.0 Approval of 4/12/06 Minutes

The Executive Committee approved the minutes via email due to a lack of a quorum at the meeting.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Committee Restructuring

Beck stated that she discussed with the Chancellor and SVCAA the idea of having the faculty members on the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee become the faculty members on the UNL Employees Committee. She noted that the sixth faculty member on the Benefits Committee could be the faculty representative to the University-wide Benefits Committee. She stated that the Chancellor felt that the chair of the UNL Benefits Committee should not be the faculty representative to the University-wide Benefits Committee because a chair only holds the position for one year and he wants to appoint the representative to the University-wide Committee for three years. Beck noted that the Chancellor thinks that merging the two committees would be a good idea and that he would work with us.

Beck reported that Professor Bradford has resigned from the University-wide Benefits Committee and will need to be replaced. She stated that the Chancellor wants to appoint someone to this committee quickly so the Senate needs to provide at least three names of possible candidates to serve on the University-Wide Benefits Committee.

4.2 Meeting with the Chancellor and SVCAA

Beck reported that there is a slight correction in the Post Tenure Review report that was written by Associate VC Jacobson. Beck noted that 11 faculty members retired before a review was conducted instead of the 10 that was reported. She stated that SVCAA Couture noted that the Deans and Directors think the review process has been very effective.

Faculty members are engaged in the process and have generally become very reflective about the work that they do. Some have become more focused and some have realized that it was time to move on and retire. Beck stated that it was reported that there were a few faculty members who had family or personal issues that caused them some problems in moving forward with their careers.

Beck noted that the Chancellor asked if there were any specific concerns that prompted the inquiry of the post tenure review procedures. She reported that she told him that there were no specific concerns and that the request was simply to get a report on how the process was going.

Beck stated that she discussed with the Chancellor and SVCAA concern over the annual reviews of Deans and the fact that confidentiality is not addressed in the letter notifying faculty members of the review. Beck reported that SVCAA Couture stated that she received phone calls from several College of Engineering faculty members about this issue. Beck stated that the SVCAA stated that she considers confidentiality to be sacrosanct and she is the only one who sees all of the comments. The SVCAA summarizes the comments and aggregates them and this is what she shows to the Dean. The Deans can waive the rights to see the actual comments and most do but two of them did not this year. The SVCAA stated that if a Dean does ask to see the comments then she redacts them and just shows him the comments without identifying the respondent.

Beck stated that she asked what happens to the evaluation file after the process is completed. She stated that she pointed out the history of what happened in a recent lawsuit and how retribution occurred because of a Dean reading the comments. Beck reported that SVCAA Couture stated that she has been thinking about this and wondered what can be done because the University does have a record retention policy. Beck stated that the Chancellor believes that the overall evaluation needs to be retained but he was unsure whether all of the specific comments need to be kept. Beck noted that the Chancellor and SVCAA will look into this matter further. Peterson stated that it could be helpful to the Dean to look at the comments that have been made. Shea pointed out that confidentiality is important to protect those individuals who may criticize a Dean. He noted that some people can be identified by the comments they make. Beck reported that SVCAA Couture stated that she also invites people to come and talk to her if they do not feel comfortable writing an evaluation, but that this also has hearsay implications.

4.3 Coordinator Evaluation

The Committee discussed making revisions to the form that will be used to evaluate the coordinator of the Senate.

4.4 Academic Dishonesty Discussion

Beck stated that she sent Professor King an email asking for an update on what the Teaching Council has accomplished regarding academic dishonesty. She stated that she does not think anything definitive has happened yet. She suggested that the Committee meet with Dr. Hecker, Director of Student Judicial Affairs, sometime in the summer to discuss the issue.

Beck noted that the Teaching Council did meet with Dr. Hecker in December. They also reviewed our peer institutions' policy on academic dishonesty and looked at several articles on the issue. She stated that Professor King indicated that a review of the software that is available at UNL was also conducted. Beck stated that the Council encourages

departments to have discussions about academic dishonesty and suggested that strong language be used on course syllabi. She noted that the student members on the Teaching Council did not think there were many violations of academic dishonesty.

Alloway suggested conducting a survey of the faculty on academic dishonesty. Peterson stated that the survey could include questions asking if the faculty member is aware of academic dishonesty occurring in their classes and if the faculty member knows what options are available if a student is caught cheating.

Flowers pointed out that some people do not want to deal with academic dishonesty by going through university channels because it is so time consuming.

Beck suggested that the Committee should continue working on addressing the problem of academic dishonesty.

4.5 Executive Committee Goals Revisited

Item postponed.

4.6 Reduction in Force Procedures

Beck stated that revising the Reduction in Force Procedures will be continued.

Shea stated that he has mixed feelings about what has happened to date with the procedures. He stated that he was disappointed that an open discussion with the Senate about the draft procedures was not held. He pointed out that the ad hoc committee worked hard on the procedures for several years. He stated that he was pleased with the draft document that the committee developed and he felt that the draft should have been pursued beyond the discussion Beck and Moeller had with the Chancellor.

Moeller stated that she believes the door is still open to make changes to the procedures. She noted that the Chancellor stated that he is comfortable with the current policy but he is open to suggestions and comments about them. She stated that Beck will chair an ad hoc committee to continue working on the procedures. Moeller stated that she needs to know where the current procedures were not followed during the budget crisis. She stated that she will be candid with the Chancellor about the problems with the current procedures. She suggested that the ad hoc committee look at both the proposed document and the current procedures to see how they can be meshed together.

Shea stated that he hopes there can be discussion with the Senate in the fall regarding a draft set of procedures. He stated that he is concerned that we will not be prepared for the

next round of budget cuts involving personnel and it would be better to prepare now. He suggested that a target date be set for completion of and Senate action on the revised procedures.

4.7 Website

Griffin, Beck, and Moeller agreed to work on renovating the Senate website.

4.8 Professor of Practice Position

Moeller stated that she is getting a lot of negative feedback from faculty members regarding the professor of practice positions. She stated that the faculty members do not feel there should be a teaching track and a research track.

Shea stated that creating two separate tracks was not the intent of the committee. He noted that the committee discussed creating a similar set of positions for the non-tenure track research faculty but it could not be easily done. He stated that the priority for creating these positions was the non-tenure track teaching positions. He noted that there was some discussion about creating similar positions for extension personnel as well. He stated that the intent was to create more equivalent positions for non-tenure track faculty members. Peterson pointed out that the real distinction is between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty members. Shea stated that the creation of these positions was to primarily address those people who are already employed by UNL. He assumes that it is not an effort to increase the percentage of non-tenure track faculty.

Beck stated that she discussed the professor of practice positions with the Chancellor and SVCAA and they feel that enough faculty members have seen the proposal since the Academic Senate and the Academic Planning Committee have both reviewed it. Beck stated that the proposal will be presented to the Board of Regents at the June meeting and it will be voted on as a new category of employee. She stated that the specific guidelines for these positions will be developed within the units.

Beck reported that General Counsel Wood has reviewed the proposal and looked carefully at the notification deadlines. She stated that she believes the issue over the apportionment of duties has been removed and that some outreach might be included. Shea noted that his understanding is that a research component of the position was not excluded but also not required. He pointed out that this needs to be decided at the local level. Alloway noted that the positions will have a heavier teaching load but will not be weighed down with other responsibilities.

Moeller asked if the professors of practice will be involved with decision making within departments. Shea noted that some departments do not want these people to have voting

powers but the committee felt that they should be involved in decisions as long as they are not regarding tenure. He pointed out that the idea was to make the non-tenure track faculty positions better.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Final Exam Week Scheduling Conflict

Griffin reported that she received a phone call from Tony Schkade, Assistant Director of Registration and Records, concerning a conflict in room and times for two final exams. She noted that a Management class and an Economics class have their final exams scheduled at the same time in the same room. Griffin reported that Schkade asked if one of the exams can be given at a different time, preferably after 12:00 on Friday of final exam week. Griffin noted that there are three students who take both classes and would have a conflict.

Griffin stated that she asked Schkade to see if there is a classroom near by on campus where one of the classes can hold their final exam. She stated that Schkade reported that a room is available in Burnett.

Beck pointed out that the request is asking for a breach in the final exam week policy. The Committee agreed that allowing the final exam to be taken on Friday would breach the policy and one allowance could eventually lead to abuse of the policy.

The Committee felt that the problem was resolved because a room is available in a nearby building where one of the finals could be given.

Griffin stated that she would report the Committee's decision to Schkade.

5.2 Report on FCAC Meeting

Peterson reported that the committee met on April 14th. He noted that the committee only meets about twice a year and the main meeting is held during the spring semester. He pointed out that the committee should give its report to the Senate during the fall semester instead of the spring because the spring FCAC meeting often falls after the last Senate meeting at which reports are made making it necessary to distribute a follow-up report.

Peterson noted that the increase for faculty salaries is the same as last year, 3.95% and the committee recommended the same percentage of distribution as last year: 3% for the department, .65% for the college, and .3% for the Vice Chancellors. He pointed out that the split is to help departments and colleges address inequities and to help departments who

may be significantly behind their peers in terms of salaries.

Peterson stated that the committee was informed that there will be a \$100,000 deficit in Academic Affairs for funding promotion increases. He pointed out that in the past these increases were funded through open positions but there is not enough money available to cover all of them on city campus. He noted that IANR can cover all of its promotion increases. Beck pointed out that IANR has been holding an large number of lines open because of the cash flow problem that it has had to deal with this year.

Peterson stated that the committee agreed that the promotion increases are important to keep. He reported that the committee felt that the increases should not come out of the 3.95% salary pool and that the administration should find funding elsewhere for these promotions although he acknowledged that there are limited alternatives for the funding.

Peterson stated that Institutional Research and Planning reported that we continue to fall behind our peers in terms of salary. He reported that UNL is 3.2% behind its peers in faculty salaries for 2005-06. He stated that this will be pointed out to the Chancellor in the recommendation letter sent by the committee.

Peterson noted that Past President Bryant worked hard for a number of years to get the Legislature to increase the retirement cap on University employees. Peterson noted that the Board of Regents increased the retirement contribution to 7.5% this year but compared to some of our peer institutions we are behind in retirement contributions. He pointed out that this is another area which makes the University less competitive.

Peterson reported that the Office of Institutional Research and Planning generates a report each year on gender and other inequities in the system. He stated that the finalized reports are not ready yet but will eventually be posted on the IRP webpage. He noted that last year the report on gender inequities showed that the overall average salary differential for women was positive but this year the average salary was lower by \$58. Beck pointed out that when the report is looked at by rank the difference is much greater, by as much as \$1500 in some cases. She noted that if this is not corrected, it will make a huge difference over a number of years. Peterson stated more work is needed on the models that are used to generate these reports.

Peterson stated that there was discussion regarding the outliers report. He noted that this report provides information on faculty members whose salary is either substantially below or above the rest of the salaries within a department/unit. He reported that the total number of outliers has decreased but and the proportion of the negative (those with salaries below the predicted salary) outliers has also declined. Beck noted that Associate to the Chancellor

Howe asked at what level the inequities should be addressed. She stated that if the inequities are the “garden variety” compression type (factors that are not caused by discrimination, either overt or unintentional) they should be taken care of by the Deans and Vice Chancellors. If the inequities are due to discrimination within a department then they should be taken care of at the department level.

Beck stated that there was a discussion on email this past winter about development leaves and the Regents Bylaws stating that a faculty member cannot make more money than their total salary at UNL if they go elsewhere and get paid while on a full academic year of 12-month leave. Rapkin pointed out that when he was in Japan he only received half of his salary from UNL and needed to receive more in order to maintain a home in Japan and one in Lincoln.

Beck suggested that a subcommittee should be created to look into this policy to see why it was created and whether it can be changed, it was agreed within the FCAC that this committee be set up.

5.3 April 26th Executive Committee Meeting

Griffin noted that President Moeller and President Elect Bradford will not be able to make the April 26th meeting. Griffin stated that the Committee is not meeting with any guests. She noted that this is a busy time of year for faculty members and asked the Committee if they want to cancel the meeting. The Committee agreed to cancel the April 26th meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, May 3rd at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Beck, Hoffman, Flowers, Moeller, Peterson, Rapkin, Stock

Absent: Alexander, Bolin, Fech, Scholz, Shea

Date: Wednesday, April 5, 2006

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Beck called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

2.0 Vice Chancellor Owens

2.1 Extension Educator Task Force

Beck stated that the members of the task force are Richard (Otto) Hoffman, Kathy Prochaska-Cue, and Andy Christiansen. She noted that Hoffman is chair.

Hoffman reported that the task force has not met yet but will do so next week. He stated that basically they have a plan of action which they will like to go over with VC Owens at some time.

VC Owens stated that he mentioned the task force to Dean Dickey and suggested that Dickey might mention this to the Extension Advisory Committee.

