

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.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Alloway, Beck, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Bolin, Rapkin

Date: Wednesday, August 30, 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 3:02 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Faculty at 5

Moeller reported that the Senate will once again co-sponsor the Faculty at 5 receptions this year. She noted that the events will be held on the following dates: October 26th, November 13th, February 23rd, and March 15th. She stated that the Faculty at 5 receptions will be held at the Sheldon Art Gallery. Faculty members can purchase a drink and have hors d'oeuvres for \$5.

2.2 Retirement Reception for Professor Robert "Mac" Sawyer

Griffin reported that there will be a retirement reception for Professor Sawyer, Teaching, Learning, and Teacher Education, on September 13th from 4:00 – 7:00 p.m. at the Wick Alumni Center. Griffin noted that Professor Sawyer served on the Senate and is a former member of the Executive Committee.

3.0 Approval of 8/23/06 Minutes

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

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Status of Survey on the Institutional Objectives of the General Education Program

Griffin reported that members of the General Education Planning Team sent some

comments and suggestions on the survey. The Committee reviewed the suggestions and revised the survey. The Committee agreed to have the survey sent out the week of September 4th.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Academic Dishonesty Grade

Moeller noted that the Committee recently read an article on the awarding of an “XF” grade to indicate a student who failed a course due to academic dishonesty. She stated that several universities are now using this grade. She reported that she checked with these universities and they are pleased with the policy on academic dishonesty.

Bradford suggested that the Committee should meet with Dr. Hawkey, Director of Registration and Records, to discuss this issue. The Committee agreed to set up a meeting with Dr. Hawkey.

Ledder stated that invoking the grade would be contingent on having a good definition of academic dishonesty. Bradford asked if it would strictly be up to the instructor to decide if the grade should be invoked. Ledder stated that he did not feel that one person should make this decision. Stock agreed and stated that there should be some kind of formal review process to insure that academic dishonesty did occur. Beck pointed out that Dr. Hecker, Director of Student Judicial Affairs, has the authority to make decisions on student judicial decisions. She noted that Dr. Hecker could refer a case of academic dishonesty to the Judicial Board.

Stock noted that the professor should have to provide evidence to Dr. Hecker in order to invoke the grade. He noted that many instructors might be unwilling to invoke the grade because the type of plagiarism may not be that bad. Ledder pointed out that the evidence would need to be substantial in order to give the grade. Flowers stated that the other alternative is to give a failing grade in a course but not convert it to an XF grade which would indicate that the student failed the course due to academic dishonesty.

Alloway asked what would happen if all other requirements of a course were passed successfully by the student except for the one requirement where academic dishonesty was discovered. Stock suggested that the instructor might want to pass the student but might give it a stigma to indicate the student was caught plagiarizing or cheating. Ledder agreed and noted that there are many different kinds of courses with different requirements. He noted that the dishonesty might not be bad enough to fail a course but enough so the student should be penalized.

Bradford stated that the mechanism for giving the grade should not be so complicated or time consuming that it would discourage someone from reporting academic dishonesty. Flowers noted that in the past Judicial Affairs would save information if a case of academic dishonesty was reported. He pointed out that if it is not reported then a student could continue cheating without other instructors knowing it.

Alloway asked if the grade would be removed after two years if the student has no further incidents of academic dishonesty. Ledder suggested that if a student graduates with only one X on their record, they could appeal to have it removed. He pointed out that if a freshman received an X it could be removed in two years and the student could do it again as a senior. Alloway asked if keeping it on the record would affect the time table for students applying to graduate school.

Stock noted that this is a complicated issue to discuss. The Committee agreed to have further discussions about it with Dr. Hecker.

5.2 10 Reasons to Become a Husker

Moeller stated that she received an email message with an attachment consisting of a brochure designed to recruit students. The brochure/postcard lists 10 good reasons to become a Husker. An email correspondence is occurring among recipients of the email to provide input regarding this postcard/brochure mailing. Ledder stated that the piece should indicate more clearly that the subject is the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, September 6th 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.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Beck, Bradford, Flowers, Ledder, Moeller, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alexander, Bolin, Hachtmann, Rapkin, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, September 6, 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

2.1 Spending Lid and Effects on the University

Moeller stated that a legislative bill to place a lid on government spending will be on the ballot in November. She noted that an attempt to put a spending lid in place was attempted a number of years ago and failed. She asked what the impact would be if the bill was approved.

Chancellor Perlman stated that Varner Hall has done a serious study on the impacts of a spending lid. He noted that Varner Hall estimated that if the lid would have been in effect the last ten years, the University budget could be reduced by approximately \$134 million or the amount it would take to run the city campus of UNL. He pointed out that, depending on how the bill is interpreted, it could also place a lid on tuition rates which would create an even greater impact on the budget of the University. He stated that the spending lid in Colorado has had devastating effects on Colorado State University. He noted that Colorado suspended the spending lid for five years because of the disastrous effect it was having. He pointed out that the spending lid is a black cloud on the horizon that needs to be carefully watched.

2.2 Public Relations on the Work of the Faculty

Moeller reported that comments have been made that the faculty is doing a lot of good work but news of this work is not being conveyed to the public. She stated that the intent is to inform the greater public about the good work being done at UNL that impacts the state,

nation and world. She cited as an example the work being done in the College of Engineering on developing equipment to detect land mines in Iraq.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he believes that the campus has a creative and effective campaign to inform the public. He pointed out that the campaign may not be noticed by the faculty but the campaign appears to be working because the climate towards the University by the public seems to be changing in a positive direction. He noted that people in the community that he has talked to may not remember all of the details but they are aware that UNL has received over \$100 million in research grants and they know about the Diocles Laser.

Moeller stated that the Committee was thinking of public relations in terms of what has direct impact on the people of Nebraska. Chancellor Perlman stated that we could try to resurrect the Town and Gown series but he thinks people are so busy these days that the series may not be well attended.

Bradford stated that he did not think the public relations image was a problem with the legislature but it appears to be a problem with the general public. He asked if there is any way to communicate better with the general population. Chancellor Perlman stated that he believes this is being done already. He noted that table tents about the University and faculty members are in fast food restaurants. He pointed out that the University is not just relying on slick brochures that go out to donors or future students.

Chancellor Perlman stated that in part it depends on how connected people are with the University. He noted that in the western part of the state the people are well connected to the University and they realize how important the University is to them. He pointed out that there has been a lot of good press in both the Lincoln Journal Star and the Omaha World Herald in the past four weeks.

Alloway asked how we make a case for the academic community to the general public. Ledder noted that there are two things that need to be considered. The first is that people do not necessarily connect expenditures with services and the second is that some people do not take an interest in things that do not personally affect them. Chancellor Perlman stated that there has been some discussion about creating an impact statement. He noted that he is not enamored with general financial impact statements because he doesn't think they resonate with the public. He stated that his administration is exploring whether UNL can do impact studies that the general public will understand. An example is informing the public of the percentage of school teachers, lawyers, judges, and business people who are educated at the University.

Alloway asked if there is something that the Senate can do to help. Chancellor Perlman encouraged the faculty to think of things from their own particular settings. He stated that material needs to be collected that shows the impact of the University but collecting all of this material can be difficult. He noted that the trick is in knowing all that is happening here because the University is a very large and complex organization. He stated that anyone with ideas or suggestions should contact either himself or the Office of University Communications.

2.3 Academic Dishonesty Grade

Moeller noted that the campus has purchased the Safe Assignment software program which will allow students to check their papers to see if they have plagiarized. The program can also be used by faculty members to check if students committed plagiarism in their papers. She noted that there have been an increasing number of cases of academic dishonesty on campus yet there is no way of tracking whether a student has been guilty of academic dishonesty. She reported that at the University of Maryland a student found guilty of academic dishonesty receives a grade of "XF" which remains on their record for two years after which time it can be removed. She stated that the Executive Committee is thinking of initiating something similar here. She stated that the Committee will work with Dr. Hecker, Director of Student Judicial Affairs, and with ASUN on this.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he thought this was a good idea. He pointed out that the procedure used to give this grade needs to be fair.

Moeller stated that she will probably appoint a task force to look into the matter further.

Chancellor Perlman stated that on a somewhat related matter the recent incident with the cheerleader may embroil us about how much the University should investigate a student's background before they are admitted. He noted that doing these kinds of investigations could be very expensive and may be unfair. Alloway pointed out that the Daily Nebraskan addressed this in a recent article. He noted that this is a murky area. Chancellor Perlman agreed and stated that each case is different as well.

2.4 Fall Enrollment Figures

Chancellor Perlman stated that UNL did very well this year in terms of enrollment. He reported that the freshmen count is up 8% from last year and total overall enrollment is up 2%. He pointed out that the ACT scores are the highest they have ever been for new students.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the number of minority students has increased as well and domestic minority students increased to 10.8% for the freshmen class. He noted that

enrollment for minority students across the boards has increased. He pointed out that people are doing a good job of recruiting and faculty members are being much more cooperative about engagement. He noted that parents are saying that they see UNL as a very friendly place and UNL outshines many other institutions in terms of on campus visits.

Bradford asked whether non freshmen classes are holding even. Chancellor Perlman noted that we still have a small junior class. Bradford asked if a lot of students in the upper classes are leaving. Chancellor Perlman reported that the retention rate is not as good for upper classmen. He noted that retention rates between the freshmen and sophomore years are up to approximately 83% retention. He noted that graduation rates have increased by 16% over the past decade.

Chancellor Perlman stated that other interesting statistics are that students who take at least 12 credit hours each fall semester since being a freshman have a graduation rate of 91%. However, 40% of our students either stop out temporarily or drop to part-time status at some point in their career and this hampers our graduation rate. He pointed out that we need to determine why the students are doing this. He stated that he suspects it is for financial reasons. He reported that those students who qualify for federal financial aid at UNL have a higher graduation rate than our peers although the average financial aid amount that our students receive is lower than our peers.

Moeller noted that some universities are reducing the amount of scholarship money to each student but increasing the number of available scholarships to attract more students. Chancellor Perlman stated that scholarship programs were looked at last year and there is better coordination of the scholarships this year.

Moeller stated that people seem to be more concerned where people received their graduate degree rather than their undergraduate degree. She pointed out that the role of undergraduate education is not addressed here. Ledder stated that the U.S. World and News Report on universities do not evaluate how many office hours faculty members offer at the universities. He noted that students going to some of the top rated colleges may in fact have limited interaction with faculty members. Chancellor Perlman stated that the National Engagement Study looks at a number of criteria when rating universities, among them student interactions with faculty members. He noted that UNL fares well in the National Engagement Study and the Board of Regents will probably use some of these scores in the university's strategic framework.

2.5 Funds for Faculty Salaries

Bradford asked if the campus has received the additional funds to bring some of the faculty

salaries up to the mid point of their peers. Chancellor Perlman stated that the campus has received the money although it has not been distributed yet to the colleges. He noted that the Deans will be notified soon and salary increases will be retroactive to the beginning of the fiscal year. He pointed out that the amount received is small relative to what is needed. He stated that the raises will be based on merit and he is looking at those units that are the furthest behind their peers. He noted that the increases will go to tenured and tenure track faculty members only.