2.2 Implication of the Governor's Veto on the Utilities Appropriation

Beck asked VC Owens if he knew of the implications of the Governor's veto. VC Owens pointed out that the utilities costs are very real costs and it is difficult to know precisely what the impacts will be. He noted that next year the Legislature will be a very different one with a different chair for the Appropriations Committee. He stated that the hard work done by President Milliken and others supporting the university will have to be repeated next year to educate the new Legislature. He pointed out that the University could be faced with more budget cuts because of the increased cost of utilities if the next Legislature and Governor do not address that situation.

Moeller asked if the efficiency measures with the heating systems made much of an

impact. VC Owens stated that they did not make as much of an impact as hoped for but have accounted for some savings.

Peterson stated that he recently met Cecil Steward, former Dean of the College of Architecture. Peterson noted that Steward is heading up an institute in Lincoln and Omaha that will work on sustainable design. He noted that the idea is to make buildings and communities that would be sustainable and energy efficient. Peterson stated that he has long thought that the University should be trying to make ourselves into a model that is sustainable and energy efficient. He stated that it is frustrating to come into buildings on the weekends and find lights on all over the place. He pointed out that the Legislature might be influenced if the University was more sustainable. VC Owens stated that this is a good point and suggested that the College of Architecture could help with this idea. He noted that there are renewable energy sources that the University should continue to look into.

Flowers pointed out that old, large computer monitors should be replaced with LCD flat screens because the old monitors use a lot more electricity. He noted that all monitors and printers should be turned off at nights and over the weekends if they are not in use.

VC Owens stated that replacing the old, leaky windows in buildings across campus can make a difference in cost over the long run. He stated that replacing windows will be done with the buildings that are renovated if the University gets the LB 605 money.

VC Owens pointed out that the two research intensive campuses use a lot of power which explains why UNL and UNMC have the highest utility costs in the system. VC Owens stated that buildings with animals have certain requirements that must be met thus increasing the cost of the utilities. He stated that finding an ultimate permanent solution to the problem is very important to UNL.

Hoffman noted that many graduate students are working on the nights and weekends here at UNL. He pointed out that the same thing does not happen as much at UNK or UNO and many of the buildings on those campuses are shut down in the evenings and on the weekends. He stated that he does not know if the Legislature is fully aware of how complex an institution the University is.

Beck stated that she received an email message from the Chancellor's office about finding speakers for the Speakers Bureau program. She asked if anybody at UNL has a speech which addresses who we are and that is understandable and humorous and can be easily presented to the public. She pointed out that this would be another way of advertising for the University. She stated that Assistant VC Moeller of IANR suggested a format for slides

shown during presentations that would have a uniform look. She noted that the format could be downloaded from a website.

Moeller stated that former SVCAA Leitzel developed an algorithm on what the university means to the state in terms of economic impact. She suggested that a team of university personnel could put this information together and it could be presented in a comprehensible way to the public.

Hoffman stated that he recently saw figures on the impact of foreign students on the economy of Lincoln. He noted that these students have a very positive effect on Lincoln's economy and we should bring in as many international students as we can because it would help the state out financially.

Beck noted that in the publication *The Voice*, an educator's newspaper, there are advertisements for other state colleges but UNL was noticeably absent. Alloway stated that UNL is targeting some advertisements for national television.

VC Owens stated that on East Campus most phones are set up to play an audio advertisement for CASNR academic programs while a person is on hold. He noted that the most recent advertisement created caters to younger people. He pointed out that this is an almost cost free way of advertising.

Peterson suggested that Michelle Waite, Assistant to the Chancellor on Community Relations, and Meg Lauerman, Director of University Communications, be invited to meet with the Executive Committee to discuss some of these ideas.

Hoffman pointed out that UNO appears to be advertising in Omaha more than UNL. He stated that UNL seems to stay away from the Omaha market. He noted that the figures in Engineering on students from Omaha are very low.

VC Owens stated that Professor Jose's television journal broadcasted on public television is very good. VC Owens stated that he has asked Professor Baquet, Head of Agricultural Economics, whether the program can be expanded to include information on other majors as well as agriculture.

Alloway stated that he has an independent study project for broadcasting students that is working on producing 30 second ads for each college. He noted that these will be used on KRNU radio. He stated that he can make them available for colleges to use. VC Owens asked if the ads can be updated. Alloway stated that for now the project is a one time deal but the ads can probably be changed.

Hoffman asked how this kind of information can be put on podcast. Alloway stated that a person would need to download it from the web. Moeller stated that using the podcast can be used to assist international students as well. She pointed out that they can obtain information about the University in their own language by listening to a podcast broadcast. Alloway noted that Duke University gave each of their incoming students a new Ipod so they could get information on their college and courses.

2.3 Vet School Agreement with Iowa State

Beck noted that the agreement with Iowa State has been made. She asked what will happen now in terms of the curriculum. VC Owens stated that we will receive a formal proposal from Iowa State which the Board of Regents will need to approve. He pointed out that the Coordinating Commission on Secondary Education will also need to approve it and they will not meet until June 1st but indications are that the Commission will approve the contract.

VC Owens stated that he has had close negotiations with Dr. David Hardin who is the person who may initially be the Head of the Veterinary & Biomedical Sciences department. He noted that Dr. Hardin is a little cautious because of the costs involved with the program but he wants to make sure that Dr. Hardin is involved in deciding which courses will be in the curriculum. He stated that there will also be a site visit by a team from the American Medical Veterinary Association both at UNL and Iowa State.

VC Owens stated that the full curriculum for the program is not in place yet but it is close. He noted that UNL will not teach the first students until the fall of 2007. He pointed out that there will be 25 students in the first class. He stated that when the last class graduates from Kansas State and the last four-year class graduates from Iowa State and Nebraska students start studying veterinary medicine at UNL, the campus will get some money back but initially it has been difficult to have enough money available to begin the new program at UNL. He reminded the Committee that IANR received a \$1.4 million budget cut due to the loss of UNL tuition and as a result of that and the fact that IANR currently is paying the difference between in-state and out-of-state tuition for Nebraska residents currently studying at both Kansas State and Iowa State, a lot of IANR faculty positions have not been filled. He stated that the process of getting the contract finalized has been very complex but it will have very positive impacts for the University and for Nebraska.

Beck asked if the curriculum is already in place at Iowa State. VC Owens stated that it is but UNL will be able to make some changes to the curriculum. He noted that Dr. Hardin agrees with this and wants to discuss the surgery program.

VC Owens noted that the contract with Kansas State only sent students and money to

Kansas. He pointed out that UNL will have more involvement with the Iowa State program. He stated that a critical element of the program is using the U.S.D.A. Mean Animal Research Center and the UNL Great Plains Veterinary Education Center both of which are at Clay Center. He noted that both Iowa State and UNL have agreed that having this component of the program will allow students to get experience with large animals. He pointed out that large animal veterinarians have been declining, in part because large animals can be physically difficult to manipulate. He noted that there will be an emphasis in large animal care but students will not be told what they should do with their careers.

Moeller stated that the contract will be more reciprocal which will result in UNL getting some of the tuition from the program. There will also be more opportunities to have experience with large animals, and greater research endeavors between the two universities. VC Owens noted that the contract was made not for costs alone. He pointed out that the department head of Veterinary and Biomedical Sciences will become an Associate Dean here and will be a member of the Dean's cabinet at Iowa State. He noted that some people think we went into the contract to get more money and to pull students away from other schools. He pointed out that 25 students in each of two classes is not a lot of students and the money from tuition will not be that significant. He stated that it might be possible in the future to have more students.

Hoffman asked if Iowa State will be the only school we have a contract with. VC Owens stated that this is correct. He noted that we had a contract with Kansas State for 19 years but before then it was with Iowa State.

Hoffman asked if it is a four-year program. VC Owens stated that it is, two years at UNL and two years at Iowa State. He noted that the basic sciences portion of the curriculum will be done here and the clinical side will be done at Iowa State. He pointed out that the clinical side generally is more expensive.

2.4 IANR Open Forum Discussion

VC Owens stated that the changing demographics of Nebraska always strikes him. He pointed out that the only growing part of Nebraska's population is among Hispanics. He stated that this community is not yet in a position to be fully embracing secondary and post secondary education and UNL needs to work in this area to assist more Hispanic students to study at the university. He pointed out that he is happy that Dr. Franco was hired as Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs. VC Owens noted that Dr. Franco will be a great role model for both Anglo and Hispanic students and he should have good access to Hispanic communities.

Moeller noted that there are 15 schools in Nebraska where the minority students actually

make up the majority of the students. She stated that she has visited schools that have a dual language program and the dominantly Spanish speaking students are doing better in their English speaking skills than the English speaking students are doing in their Spanish speaking skills. She stated that a 12 year study will be conducted in the schools. She noted that there is a high drop out rate among Hispanic students and that it is difficult to show them the economic impact of dropping out.

2.5 Procedures for Evaluating Dr. Owens

Beck stated that she just met with Associate to the Chancellor Howe to discuss VC Owens' evaluation process. She stated that Howe and she discussed what groups should be asked to provide input. She noted that VC Owens will also be asked this question. She stated that all IANR faculty members, including those on courtesy or adjunct positions will be given the opportunity to provide input. She stated that some outside constituents administrators (head and above), and students in CASNR will be included in the process as well.

Beck stated that the report VC Owens has written on his accomplishments and goals will be sent electronically to all those participating and the evaluation form will be at the end of the report. She noted that to access the form people will need to read the report. She stated that a number will be given to each evaluation form submitted to verify that it is a legitimate response but this number will be separated from the response once the verification is made. She noted that the responses will be sent to an email address that only the Chancellor and his assistant will have access to.

Beck reported that the committee that will review and summarize the responses will be composed of the IANR Liaison Committee members and five members of the Senate Executive Committee. She stated that there will be a meeting next week to finalize the process and they hope to have a short turn around so that the information can be collected before the end of the academic year.

VC Owens stated that he welcomes the evaluation.

2.6 Issues on the Horizon

VC Owens stated that one of the things he is happy about is the money that has been identified to assist in recruiting females to the areas of engineering and the physical sciences. He stated that it is not enough money to solve the problem but it is better than none.

VC Owens noted that this year he will be hosting the tenure and promotion reception along

with Chancellor Perlman and SVCAA Couture which will be held on April 26th at the Champions Club.

Peterson stated that the Chancellor indicated several times earlier that departments will get feedback on their strategic plans. He stated that there are many units that have not received this feedback. Moeller and Flowers agreed. Beck pointed out that it will be difficult for units to work on their new plans if they do not have feedback from their first plans. VC Owens stated that there will be a meeting in April with the Senior Administrative Team and Deans and this topic will be discussed.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Master's Week

Beck stated that she has been asked to find a volunteer for the Master's Week. She noted that the person would read over the applications for nominees and then meet with a committee to decide who should be invited. She pointed out that it is a one-time meeting. Rapkin volunteered to serve.

3.2 Speaker's Bureau

Beck stated that the Chancellor wants to revise the list of speakers and get new people involved. She stated that she will send a message to the Senate asking them to consider either themselves or someone else to participate.

3.3 Emeriti Association

Beck noted that the Emeriti Association has a liaison with the Senate but their meetings are at the same time as the Senate. She stated that the Emeriti Association is considering conducting exit interviews with retiring faculty members. She suggested having the Emeriti Association give a report to the Senate at some time during the academic year. Griffin noted that the Executive Committee has met with members of the Emeriti Association in the past and this could also be done.

4.0 Approval of 3/29/06 Minutes

Moeller moved and Flowers seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Committee Restructuring

Beck stated that it was suggested at the IANR luncheon that we might want to consider

having the faculty on the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee (FCAC) serve on the UNL Employee Benefits Committee. She noted that this might provide some continuity.

Peterson stated that the FCAC does have some responsibility for non-monetary benefits. He noted that there have been suggestions in the past to eliminate the UNL Benefits Committee. Beck pointed out that there are benefits at the campus level that the UNL Benefits Committee can work on.

Beck proposed that the Committee continue looking at the committees over the summer to see if changes can be made.

5.2 Safe Assignment

Hoffman stated that he wants to call attention to the Safe Assignment program and suggests that faculty members use it. Peterson pointed out that Information Services wants to get feedback on the program to see whether it should be purchased. He stated that faculty members need to know who comments should be sent to. [Comments on the Safe Assignment program should be sent to Professor Beth McNeil at mmcneil1@unl.edu].

6.0 New Business

6.1 Evaluation of Academic Senate Coordinator

Beck reported that it is expected that the President will evaluate the Coordinator of the Senate but this has not been done in several years. She stated that she believes that it is a mistake not to do this because having a record of documentation would be beneficial. She stated that having a record could assist in arguing for a higher salary for the Coordinator and could protect the Coordinator should there be problems with a President.

Beck stated that the President would coordinate the evaluation process and would get feedback from all of the members of the Executive Committee.

Flowers noted that the Computational Services and Facilities Committee conducts an evaluation process on the Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Services. He stated that the Associate Vice Chancellor excuses himself from the meeting when the evaluation is done.

6.2 Content Program

Hoffman reported that there is a program on Blackboard called Content that allows faculty and students to store their documents. He noted that currently students are limited to 200 megabytes and faculty members are limited to 350 megabytes but these limits will be

removed when the new servers are put in place.

Peterson stated that it has been discussed in the General Education Revision Committee to have students store some of their work in a place where it can be retrieved as a portfolio of work when the student enters their senior year. He noted that it sounds like the Content program could do this.

Hoffman pointed out that this is particularly helpful for students who do not have their own computer. Rapkin noted that it could put an end to students claiming that they couldn't turn a paper or project in because their computer crashed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, April 12th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Alloway, Beck, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Rapkin, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Bolin, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, May 17, 2006

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Moeller called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 UNL Faculty Representative to the University-wide Benefits Committee

Moeller reported that Professor Hope, Psychology, has been appointed to the University-wide Benefits Committee by the Chancellor.

3.0 Approval of 5/3/06 Minutes

Alloway moved and Alexander seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Accreditation Report Chapters

The Committee reviewed the chapters of the self-study report for accreditation. Comments and suggestions on each of the chapters were forwarded to Professor O'Hanlon, chair of the accreditation self-study.

4.2 Status of Academic Senate Changes

Moeller reported that there is some discrepancy on whether the academic assembly needs to vote on the changes to the Senate structure or whether it is sufficient for the Senate to approve the changes. She stated that the discrepancy is being looked into. She pointed out that both ASUN and the Board of Regents need to approve the changes because they will change the UNL Bylaws.

4.3 Surveying the Faculty on Institutional Objectives

Moeller noted that a suggestion was made at the last meeting to survey the faculty members on the institutional objectives developed by the General Education Revision Committee. She suggested that the Executive Committee should form an ad hoc committee to work on creating the survey. Ledders, Alloway, and Flowers agreed to serve on the ad hoc committee.

The Committee felt that September would be a good time to initiate the survey. Rapkin suggested that a summary outlining the reason and process for changing the general education program should be sent out before the survey to help give faculty members some background knowledge.

Ledder pointed out that the survey will help to determine if there is a consensus of approval for the institutional objectives. He noted that getting a consensus of approval for the institutional objectives will be the easy part of the revision process.

The Committee agreed to meet with Professor Janovy, chair of the General Education Revision Committee, to discuss the survey.

4.4 UNL Honor Code

Moeller reported that she met with VC Griesen and they discussed the University Judicial Board. She noted that VC Griesen believes that there may be some discussions about creating an honor code. Flowers pointed out that the University does have a student code of conduct which may cover the honor code.

Ledder stated that there should be a document that states acceptable and unacceptable behavior and each student would sign the document when they begin school. He noted that the main virtue of such a document is that it would get the message out to students about what are acceptable and unacceptable actions.

Moeller stated that the Committee should meet with ASUN about creating an honor code. Beck suggested the Committee should also meet with Professor King, chair of the Teaching Council, and Dr. Hecker, Director of Students Affairs, since they are both working on the issue of academic dishonesty.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Email Message from Professor Chouinard

Moeller reported that she received an inquiry from Professor Chouinard, Mathematics, regarding the relationship between the administration and the Academic Senate. Citing the name change and the lack of candidates for committee appointments and Senate positions,

he expressed concern regarding what he perceived as an adversarial relationship between the Administration and the Academic Senate. Bradford stated that people may decide not to run for election because they have confidence in the candidates who are on the ballot. He noted that this was the case for him when Moeller ran for President- Elect.

Alloway recalled discussions from previous Senate meetings about the effect of apportionment of duties on some faculty members' willingness to serve on campus organizations; faculty with a small apportionment for service may choose to focus their time and efforts on those activities that more directly relate to their promotion and tenure. Griffin noted that many faculty members feel they do not have the time to do service work because of the pressure they are under to conduct research and teach.

Moeller stated that she believes that she resolved the issue with Professor Chouinard and assured him that the Senate is not here to be in an adversarial position with the administration. She pointed out that Professor Chouinard raised some good issues and she would rather that he and anyone else feel free to discuss any issues that they may have with the Senate.

5.2 Evaluation of the Senate Coordinator

Moeller stated that the evaluation form for the Senate Coordinator will be sent out to the former Executive Committee members as well as the current members. She asked that all forms be sent back to Secretary Alloway so he can tabulate the results. Beck, as Past President, will write the evaluation based on the information provided on the forms.

5.3 Breakfast of Champions

Beck reported that she attended the Breakfast of Champions event that is conducted by the University and the Athletics Department. She stated that it was a huge event which is done to honor 8th grade students who excel in both athletics and academics. She stated that it was very well attended. Ledder pointed out that it would be nice if they held such an event for students who excel in academics.

5.4 Alleged Violations of 15th Week Policy

Alloway noted that questions have been raised about alleged violations of the policy and asked what the Senate's role and response should be. He reported hearing a complaint from a student about an instructor who announced in class on Monday of the 15th week that he had decided to give a final exam, and that the exam would be given on Friday of the 15th week. The timing of both the announcement and the exam would appear to be in violation of the 15th Week policy. The committee also discussed reports of a final that was given on Friday afternoon of finals week after the time when finals were to have been completed. Moeller stated that she is looking into the violations and will report back to the committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:34 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, May 31, at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Alloway, Beck, Bolin, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Rapkin, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Absent:

Date: Wednesday, May 31, 2006

Location: 201 Canfield Administration 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

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

2.0 Chancellor Perlman/SVCAA Couture/VC Owens

2.1 Summer Enrollment Figures

Chancellor Perlman reported that enrollment for those summer courses with reduced tuition rates is up by at least 23%. Ledder asked if the sale on tuition is for specific courses. Chancellor Perlman stated that the sale is for freshmen level courses. Alloway asked if the increase in enrollment is meeting the expectations of the administration. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that this is the first time that a tuition reduction for specific courses has been offered so there were no expectations.

Chancellor Perlman noted that the enrollment for the 2006-07 freshmen class is not as large as he had hoped. He stated that it was originally thought that we could have 500 additional students but it will more likely be 350. He noted that this is still a healthy increase.

SVCAA Couture stated that there has been concern that enrollment figures for this summer would be down again by as much as 2% but overall it is down only 1%. She noted that the summer sale courses show about a 25% increase over average enrollment in these courses in the summer.

Bradford stated that departments were running advertisements in the Daily Nebraskan for courses. He pointed out that this creates competition between units for existing students and questioned whether this is beneficial for the university. SVCAA Couture stated that advertising makes students more aware of courses but does not necessarily create competition between departments.

SVCAA Couture stated that she is working on creating a summer school advisory committee to coordinate more effectively the courses that are taught during the summer. She noted that there may be some courses that are scheduled at the same time during the summer, requiring a student to decide which course to take instead of enrolling in both courses. She stated that the goal is to get more students in summer classes because it helps with graduation rates, eases pressure on class enrollment in the fall and spring, and brings in more revenue.

Alexander asked if evening classes are being looked into as well. SVCAA Couture stated that more needs to be done with night classes throughout the year. She pointed out that the campus needs to think of ways to make our programs more attractive to students and offering more evening classes is one way of doing this. Moeller agreed and stated that K-12 teachers throughout the state who want or need to take courses would appreciate having more evening courses that they could attend.

SVCAA Couture stated that this was the first year that students were given an incentive to take summer courses and it has worked well. She noted that experience at other institutions with incentive programs is that the first year there won't be much improvement but the second and third years show greater improvements. She stated that she sees real opportunities with incentive programs at UNL.

2.2 Budget Update

Chancellor Perlman reported that the Board of Regents will most likely approve the budget for next year at their June meeting. He stated that the Board will also be looking at a second draft of the 2008-09 biennium budget but this request will probably not be approved until the end of July. He noted that the next biennium budget will need to be in the Governor's office in September.

Chancellor Perlman reported that for next year President Milliken has added \$1 million into the budget to begin to address bringing faculty salaries at UNL and UNMC up to the average salaries of their peers. Chancellor Perlman stated that no guidelines have been set yet on how this money will be used and distributed.

Chancellor Perlman stated that there have been some preliminary conversations about using the money for units that are significantly below their peer groups in terms of salaries. He stated that the salary increases with this money will be clearly merit based and limited to people with high performance records.

Ledder asked if there has been any consideration for structural readjustments. He pointed

out that the hiring rates have changed over the years and some faculty members who have been here for a length of time are being paid below what newly hired assistant professors are paid. He noted that it has been quite a few years since this issue has been addressed. Chancellor Perlman stated that the decision on how the money can be used will be decided by Central Administration. He pointed out that \$1 million is not a lot of money when it is split between UNL and UNMC. He stated that Deans could use some of the money from the annual salary increases to address issues of salary compression. He stated that he doubts that the problems will be able to be solved this year.

Chancellor Perlman reported that Programs of Excellence funds will be in the budget. He noted that there will be \$1 million for diversity that was not in the budget last year. He pointed out that we will continue to face some risks with the budget in part because of the adjustments being made to the system due to tuition shortages. He noted that this could result in a shortfall for UNL. He stated that it is predicted that there will be a utilities shortfall since the Governor vetoed the money to cover utilities next year. Chancellor Perlman stated that next year we will be able to monitor the heating and air conditioning in most buildings which will help with the utilities costs.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the faculty will receive nearly a 4% salary increase this year which will help us to catch up to our peers. He noted that many of our peer institutions are only getting a 3% increase.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the tuition increase in next year's budget is set for 6%. He stated that 5% is tuition increase and 1% goes to LB605, the Legislature's building maintenance fund. He noted that the first two buildings that will be worked on as a result of the LB605 money will be Sheldon Art Gallery and the Physics building. He stated that Sheldon is ready to go but the Coordinating Commission on Secondary Education will need to approve the construction for the Physics building which could cause some delays. He pointed out that delays mean greater costs for the University but the Commission has never failed to approve the construction of new buildings. He stated that the next set of bonds is scheduled to go out in 2009 and Animal Science and Keim Hall are the next buildings scheduled for work.

Scholz asked if most of the work on Sheldon is on the outside of the building. Chancellor Perlman stated that the outside of the building is in bad shape. He noted that all of the weight of the exterior skin of the building is pressing on the base.

Beck pointed out that some buildings, such as Animal Science, are just freezing cold due to over air conditioning. She asked who controls the air conditioning. Chancellor Perlman stated that rooms in most buildings, particularly older buildings, cannot be controlled.

Ledder stated that since Avery Hall has been renovated there is very good control of the ventilation system. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that most of the money from LB605 will be used to deal with heating and air conditioning systems of buildings.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he has received letters from alumni trying to save Brace Hall. He noted that there are no current plans to demolish the building but neither are there any plans to renovate it. He pointed out that the LB605 money allow some buildings to be brought up to standard but those buildings that cannot be brought up to date need to be torn down.

Chancellor Perlman noted that Ferguson Hall cannot be redeemed and will eventually be torn down. He stated that Brace and Behlen pose a problem. If LB605 money is used to fix these buildings then there will not be enough left to deal with Physics. He noted that at this point no decisions have been made. He pointed out that there are real space problems on this campus. Behlen is being used for some faculty offices and some minor maintenance work might be done on this building which can be used for some units if they are willing to help pay the cost of operating the building. He stated that the hope is to have a new building in the location of Brace and Behlen using the façade of Brace but having a building that is modern and effective.

Chancellor Perlman reported that included in the proposed budget is two years of salary increases with a total of 4.5% for faculty and staff. Also included is \$4.8 million in each of the two years to bring UNL and UNMC up to their peers in terms of average salaries.

Chancellor Perlman stated that there will likely be a change in how the Programs of Excellence are funded. He noted that every year up until now there was a budget line of \$3 million for the programs but there was no effort to articulate in advance what these programs were. He pointed out that the Legislature never funded the Programs of Excellence in the past but President Milliken is going to try to make the programs more attractive to get funding for them. He noted that UNMC is pushing hard for the creation of a College of Public Health. He stated that units at UNL will collaborate if the new college is formed but the campus as a whole will not be involved if the College of Public Health is created.

Chancellor Perlman reported that information was provided at a recent meeting by Central Administration showing that over the last ten years actual state tax dollars going to the University have never fully covered salary increases and health coverage. He noted that these costs were covered by tuition.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the “No child left behind” program and the regulations that

it places on teachers has great opportunities for the university. He wondered whether there is a mechanism to tap a search for these teachers. Moeller stated that her department has an immersion program but it has been challenging to get Spanish credit for the courses offered during the immersion. Chancellor Perlman stated that there should be a mechanism for departments to determine how many teachers in the state need certification in their discipline.