Bradford asked how the allocation was split between UNMC and UNL. Chancellor Perlman stated that it went to the two campuses.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Institutional Objectives Survey

Moeller reported that the survey on institutional objectives will be sent to the faculty this week. This survey is aimed at enhancing awareness of the institutional objectives, informing the faculty about the progress of the curricular reform at UNL, secure faculty input and opinion and to stimulate discussion among the faculty about general education and its impact on curriculum at UNL.

4.0 Approval of 8/30/06 Minutes

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

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Senate Meeting

Moeller discussed the PowerPoint presentation she is planning to show at the Senate meeting. She noted that the Senators will be asked to form groups to discuss how a good curriculum impacts the faculty. The Committee discussed what guidelines can be given to the Senators as they break into groups to discuss general education.

5.2 Commencement Committee

Moeller stated that she was contacted by faculty members of the Commencement Committee who had concerns over the proposed merger of the committee with the Honorary Degrees and Honors Convocations Committees. She stated that the members of the committee did not see the proposed syllabus and thought that the committee was going to be eliminated. She pointed out that most of the members on the committee enjoy working on it. Moeller stated that a copy of the proposed syllabus was sent to the committee for them to review.

Bradford pointed out that faculty members are needed on many different committees and the situation has to be looked at globally. He stated that people could be placed on other committees where faculty members are needed. Beck noted that the Commencement Committee does not make any policy decisions and therefore faculty input is not needed. She asked why there should be a committee of faculty members if faculty input is not needed. She noted that the staff members on the committee do the work of preparing for commencement. Moeller pointed out that the faculty members of the committee do make a physical presence at commencement.

Griffin stated that once the committee sees the proposed syllabus they will realize that the committee is not being eliminated. Ledder stated that the members could serve on the combined committees and have greater responsibilities.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Draft Resolution on Institutional Objectives

Ledder presented a draft proposal for the Senate to endorse the institutional objectives. He stated that he can envision the faculty putting the institutional objectives into their syllabus for freshmen classes and could explain to students how the course fits into the objectives. He stated that it is important for the faculty to whatever it can to show students what they will gain by the general education program. The Committee reviewed and revised the motion.

6.2 Emeriti Association

Beck stated that in a conversation with the Emeriti Association last semester, they stated that they would like to give a report to the Senate at a future meeting. She noted that the Association is considering conducting exit interviews with people who are retiring.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:37 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, September 13th 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: Alloway, Beck, Bolin, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Scholz, Stock

Absent: Alexander, Rapkin, Zimmers

Date: Wednesday, September 13, 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 3:05 p.m.

2.0 ASUN (Matt Schaefer, Greg Gifford)

2.1 Safe Assignment

Gifford stated that ASUN is concerned that the Safe Assignment program will be used as a policing tool rather than an educational tool for students. He stated that the ASUN would like to see a program that can be used to educate students rather than punish them.

Moeller stated that in previous meetings of the Academic Senate it was reported that Safe Assignment is a diagnostic tool for students to use as well as for faculty use. She stated that students can check their papers to see if they have paraphrased or not cited references properly before they turn the paper into their professors.

Schaefer stated that students thought that a professor would have to give permission for students to use the program. Moeller pointed out that the program is on Blackboard and anyone can access it. Alloway noted that the program is under the assignment tab in Blackboard.

Alloway stated that there are segments of the university population that are less informed about proper citations and what constitutes plagiarism. He pointed out that the faculty felt that Safe Assignment could be a real educational tool to help these students.

Bradford pointed out that there is a serious problem with intentional plagiarism. Flowers noted that this is not only with students. Alloway reported that there have been cases of

faculty members at other universities who have been found guilty of plagiarizing.

Moeller stated that she tested the Safe Assignment program this summer with students in her graduate class. She noted that the students thought it was a great tool.

Gifford stated that students were told that a faculty member had to allow the students to use the program.

2.2 Academic Dishonesty Grade

Moeller stated that several universities are using and having success with giving the grade of “XF” to a student found guilty of academic dishonesty. She noted that the grade is designed to inform people that a student has intentionally been found guilty of cheating. If there are no further incidents, the grade can be removed after a period of two years.

Moeller stated that the Executive Committee wants to work with the students to develop a definition of academic dishonesty. She pointed out that the current policy is not visible. She stated that the Committee will work with ASUN and Dr. Hecker’s office to develop a policy. Ledder stated that he would like to see an academic honesty policy that is not just geared towards students but to all members of the academic community.

Schaefer asked when a faculty member would have the opportunity to see a student’s academic record. Bradford stated that a committee would need to review whether the grade should be given. Ledder pointed out that academic advisors could check on a student’s record.

Alloway stated that nothing will develop on the grade until the campus has a better definition of academic dishonesty. He pointed out that the faculty does not want anything that could be unfair. Bradford noted that procedural protections on giving the grade need to be ensured. Alloway stated that preliminary suggestions are that Judicial Affairs would actually determine whether the grade should be given. It would not be up to one individual to make that decision.

Flowers pointed out that the Judicial Affairs Office would also need to keep track of the records of these cases. He noted that faculty members are currently required to report incidents of academic dishonesty. Bradford stated that this policy is probably not being followed by many people. Flowers agreed and stated that many faculty members may not be aware of this policy. Alloway noted that many professors do not want to deal with a lengthy process so they will often not report a violation.

Schaefer stated that he heard from a student that a professor was offering students extra

credit in a course for turning in a student who is cheating.

Moeller stated that she recently had an incident with one of her students who plagiarized 70% of their paper. Moeller was told that she should go to Judicial Affairs about the incident but the procedures were lengthy and time consuming.

Beck pointed out that a faculty member can ask Judicial Affairs to maintain a record of the incident without taking action because she has done that on one occasion, but she doesn't know how well this actually works. Schaefer asked if the student was informed that this was being done. Beck stated that she informed the student.

Stock stated that he believed it would be news to many faculty members that they are required to file a report. He pointed out that there are many fuzzy cases of academic dishonesty and it is up to an instructor to deal with the students in these cases. He noted that particular cases of academic dishonesty might not be severe enough to warrant going through Judicial Affairs.

Bradford stated that the Executive Committee is just beginning preliminary discussions about the grade option. He pointed out that the Committee will consult with ASUN when a draft policy is written. Moeller stated that the Committee will definitely work with ASUN further on this subject.

2.3 Syllabus Policy

Schaefer stated that ASUN would like to have a policy for the campus that requires each course to have a syllabus. Bradford asked if the policy would apply to only undergraduate courses. Flowers noted that some undergraduate courses such as independent studies usually do not have a syllabus because of the nature of it. Ledder stated that the draft policy deals with these courses by using language that the policy is for courses "in the traditional sense of the word."

Bradford stated that he is unsure about requiring a grading policy in the syllabus. He asked what kind of grading policy the students are wanting, a letter grade scale. Schaefer stated that the syllabus should state how grades will be assessed. Alloway suggested substituting grading policy with "method of evaluation." He pointed out that using this language would allow professors to state what is appropriate for their course.

Stock stated that he has concerns with stating the time and place of the final. He noted that he does not want people to infringe on the 15th week policy but he sometimes will not decide until the middle of the semester whether he will give the students a take home final. Ledder pointed out that some times professors do not know the location of where the final

exam will be given. Schaefer stated that the important thing is that the professors eventually communicate when and where the final exam will be held. Ledder noted that he posts the final exam information on his website and announces it in two different class periods.

Alloway stated that it is important for the students to keep their email addresses up to date on Blackboard. He noted that he has had email messages returned because the students have changed them.

Bradford pointed out that not all professors distribute printed copies of their syllabus. Schaefer stated that ASUN encourages professors to use Blackboard as much as possible.

Schaefer stated that it is helpful to students who are shopping for classes to have a copy of the syllabus on the first day of class. He noted that listing the prerequisites for the course of the syllabus can alert students that they are not ready to take a particular course.

Gifford stated that ASUN has been told that there are instructors who say that they are constructing a draft syllabus but then it never gets distributed. He stated that the policy is an attempt to make sure this practice stops.

Schaefer pointed out that having a syllabus protects faculty members as well because students cannot argue against an assignment if it is posted in the syllabus. He stated that ASUN will continue working on the policy and will be in touch with the Senate about it.

2.4 Book Orders

Schaefer stated that ASUN wants to encourage faculty members to turn in their book orders by October 15th. He noted that students get a better buy back on their books if the order has been submitted by that date.

2.5 ASUN Government Liaison Committee

Schaefer reported that a big focus of the ASUN is with the Government Liaison Committee who will work with the City Council and State Legislature about the proposed spending lid bill. He stated that ASUN is trying to get funding for a student campaign to fight against the proposed legislation by getting people to vote against it.

Moeller reported that the Chancellor discussed at the Deans and Directors meeting this morning that state employees must be careful with their activity towards the bill. She noted that employees cannot speak at any venue about the bill during the time when they are on the job.

Ledder stated that anything the employees of the university will say will be held with suspicion. He pointed out that students will carry more weight with the public because they are not getting paid by the university.

Moeller noted that employees cannot use any equipment or work time in the effort to fight the lid.

2.6 Technology in the Classroom

Schaefer stated that ASUN is also looking into the use of podcasts. He stated that ASUN will continue to work and encourage faculty members to use innovative ways to teach.

Bradford asked if professors who use PowerPoint in the classroom later post their slides on Blackboard. Schaefer stated that he is starting to see more of this. Ledder asked if this would affect class attendance. Beck stated that she heard that it can. Moeller noted that a professor could require class attendance.

Beck stated that she uses PowerPoint presentations in her classroom but she tells students that not all of the information that is given in class is on the PowerPoint presentation. Schaefer noted that it makes taking notes in class much easier.

Alloway stated that he has had a 50/50 response from students on the PowerPoint slides. He noted that some say too much information is provided while others like having the slides posted.

2.7 Academic Rights and Responsibilities of Students

Schaefer stated that a resolution will be presented at the ASUN meeting tonight on the academic rights and responsibilities of students. He noted that students should be aware of these and if they are violated they should take appropriate action. He stated that he has met with Vice Chancellor Franco and they are working on forming a joint campaign to inform students of what they can do if they feel that their academic rights have been violated. Gifford stated that they want to call students' attention to the fact that there are processes in place and an ombudsman on campus to handle situations if a student's academic rights have been violated.

3.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

4.0 Approval of 9/13/06 Minutes

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

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Review of Responses to Institutional Objectives Survey

The Committee reviewed the responses that have been received to date on the survey. The Committee agreed that a reminder should be sent out next week to the faculty encouraging them to respond to the questionnaire.

Moeller stated that she is trying to find out why the colleges have to approve the revisions to the general education program. She noted that at other universities it is usually the Faculty Senate that approves such changes. She reported that she has asked Associate to the Chancellor Howe to check to see if it is state statute for the colleges to approve the curriculum changes.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Review of Senate Meeting

The Committee agreed that there were very good group discussions on the Institutional Objectives. Ledder noted that the way the committee reports are being presented is much better.

6.2 Deans and Directors Meeting

Moeller stated that she attended the Deans and Directors meeting. She reported that web development was discussed. She noted that 50 different web designs were submitted and 8500 UNL representatives took part in voting for the web design that would be adopted. She stated that the idea was to have a web design that was consistent, easy to use, had branding and accessibility. She noted that the web will be redesigned in 2009.

Ledder pointed out that the web design did not consider ease of visual use. Flowers stated that no one on the web development team has any real background with visual perception. Ledder noted that the campus was interested in legal compliances but did not take into consideration accessibility for visually impaired people. He suggested that Christy Horn, ADA/504 Compliance Officer, should be contacted to get a group of people to test the website.

Moeller stated that a very good presentation was given by Professor O'Hanlon on the accreditation report. She noted that the presentation shows that the report is not a defensive report but one that is reflective and moves the campus forward. She stated that the final version of the report will be on the web.

6.3 Board of Regents Meeting

Moeller reported that most of the meeting was occupied with discussions about the UNO

situation. She stated that Professor Lewis, Mathematics, did give a presentation on Math in the Middle. Moeller noted that the Board was very impressed with the presentation.

Moeller reported that Dr. Pratt, Interim Provost, gave a presentation on gender equity data. Moeller pointed out that only 14 women on campus make over \$100,000 while there are nearly five or six as many men who make over \$100,000. She pointed out that in some cases the men have been here for a long time. She stated that a full report on gender equity will be presented to the Board this fall.

Moeller reported that the Chancellor met with the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women. She stated that the Chancellor wants the Commission to help get more information on finding another day care facility.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, September 20th 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.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Beck, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alloway, Bolin, Rapkin

Date: Wednesday, September 20, 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 3:01 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Early Retirement Program

Moeller stated that she has heard that the early retirement program is no longer in place at the University but one-on-one negotiations can still take place. Chancellor Perlman stated that a circuit court has determined that early retirement programs are not constitutional. As a result, General Counsel Wood recommended that the University terminate the program. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that the termination of the program does not prohibit individual negotiations from taking place although cost factors need to be carefully considered if a negotiation occurs. He noted that the cost of health insurance is the major issue.

2.2 Update on Chemistry Professor Investigation

Chancellor Perlman stated that he has received the police report investigation. He noted that he will be meeting with Professor Belot. Chancellor Perlman stated that he needs to review the report again before deciding what action he will take. He noted that regardless of his decision the proper procedures will be followed.

2.3 Issues on the Horizon

Moeller stated that she has heard that there is a possibility we might be facing a \$5 million budget cut. Chancellor Perlman stated that we have about a \$5 million budget cut with the assigned minus figures in the budget. He noted that if prices hold consistent, the utility bill for UNL could end up in the red by \$5 million. He pointed out that the legislature gave

some appropriations last year to cover the utility costs and he hopes that it could happen again. He reported that the campus has just been informed that the utility company that provides half of the campus' electricity is raising rates. He stated that we are not in great financial shape but no budget cuts are being planned.

Moeller reported that she understands that Dean Hoffman has resigned. Chancellor Perlman stated that this is correct and that it was a voluntary decision by Dean Hoffman. Ledder noted that Dean Hoffman is resigning as Dean but will stay on as a professor in the School of Biological Sciences. Chancellor Perlman stated that he will be starting a search soon to replace Dean Hoffman.

Chancellor Perlman stated that one of the big issues that the campus is working on is the general education revisions. Moeller reported that during the Senate meeting last week the Senators met in small groups to discuss the institutional objectives. She stated that there have been 507 responses to the Senate survey. She noted that the idea is to get faculty optimally involved in the process of revising the general education program. She pointed out that getting the colleges to approve the revisions may be challenging. She stated that she did some research and found out that there is a statute going back to the turn of the century where colleges are the body that makes the decision on the curriculum. She pointed out the University of Nebraska is probably one of the only institutions that does this.

3.0 Deb Thomas, Assistant Vice President for Administration, and Ron Withem, Associate Vice President for University Affairs

Thomas stated that they wanted to speak to the Executive Committee about the impact of state limit spending on the University. She noted that the ballot initiative seeks to limit state spending increases to the combined rate of inflation plus population growth.

Thomas noted that grassroots advocacy is extremely important because there will be 22 new senators in the state legislature. She pointed out that Withem has traversed all over the state meeting these legislators but external grassroots advocacy needs to occur as well. She stated that there is a new computer service which will allow Withem to get information on supporters of the university and the legislators they may know. She pointed out that personal contact with state legislators is very helpful. She stated that if there is a particular senator that is against the university, her office would like to quickly be able to communicate with people who can then communicate with the senator. She gave cards to the Executive Committee asking if people in the Senate would sign up with the program. She noted that to become a University Ambassador all you need to do is to go to <http://www.ciclt.com/ungr> and click on the "Join University Ambassadors Now!" link and then complete the form and submit the information.

Withem stated that the rules from the General Counsel's office concerning university employees speaking about the "Stop OverSpending Nebraska" ballot initiative state that taxpayer resources cannot be used to support or oppose the ballot initiative but factual information about the impacts the bill will have on the University can be communicated. He pointed out that employees can talk about factual information during work hours but cannot suggest to anyone whether they should support or oppose the initiative. He stated that employees can say whatever they want on their own time.

Withem reported that the measure is being funded with \$1 million but only \$2,000 of this is from Nebraska. The other money comes from a New York real estate magnate by the name of Howard Rich. The only other states that will consider the initiative are Maine, Michigan, Montana, Nevada, and Oregon. It has been knocked down in all of the other states.

Withem noted that the appeal of the initiative is based on its simplicity; the government is spending too much money. If the initiative should be placed in the constitution it would limit growth in the state. He noted that Colorado passed similar legislation. At first it did not have as much impact because the size of the population kept on growing but it has now been suspended for five years because the negative impacts are severe.

Withem stated that an analysis assumption indicates that if total state spending only grew 3% per year from 1997-2007 as allowed under the lid, appropriations to higher education, state agencies, and aid to local governments would have been significantly reduced and all of these entities would have had to take proportionate reductions. He pointed out that during the recent budget cutting years the university took a 10% reduction which was far more than other state agencies which only received a 2% reduction. He noted that if the lid was effective for the past 10 years tuition rates would have increased to approximately \$8,500 per year to help offset the loss.

Withem reported that if the lid was in effect for the past 10 years the loss to the university's state appropriated budget would be more than \$134 million. This is equal to the amount needed to operate city campus or the combined appropriations made to the Med Center and UNK.

Withem stated that if a 3% spending lid would go into effect now it would eventually end state appropriations to the university and force the university to become a private institution. He pointed out that under this scenario, tuition could increase greatly.

Ledder pointed out that the analysis assumes that the enrollment rate would not change but

more than likely enrollments would drop significantly having an even greater negative impact on the university. Flowers noted that lack of support for programs will result in a loss of faculty members as they leave to go to institutions that have greater support. This would further erode the number of students enrolled. Withem stated that Colorado has lost a lot of good professors because of the negative impacts the lid has had on the universities there.

Thomas pointed out that it is not factually clear whether or not tuition could be used to offset the loss of funds with this initiative. Moeller asked if information on the impact on the Colorado state lid can be sent to the Committee. Thomas noted that Colorado has the advantage of having a lot of out-of-state students who pay higher tuition rates.

Beck asked if Withem and Thomas have a sense of how people feel about the initiative in the state. Withem stated that many organizations are coming out against it including the Chamber of Commerce, Nebraska Farmers Union, and AARP of Nebraska to name a few. He noted that there are two websites concerning the initiative: <http://www.notinnebraska.com> opposes the initiative and <http://www.sosnebraska.com> supports the measure.

Thomas stated that the initiative is called Amendment 423.

Bradford noted that the Senate can make a motion against it. He stated that he will draft a motion and present it at the Senate as an emergency motion.

4.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

5.0 Approval of 9/13/06 Minutes

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

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Institutional Objectives Survey Responses

Moeller reported that there have been over 500 responses to the survey to date. She reported that she summarized the feedback that was made by the groups from the Senate meeting. She noted that some concerns with the institutional objectives are: special problems with large classes, pragmatic issues related to large classes, and concern that this will end up being another form of faculty evaluation that is not very accurate.

Implementation points raised are: how will students demonstrate that they achieved these objectives, will faculty know how to assess these objectives, more concern about implementation, outcomes are what we should discuss and implement, and how to meet these objectives. One suggested change is to replace the word exercise in the third

objective.

Bradford noted that it will be interesting to see if the outcomes will match the objectives. Ledder wondered when the outcomes will be finished. Moeller stated that the outcomes dealing with the arts and humanities and social sciences have been completed.

6.2 Commencement Committee

Moeller reported that she is receiving a number of email messages from members of the Commencement, Honors Convocations, and Honorary Degrees Committee about the proposed merger of the committees. She noted the Professor Berger, who is a member of two of the committees, pointed out that the faculty members need to make decisions concerning the requirements for receiving honors. He noted that faculty members would be outnumbered on the proposed combined committee. Beck pointed out that only faculty members will be voting members of the combined committee when issues of policy or decisions about honors criteria or honorary degrees come up; the first two happen rarely, which is one reason for combining the committees.

Moeller stated that most committee members are not interested in taking on additional work. She noted that the committee members are talking about what the advantages and disadvantages will be if the committees are combined. She stated that she wants to hear what the committees decide and then she will report back to the Executive Committee and the Senate.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Conflict with Membership of Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee

Moeller stated that there is a conflict with the membership of the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee. She noted that there are members on the committee that are from the same college and the syllabus requires that each of the five members be from different colleges. She pointed out that this has occasionally occurred in the past.

Beck stated that the reason for having the members from different colleges is due to voting and minimizing the possibility for conflicts of interest when cases come up. She noted that a member of the committee may have to recuse themselves from voting if a case comes before them from someone within their college.

The Committee agreed that an election will need to occur to replace a member of the committee. Griffin pointed out that the Senate will need to approve the ballot. It was suggested that the motion to approve the ballot be declared as an emergency motion in order for the vote to be conducted quickly.

7.2 Faculty Salary Increases

Bradford asked if anyone has heard about the raises that some faculty members will be receiving to bring them up to the level of our peer institutions. Beck stated that this has already happened in the Institute. Bradford stated that he has heard that the Deans have the funding but have not acted on it. Beck stated that it has only recently occurred in the Institute.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Alloway, Bolin, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Beck, Moeller, Rapkin

Date: Wednesday, September 27, 2006

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

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

2.0 Vice Chancellor Franco

Vice Chancellor Franco stated that the campus recently hosted Parents Weekend with approximately 300 parents attending from 16 different states. He reported that the parents were very pleased with their visit and particularly enjoyed hearing how their kids are doing in the classrooms. He stated that he appreciated professors taking the time to participate in the event and hoped more faculty members will be involved next year.