Ledder stated that it seems that the administration is suggesting a different form of scheduling courses. He noted that it is difficult for some people to get down to campus. He pointed out that the Mathematics department has a 5 credit course but many day students will not take it as an evening course. SVCAA Couture stated that departments are self-selecting with evening classes. She noted that often people with full-time jobs take the evening courses. She stated that some disciplines might need to have continuance over times when these courses are offered. She stated that the evening courses need to be looked at.

Ledder wondered whether there was a way to find out if students would sign up for a 4:30 course. Moeller stated that one of her classes was taught early in the morning and only seven students enrolled. The course is now taught at 4:30 and there are 32 students in it. She suggested that each discipline would have to look at the need for evening courses.

Ledder pointed out that departments are overcoming how evening programs are funded because it is being done differently now than it was done for many years. Moeller stated that a bigger issue is getting classroom space. Ledder stated that courses being spread out over a larger amount of time should help with the space problem.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he is trying to push Deans and Chairs to be more entrepreneurial. He stated that he is willing to bear some of the financial risks for sensible proposals if they will have potential. He noted that departments can minimize their risks by looking at the enrollment figures for courses at Southeast Community College to see where the market is for students.

Beck asked if it is widely known by the campus that the Chancellor is interested in spreading out courses so there are more available in the evening. Chancellor Perlman admitted that part of the problem with the strategic planning process is communicating to the faculty of what the administration is trying to accomplish.

SVCAA Couture stated that a number of Deans and academic units submitted ideas for generating tuition including courses that might be alternatives for those that some of our students now take at Southeast Community College. She stated that she believes some

suggestions can be made to colleges next year.

2.3 Violations of 15th Week Policy

Alloway reported that the Committee has heard of some violations of the policy. He noted that in particular an instructor announced on the Monday of the 15th week that there was going to be a final which would be given on Friday of the 15th week. He stated that the Committee was also made aware of a final that was given after 12:00 on Friday of finals week when all exams were supposed to have been completed.

Moeller noted that the burden is on the students to report if there is a violation but she understands the hesitancy on the part of students to do so because they are fearful that it could impact their grade. She asked what can be done when the Senate gets these kinds of reports.

SVCAA Couture stated that this was the first time she has heard about these violations. Ledder asked if she received similar reports before the policy was changed. SVCAA Couture stated that she heard that there may have been issues before the policy was enstated, but she knows the students actively campaigned to change the previous dead week policy and now that the Senate has approved a change, no problems had been brought to her attention. She noted that she and VC Owens sent out an email message to all faculty members and Deans to make them aware of the new 15th week policy. She stated that they will send out another email message about the policy next fall. She pointed out that if the Executive Committee becomes aware of violations again, she will be happy to discuss issues about specific violations with the Deans so they can be addressed in each college.

Ledder suggested that a short email message be sent out spelling out the policy guidelines. SVCAA Couture stated that she would like to send the message in conjunction with the Senate. She noted that it would be helpful if the Executive Committee suggested how to word the message.

Ledder suggested that the Executive Committee should check with ASUN to see if there have been a lot of problems with the new policy. SVCAA Couture stated that she will reiterate to the Deans Council the policy and ask them to speak to the chairs to make sure that we have more compliance with the policy. She noted that adjunct professors may not receive the information which could lead to possible violations.

Alexander stated that he has received very positive feedback from both faculty members and students on the new policy.

2.4 General Education Revisions

Moeller reported that members of the Executive Committee will be meeting with Professor Janovy in July to discuss what the faculty role is in the revision process. She noted that she is forming an ad hoc committee to come up with ideas on how to get the faculty involved in the process. She pointed out that the Senate is considering conducting a survey to get faculty endorsement on the institutional objectives. She stated that the Committee is trying to move discussion into the faculty arena in the hopes of getting the faculty to participate more.

SVCAA Couture noted that the General Education Planning Team and the General Education Advisory Committee are a faculty driven effort. She stated that she thinks Professor Janovy will welcome suggestions and opportunities to get the word out to faculty on the progress of the revision. She noted that Professor Janovy has addressed the Deans Council and a number of outcome statements for the new program have been endorsed by the planning committee.

Ledder stated that his concern is that the committee is putting a lot of time and effort into the revision and he thinks they will come up with a good proposal but the faculty will have to vote on it and the proposal may not be approved because the faculty does not understand what is going on and why. He pointed out that the faculty should be aware of what is going on each step of the way. If this is done the faculty will get ownership of the revised program and are more likely to be in favor of it.

SVCAA Couture stated that she thought this was an excellent idea. She noted that the general education revision team has done consultations across the campus and have involved the Deans, but it is also important to have faculty input. She stated that the faculty members on the teams have been reporting regularly to their Deans and chairs about what is going on. She pointed out that information on the revision process is being placed on the website (<http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/gened/>). She agreed that there has to be widespread understanding about the proposed revisions.

Moeller stated that the implications of the revisions need to be addressed correctly. She pointed out that in order for ownership to occur there needs to be discussion and endorsement from the faculty. SVCAA Couture suggested that open forums might be held about the revisions. Moeller stated that open forums may not be the optimal forum for attracting large numbers of faculty members. Perhaps the Academic Senate ad hoc committee could investigate ways to engage the faculty in these discussions.

SVCAA Couture stated that the teams have made progress on the learning outcomes but there are issues that they are struggling with, such as what are the challenges involved in assessing outcome based programs. She stated that we know that there needs to be a

balance between the program being labor intensive and too efficient. She noted that course transferability for transfer students is a huge issue that needs to be dealt with. She stated that we want to make it easy for students to transfer between colleges and not lose credits. She noted that the idea is to integrate majors better with the general education program.

SVCAA Couture stated that she is personally pleased with the progress that has been made so far but the proof will be in the pudding. Chancellor Perlman stated that structural criteria will need to be addressed so the colleges can agree on the program without competing against each other.

SVCAA Couture pointed out that there will need to be some oversight of the program. She noted that the philosophy of the current program was good but as it grew courses were added that did not necessarily meet this philosophy. Ledder stated that there needs to be more accountability for the courses that want to be added to the program.

Ledder stated that if students are required to submit a portfolio of their work to show their accomplishments they will do it. SVCAA Couture stated that there have been discussions about requiring a portfolio. She noted that this raises some questions regarding how the portfolio will be done so that it is effective without being a burden for the faculty.

Moeller suggested that the students be more actively involved in the assessment process related to student outcomes rather than adding another layer of faculty evaluation. SVCAA Couture noted that a number of guest speakers have discussed how other universities are handling this. She stated that the speakers all said that students taking responsibility for the learning is important.

SVCAA Couture thanked the Committee for their comments on the accreditation self-study chapters. Moeller stated that she recently met with Professor O'Hanlon to discuss the Committee's comments and concerns.

VC Owens stated that he just came from a teleconferencing meeting with Iowa State about the veterinary program and he is happy to report that the President of Iowa State just signed the agreement. VC Owens stated that the next step is to get the approval of the Coordinating Commission which he did not think was going to be a problem.

Ledder stated that he is aware of a student who intends to get an innovative, well thought out program of studies for a major who has had difficulty getting the program approved because of bureaucracy. He noted that the Arts & Sciences' curriculum committee would not look at the program because the paperwork was not submitted by a particular date. He pointed out that bureaucracy such as this turns students off to the University. He stated that

he would like to see the campus make more of an effort in helping students. Chancellor Perlman agreed and stated that there is faculty bureaucracy as well as administrative bureaucracy. He noted that he has heard of a number of instances where faculty members have not been cooperative. He pointed out that these kinds of things damage the university.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Meeting with Professor Janovy on the General Education Revision

Moeller announced that members of the Executive Committee will be meeting with Professor Janovy, Chair of the General Education Advisory Committee, to discuss how the Senate can facilitate more discussion with the faculty on the revisions and the Senate conducting a survey on the institutional objectives.

4.0 Approval of 5/17/06 Minutes

Alexander moved, and Flowers seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Conflict with Process for Approving Changes to the Academic Senate

Moeller reported that there is a slight conflict between the UNL Bylaws and the Senate Bylaws regarding whether the academic assembly needs to approve the changes to the structure of the Senate. Griffin noted that in the past changes to the Senate Bylaws required a vote of the academic assembly. Bradford stated that a vote of the assembly should be conducted as it has been done in the past. Moeller stated that the election will be done in the beginning of the fall semester.

5.2 UNL Honor Code

Griffin distributed a copy of the UNL Honor Code that is found in the Undergraduate Studies Bulletin. Ledder noted that the code is weak and is more of a virtue code than an honor code.

Moeller suggested that the code should be changed to reflect issues of academic dishonesty. She stated that the Committee should work with the office of the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and with ASUN to restructure the honor code.

Moeller suggested that an ad hoc committee should be formed to look at revising the code.

5.3 Report on Discussion with Professor O'Hanlon on the Committee's Suggestions for the Self Study Chapters

Moeller stated that she met with Professor O'Hanlon to discuss the comments made by the

Committee on the accreditation self study reports. She noted that he disseminated the comments to the committee working on the chapters. She reported that the committee felt the suggestions were helpful and clarified why other suggestions were not feasible.

Moeller stated that the length of the document is nearly half that of the last study submitted to the accreditation council. She noted that the Nebraska Research Initiative will be included in the report and the areas on the budget cuts and the firing of tenured faculty will be deleted.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Certification for Use of University Vans

Beck reported that she wanted to get documentation that she had been certified to drive a van but it was very difficult to obtain this information. She pointed out that there is no coherent system of documentation that is easily accessible. She stated that we need to have a better system for retrieving this information. She pointed out that the IACUC certification is printed out and given to a faculty member so they can put it in their file. She suggested that something similar should be done with the van certification. The Committee stated that Vice Chancellor Jackson should be contacted about this.

6.2 Graduate Student Grades

Moeller stated that she was contacted by the chair of the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee about concerns several faculty members have regarding the changing of a grade from an incomplete to a withdrawal. She noted that in the Graduate Studies Bulletin on page 18 it is listed that the Office of Graduate Studies must approve a withdrawal if the student is dropping the course $\frac{3}{4}$ of the way through the semester and without the instructor's approval. She pointed out that a W does not have a grade value to it so the change had no impact of the student's gpa.

Moeller reported that she spoke with Executive Associate Dean Weissinger about the situation and was informed that the issue was discussed with the chair of the department who indicated that the instructor was fine with the change but the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee was still contacted.

The Committee will meet with the chair of the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee on June 28th to discuss the situation.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:29 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, June 14, at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator

and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Bradford, Bolin, Flowers, Ledder, Moeller, Rapkin, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alexander, Alloway, Beck, Hachtmann

Date: Wednesday, May 3, 2006

Location: 201 Canfield Administration 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

Moeller called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m.

2.0 SVCAA Couture

2.1 Update on Strategic Planning

SVCAA Couture reported that hearings on the strategic plans by the Deans and Directors that report to her and VC Owens have been completed. She noted that Deans and Directors who report directly to the Chancellor will present their reports in the middle of the year. She stated that the presentations were 10 minutes long with an additional 5 minutes allowed for questions. She noted that the presentations were focused and intense.

SVCAA Couture stated that last year after the presentations were made the College of Journalism and Mass Communications, NET, and the Hixson-Lied College of Fine Arts worked together to create a cooperative internship program for students. She noted that after this year's presentations she observed a number of conversations occurring between members of the different colleges about possible collaborations.

SVCAA Couture reported that the department and college plans were due in her office on March 15. She stated that the administrative team is still sorting through the data and will read all of the plans and provide written responses. She stated that the feedback to the Deans will probably be given by mid-July.

SVCAA Couture stated that one issue that has to be addressed is identifying resources to address strategic priorities in the college plans and then deciding how these resources will be distributed.

Ledder asked if some units did not submit strategic plans. SVCAA Couture stated that each college organizes their process in different ways. She noted that all colleges and directors are required to submit their plans, but some colleges submit individual department plans while others integrate their department plans into one comprehensive plan. She stated that some colleges have their Executive Committee assist in developing the strategic plan.

2.2 Update on Accreditation Process

SVCAA Couture distributed information on the accreditation process indicating what has been completed to date. She noted that a draft of most of the chapters for the self study program can be found on the web site <http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/accreditation>. She stated that the Academic Planning Committee received the accreditation update as well. She invited faculty members to look at the chapters and to provide feedback on them. She stated that all of the chapters should be completed by the end of May.

SVCAA Couture reminded the committee that UNL is scheduled for its 10 year accreditation in November, and that UNL is doing a special emphasis self study, focusing on strategic planning. She stated that she believes that the written portion of the self study should be completed and ready for printing by July 1.