Vice Chancellor Franco reported that he recently attended the Midwest Consortium for Service Learning. He noted that 25 institutions participated in the consortium. He stated that many professors have students involved in service learning and he is working with Dean Kean to see if there is much interest in establishing a service certificate program.

Vice Chancellor Franco stated that service learning has been around for a number of years but is getting more popular. He noted that this is service work that is done in the context of a discipline such as students in a psychology class working at a local clinic. He pointed out that some courses could be designated as service learning courses and students would receive credit for the work. He noted that learning experience can be applied in many different fields and if there is enough interest in establishing a service certificate program, he will pursue it.

Vice Chancellor Franco stated that he attended an AAUP meeting in Washington DC on academic freedom. He noted that one of the main topics of discussion was about withdrawing an invitation to a guest speaker that was invited to campus by either the university, faculty, or a student organization. He stated that the discussion centered on

what circumstances would have to occur in order to un-invite the speaker. He noted that a policy statement was drafted regarding this issue. He pointed out that the policy states that basically once you invite someone you should rarely un-invite them. The one issue that would justify withdrawing the invitation is safety, whether it is for the safety of the participants or the speaker. He noted that campuses need to weigh the reality of what the consequences can be if a controversial speaker is brought to campus.

Vice Chancellor Franco stated that mid-semester checks are currently going on. He stated that a number of programs for the students are taking place in the Union and he appreciates the faculty members getting involved. He pointed out that the mid-semester checks are a reminder to students of what they need to do with their classes.

Vice Chancellor Franco stated that he wants the campus to provide more activities for students, particularly for those under the age of 21. He noted that many of these students are saying that there are not enough things for them to do. He reported that there will be a tailgating party, without alcohol, in front of the Union when Nebraska plays against Texas. He stated that 4,000 – 5,000 students are expected to attend the tailgate party. He noted that the students have suggested doing a similar tailgate party for the basketball games as well.

Vice Chancellor Franco stated that there have been three fires recently, two in fraternity houses and one in an off campus apartment rented by students. He noted that two of the fires were at fraternity houses on campus and the other was off campus. He stated that one fire occurred due to a lightning strike and the other is still being investigated. He noted that he had the Fire Marshall inspect all of the fraternity and sorority houses on campus to make sure that all of the houses are safe.

Vice Chancellor Franco stated that he wants to reach out to other parts of the state and he is planning to travel throughout the state to meet prospective students. He noted that he wants to work on providing access to higher education to lower income students. He stated that he is working with the Grand Island schools to identify 50 low income students. The high schools will work with these students for four years to make sure they meet the requirements to attend the university. If they meet the standards the university will help them financially and the students will qualify for Pell grants.

Ledder noted that part of the criteria for these students is to be a first generation college student. He asked if the students also show academic promise. Vice Chancellor Franco stated that they do show academic promise and in Grand Island a math and English teacher have been identified who will work with these students throughout the four years they are in high school.

Scholz pointed out that it is good see these initiatives started. He asked if there are other things that Vice Chancellor Franco thinks needs attention. Vice Chancellor Franco stated that overall he has found the university to be in better shape than he thought. He noted that faculty members have been very involved with students. He pointed out that the Greek system is very good and he wishes that the good things that the Greek houses do would get more attention.

Bradford asked if there are any persistent concerns that the Vice Chancellor hears from students. Vice Chancellor Franco stated that one current concern is about the Safe Assignment program. He noted that students are supportive of the program but they want to see it used as an educational tool, not just a tool for punishing.

Stock pointed out that academic dishonesty seems to be spiking on campus and the Committee is looking into the idea of having an “XF” grade to indicate a student failed a course because they were caught cheating. Vice Chancellor Franco stated that the question is how to help students become better. He noted that some students make mistakes but we need to provide a learning environment for them. He speculated whether we need to educate students better about what is considered cheating. Ledder stated that the Committee has been discussing the issue and feels the university needs to have a clear definition of academic dishonesty. Vice Chancellor Franco stated that faculty members may need to spend more time educating students on what is considered academic dishonesty. Alloway stated that the Committee has had numerous conversations about the teaching aspect of Safe Assignment and looks at it as a teaching tool. He pointed out that it is getting harder for faculty members to know if they are bringing accurate charges of plagiarism against a student and Safe Assignment would help identify true cases of plagiarism. Ledder noted that there are some willful attempts by students to defraud the system and the faculty want to do something about this but the grade would only be used in egregious cases.

Flowers stated that a substantial number of faculty members seem to be unaware that our current student code of conduct (section 4.2) specifically *requires* that faculty report to Judicial Affairs as well as their department head or chair if an incident of academic dishonesty leads to a reduction in a student’s grade. He wondered how much additional value the “X” grade would provide if the current mandatory reporting policy was actually followed. Vice Chancellor Franco stated that he does not want to interfere with classes but faculty members should let Judicial Affairs know if there are cases of cheating.

Alloway stated that it was nice to hear that the campus is trying to do things to provide more activities for underage students. He noted that a candidate for the Director of the

Student Unions suggested having a night club in the union. It had all the trappings of a dance club but without the alcohol. Vice Chancellor Franco stated that there have been suggestions to keep the union open later at night.

Stock noted that the university received grant money to assist in curbing binge drinking. He asked if the grant is still going on and how it is enforced. Vice Chancellor Franco stated that the grant is for nine years and we are toward the end of the grant period. He stated that the efforts have had an impact. He pointed out that the good neighbor policy is having an effect. This is when university students and campus police work together to educate students about reducing noise in their neighborhoods and in being responsible neighbors.

Zimmers stated that he hopes the Vice Chancellor calls on extension faculty members when he travels throughout the state. He pointed out that the extension staff are very involved with 4H and can help with making contacts with prospective students. Vice Chancellor Franco stated that the extension personnel are already helping out and he plans to ask for their assistance in his travels.

Bradford stated that the recent incident with the Chemistry professor and conversations with ASUN gave the Committee the sense that students do not know where to go to report problems. He asked if there is anything we can do to make students more aware of what steps they can take. Vice Chancellor Franco stated that the best way is through faculty members. He stated that if faculty members can communicate what students can do, this would be helpful. He pointed out that students need to feel that they can report things without being penalized. He noted that having a student ombudsman would help.

Bradford asked if students are made aware of their academic rights during freshman orientation. Vice Chancellor Franco stated that they are but they are so bombarded with information that they often do not remember. Ledder suggested reminding them of their rights and encouraging them see the department chair during the mid-semester check.

3.0 General Education Planning Team – Review Results of Survey on Institutional Objectives (Professor Janovy, Professor Peterson, Professor Mitchell, Jessica Jonson, University-wide Assessment Coordinator)

A cross-tabular breakdown of the responses of the survey was distributed to the Committee. Flowers stated that the survey results show that there are no real areas of disagreement on the Institutional Objectives and overall there is a strong endorsement of the objectives.

Bradford stated that he was impressed with the response rate across the boards. He noted that in the small group discussions at the last Senate meeting there was concern over the use of the word “exercise” in the third objective. Janovy stated that members of the

General Education Planning Team (GEPT) and General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) had concerns as well.

Peterson reported that the committees are working on developing proposals that will go to the college curriculum committees on the institutional objectives and the outcomes. He noted that the results of the survey will help to determine some issues that faculty members might be concerned about. He pointed out that the difficulty will be in getting seven different colleges to ratify the revised program.

Janovy stated that the proposals are currently in an outline form and when it is presented the outcomes will be separated from the proposals. He noted that the proposed outcomes can be found on the web at (<http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/gened/outcomes.shtml>). Ledder asked if the outcomes were completed. Janovy stated that most of them are completed and he does not expect much further wordsmithing on them. He stated that the goal is to talk to the faculty about the outcomes in the beginning of October. Jonson noted that initially the committees thought the outcomes could be separate from the institutional objectives but they realized this could not be done.

Ledder stated that the Executive Committee would like to discuss the outcomes at the November 7th Senate meeting and possibly vote on a resolution to support the outcomes at the December 5th meeting. Janovy stated that it would be helpful if faculty members were sent a message to look at the website to review the outcomes. Peterson noted that faculty members should try to focus on the outcomes and not spend so much time focusing on whether their course fits the outcomes.

Ledder stated that he liked the idea of separating the outcomes from the structure of the general education program because it gets people to think about what students should know when they are finished with their education here. Peterson stated that the idea of the GEPT is to get people to agree on what we want to accomplish with the students' education. He pointed out that more faculty involvement in the revision process will help to shape the general education program at UNL.

Janovy stated that the committees are trying to move forward on the schedule as charged. He noted that there is a big body of conversation taking place about assessment of the general education courses. He stated that the committees are thinking about the idea of having a contract with the faculty member for general education courses. The idea is that the professor will require students to generate a product, or products, for the course and the professor will submit a few of these finished products as samples to the assessment database. He noted that there will be some education involved when this is first unveiled but this process will allow more faculty power in what goes on in the classroom which will

in turn alter the fundamental nature of the undergraduate experience. He pointed out that without some kind of assessment of the program, it will eventually wither away.

Ledder asked if professors can contract a course to meet a few of the outcomes. Peterson stated that the expectations are that the courses contracted would reinforce the institutional objectives and outcomes that apply to that course. Mitchell pointed out that the committees worked hard to make the outcomes not be discipline specific.

Ledder noted that there is a motion before the Senate to endorse the institutional objectives. Hopefully this will encourage the faculty to support the objectives.

Bradford stated that there is some question whether the Senate needs to approve the general education program. He stated that he looked at the state statutes and the Regents Bylaws and the Bylaws clearly states that “the faculties of each major administrative unit shall establish a governing agency for dealing with matters of interest to more than one college.” He noted that this would apply to the general education program because it is a matter of interest to more than one college therefore it should need Senate approval.

Ledder asked what would happen if only six of the seven colleges pass the general education program. Peterson stated that he is concerned with the Engineering College because of all its course requirements. Alexander stated that he thinks the revised program is needed and a lot of Engineering professors are already doing some of these kinds of courses.

Janovy stated that the next issue will be whether the faculty members will be willing to take the next step of generating the products for the assessment database. Stock asked if the contracts will be attached to the professor or the courses. He noted that in his department a number of professors can be teaching different sections of the same course. Janovy stated that the Deans were adamant that the contract be with the department. He noted that there has been some preliminary discussion on the contract. It has been suggested that 20% of the graded activities would be needed for the assessment database. He pointed out that students would know ahead of time which of their graded projects would be included in the database. He stated that currently the committees are thinking that at least two pieces of evidence of coursework should be included. He noted that the evidence could include the best performance in the class and the other could be one at the mid point of the class. Ledder stated that in the peer review project a minimal set of products was needed for the course to be assessed. This set included a paper with a low A grading and another with a low C grading. He stated that by knowing the subject matter of the course it can be determined how the class did in the course. Janovy noted that the idea is to have an outsider look at the course assignment and the rubric for it and then look at the assessments

to see if the course is on target for complying with the contracted outcome(s). Mitchell pointed out that the committees want to ensure that the process is as easy on faculty as possible.

Peterson stated that the Senate has been very helpful with getting the faculty involved with the institutional objectives and the survey has provided interesting information. He noted that the committees want to have open conversations about the general education program.

Bradford thanked the GEPT and GEAC committee members for all of the work that they are doing in trying to revise the program.

4.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

5.0 Approval of 9/20/06 Minutes

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

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Draft Motion on Spending Lid

Bradford stated that he is interested in getting comments from the Committee on the draft motion. He noted that he will be presenting the motion as a Senator so it did not need to be voted upon by the Executive Committee.

6.2 Status of Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee

Griffin reported that Professor O'Hanlon has agreed to switch from the Committee to the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Panel for the remainder of his term. She stated that President Moeller will replace Professor O'Hanlon on the ARRC with someone from the Panel.

Ledder stated that Professor Chouinard, Mathematics, has agreed to resign from the ARRC because he felt it was important to have a balance of female faculty members on the Committee. Griffin noted that an election will need to be held to replace Chouinard since he is resigning from a three year term. She stated that the Senate will need to approve the ballot which will be presented to them at the October 3rd Senate meeting.

6.3 Safe Assignment Evaluation Policy Committee

Flowers reported that he has been assigned to serve on the committee. He noted that the committee will try to develop a policy about usage of the Safe Assignment program. He stated that there is concern that guidelines should be developed on how instructors should

use the program.

Bradford asked if the program was available for students to use. Flowers stated that students can use the program only if the professor allows it. He pointed out that the new manual for the program clearly encourages professors to do this.

Bradford stated that he would like to see the program available for students to use, particularly if the idea is to encourage them to learn what is considered plagiarism. Ledder stated that he is uncomfortable with not giving a faculty member the choice on whether to allow students to put their draft papers through the Safe Assignment program. Stock agreed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday October 4, 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, Moeller, Ledder, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Bolin, Hachtmann, Rapkin, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, October 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

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

2.0 Matt Hecker, Director, Student Judicial Affairs

Moeller stated that the Committee wanted to get Hecker's input on academic dishonesty. She noted that UNL's policy on academic dishonesty is slim.

Ledder distributed copies of the academic dishonesty policies at several other institutions. He noted that some of the schools have an extensive definition of academic dishonesty. He noted that some of the policies include examples of what is considered academic dishonesty. He stated that there needs to be caution in just listing examples of academic dishonesty because there are different kinds of academic dishonesty and not all of them can be listed. Flowers suggested that a policy might want to include both examples and themes about academic dishonesty.

Alexander pointed out that if a new policy on academic dishonesty is created at UNL it needs to emphasize it for the whole academic community, not just students. He stated that it would be very hypocritical for administrators and faculty members to talk about academic dishonesty and then have one of them commit it. The Committee agreed.

Moeller noted that the Committee is considering an "XF" grade for students who fail a course because they have been caught cheating. She stated that the Committee wants to hear Hecker's views on this and what the Committee can do about it. She pointed out that the Committee plans to work with Vice Chancellor Franco and ASUN on it.

Hecker stated that three key strategies need to be approached in order to address the issue of academic dishonesty. The first is how we define academic dishonesty on this campus. The second strategy is education, how do we promote a new policy and let people know what the expected standards are. The third is how we deal with violations of the policy. He noted that currently violations seem to be dealt with differently in the colleges and even in the departments. Bradford pointed out that there are different procedures to deal with administrators and faculty members who are found guilty of academic dishonesty.

Hecker stated that if the current policy found in the Student Code of Conduct is modified, it will need Board of Regents approval. He noted that the Academic Senate and ASUN would need to approve and recommend the changes to the Chancellor and the Chancellor would then send it to the Board. He stated that he does not believe there would be a lot of student sentiment against a new policy. Alloway stated that the skepticism on the students' part might be due to not having a clear policy.

Moeller stated that she liked the idea of promoting a new policy as educational. Hecker stated that education is particularly important with the younger generation because they are so technologically savvy. He noted that many students think that if information is available on the internet than it is automatically public property. Bradford agreed and stated that it is easier to attribute a reference when it is taken out of a book.

Griffin stated that when a new policy is developed there could be a web page that clearly states the policy and also gives examples of what is considered academic dishonesty. This might help students who are unsure when writing a paper whether they are plagiarizing. Bradford pointed out that cheating on exams is a much clearer example of academic dishonesty as opposed to plagiarizing.

Hecker stated that a strong selling point for the "XF" grade is that it makes it clear what the grade is and why it is there. He pointed out that nothing like this exists here. He stated that a student could fail a course because of academic dishonesty but then retake it and no one would know. He stated that the difficulty of the grade is that you potentially blend academic and behavioral records. He noted that behavioral records are retained for seven years and he understands that the XF grade would not be retained. Bradford stated that this has been proposed if there are no further violations by the individual.

Bradford asked if Judicial Affairs keeps a record if a student is caught cheating and it is reported. Hecker stated that a record is kept. Bradford asked if a check is done to see if a student has cheated before. Hecker stated that his office would check to see if a student is a repeat offender.

Moeller asked how many cases of academic dishonesty are reported. Hecker stated that he does not know the exact number but would estimate that his office receives approximately 50 – 60 cases but he believes that most of the time violations are not reported. Ledder stated that having an XF grade on the grading sheet would make it easier to report violations.

Ledder asked who makes the decisions on whether there should be sanctions when a case is reported. Hecker stated that he makes the decision or a student can appeal the decision and it would go to the Judicial Board. He noted that 5 faculty members and 4 students make up the Board. Ledder stated that he would think that the Board would need to have a vote of 2/3 to assign an “XF” grade, this way there could not be a voting block.

Moeller asked if academic dishonesty has increased in the past five years. Hecker stated that it has.

Moeller stated that in her department if students are caught cheating they are given an option of what can be done about it but it is not reported to Judicial Affairs because of the hassle to do so. Ledder pointed out that this is probably why more cases are not reported. Beck stated that an “XF” grade might act as a deterrent for students because it is a very visible grade.

Zimmers asked what happens if a student is caught cheating more than once. Hecker stated that in these cases the student is almost always suspended. He noted that the typical suspension is for two academic terms. Alloway asked if they have to re enroll once the time period for the suspension has ended. Hecker stated that the students have to apply through Judicial Affairs.

Ledder asked what fraction of the suspended students tries to re enroll. Hecker stated that nearly all of them try re enrolling. He pointed out that the students usually recognize the opportunity they have in going to college and they realize that they do not want to throw it away.

Ledder asked how many cases of suspension are there typically in a year. Hecker stated that it is usually fewer than five. He noted that usually meeting with the student and explaining the academic consequences of being put on probation takes care of the situation.

Ledder stated that he wonders whether the number of violations will increase with the use of the “XF” grade but not necessarily the number of suspensions. Beck stated that faculty members need to report the violations. Hecker stated that he would like to see the numbers

of actual violations. He noted that recently a senior student was caught plagiarizing and he claimed that she did it throughout her college career and had not been caught. He stated that this is a telling comment indicating that there are many different styles and ways of dealing with the incidents.

Stock agreed that we need to encourage students to do more original work but he would be hesitant to stigmatize a student with a grade of “XF” if the case of academic dishonesty was not completely clear.

Moeller asked Hecker if he would support having an “XF” grade. Hecker stated that he would. He thinks it is a useful tool and he liked the idea that it would be easy to do with a grade that a professor can record. He pointed out that the issue would be what kind of process is available for students to petition the grade.

Hecker reported that the university is working on developing a web resource page on academic integrity. The website would include sample statements for instructors to use on their syllabus, tips on how to catch students cheating, and other samples. He stated that also being developed is the concept of having an academic integrity seminar for students who have been caught cheating. He noted that currently there is a seminar for violators of the alcohol policy and the academic integrity seminar would be similar.

Moeller asked what would be the best way to proceed. She suggested creating a task force consisting of students, faculty, members and members of the Judicial Affairs Office. Hecker stated that this would be the best strategy. He pointed out that this will need to have a strong sense of faculty support rather than it being developed by the administration.

Beck suggested that once a policy is developed, each department should be encouraged to list the policy webpage as a resource link on their website.

Hecker stated that before any webpage is put on the internet about this issue, he wants to present it to the Executive Committee to get input on it.

Moeller stated that she will create a task force and ask Matt Schaefer, President of ASUN, for students to serve on it. Beck suggested asking the Senators to see if anyone is interested in working on the task force. Ledder suggested having a representative from each of the colleges.

3.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

4.0 Approval of 9/27/06 Minutes

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

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Pending Motion on Merging the Commencement, Honors Convocations, and Honorary Degrees Committee

Moeller noted that in the Commencement Committee's annual report to the Senate they recommend that the Senate not merge the Committee with Honors Convocations and Honorary Degrees. She noted that one concern of the Committee's is that the faculty members could be a minority for voting purposes.

Beck pointed out that one point of merging the committees is to reduce the need to have faculty serve on so many committees. She noted that the Honors Convocation Committee only votes on policy changes and these changes are rarely made. Griffin suggested that an ad hoc committee be formed to deal with Honors Convocations policy changes when needed.

Ledder noted that the Honorary Degrees Committee was very different from the Commencement and Honors Convocations Committees. Beck stated that she would favor leaving the Honorary Degrees as a separate committee but combine the Commencement Committee and Honors Convocation Committee. She noted that the voting members of the combined committees can vote on honors convocations policies when they come up.

The Committee agreed that combining only the Commencement and Honors Convocations Committee was a good idea. Beck stated that she would revise the proposed syllabus and get it back to the Executive Committee.

Moeller stated that she wished there was a way to get more faculty members to attend Commencement. She noted that the Board of Regents members were very pleased to see the number of faculty members increased slightly this year.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Review of Senate Meeting

The Committee agreed that having condensed committee reports helped. The Committee agreed that the accreditation presentation was done well, although they are dismayed to see that the section in chapter 3 of the self-study report regarding the termination of tenured faculty members has not been changed to accurately reflect what occurred.

Beck suggested that the Committee might want to convey that it is not happy that this section of the report has not been accurately corrected. She pointed out that the Academic

Planning Committee also wanted this section corrected or removed. She stated that she understands that the Academic Planning Committee is planning to discuss this again.

Zimmers asked how many of the Executive Committee's suggested changes were made to the self study report. Moeller stated that some changes were made but not many. The Committee agreed that Moeller should contact Professor O'Hanlon and inform him that if the chapter is not corrected, faculty members will let the accreditation team know the error and their concern for the lack of faculty input into the study.

Alexander stated that he was surprised by the tone of the presentation coming from a faculty member and past Dean. He stated that one wants to be positive but not to a point where an outsider would consider this cheerleading. Moeller pointed out that Professor O'Hanlon feels very strongly that the university is doing a lot of things. She noted that in her discussions with Professor O'Hanlon he stated the he believes the self-study format is one that will help us improve without expending a lot of energy that is required with the traditional accreditation process.