SVCAA Couture reported that several suggestions have been made for additions to the chapters, including some suggestions regarding coherence of the written chapters.

Moeller asked who wrote Chapter 2. SVCAA Couture stated that there are task forces providing information for each chapter and the number of faculty members on each task force is indicated on the sheet of information she distributed. She stated that the task force develops the data and then gives it to Kim Hachiya, Specialist, Office of University Communications, who is writing the first draft of some of the chapters. A subgroup then reviews the draft before it is put on line. She noted that Professor O'Hanlon is incorporating the responses from the university community in subsequent drafts; he is coordinator of the entire self-study process.

Moeller reported that several faculty members have raised concerns about a section in Chapter 2 regarding the firing of tenured faculty members during the budget cuts. SVCAA Couture stated that the task force wants to get feedback on the draft chapters and she encouraged Moeller to address her concerns to Professor O'Hanlon. Moeller stated that she will contact Professor O'Hanlon about the concerns of the faculty members.

2.3 Confidentiality Issues Regarding Annual Evaluations of Deans and Retention

of Records

Moeller noted that the SVCAA had email exchanges with Beck about record retention of annual evaluations. Moeller stated that the main concern is with the retention of individual comments made in conjunction with the evaluations. She wondered whether a summary of the comments can be kept rather than the individual comments. Bradford noted that there can be legal issues with destroying the evidence gathered for evaluations.

SVCAA Couture stated that she has not had the opportunity to discuss the issue in depth with the Chancellor yet. She noted that for the annual evaluations, the Dean of a college identifies an advisory committee who then responds to a survey evaluation form that is sent out for each Dean. Faculty members across the college are also invited to submit comments about the Dean or Director's performance to her directly. She pointed out that the individual responses from the advisory committee cannot be identified by the Dean or Director, nor are responses from individual faculty members give to the dean.

Moeller asked if the surveys are sent back electronically. SVCAA Couture stated that the surveys as well as the individual faculty comments are received electronically. She noted that this year a Dean and one Director did not waive their rights to review the individual comments received from faculty members. She stated that what this means is that if the Dean or Director requests to see the comments she will give them a redacted version in order to protect the identity of the faculty members. She pointed out that she has informed individual faculty members of this process, at their request.

SVCAA Couture stated that the administration needs to get clarification on how long records have to be retained. She reiterated that she does not release any comments that are not redacted. She pointed out that she would like to be able to dispose of the information altogether, but she believes that the University's policy is that we have to keep records for five years.

Moeller noted that whenever comments are redacted they are open to interpretation and the meaning and intent of the statement could be misinterpreted. SVCAA Couture pointed out that any faculty member can meet with her privately to make comments about a dean or Director's performance if they are concerned about putting them in writing. She noted that she is not obligated to speak to a Dean about comments made in evaluations unless they involve issues of harassment or misconduct. She stated that she wants faculty members to know that they can come and speak to her directly to get an issue resolved. She pointed out that she does not want to have an issue of concern out there that is not brought to her attention. She stated that faculty members should feel free to speak to her at any time, not just during an evaluation process.

Moeller asked if the SVCAA will check on the retention issue and get back to the Committee. SVCAA Couture stated that she will check on the issue of record retention and she understands why it is a concern to faculty members. She pointed out that not all responses to evaluations are negative and that many faculty members have complimentary and supportive comments to make about their Deans.

2.4 Progress on Revision of General Education Program

SVCAA Couture stated that many things are happening with the general education revision process. She noted that the Chancellor had reported in his State of the University address that the revision would be a faculty led process. She stated that since that time a General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) was formed which created a staged process for general education review. The committee has now developed four institutional objectives which are designed to provide the framework for the outcomes of the program now in development.

SVCAA Couture stated that the structural criteria for the general education program have been discussed but no formal proposal has yet been developed. She noted that discussions need to be held about what kind of program will be in place, what courses will be involved, if experiences outside of classroom work will be credited toward a student's general education, and how we deal with transfer students.

SVCAA Couture reported that the third component of the revision and reform effort will be developing the actual general education program and the fourth will be the assessment and oversight process. She pointed out that some of these issues are being discussed simultaneously and revisions will probably need to be made to earlier decisions as the process continues to develop.

Moeller asked if the general education revision is tied to the strategic planning process and whether there is interface between the GEAC and the faculty. SVCAA Couture stated that the faculty has been informed about some of the progress being made and the faculty has been asked a number of times to provide feedback. Moeller noted that revising the general education program will take the faculty working together. SVCAA Couture agreed. She wondered whether a program such as the one being created by the Colleges of Architecture, Journalism and Mass Communications, and Fine and Performing Arts for visual literacy could have contributions to the general education program.

SVCAA Couture noted that a general framework is being developed for the program now, and that it is important for the committee to now consider administrative constraints because the program cannot succeed if it can't be managed correctly by faculty and departments. She pointed out that the content of the program is up to the faculty, but it

must meet some structural criteria, such as being complimentary to students' major programs and workable for transfer students.

Moeller stated that there needs to be discussion on the faculty role in the general education revision. She asked what the faculty as a whole should actually do. She pointed out that if we can articulate in comprehensive steps what the role will be more people will get involved in the process. She noted that right now the concept is abstract. She stated that the Executive Committee should have a conversation with Professor Janovy about how this will be done.

Ledder pointed out that there has been no effort to build consensus yet from the faculty. He stated that no one has an idea of what percentage of faculty members support the objectives. He noted that many students have no idea what a general education is for. He stated that an effort should be made to see if there is a consensus amongst the faculty regarding the objectives. He stated that he had hoped to have an open forum discussion on the institutional objectives at one of the Senate meetings but this was unable to occur this spring. He stated that faculty members should be encouraged to include the institutional objectives in their syllabus. He noted that students do not think that developing intellectual skills is important but if they hear it enough they will realize just how important it is.

Moeller agreed that there should be a consensus of the faculty on the institutional objectives. She suggested that a survey could be conducted with Zoomerang to poll the faculty members. SVCAA Couture stated that this was a great idea and suggested that the Committee should contact Professor Janovy about doing this.

SVCAA Couture noted that the faculty members on the revision committees should be going back to their colleges and departments and discussing what progress is being made with the general education revision and reform effort. She pointed out that the institutional objectives have been distributed to the campus at large and that faculty members have been invited to respond to them.

Ledder stated that he gets the sense that the GEAC does not want to get broad faculty feedback. He stated that he thinks it would be an enormous mistake not to get broad faculty feedback on some of the proposals. He pointed out that the process would be flawed if we do not get the endorsement of the faculty.

SVCAA Couture stated that the GEAC is realizing that the colleges need to address the issue of getting the endorsement of the faculty. She noted that the GEAC does not want to preempt the colleges' role in endorsing the final curriculum. Ledder stated that he has contemplated this for some time. He pointed out that the colleges meet only once a

semester and the meetings are not a deliberative process. He stated that the Senate can be a place where a deliberative discussion can take place. He noted that general education is not a college enterprise but a campus enterprise. SVCAA Couture pointed out that several different groups on campus need to buy into the revised program, once it is developed. She stated that college curriculum committees, among other university units, need to understand and endorse the program. Ledder noted that when it is time to adopt the revised program it will become a college issue but the Senate should be able to endorse the program. He pointed out that it would carry more weight if the Senate endorsed the proposed program.

SVCAA Couture stated that she will relay this information back to the GEAC, noting also that college curricular bodies and the APC approve curriculum. She reported that on May 23rd Professor Janovy will be speaking to the Deans and Directors Council about the progress to date on the revision. She stated that a sketch of the first draft of the outcomes will be presented as well. Ledder stated that the objectives should be approved first by the faculty before a draft of the outcomes is presented. SVCAA Couture pointed out that it would be hard to disagree with the objectives as they are now stated, and that the process, while stated, will also need to be iterative.

Moeller suggested that the Academy of Distinguished Teachers would be a great venue to present information and get feedback on the general education program. It was suggested that the Teaching Council would be another group that should look at what has been done on the revisions.

Rapkin pointed out that many faculty members do not have a clear idea of what our current practices are with the general education program. He stated that it would be helpful if it was pointed out what is currently being done and what we want to do when presentations are made. SVCAA Couture noted that the general education web site (<http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/gened>) does have a summary of the previous issues with the current program. She pointed out that the difficulties with the current program are tough issues for people to understand out of context, but that a great deal of information is on the website.

Moeller noted that the general education program has large implications down the road on things such as assessment. She asked how students will accomplish the objectives of the general education program. She is not sure that the faculty has a deep understanding of the implications of a revised general education program. SVCAA Couture agreed and stated that there are a lot of things in flux. There are a lot of creative ideas being expressed, and the faculty committees need to determine where best to go with them. Ledder noted that there are a lot of repercussions beyond the general education program. He stated that the revisions might be more of a problem for some departments than others because some students are required to take a lot of courses in other majors.

Moeller stated that more broad-based discussions are needed. She stated that addressing the changes to the general education program cannot happen at the readiness stage because things can no longer be changed. Flowers stated that there will be a burst of faculty interest when it becomes known what courses will be affected.

SVCAA Couture agreed that more discussion is needed and stated that some structural constraints of the program will need to be talked about extensively. Ledder questioned whether we are going to put a cap on the number of credits that a student needs to get in order to complete the general education program. SVCAA Couture stated that a question that needs to be answered is whether only course credits will be part of the program or whether experiences outside of course credits will count towards the program. She pointed out that decisions like these will affect how the program is coordinated and managed.

Stock stated that conducting a Zoomerang survey on the issue could provide thoughtful input from the faculty. SVCAA Couture stated that it could be a useful tool but the survey should be simple to deal with so that more faculty members will participate.

2.5 Gallup Survey

SVCAA Couture stated that out of the 183 neighborhoods identified, as of today, 43 had 100% participation in the survey, 29 had 90% participation and only 3 had less than 50% participation. She stated that there was an all time high of 77% overall participation.

Moeller asked if the survey was closed now and if the Executive Committee will get a summary of the results. SVCAA Couture stated that the survey was closed, but she did not have details on how the results will be distributed this time. She stated that she assumes it will be handled the same as last time.

2.6 Professors of Practice

SVCAA Couture stated that a draft proposal for the Professors of Practice titles was distributed to the Deans and the Academic Planning Committee. The administration is working with General Counsel Wood on the draft to get it ready for the June Board of Regents' meeting. SVCAA Couture stated that after the Regents approve the titles, departments will need to develop promotion criteria for each of the job titles within the Professor of Practice classification.

SVCAA Couture reported that once the new Practice titles are approved, the Senior Lecturer titles will be grandfathered in but it will not be used again for new hires once the Professor of Practice title is adopted. She noted that current Senior Lecturers can remain in

this title or they can apply for the Professor of Practice title.

Scholz asked if the title would become effective immediately if it is approved. SVCAA Couture stated that the title will be effective but departments need to develop criteria for promotion within the ranks of the Professor of Practice title before it can be used. She pointed out that once colleges develop criteria, departments within colleges may develop their own criteria or elect to use what is established in the college. Scholz asked if there is a time table for when the criteria should be set. SVCAA Couture stated that ideally she would like to see colleges and departments develop criteria by December. Scholz asked if it is conceivable for a department not to adopt the title by not setting the criteria. SVCAA Couture stated that this is conceivable and she knows of one department that does not intend to make use of it. Scholz asked if this is acceptable. SVCAA Couture stated that it is because it is up to the departments and colleges to decide to employ the titles, based on unit needs.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Professor Ari

Moeller reported that the Senate Office received a letter from the State Department stating that the matter of Professor Ari's visa is still being processed. She pointed out that the letter was a generic letter with no explanation for the delay in Ari's visa.

4.0 Approval of 4/19/06 Minutes

Flowers moved and Stock seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Evaluation Form for Coordinator of the Senate

Moeller pointed out that the members of the Committee had a copy of the revised evaluation form. She stated that if anyone has further revisions they can notify her by email.

6.0 New Business

6.1 New Senate Surveys

Moeller stated that she would like the Committee to think of surveys that the Senate should conduct with Zoomerang. She noted that she does not want to over use the surveys but it could be used in ways to inform the Senate and give voice to our faculty. She suggested that the next survey could be on the institutional objectives and outcomes of the general education revision.

Rapkin stated that there should be some opportunity for the faculty to learn about the general education revision before a survey is conducted. He pointed out that the learning

curve is steep because the process is so complex. He stated that providing a bird's eye view of the process and having references to the general education website would be helpful, otherwise the survey will not be fruitful. Flowers pointed out that we could get an uneven response on the survey. He noted that departments should have some pretty intensive discussion on the outcomes of the program. Stock pointed out that his department has not had a discussion on the general education program since the previous attempt at a revision. He stated that the devil is in the details and the institutional objectives are not the problem but the implementation of the program is where the problems will come in.