Ledder stated that the report does not admit our shortcomings and problems that we will be facing in the future. He stated that he doesn't mind the truthful positive things in the report but it does not address where we need to go.

6.2 Parking by Anderson Hall

Alloway reported that Chief Yardley of the Campus Police spoke with faculty members of the College of Journalism and Mass Communications about the parking lot next to the building. Alloway stated that the police are considering closing the lot down on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights because of the mess left after the bars close. He stated that Chief Yardley reported that ticketing alone is not doing any good. He reported that a suggestion was made to have the lot monitored by having a toll booth similar to what they used to have in the parking lot behind the Temple Building. He noted that parking is not interested in doing that because it is not economical. He pointed out that the lot cannot be closed on Thursdays because of evening classes.

Griffin suggested having the cars towed from that lot on Friday and Saturday nights if they do not have a university hang tag. Alloway stated that the police are considering doing this.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, October 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 Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Bolin, Bradford, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alexander, Beck, Flowers, Rapkin

Date: Wednesday, October 11, 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 3:03 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Executive Committee to Meet with the Accreditation Team

Moeller reported that she sent Professor O'Hanlon an email message expressing the Committee's objection to the paragraph in the self study report referring to the vote of the faculty on the budget cuts. She noted that the Committee expressed concern during the summer about the inaccuracies of the paragraph and were disappointed that the changes were not made to the report. She stated that Professor O'Hanlon wants to meet with the Committee on October 25th to discuss the concerns. She noted that the Committee will also be scheduled to meet with the Accreditation Team during the team's visit in early November.

3.0 Approval of 10/4/06 Minutes

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

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Commencement and Honors Convocation Committee Merger

A copy of the syllabus of the proposed combined Commencement and Honors Convocation Committee was distributed to the Committee. Moeller noted that the faculty members of the combined committees will constitute a majority of the members of the committee. She pointed out that this was one of the concerns of the Commencement Committee over the first proposal to combine the two committees with the Honorary Degrees Committee.

Stock moved that the Commencement and Honors Convocation Committee syllabus be approved to replace the original proposal of combining the Commencement, Honors Convocation, and Honorary Degrees Committee. Ledder seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Moeller stated that she will send the members of the Commencement Committee a copy of the newly proposed syllabus.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Senate Voting on General Education Program

Bradford stated that in reading the provisions in the state statues it is clear that colleges have to vote on curriculum issues. He pointed out that while the Regents Bylaw states that each college has the power to determine requirements for graduation, the Regents Bylaws also state in 2.12.1. C under Responsibilities of Faculty Governing Agencies reads “Each agency shall have the following general responsibilities:... (c) Act on academic matters that affect more than one college.”

Moeller noted that having the Senate vote on the proposed general education program puts the governance back on the Senate. She asked what the procedures should be in voting on the program.

Ledder stated that he believed that the Senate should vote on the proposals first. He pointed out that at the college level there is no possibility for amending the proposal but this could be done at the Senate because it does not act in parallel with any other body on campus. He noted that he does not want to change the proposal but if concerns are found the faculty should have the opportunity of making amendments. Bradford stated that he did not think that there should be a possibility of amendments because the changes would probably not be significant enough to change the proposal.

Ledder stated that he thinks the GEPT and the GEAC would be in favor of having the Senate vote on the proposals. He noted that colleges could vote against the proposal but this could change if the Senate supports the proposal since the Senate is composed of representatives from units across the campus. He noted that in its motion the Senate could recommend that the colleges approve the proposal.

5.2 Draft Diversity Plan

Moeller questioned whether the diversity plan is supposed to be a part of the campus strategic plan. Bradford wondered whether it is an update of what we already have. Alloway suggested that if it is an update, a comparison between the original plan and this

one would be helpful, since references are made to the former plan.

Bradford pointed out that one of the quotes used in the draft plan are from a previous second draft from 1999. He questioned if the plan was ever adopted, and if not, why.

Stock stated that the English department advisory committee discussed the plan and raised concerns. He noted that there is pedagogically a way of teaching that challenges students to think and the plan appears to stifle that way of teaching. He stated that the tone of the plan is a problem.

Bradford stated that another problem with the plan is that they group different classifications of employees together in the same objective without acknowledging that things may be handled differently by the different classifications of employees. Ledder pointed out that there should be a distinction between the pedagogical environment and those environments that are not.

Ledder noted that some departments have already been very successful in improving their climate. He stated that those departments should not be told that they need to do a climate improvement plan.

Bradford pointed out that the plan calls for evaluating faculty and staff in areas where they have no control. He pointed out that some of the evaluation plans will not work in an academic collegial setting.

Bradford stated that the plan sounds like it is a quota program. Ledder noted that some of the goals the faculty and departments have little control over. He noted that it might be a good idea to try to meet the goal but the reality is that it cannot always be done. He pointed out that the mathematics department has tried hard to recruit minority faculty members and has not had as much success as they would like simply because the people are hired elsewhere for a variety of reasons. Bradford noted that the university can create equal opportunities but can not create equal results.

The committee agreed to meet with the committee that wrote the plan to discuss its concerns.

5.3 General Education Outcomes

Ledder stated that most of the outcomes are non-controversial but number 10 could create problems for some departments (to see the outcomes go to: <http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/gened/outcomes.htm>). Moeller pointed out that departments could get around number 10 by having a course that integrates what the students know.

Ledder asked if the Senate should conduct a survey on the outcomes before the structural criteria for the general education program is developed. He noted that the structural criteria are the rules that will determine how the outcomes will be satisfied by a student. Ledder pointed out that students will only be able to satisfy three of their outcomes in their major. He stated that the other outcomes will need to be satisfied with other courses.

Ledder noted that no department will have courses that can meet all of the outcomes. He pointed out that the purpose for the general education program is to get students to take courses in a variety of disciplines in order to give them a broader education. Moeller asked if the departments will identify which courses will meet specific outcomes. Ledder stated yes and pointed out that no course can be designated for more than two outcomes. He stated that a student can only claim credit for one of the outcomes from any one course, and in cases where a course can meet more than one outcome it will be up to the student to identify which of the two outcomes will be credited.

Zimmers asked if passing the course satisfies the requirement for the outcome. Ledder stated that he is not sure what the general education committees are planning. He stated that he thinks fulfilling the outcome requirement would be based on a particular assignment for the course rather than the whole course. He noted that a student in the class might receive a C for the course but not meet the criteria because the student received a D on the paper. Alloway suggested that creating additional grading and reporting work for faculty member might be met with resistance. Hachtmann noted that it would be difficult to explain to the students as well.

Scholz asked who would monitor whether students meet the outcome requirements. Ledder stated that the students would probably have to sign a form which would be retained by Registration and Records. Scholz asked if the instructor would have to report two grades, one for the course and one for the outcome. Ledder stated that this is a possibility. Stock pointed out that this should not be too difficult. He stated that instructors could receive a separate roster identifying students who are taking the course to meet an outcome requirement. Ledder noted that probably one assignment for the course will meet the outcome requirement and the grade on that assignment will be reported as evident of meeting that outcome.

Ledder noted that proposed structural criteria calls for the instructor to establish a plan that will demonstrate how the outcome will be met by the course. The Curriculum Committee will then decide whether the course is approved for meeting the outcomes identified and then a contract would be signed with the department. He noted that in order for the program to work the course must meet the outcomes and the students must meet the

requirements of the outcome in the course.

Scholz pointed out that having two grading systems seems overly complicated. Ledder noted that the grade for the outcome requirement would be a pass/no pass grade.

Scholz asked if there would be an appeals mechanism for students to dispute a grade on the outcome. Ledder stated that he thinks there would be. He pointed out that the Nroll system would need to be changed so students can indicate what outcome the course is going to meet for them.

Bradford stated that he can see students resisting the outcome requirement in part because it might be difficult for students to determine how the course will meet the outcomes. Moeller pointed out that the good assessment tools will need to be in place in order to explain to students why they received a certain grade.

Alloway questioned how outside activities such as internships will be factored into the outcome requirements. It was pointed out that students should be allowed to petition departments to get credit for outside experiences. Alloway noted that it may be difficult to evaluate whether outside experiences meet specific outcomes because they sometimes take place off campus and may not be monitored in the same way as a class. Moeller stated that a faculty committee would need to determine whether outside experiences meet the outcome criteria. Ledder pointed out that only a pass/no pass grade would need to be given.

Scholz wondered whether experiences predating enrollment, such as in the case of non-traditional students, would count. Ledder stated that he thinks that they might. He noted that part of the push for revamping the general education program is to help deal with transfer students. Bradford wondered whether some skills acquired in high school would count. Ledder stated that these kinds of things will need to be worked out by the committees.

Stock stated that he is unsure how some assignments could be measured to meet the outcomes. Ledder stated that group work could be an issue that needs to be considered.

Bradford pointed out that outcome number two is illegal because the use of the words oral and visual is a violation of the American Disabilities Act. He noted that instead it should read “demonstrate effective communication skills through the assessment and critical evaluation of information.”

Bradford questioned the use of the phrase “standards of evidence” in outcome number five. Stock noted that it is important not to get bogged down in the details.

Ledder volunteered to send Professor Janovy the Committee's feedback on the outcomes. He pointed out that the colleges will receive proposals on the outcomes and the structural criteria in December. He noted that a copy of the proposals will be sent to the colleges in a couple of weeks.

The Committee agreed that the Senate should discuss the outcomes at the November Senate meeting.

The Committee discussed when the survey should be designed and sent out. Moeller pointed out that before the survey is sent out there needs to be an explanation of the relationship between the objectives and the outcomes.

5.4 Search Committee for Dean of Arts and Sciences

Moeller reported that she sent an email message to the Chancellor reminding him that the UNL Bylaws state that the advisory committee shall be determined by the selecting officer in consultation with the elected heads of ASUN and the Academic Senate. She stated that she has asked the Chancellor when he wants the Executive Committee to provide a list of names for the committee. She noted that Senior Vice Chancellor Couture will be the selecting officer and Moeller will be meeting with her soon about the search committee.

The Committee suggested some faculty members for the search committee. Moeller stated that she will keep the Committee informed about the progress of the search committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:52 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, October 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 Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Alloway, Beck, Bradford, Bolin, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Scholz, Stock

Absent: Moeller, Rapkin, Zimmers

Date: Wednesday, October 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

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

2.0 Chancellor Perlman, SVCAA Couture, and VC Owens

2.1 Draft Diversity Plan

Bradford reported that the Committee has a lot of concerns about the draft plan. Chancellor Perlman stated that the draft plan was put out for the university community to discuss and provide feedback. He encouraged the Committee to get responses back soon on the plan. He noted that he wants to have a plan that the campus could adhere to.