Moeller asked how to reach the faculty to get them motivated to be involved in this process. Rapkin pointed out that many people might not want to bother getting involved if they think it is going to be changed again in five years. Moeller noted that the effort under former SVCAA Leitzel with the comprehensive education program was helpful. Moeller asked if we could ask the senators to send a little summary to their departments about the proposed revisions to the general education program. Rapkin suggested enlisting former President Peterson to give a summary of the revisions.

6.2 Senate Priorities for Next Year

Moeller stated that the Committee will work on the Senate priorities at the retreat in August but she wanted the Committee to start thinking about priorities we want to address.

Ledder suggested that one of the priorities to consider is the issue of academic dishonesty. He asked why the university does not have an honor code. He suggested getting ASUN interested in a mutual honor code. He pointed out that the time is ripe given the situation with Regent Hergert. He stated that Kansas State and Colorado have honor codes. He noted that Kansas State's honor code includes two features: a pledge and a judicial committee that has a student majority. He stated that stricter honor codes, at the military academies for example, also have unproctored exams and a requirement that students turn in classmates who cheat. These latter features are what most people think of as the meaning of an honor code, but many public institutions have a modified honor code like the one at Kansas State. The main point is not to catch and punish all of the cheaters, but to publicize a view of academic honesty supported by students as well as faculty.

Bradford stated that the Law College has an honor code and they have un-proctored exams. He noted that he has served on the Law College Honor Committee and it was typically the student members who were the most aggressive in handing out judgments. Ledder suggested that the judicial board should have a policy where the majority of the faculty and student members must approve a judgment.

Moeller stated that she liked the idea of the honor code. She pointed out that how to deal

with plagiarism is totally up to the instructor and that there is not a satisfactory process in place to deal with it. She suggested that the Committee work with ASUN on the idea of an honor code.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, May 17 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Scholz, Stock

Absent: Alexander, Beck, Bolin, Bradford, Flowers, Rapkin, Zimmers

Date: Wednesday, June 14, 2006

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Moeller called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Letter Supporting Professor Ari

Moeller reported that the Senate office received a copy of a letter sent by the Faculty Senate of Georgetown University to Secretary of State Condoleeza Rice and Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff urging that Professor Ari be granted a visa without further delay.

2.2 News Release on Interim Provost

Moeller reported that Professor Pratt, English, will be interim Executive Vice President and Provost, beginning July 15 if approved by the Board of Regents. Current Executive Vice President and Provost Noren has accepted a position at UNMC as Director of Public Health Programs.

3.0 Approval of 5/31/06 Minutes

Due to the lack of a quorum, approval of the 5/31/06 minutes was postponed.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Email Exchange with GEAC (General Education Advisory Committee)

Moeller noted that members of the GEAC are concerned with the Senate conducting a survey on the institutional objectives. She pointed out that members of the Executive Committee will meet with Professor Janovy and other members of the GEAC to discuss the survey. She stated that the Executive Committee will point out to the GEAC that the survey is just to get a consensus of approval on the institutional objectives, not to rewrite

them.

Moeller stated that she wants faculty to be aware of the implications of the changes to the general education program. She noted that information about the revisions needs to get to the faculty in ways other than a forum.

4.2 Appointments to Committees

Moeller stated that she would like to get input from the Committee on appointments to the various campus committees. She asked the Committee to review the list of nominees generated by the Committee on Committees so it can be discussed at the June 28th meeting.

4.3 Preliminary Thoughts on Survey on Institutional Objectives

Due to a lack of Committee members, the item was postponed.

4.4 ASUN Report on Violations of 15th Week Policy

Griffin reported that ASUN received two complaints on violations of the 15th week policy. She noted that one of the complaints was not legitimate and the other complaint was able to be resolved with the instructor.

Hachtmann suggested that it be pointed out in the email message that will be sent out to faculty members before the fall semester that the 15th week refers to the 15th week of instruction, not the actual calendar week.

5.0 New Business

No new business was discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:12 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, June 28th at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Beck, Bradford, Bolin, Flowers, Ledder, Moeller, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alexander, Hachtmann, Rapkin, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Moeller called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Cancellation of New Child Care Facility

Moeller reported that she received an email message from Vice Chancellor Jackson stating that the plans to open a new child care facility have been cancelled. The email message stated that renovations to open the facility would cost \$1.35 million more than is available for the center. Moeller stated that the University will continue with the present childcare program because at this point there is no hope for funding to help cover the cost of a new facility. She pointed out that this news is very discouraging because efforts to have an on-site daycare facility have been going on for a long time.

Alloway wondered what will happen to the money that was going to be used for the new facility. Moeller stated that she did not know but will ask the Chancellor this question when she sends him a letter conveying the disappointment of the Executive Committee on the cancellation of the efforts. Beck pointed out that the money that has been set aside for a new child care facility needs to be protected for future use.

3.0 Approval of 5/31/06 and 6/14/06 Minutes

The Committee approved the minutes of 5/31/06 and 6/14/06 as amended.

4.0 Unfinished Business

No unfinished business was discussed.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Email Message on Unprofessional Behavior

Bradford reported that he received an email message from a faculty member regarding unprofessional conduct. He noted that the faculty member wanted the complaint brought to the attention of the Executive Committee and a formal complaint will be made to the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

5.2 Professor Prochaska-Cue – Grade Changes Made by Administrators

Prochaska-Cue, Chair of the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee, reported that she has been contacted by faculty members who are concerned with the Graduate Studies Office changing a student's grade to a W without consulting with the instructor. She noted that the faculty members are concerned that the decision to grant a grade of W does not follow a formal process and decisions are made on a case-by-case basis.

Prochaska-Cue stated that the faculty members raised three concerns: 1) that a W can be given without documentation of the criteria that were used in making the decision; 2) that students may not be encouraged to work things out with a faculty member; and 3) that it could be seen as an attempt to protect a student's grade point average.

Moeller noted that the Graduate Bulletin states that a student can drop a course three-quarter of the way through the semester if the Graduate Studies office approves. She stated that she spoke with Executive Associate Dean Weissinger about the issue and Weissinger pointed out that a W is not a grade and that giving a W is not within the purview of the faculty; it is an administrative function. Beck stated that technically Graduate Studies may be able to change a grade but it is a bad policy not to communicate with the faculty member. She pointed out that the interpretation by many faculty members is that the Graduate College would be taking away the purview of the faculty by making a unilateral decision about this change.

Flowers noted that at the undergraduate level there is a process that students must go through in order to get a W. He suggested that there might need to be a process for graduate students as well.

Moeller stated that she could send a letter to Weissinger asking for her to communicate with the faculty members involved in similar situations. Ledder noted that it is a matter of courtesy to be in communication with the faculty member. Alloway pointed out that it seems odd that a situation involving a class structure would not involve input from the faculty member.

Prochaska-Cue stated that the faculty members are concerned that without any criteria the

decisions may not be evenly applied. Flowers noted that in cases of academic dishonesty it is possible for a student to withdraw from a course before action can be taken against the student. Ledder stated that it is incumbent on the person making the decision to get input on why the student might be withdrawing from the course.

The Committee agreed that Moeller should write a letter to Weissinger and copy the letter to the chair of the department, the faculty members involved, Prochaska-Cue, and Vice Chancellor Paul who, Vice Chancellor of Research and Dean of Graduate Studies.

5.3 Accreditation Chapter 5

The Committee felt that the chapter does not flow properly and the graphs used in the chapter are difficult to interpret. The focus of the chapter is to demonstrate the competency of the campus to fulfill its mission according to the resources available, yet this is not clearly and directly addressed. There is a lengthy list of events, activities and accomplishments, but there is a lack of demonstration as regards to how this will be integrated in order to fulfill the mission of the university.

Moeller stated that she will send the Committee's comments to Professor O'Hanlon who is chairing the accreditation efforts.

5.4 Faculty Club

Moeller stated that she has received several email messages from professors who would like to have a place where faculty members can go to discuss work and to socialize with their colleagues. She noted that a number of years ago there was a faculty club at the Lincoln University Club. Beck pointed out that in the Wick Center plans a faculty club was to have been included in the lower level but somehow the agreement was dropped.

Stock noted that it is a good idea to have a faculty club but finding a place to have one is a problem. He stated that belonging to the Lincoln University Club was expensive.

Flowers stated that universities that have a place of tradition for their faculty club usually have good attendance but a lot of younger faculty members have a very different approach to work. He noted that younger faculty members seem to have more allegiance to individual responsibilities and having to work 60 or more hours a week to get tenure leaves little room for socializing.

Moeller suggested that there might be a place in the new Culture Center.

Beck noted that there is a new hospitality program starting on campus. She suggested that forming a faculty club could be linked to the program. She stated that the faculty club at

the University of Delaware has a gourmet restaurant that is run by students.

Flowers suggested conducting a quick survey of the faculty to see what the interest is. Stock stated that it would be worth exploring. He noted that years ago the English department used to have a table at the faculty club but there is now a change of atmosphere on campus and people stay in their office working or communicating on their computers.

Moeller stated that the Committee can discuss the issue with the Chancellor at their next meeting with him.

5.5 Committee Assignments

The Committee worked on selecting faculty members to serve on the various Senate and campus committees.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:09 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, July 12, 2006 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Beck, Bolin, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Scholz

Absent: Alexander, Alloway, Rapkin, Stock, Zimmers

Date: Wednesday, July 12, 2006

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Moeller called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Meeting with Professor Janovy

Griffin reminded the Committee that there would be a meeting on Tuesday, July 18th at 10:00 a.m. with Professor Janovy to discuss the Senate conducting a survey on the institutional objectives.

3.0 Approval of 6/28/06 Minutes

Flowers moved and Beck seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Draft Letter to Executive Associate Dean Weissinger

The Committee reviewed the letter that will be sent to Weissinger asking for communication with faculty members when a graduate student is requesting withdrawal from a course.

4.2 Letter to the Chancellor on Cancellation of the Child Care Facility

The Committee reviewed the letter that will be sent to the Chancellor on the cancellation of the child care facility. Moeller noted that the letter suggests changing the facility to an appropriate location and points out that childcare is a major concern for faculty and staff members with children and is important for recruiting and retaining new faculty members.

4.3 Faculty Club

Moeller reported that she received an email message from Associate to the Chancellor Howe stating that there is a \$17,000 endowment at the Foundation that can be used for a faculty club but only \$8,000 can be spent. Interest earnings on the endowment will probably generate about \$750 a year. Howe consulted with the Chancellor and the Chancellor stated that the Senate Executive Committee should be the group to decide how the money can be used.

Moeller reported that she did some checking on the web about faculty clubs at other institutions. She noted that many young faculty members have to work about 60 – 80 hours per week and may not have had the cultural experience of having a faculty club. She suggested that a quick survey could be sent out asking faculty members if there is any interest in having a faculty club.

Bradford stated that he does not see any value in having a faculty club. He pointed out that time allocation may not be a reason why people do not go to faculty clubs. He stated that the reason could be attitudinal.

Hachtmann stated that as a faculty member who has been here only four years it would be great to get to know people in other departments and colleges. She noted that a colleague recently left UNL because it was so difficult to meet anyone outside of her department or college. Hachtmann wondered how many other faculty members feel the same way.

Bradford suggested that if a survey is done one of the questions should be how much people would be willing to pay to go to a faculty club. Bolin stated that the survey could also ask if faculty members are interested in meeting other people on campus.

Bradford pointed out that having two campuses, city and east campus, may create a problem. Hachtmann noted that location and time may be other important factors in the success of a faculty club.

Moeller and Flowers agreed to draft a short survey.

4.4 Committee Assignments

Griffin reported that some faculty members, previously identified, respectfully declined to serve on committees due to other commitments. The Committee worked on identifying faculty members for various committees.

4.5 Involving Faculty in the General Education Revision Process

Moeller stated that she has been reading about revising general education programs and contacted ACE colleagues from across the country to get ideas about how to get faculty

involved in the revision process. She presented a summary of ideas and suggestions from the ACE colleagues.

Ledder pointed out that in the article “Avoiding the Potholes: Strategies for Reforming General Education” the author Jerry Gaff cited an example where issuing a single, final report resulted in a defeat of the revision by the faculty. He noted that efforts to revise the general education program are more successful when the faculty is issued a series of report as the revisions progress.

Ledder stated that there are two distinct issues with the process: one is content and the other is procedural. He noted that it is the procedural issue that needs help. He pointed out that the committees working on revising the general education program need to get feedback from the faculty at each stage of the revision process. He noted that people need to buy into the rationale behind the revisions. Moeller agreed and stated that approval of the revisions needs to be gained incrementally.