Bradford asked if there will be a second draft after comments have been received. Chancellor Perlman reported that he is more interested in having conversations about what needs to be done because there is a plan in place already. He stated that there needs to be healthy conversations about where we are going with diversity. He pointed out that the campus cannot afford to do everything that needs to be done but we need to determine what steps need to be made in order to move the campus forward. He noted that there are good results with the increase in the number of assistant female faculty professor and the increase in diversity in the freshmen class. He stated that he hopes there will be a realistic plan about what else the campus needs to do.

2.2 Senate Voting on General Education Program

Bradford stated that the Regents Bylaws clearly states that the faculty governing agency of each major administrative unit shall “act on academic matters that affect more than one college.” He noted that the Executive Committee understands this to mean that the Senate will need to vote on the revised general education program since it is an academic matter

that affects more than one college.

SVCAA Couture stated that there are a number of issues that need to be discussed on this issue. She noted that her understanding of the Regents Bylaws is that the Senate works as an advisory committee. She pointed out that by law the colleges have to weigh in on the curriculum of their college. She stated that whatever action the Senate wishes to act on should not preempt the voting by the colleges.

Ledder pointed out that the Bylaws do not read that the Senate is an advisory committee on academic matters. The Bylaws read that the Senate acts on academic matters. SVCAA Couture stated that the Bylaws will be followed but the colleges should have the opportunity to exercise their vote first. Ledder stated that the Senate vote would be an additional requirement, not a replacement for the colleges voting. He stated that the Committee thought it might be best for the Senate to vote first to hopefully give some momentum to the proposed program.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the way things have worked is that the colleges have control of their curriculum. He stated that for purposes of the college curriculums if they vote yes on the new general education program then it will be approved. He noted that the effort is to try and get all of the colleges to agree to a university-wide program. Ledder asked if it is possible for all but one of the colleges to approve the program and if this happens, will the program go into effect for all but the one college. Chancellor Perlman stated that this is correct. He stated that he hopes that all of the colleges will approve the program because it would be much better for students who transfer from one college to another. He noted that this is one of the problems with the current program.

Ledder asked if the colleges will be able to amend the proposal. SVCAA Couture stated that technically all things are allowed but the GEAC and GEPT are trying to make everyone aware of the proposals and will get all of the differences worked out so that we can all come to an agreement on it. She stated that she thinks the Deans are committed to getting the word out on the programs.

Ledder stated that this is what the Senate is trying to do as well. He noted that the first step may be to get the Senate to either endorse or approve the program. He stated that the plan is to have the Senate vote on something in December such as what was done with the institutional objectives this month.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the general education program is actually not an area that crosses academic boundaries because it is an independent decision that will hopefully be done in a way that is coordinated. He stated that if the Senate believes that what the

committees have done is right then it should endorse the program or recommend that the colleges should approve the programs.

Ledder stated that he does not think the program is going to work out if Arts & Sciences votes no on the program and the other colleges vote for it. He pointed out that many of the outcomes of the program will be met by many courses in Arts & Sciences. Chancellor Perlman agreed that Arts & Sciences have had a traditional roll of providing courses for the general education program.

2.3 Gallup Survey Results

Chancellor Perlman stated that there will be a powerpoint presentation available on the web soon that shows the general results of the Gallup survey for the past three years. He noted that the presentation is for the campus as a whole and does not show results below the campus level. He stated that the presentation includes results based on race, gender, and sexual orientation. He noted that in large measures the results are pretty positive and there is a continued high response rate. He stated that overall the results have been pretty good.

Chancellor Perlman reported that facilitators will soon be going out to the colleges and departments to speak to them about their results. He stated that he hopes people will take the results seriously.

2.4 Issues on the Horizon

Initiative 423

Chancellor Perlman stated that he wanted to talk carefully about Initiative 423. He noted that if the Initiative passes the consequences to the university would be extraordinarily negative. He reported that the polling data is mixed right now with some indications showing that there are more people in favor of the Initiative. He noted that this is particularly true for western Nebraska. He stated that he wanted to encourage faculty and staff members to vote in the election. He noted that people should take seriously the information about Initiative 423. He stated that the Initiative has definite implications for the university.

Bradford pointed out that the Senate took a position against the Initiative at the October 3rd Senate meeting but the press was not there to take note of this. Beck noted that reporters could contact us about it. Chancellor Perlman stated that there has not been much press coverage of the issue because the focus has been on a lot of the other races.

Family Friendly Policies

SVCAA Couture stated that an ad hoc committee, comprised of deans and faculty members, has been reviewing the existing campus family friendly policies and have developed a draft as requested by Chancellor Perlman. She stated that the policies seek to help faculty members who are dealing with family issues. She distributed copies of the draft policy.

SVCAA Couture stated that the Chancellor is working with Central Administration to review current University-wide policies. She noted that Central Administration's plan is to create brochures about the family friendly policies so faculty members can easily find information on them.

SVCAA Couture stated that she would like to get the Senate's input on the suggested draft. She asked if the Committee could get a response back in a couple of weeks.

SVCAA Couture stated that the first proposal is to extend the right for faculty members to apply for modified duties. She noted that the half-time tenure track policy is "permission to be on a reduced FTE tenure clock, at .5 FTE, may be granted only when the faculty member has significant familial demands, or for personal circumstances related to the health of the faculty member. In any request under this policy, the faculty member must represent that the requested reduced FTE tenure clock is necessary for reason of significant familial demands or personal health." She pointed out that there is already a similar policy in place but this would be an effort to capture the policy in a way that would help those with family issues that might interfere with their job.

SVCAA Couture stated that what is new with the proposed policy is that people can apply for a half-time, tenure track appointment. She noted that there are some restrictions on when this can be done. She stated that a faculty member who applies through the appropriate channel would be put on a .5 FTE. She pointed out that the proposal also describes other requirements that address how the tenure clock will be dealt with.

SVCAA Couture stated that this first recommendation for family friendly policy is an extension of the existing policy. She pointed out that the half-time tenure track option is currently not available.

Bradford asked if the AAUP tenure clock is based on six years of full-time equivalency in academic years or is it based on calendar years. He wondered whether this could create a problem with the policy. SVCAA Couture stated that she will ask the committee to look into this matter.

Beck noted that pre-tenure faculty members have been put on half-time duties before. Vice

Chancellor Owens pointed out that this has been done on an ad hoc basis. SVCAA Couture stated that it has not been an available standard opportunity before and if the proposal is approved, it would be standard.

Scholz asked if faculty members would have to make the request annually. He also asked if the faculty member can go back to full-time status if the family situation changes. SVCAA Couture stated that applying for the modified duties would not have to be done on any given year. She noted that the issue of whether the faculty member can return to full-time would need to be negotiated.

Bradford stated that the Executive Committee will discuss the proposed at its next meeting.

Accreditation of Veterinary Program

Vice Chancellor Owens reported that the Veterinary Association will arrive on campus for the accreditation of the new veterinary program with Iowa State. He noted that the accreditation team will then go to Iowa State to complete the accreditation review. He stated that the accreditation process is moving faster than he thought. He stated that the program is busy filling appointments for the program. He noted that the program has attracted national attention. Beck reported that students are very excited about the new program.

Vice Chancellor Owens reported that there is a new faculty member in Agricultural Economics, Professor Lubben, who has written a background paper about Initiative 423. Vice Chancellor Owens noted that the paper is just an analysis of the Initiative and it can be found on the web at <http://agecon.unl.edu/pub/initiative%20423.pdf>.

Chemistry Professor

Bradford asked what the status is with the chemistry professor who was suspended this semester. Chancellor Perlman stated that he is dealing with the matter. He noted that there has been some delay in the decision making process but this has been for legitimate reasons. He stated that some decisions will be made soon. He reported that the professor is still suspended from the university.

Professor Ari

Alloway asked if the university has heard anything about Professor Ari's request for a visa. Chancellor Perlman stated that the university has heard nothing further on the case. He noted that a considerable period of time has elapsed and inquiries have been made on our behalf but the university has still had no response.

State Fair Property

Chancellor Perlman stated that he has seen some debate with the State Fair Board and the university's interest in the state fair grounds property. He noted that the university would be very interested in the property only if there was a way to move the state fair grounds to North 84th street in a way that would be advantageous to the State Fair Board. He pointed out that university planning would be very long term and currently the university needs to deal with the Antelope Valley Project. He pointed out that in the future the university will need to look for land.

Bradford asked if the City of Lincoln has looked at the state fair grounds to build an arena. Chancellor Perlman pointed that there is not much room out there and it is in the flood plains. He stated that only about 60% of the land could be captured.

Alloway asked if there is enough room on 84th street to relocate the state fair grounds by the Lancaster Events Center. Chancellor Perlman noted that most of the land around the Events Center is owned by the university and used for agricultural research. He stated that he has seen three drawings of how the fair grounds would fit out there. He noted that there are flood plain issues that would need to be addressed.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Beck Departure

Beck announced that she has accepted a position at Clemson University as department chair of the Animal and Veterinary Sciences program and will be leaving UNL in January.

4.0 Approval of 10/11/06 Minutes

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

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Communicating with the Public About the Work of the Faculty

Alloway noted that the Committee discussed what the university can do across the state to communicate better about the work of the faculty. He suggested that the Committee needs to discuss this further. Beck agreed. Bradford questioned whether this is the kind of thing that needs coordination by the administration to help do. The Committee discussed what could be done. It was suggested that the Committee might want to meet with reporters from the Lincoln Journal Star and the Omaha World Herald to discuss the issue.

Beck noted that last year there was discussion about inviting the Museum faculty to meet with the Committee to discuss how the collections are faring since the elimination of the Museum Studies program. The Committee agreed to discuss the issue further.

5.0 New Business

No new business was discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, October 25 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, Bolin, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Rapkin

Date: Wednesday, October 25, 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 3:03 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Computational Services and Facilities Committee

Flowers reported that the committee recently met and is discussing the need to update the charge and syllabus of the committee. He noted that the responsibilities and charge of the committee have not been changed in fifteen years and they need to be updated and restructured. He stated that the committee is hoping to prompt better communication between the Senate, the committee, the administration, and others on campus.

2.2 Letter from the College of Architecture

Moeller reported that she received a letter from faculty members in the College of Architecture who are opposed to the changes to the Senate Bylaws because they are concerned with having adequate representation in the Senate. The letter pointed out that the College was pressured into reorganizing by creating four programs and eliminating departments but was told that they would not suffer unduly because of the restructuring. The faculty members in the College of Architecture are concerned that they would lose a representative to the Senate.

Bradford pointed out that the changes to the Bylaws actually protect colleges that are being restructured because it ensures that each college will have two representatives, and if there are more than 50 faculty members, the college will have three representatives. He volunteered to write a letter to the faculty members in the college to address their concerns.

2.3 Teaching Academic Integrity

Zimmer stated that he received an email message from a faculty member who stated that the issue of academic dishonesty should be addressed from a positive approach rather than a negative, punitive approach. The faculty member suggested that freshmen students should be taught academic integrity in freshmen required courses and they should be taught how to distinguish credible sources on the web and how to accurately reference other sources of information.