Ledder noted that even though the Seante does not vote on curriculum issues, it is charged with advising the administration on such issues and can do so on its own initiative. Moeller noted that revising the general education program is one of the most critical things occurring on campus. She pointed out that the revised program will have major impacts on the curriculum of the campus and will have direct impact on many faculty members. She noted that she will be speaking to the Chancellor about engaging the faculty in the process.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Chapter 6 – Accreditation Self-Study Report

The Committee reviewed Chapter 6. The question was raised why the chapters are put on the web for review when they have not been completed. The comment was raised that it is not effective for faculty to review the chapters when they are not finished.

Moeller stated that she will contact Professor O’Hanlon and let him know the concerns of the Committee on this chapter.

5.2 Draft Syllabus for Merging the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee Faculty Members with the Employee Benefits Committee

Beck noted that the proposed revisions came out of discussions that occurred last year on how to reduce the number of committees that faculty members need to serve on. She pointed out that both committees address employee concerns. She stated that the proposed revision would have the faculty members from the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee serving as the faculty members on the Employee Benefits Committee. She noted that the representative to the University-wide Fringe Benefit Committee, who is

appointed by the Chancellor, would also serve as a member of the combined committee. Bradford stated that the syllabus for the University-wide committee did not state that the Chancellor appointed the campus representative to the committee. Beck stated that in the past, the Senate has recommended names of faculty members to the Chancellor and he chooses from the list. Griffin stated that she will check with Central Administration to get clarification.

Bradford stated that several years ago the Employee Benefits Committee was considering recommendation to eliminate the committee altogether because input from the committee is not considered by the University-wide Fringe Benefits Committee. Beck noted that the UNL Employee Benefits Committee includes staff members and there are other kinds of benefits on campus other than health benefits.

Bradford stated that he thinks streamlining the committees is a good idea. He questioned whether the representative to the University-wide committee should be subject to the same term length as the other members. Beck stated that this is a good question and suggested that this needs to be considered.

Griffin wondered whether faculty members might object to serving on two committees. She noted that faculty members are frequently asking how often and how long committee meetings are held before they will agree to serve. Beck and Bradford pointed out that both of these committees meet only a few times during the year.

The Committee agreed to discuss the idea of combining the committees further.

5.3 Notification of Salary Increases

Beck asked the Committee if they received a letter from their department chair informing them of what their salary increase will be. She noted that some faculty members did receive a letter, some are told what the percentage of increase will be, and others receive no information until the official notice is sent out. Responses from the Committee varied. She noted that she would like to bring it up with the Faculty Compensation Committee next year that there should be a uniform procedure for informing faculty members.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:14 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, July 26th at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Beck, Bolin, Flowers, Ledder, Moeller, Scholz, Zimmers

Absent: Alexander, Bradford, Hachtmann, Rapkin, Stock

Date: Wednesday, July 26, 2006

Location: 201 Canfield Administration 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

Moeller called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m.

2.0 Chancellor Perlman/VC Owens

2.1 Child Care

Chancellor Perlman stated that there is no additional news to the recent announcement of the cancellation of the plans to put a day care facility into the north side of the Whittier building. He pointed out that the idea all along has been that the university could make a limited contribution to creating an on-campus day care facility. He noted that the intent was to create a facility that would attract a private supplier that could possibly offer day care at prices below the market since the supplier would not have to pay rent.

He reported that the search for a suitable location and building identified the north side of the Whittier building because it would be able to provide an outdoor facility and drop off and pick up location. He stated that people in the Facilities department thought the renovation of the building could be done for \$1.7 million. A committee was then formed to work on developing a child care facility and an RFP was submitted to the market. The RFT envisioned a high-end day care facility but it was actually more of a child development facility. He reported that only two bidders could meet the requirement of the RFP and negotiations took place with both bidders. He stated that there was some concern that the price of using the facility would be at the high end of the market. He noted that a consultant came in and worked with one of the bidders to design a facility.

Chancellor Perlman reported that two things happened. Facilities Management grossly under estimated the cost of renovating the building and the design of the facility was changed to meet the demands for a high end child development facility. When everything was reconfigured the actual cost was up to \$3.1 million which the university does not have.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the \$1.7 million is still available and won't go any place. He pointed out that efforts to create an on campus facility have not stopped but a question has arisen as to whether we should be shooting for such a high-end day care facility. Ledder asked if the administration envisioned the facility being used by families with each parent being a professor who can afford a high-end facility or will the facility be for staff as well who cannot afford such high prices. Chancellor Perlman stated that this is part of the issue. He noted that during the last stage of the recent planning process the university wanted to negotiate a sliding fee scale but even still the cost would have been expensive. He stated that most of the staff would not have been able to afford the facility and he worried that there were some lower-paid faculty members who could not afford it as well.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he is a little perplexed about where to proceed. He stated that he would like to get broader input from the campus about what they think is the best thing to do. He pointed out that the kind of day care will depend on the goals and objectives of having an on-campus day care facility. He noted that recruiting and retaining faculty members is one of the goals and another goal is to make life easier for all employees. He stated that faculty members typically have more resources so they want a high-end day care center. He pointed out that the university does have a day care center at the YWCA. He noted that it comes close to being accredited, in part because it has good leadership and most of the employees have college degrees.

Chancellor Perlman stated that it might be possible to outfit the north side of Whittier for less than \$3.1 million if restrooms are not centralized but the cost would still be more than the \$1.7 million that is available.

Chancellor Perlman stated that it would be most helpful to him if the Senate could conduct a survey on what kind of child care facility would be needed in order to achieve the objective of faculty recruitment. He pointed out that high end child care is available in Lincoln but having a facility on campus would have its advantages.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the issue has not been dropped and the administration will continue to push forward on it.

Moeller suggested surveying faculty members who have been hired in the past five years to get their opinion on the need for on-campus child care. Chancellor Perlman stated that the faculty should be surveyed to see what factors matter most in a child care facility. He wondered whether there could be a balance between a top of the line facility or the next tier.

Scholz asked if the students fit into the equation in terms of use. Chancellor Perlman stated that the current day care program at the YWCA does have some student use. He noted that there are approximately 20 slots available for students through a grant from the federal government but the government's payment does not cover much of the cost.

Moeller stated that the most outspoken need for child care came from the staff. She pointed out that their financial situation is tighter and the working hours of the staff are more restrictive. Ledder noted that there are two distinct clientele groups for the day care with little overlap between what they can afford and want.

Scholz asked if child care facilities at other institutions have been looked at. Moeller stated that they have and some have outstanding child care programs. Scholz noted that financing appears to be the big issue and he wondered what models other institutions have used to make child care centers work on their campus.

Chancellor Perlman noted that we do have a top of the line child care development program with the Ruth Staples Child Development Laboratory. However, there is a waiting list to get your child into the program and the laboratory has limited hours.

Zimmers asked if the facility would be used more by the faculty or the staff. Chancellor Perlman stated that he believes that this will depend on what we do with the child care program. He noted that probably more staff members need the facility and more staff use the child care at the YWCA.

2.2 Faculty Club

Moeller stated that some faculty members have been asking about starting a faculty club again. She noted that Associate to the Chancellor Howe informed the Senate Executive Committee that there is approximately \$8,000 that can be used for a club. She stated that there has been some limited discussion on the subject but junior faculty members appear to be engaged in 80 hour work weeks and do not want to interact with colleagues where as more senior faculty members are interested in collegiality. She stated that it would be nice to have something like other institutions have where the faculty club is an environment for more conducive thinking. She stated that the Committee is considering asking the faculty how interested they would be in creating a faculty club.

Moeller asked the Chancellor if he thinks a faculty club is something that the Senate should pursue or if he can think of some place for the faculty to have a meeting place. Chancellor Perlman stated that he remembers the faculty club that used to be on campus. He stated that it was very nice and meals could be purchased there but he did not think that it functioned very well. He stated that he is skeptical about a faculty club but this is based on

the limited participation of faculty attending the Faculty at Five events or the Chancellor's Distinguished Lectures program.

Chancellor Perlman stated that a room at the Student Union could be reserved every Wednesday or some other time and faculty could be invited to come. He suggested that the Senate could try this to see if it would work. Ledder stated that interest in faculty members socializing might be different in other disciplines but in his department there is not much interest in socializing.

2.3 Budget Update

Moeller asked if there was any new information regarding the budget. Chancellor Perlman stated that there is nothing new at this time. He noted that he just received an email message from Central Administration regarding the allocation of money for UNL but he has not had a chance to review it with Vice Chancellor Jackson yet.

Moeller asked if the funding for the cleanup at Mead is an issue. Chancellor Perlman stated that this has been basically taken care of. He noted that the utility bills have been paid for last year but not for this year and there will be a shortfall.

2.4 Fall Enrollment

Chancellor Perlman stated that everything looks good but we will not know for sure until the students actually come to campus in August. He noted the number of students enrolled in the amount of housing requests is a possible reflection that enrollment is up.

Alloway stated that he was surprised to see the number of people who put down the non-refundable deposit and asked if the administration has learned anything by these numbers. Chancellor Perlman stated that we do not have the number of years of experience with the deposit to be able to see if it is a predictor of enrollment. He noted that the Chronicle of Higher Education states that the phenomenon of people paying the deposit and not attending the institution is occurring across the country.

2.5 Update on the School of Natural Resources Building

Vice Chancellor Owens stated that Hardin Hall was rededicated a few weeks ago. He reported that faculty, staff, and students are moving into the building. He noted that the inside of the building has been totally renovated and it looks very good. He stated that each faculty member has a good office and the laboratories are first rate.

Vice Chancellor Owens reported that two finalists have been brought in for second interviews for the position of Director of the School of Natural Resources.

2.6 Issues on the Horizon

Chancellor Perlman stated that one of the important things occurring on campus is the revision of the general education program. He stated that revising the program will move the university forward. He pointed out that the current general education program is not working for us.

Chancellor Perlman stated that another major effort is the self-study accreditation process. Moeller stated that the Committee has been reviewing the draft chapters of the self-study report and have been providing feedback to Professor O'Hanlon on them. She pointed out that the document is largely incomplete so it has not been possible to provide as much input as possible. Chancellor Perlman stated that he didn't want to do a self study report where the information gathered could not be used elsewhere. He reminded the committee that it will not be a typical comprehensive accreditation but rather one focused on strategic planning. He stated that the report needs to be easy to read and not too long.

Vice Chancellor Owens stated that the Senate could be helpful in having Senators get information back to their departments about the accreditation report. He pointed out that the accreditation team is noted for stopping faculty, staff, and students on campus to discuss things. He stated that strategic planning and assessment are issues that should be discussed. Moeller stated that the Committee will bring this to the attention of the Senate. Beck suggested that UNOPA and UAAD be notified as well.

Chancellor Perlman noted that assessment is a national issue. He pointed out that the Board of Regents is looking at it and that the campuses will be getting more involved with it.

3.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

4.0 Approval of 7/12/06 Minutes

Alloway moved, and Beck seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Clarification on University-wide Benefits Committee

Moeller noted that Bradford questioned whether it is the Chancellor who appoints the campus representatives to the University-wide Fringe Benefits Committee. She stated that Griffin obtained a copy of the most recent syllabus of the committee and it states that it is the Chancellor who appoints the representatives.

Beck asked who the extension person is who on the committee. Griffin stated that she will check to see if this position is filled.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Report on Meeting with Professor Janovy on General Education Survey

Moeller stated that the members of the Executive Committee met with Professor Janovy along with Professors Peterson, Minter, and Woodward. She noted that the meeting went well and at the end there was agreement to work together to develop a survey to get greater faculty input into the revision of the general education program. The committee then discussed possible wording for the survey.

Moeller stated that in her meeting with the Chancellor last week they discussed the 11 outcomes being developed for the general education program. Ledder stated that the outcomes are what the institutional objectives are trying to accomplish. He stated that he liked the outcomes because it gets away from the philosophy of a one size fits all approach to education. He noted that with these outcomes faculty members can select which one best fits their courses.

Moeller stated that in her meeting with the Chancellor he asked what kinds of incentives we can create to get people engaged in the process. She asked what can be put in place that will allow faculty members to voice their concerns and fears about the revisions. Ledder stated that value judgment questions can be asked.

The Committee then discussed what should be stated in the introductory letter to the survey. Moeller stated that there will be a detailed discussion about the general education revisions at the September Senate meeting.

6.2 Proposed Commencement & Academic Honors Committee – ASUN Concerns

Griffin reported that she received a phone call from ASUN raising concern that the student members on the existing Commencement and Honors Convocations Committees are voting members. The new, proposed syllabus does not give the students voting privileges. Beck stated that the syllabus was changed to non-voting members because no student members have been appointed to the committees in the last few years. She stated that there is no problem in giving the students voting privileges again and that change will be made.

6.3 Executive Committee Retreat

Griffin stated that the Executive Committee retreat will be held on August 16th beginning at 12:00 in the Schorr Presidential Suite at the Hewit Place.

6.4 Chapter 7 – Accreditation Self-Study Report

The Committee reviewed and discussed Chapter 7 of the report.

6.5 Conflict of Interest in Research Policy

The Committee agreed to review the draft policy and submit feedback to Bradford so he can send a response back to Associate Vice Chancellor Espy on it. It was noted that the policy is for UNL only, not a University-wide policy.

6.6 Note From Executive Associate Dean Weissinger

Moeller reported that she received a reply from Executive Associate Dean Weissinger regarding the procedures for changing a graduate student's grade to W. Moeller noted that Weissinger stated that from now on instructors will be contacted and consulted with before a graduate student can withdraw from a course.

Moeller stated that she received an email message from an instructor who read the last minutes of the Executive Committee meeting. The instructor stated that the example of a student using a W to get out of being caught for academic dishonesty was very accurate because it happened in one of his courses.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:14 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, at August 9th at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RETREAT

Present: Alloway, Beck, Bolin, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Scholz

Absent: Alexander, Rapkin, Stock, Zimmers

Date: Wednesday, August 16, 2006

Location: Schorr Presidential Suite, 1155 Hewit Place

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

Moeller called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Weekly Meetings

Griffin announced that the Executive Committee will begin meeting each week starting with next week's meeting. The meetings will begin at 3:00 pm.

3.0 Approval of 7/26/06 Minutes

Moeller noted that there was no quorum at the 8/9/06 meeting which is the reason that the minutes of the 7/26 Executive Committee meeting are now being approved. Alloway moved and Flowers seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Survey on General Education Revisions

Moeller reported that she and Flowers drafted a quick survey that will eventually be sent to the faculty for input on the institutional objectives developed for the revised general education program. The Committee reviewed and revised the survey.

The Committee suggested that an email message should be sent to Senators asking them to poll their faculty on how they envision their department will react to the institutional objectives.

4.2 Handout on General Education Revisions

The Committee reviewed and revised a handout being developed for the September 12th

Senate meeting on the general education revision process.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Goals for the Senate for 2006-07

The Committee worked on developing the goals for the Academic Senate for the 2006-07 year.

5.2 Campus Recreation Advisory Council

Griffin reported that a faculty member called with concerns about the increase in campus recreation fees for faculty and staff members. The faculty member pointed out that the list of Council members in the recreation center indicated that there was currently no faculty representative serving on it. Beck stated that Professor Jackson, Food Science and Technology, was appointed to the Council.

The Committee noted that the University wants to develop a wellness program. Consideration should be given to keeping membership fees to the recreation center low for faculty and staff members if the university wants to promote the wellness program. Ledder pointed out that some institutions have free membership for the faculty and staff. He suggested that our peer institutions should be surveyed to see what or if they have fees for the use of their recreation facilities.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, August 23rd at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Alloway, Beck, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Bolin, Rapkin

Date: Wednesday, August 23, 2006

Location: Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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

Moeller called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

2.0 Nancy Myers, Director, Organizational Development and Tom Workman, Assistant Director, Student Involvement

Myers reported that last year an effort was started to increase student recruitment and retention at UNL by the Offices of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. These two offices collaborated to develop a pilot educational seminar called “Serving Students the Big Red Way.” Myers noted that 350 faculty members and administrators attended the workshops held this past spring. She stated that the goal of the program is to help students feel that they belong to UNL and that we want them to succeed.

Myers noted that administrators, faculty and staff across the campus frequently hear how bureaucratic UNL is. She stated that she and Workman are encouraging departments to look at their various processes that involve students to see if they can create a better service relationship with the students. She noted that the effort wants to expand the program to involve a broader range of people on the campus and wants the Senate’s feedback on the best way to do this.

Workman reported that when retention and overall student satisfaction were reviewed for the “Everyone a Learner, Everyone a Teacher” report written in December 2003, a number of focus groups were conducted and many students were interviewed. He pointed out that that there was a recurring theme from the students that they felt disconnected from the university. He noted that some of this disconnection was systematic.

Workman stated that the interviews showed that many students do not feel that they are important at UNL. He stated that the question is what contribution could we at UNL make that might improve the University's relationships with the students. He noted that advising is a significant issue that needs to be addressed. He stated that the Serving Students program is designed to improve the relationships between the students and the university. He noted that for some units, relationships between their department and the students were the last thing that departments have looked at.

Workman stated that the program tries to look at the current systems and procedures that are in place from the students' perspectives to see how they operate. He pointed out that an example is the general education program which many students feel is designed to weed students out of the university.

Workman stated that the question is how to build a training workshop that will be effective. He noted that the problem with many workshops is that after the workshop is over, nothing happens and no changes are made. He pointed out that in order for changes to happen at the department level, the department chairs will need to be involved. He stated that the base of the program is to provide a two hour workshop with a one hour follow up afterwards. He noted that the follow up time allows participants to actualize what they learned.

Myers stated that she and Workman feel that it is very important to get feedback from the Executive Committee about the program. She noted that she has heard that the faculty won't buy into the program but she believes most faculty members are very engaged with their students. She stated that part of the plan is to look at examples of best faculty interactions with students and discuss this. She asked how we can best recognize faculty interactions.

Workman noted that going through the process of developing this program he has constantly been reminded that this issue doesn't relate to the faculty. He stated that he is getting a strong sense that the faculty members are a group that cannot be included in the same program as the staff members.

Ledder pointed out that the material that was distributed to the Committee does not show where the faculty has been included in the program. He stated that as a professor he would want a better idea of what he is going to learn at the workshop.

Myers asked what would be the best way to disseminate the information on the workshops to the faculty. Ledder stated that an email message should be sent out to the faculty a few weeks before the October 12th workshop. He noted that the email message about the

workshop should indicate what aspects of serving students affect faculty members.

Moeller stated that the way faculty members interact most powerfully with students is through work. She stated that faculty members need to have a reason/context to interact with students that is mutually beneficial. She suggested that the workshop be framed to better inform faculty members how they can attract students to work together on research projects, service learning initiatives, and related teaching and learning opportunities.

Alloway pointed out that the university jargon indicates that there are academic units versus service units and this may cause some confusion. He stated that it might be helpful for the program to clearly define the term service better rather than just using the term academic service to students. Ledder suggested engaging and interacting with students as an example of terminology that could be used.

Workman stated that one of their concerns is that they want to be clear to the faculty that what is considered service to the students is not about teaching styles or teaching pedagogy. He noted that it is about the professor's relationship formation with the students that the program wants to help address.

Bradford pointed out that all of the scheduled workshops are during prime class hours. He suggested that if the attempt is to reach the faculty then workshops should be held in the later afternoon. Ledder noted that October 12th is a Thursday and it might good to also have a workshop for faculty members who teach on a Monday, Wednesday, Friday schedule.

Workman stated that he is hearing from the Committee that there is a distinct separation between service from the faculty and the academic units. He asked if there should be a separate workshop for faculty members that more specifically addresses the kinds of service they are involved in. Ledder pointed out that the faculty will be turned off to the workshops if they attend a three hour workshop only to find out that half of it does not pertain to what they do. Bradford stated that interaction with the staff members is important though because often the staff and the faculty members are dealing with the same issues in helping students.

Scholz stated that he attended the first workshop and felt that it was very relevant. However, it would be helpful to have a separate session devoted to the faculty so it addresses the key roles for faculty members. He stated that he thinks the message of the program would come across more powerfully if there were separate workshops. Alloway suggested that there could be concurrent sessions held with a period of time set aside for the staff and faculty members to meet to discuss common issues.

Myers asked if the Senate would sponsor a seminar for the faculty. Ledder wanted to hear some examples of what a workshop would discuss. Workman stated that the goal is to create a satisfying relationship for the students. He noted that the workshop would look at how the relationship is formed and the various components of it. He stated that specific skill levels are taught and questions addressed such as what happens if a conflict or disagreement occurs with a student and how to deal with the stress of service work.

Workman stated that he is creating a page on the Student Involvement website called Get to Know Me in which students list the one thing they want faculty members to know about them. He pointed out that when students think of the university, they automatically think of the faculty.

Ledder stated that he does not need to deal with aspects of students needing signatures on a form. He pointed out that what he deals with are students thinking that something isn't fair or they are worried about grades. He asked if the workshop deals with these kinds of issues. Workman stated that the workshop also discusses how faculty members can say no to students and how they can learn to tell the students that they need to do some things for themselves.

Ledder stated that most faculty members have had to deal with students who have to get a certain grade to retain a scholarship or stay in a program. He noted that there are recurring problems that happen each year. He stated that one of the questions that he is looking at is how to alleviate concerns that periodically arise. He noted that one idea is to create a website with examples of best practices that demonstrate how faculty members can deal with these recurring concerns. Myers stated that it could become a resource for faculty members to use.

Alexander stated that students are becoming so busy these days that they are not joining professional societies. He pointed out that these societies help provide a linkage to people in the areas students are studying. He noted that students are ignoring the opportunities they have to engage with the faculty. Workman stated that he does not know if this can be changed. He pointed out that 35% of students are working full-time and carry a full-time class load. He noted that 98% of the students on campus work. He stated that the reality is that many students need to work and the problem is what we can do to make the university's relationship better with these students.

Moeller pointed out that the faculty cannot always meet the needs of individuals who are going to school full-time and working full-time. She stated that she wants to invest her time in people who are willing to make a commitment to their education. She suggested

that it would be helpful to hear from faculty members about what works for them.

Ledder stated that to faculty members it is obvious that you cannot be a full-time student and a full-time employee but students do not seem to understand this. He pointed out that student surveys have shown that students do not recognize that their level of effort and commitment is the most important factor in determining their success in a course.

Workman stated that there is a divide growing between how we attract students and what they get when they come here. He noted that the admissions office is telling students that we will make it work for you but once the student gets to campus this is not always the case. He noted that they are seeing 22 years old who are already hitting the wall.

Alexander asked what as a faculty member he is supposed to do. Stock noted that faculty members can offer generous office hours and encourage students to come and speak with them. He stated that some faculty members may feel that they are doing all that they can do for the students.

Workman stated that part of the answer is to look at the systems that are in place. He noted that nationally interactions are being conducted electronically. He pointed out that the School of Music has a digitized relationship with their students. He stated that when students arrive on campus they receive an email message with a video clip in it that introduces the student to his/her instructors. Alloway noted that students often expect an immediate response when they contact their instructors through email, regardless of what time the email is sent.

Myers thanked the Committee and stated that a sample seminar will be developed. Workman stated that he would like to see the workshop arranged in a roundtable format. Ledder urged that the workshops be more specific for faculty members. He suggested addressing issues such as speaking with students after class, what to do with emails and what to do with the short period of time before class begins.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Safe Assignment

Moeller announced that she received word that the Safe Assignment is back on Blackboard for use. She reported that she sent an email to the Libraries thanking them for purchasing the program and for their work in reviewing it. She noted that she is encouraging students to use it as a diagnostic tool to help them with their papers. Alloway noted that all papers reviewed by Safe Assignment get added to the program's local database so a student who tries to use a classmate's paper will get flagged by the program. He said that simply notifying students their work will be reviewed by Safe Assignment may cause them to be

more careful about lifting content from other works.

3.2 Notable Nebraskans

Beck stated that she thinks that Patsy Takemoto Mink, former Congresswoman from Hawaii and author of Title IX should be listed as a notable person who attended UNL. Beck reported that Mink spent a year here in the mid-1940's as a student and her experiences here with segregation of the residence halls were influential in her writing Title IX.

3.3 Coalition Against the Spending Lid

Moeller reported that she received an email message from Professor Haller about a coalition that is being formed in Nebraska to fight the spending lid proposal. Bradford asked if the Senate should take a position on the proposed legislation. The Committee agreed that a motion should be drafted and presented to the Senate at the September meeting.

4.0 Approval of 8/16/06 Minutes

Minutes approved as amended.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Senate Goals

The Committee further revised the Senate goals for 2006-2007.

5.2 Senate Survey on General Education

The Committee reviewed and made minor revisions to the survey. Griffin reported that she will be sending a copy of the survey to Professor Janovy for him to distribute to the GEPT committee.

5.3 General Education Handout for the September Senate Meeting

The Committee reviewed and revised the handout for the Senate meeting. Moeller stated that she and Griffin will produce a Powerpoint presentation on the handout.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Ballot Letter on Changes to the Senate Bylaws

Griffin distributed a copy of the letter that will be distributed to the academic assembly asking them to vote on the changes to the Senate Bylaws. The Committee reviewed and revised the letter. It was suggested that the letters be given to each Senator for them to

distribute to their colleagues asking the colleagues to please vote.

6.2 Pepsi Student Event Fund Review Committee

Alexander volunteered to serve on the Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, August 30th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.