Bolin noted that the Library freshmen course addresses some of these issues.

2.4 Safe Assignment Committee Meeting

Flowers reported that the Safe Assignment Committee will be meeting on Monday, October 30th.

Alexander asked if there was some way that a thesis or dissertation could be checked using Safe Assignment without having to put a fake course into the program. Moeller noted that the program should be readily available for those who want to use it, regardless of whether it is for a course or just to check a paper. Flowers stated that he believed the program can be set up to allow people to check papers regardless of whether they are for a regularly scheduled course.

Bradford asked why a faculty member has to go through Blackboard to use the program. He asked if the program can be used from Safe Assignment's own site. Bolin stated that she would check to see whether these concerns can be addressed by the Safe Assignment program.

3.0 Approval of 10/18/06 Minutes

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

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Arts & Sciences Dean Search Committee

Moeller reported that she met with SVCAA Couture and brought the list of faculty members that the Executive Committee identified as possible members of the search committee. Moeller noted that the list was composed from input from the members of the Committee as well as several other people on campus. She noted that there were four faculty members who were on both the Committee's list and SVCAA Couture's list. Moeller reported that she and SVCAA Couture were eventually able to identify 19 possible search committee members. Moeller stated that the actual committee will have 9 – 11 people on it. She pointed out that the UNL Bylaws state that there needs to be twice as

many names on the potential list of candidates for the search committee.

Beck stated that she hopes that SVCAA Couture will consult with the Executive Committee again if a number of potential candidates are unable to serve on the committee. Moeller noted that SVCAA Couture wants to have a lot of the members be from the College of Arts & Sciences. Moeller pointed out that the faculty members must make up a plurality of the committee members.

4.2 NCA Accreditation

Moeller stated that Professor O'Hanlon volunteered to come and talk to the Committee about its concerns with the self-study report. She pointed out that the Committee is also scheduled to meet with the accreditation team on November 6th.

Professor O'Hanlon noted that the team is coming in on Sunday, November 5th. The team will meet with the Chancellor first and the rest of the visit is organized into five tracks. He stated that he did not expect the meetings to be tightly bound regardless of the track it is in and all kinds of matters could be addressed in the meetings.

Professor O'Hanlon stated that there will be open meetings for students as well as a luncheon with representatives from ASUN. He noted that there will also be open meetings for staff and faculty members.

Professor O'Hanlon stated that there will be many meetings but there will also be room for the team to have additional meetings if they desire. He pointed out that the team has to verify the self-study report.

Professor O'Hanlon reported that there will be an exit report on Wednesday. He stated that the report by the accreditation team will take nine to ten weeks to be completed after their visit.

Moeller asked if everything the team needs to see is on line so that the team can review it before they come. Professor O'Hanlon stated that there will be two work rooms for the teams and laptop computers will be provided along with a USB scan disk with the report on it.

Professor O'Hanlon stated that the Executive Committee is meeting with the track that covers the broadest chapters of the self-study report. He noted that this will allow the

Committee to discuss many issues with the team.

Professor O'Hanlon reported that the deans will need to have examples of their strategic planning when they meet with the team and they are allowed to bring in additional people to the meetings. He noted that the Academic Planning Committee is meeting with the team and its first task will be to explain to the team what their role is on campus.

Moeller noted that the Committee has particular concerns over the section of the report that addresses the firing of tenured faculty members during the budget crisis. She pointed out that this section does not give an accurate account of what transpired during this time period.

Beck summarized the concerns of faculty members as follows: she stated that faculty members are concerned with the way the report was written because it appears that the firing of tenured professors was a strategy for protecting undergraduate education. She stated that the paragraph does not reflect the reality of the situation. She pointed out that this solution for dealing with the budget cuts did not have the full review from the Academic Planning Committee and some of the things that transpired happened over the objections of the APC. She noted that the response in favor to the question of faculty support for the cuts is quite misleading because the questions posed were confounded. She pointed out that firing tenured professors hurt UNL's reputation nationally even to the point that some faculty members were subjected to negative fallout at national conferences. She stated that this section of firing tenured faculty members should not be written as if it were a good thing.

Professor O'Hanlon stated that the team will be meeting with the faculty members who served on the APC during the budget cutting period.

Moeller read a copy of an article from the Lincoln Journal Star which indicated that the AAUP did not think guidelines were adequately followed during the budget crisis. Beck indicated that the article cites Roger Bowen, current general secretary of the AAUP, who was in Lincoln in 2004; he was not the general secretary at the time of the budget cuts.

Professor O'Hanlon stated that the Committee is free to bring up the issue to the team. He stated that he did not know whether the team will even mention this section.

Moeller stated that she thinks the role of the Committee is to talk about some of the good things that have happened on campus as well as some of our needs. She pointed out that the issue concerning the budget cuts will not be the central mission of the Committee's meeting with the team but the team needs to understand the context of what happened.

Beck stated that she appreciates the Committee being scheduled to meet with the team. Professor O'Hanlon noted that we are doing a lot of good things here at UNL. He stated that he did not know how much is going on here until he got involved in working on the self-study report.

4.3 Family Friendly Policies

Moeller noted that the proposal is to allow a faculty member to have his/her FTE tenure clock reduced to .5 FTE when there is significant familial demand or for personal circumstances related to the health of the faculty member.

Ledder questioned the tuition remission policy and why a family member enrolled part-time is not eligible for the tuition remission. Bradford noted that this is a restriction made by the Board of Regents. Ledder stated that a spouse should be able to take an evening course under tuition remission. He pointed out that the existing policy is not that family friendly. Bradford noted that the current policy is an improvement over the previous policy which only gave tuition remission to the employee.

Ledder stated that he liked the proposal for the half-time tenure track. He noted that it allows people to better integrate their professional life with their personal life for a short period of time when there are significant personal stresses. He pointed out that the university does not seem to suffer from it and it would benefit the individual faculty member.

Bradford questioned whether the Modified Duties proposal is a substitution of the existing policy or a modification. He pointed out if the proposal is meant as a substitution it is more limiting than the existing policy. He noted that the proposal introduces the possibility of reallocating faculty members duties until they return to full-time status.

Ledder pointed out that the proposal does not address tenure clock interruption. He stated that the proposal should be added as an alternative policy to the existing policy.

Bradford questioned why the faculty member using the new policy can only be partially reduced for an entire semester. He noted that in the existing policy the primary care giver can get full release.

Alexander pointed out that in reality what happens is that a lot of people pick up the duties of the people on release without getting any extra compensation for the increased workload. He noted that if a faculty member is on half-time duties, then some of the money from the salary line should be given to those people who pick up the extra duties.

Ledder questioned what would happen if a faculty member only needed a month on part-time duties rather than a whole semester. He wondered whether there is any alternative for this need. Alexander pointed out that in some cases what was supposed to be only a few weeks or month leave turns into a three month leave. He pointed out that the policy could be abused.

Alexander stated that money needs to be made available to compensate anyone who picks up the additional duties of the faculty member who is going half-time. Ledder noted that number six of the policy states that “the first priority for salary savings realized from a reduction in FTE will be to cover any resulting instructional needs.” Beck stated that in the past some female faculty members had to pay for substitutes out of their own pocket in order to take leave. Moeller pointed out that there was no unified procedure on this but it was supposed to be negotiated in the department.

Moeller asked if there were any objections to the new policy. Bradford stated that he is concerned that there could be violations with the AAUP on the tenure clock. He noted that the AAUP policy on the tenure clock is phrased in terms of full-time faculty members. Flowers noted that the AAUP guidelines are ambiguous about half-time faculty members.

Bradford questioned how it will be ensured that the policy is not abused by administrators. Ledder noted that the policy should only apply to faculty members who are already employed here. Beck stated that it could be written into the policy that it would only apply if it is requested by the faculty member. Ledder stated that someone could be coerced into working half-time. Bradford stated that the policy could be abused by forcing people to accept half-time employment or risk not getting tenure. He noted that the AAUP states that the probationary period for full-time faculty members should not exceed seven years. He pointed out that the proposal would appear to violate this policy.

Beck suggested that we ask AAUP for an opinion on the matter. She noted that she did not think a faculty member could drop below 80% and retain a tenure-track position. Bradford pointed out that AAUP has a new standard on part-time faculty members but not on half-time tenure track faculty members.

Moeller noted that SVCAA Couture will be contacted to see if the proposal is a supplement or a replacement for the existing policy.

4.4 General Education

Ledder noted that the structural criteria have been revised by the GEAC by reducing the number of criteria from ten to nine. Bradford stated that it appears that number ten has

been merged into point number one.

The Committee discussed the concerns of a faculty member about the proposed new program. Ledder suggested that we shouldn't be mandating a liberal education for all colleges. He cited the College of Engineering as an example. Bradford pointed out that the university does not require all students to graduate with a liberal arts degree.

Ledder stated that there seems to be a philosophical difference between the existing ES/IS program and the proposed achievement-centered education program. He noted that the philosophy behind the existing program is for students to take courses across the disciplines while the proposed program is designed to help students to attain skills and knowledge. Moeller pointed out that the proposed program is a paradigm shift in the philosophy of general education.

Bradford stated that there are courses that could certainly meet more than two outcomes.

Moeller stated that the Senate will discuss the outcomes and the structural criteria at the November Senate meeting. She asked whether a motion should be made similar to that done in October on the institutional objectives. Ledder stated that he thinks another resolution should be introduced in November which endorses the outcomes and structural criteria. He noted that the Senate would not vote on the motion until the December Senate meeting.

Alexander questioned why the colleges are not voting on the entire general education program at once. He noted that the College of Engineering is concerned with the assessment portion of the program. Ledder stated that he can ask this at the open forum. Bradford pointed out that by presenting the program in sections it gives the faculty members a basic idea of what we want students to learn and the proposal can be modified easier if it is done in steps.

Ledder noted that there are the structural criteria now but there needs to also be a structural mechanism. He pointed out that implementation and assessment mechanisms need to be developed next.

4.5 Possible Meeting with Melissa Lee, Lincoln Journal Star, and Matt Hansen, Omaha World Herald

Moeller suggested that members of the Nebraska Press (Melissa Lee, Lincoln Journal Star, Matt Hansen, Omaha World Herald, and the Daily Nebraskan) be invited to meet with the Committee to discuss how articles could be written about the work faculty members are doing. She suggested that Committee members provide examples of research and work

conducted by faculty members that may be of interest to Nebraska citizens.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Draft Diversity Plan

Item postponed until next week due to lack of time.

5.2 ASUN Syllabus Policy

Moeller reported that Greg Gifford of ASUN is seeking an Executive Committee member to work with him on creating a syllabus policy. Ledder volunteered to work on the policy.

5.3 Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee Meeting

Beck reported that the FCAC met this week. She stated that the committee discussed the reports that will be prepared for the spring such as the peer comparison report which will show how salaries have changed over a period of time. She noted that there was a lot of discussion about the gender equity report. She stated that the reports in the past have shown no statistical differences in salaries between men and women but it is unclear what data is actually being put in. She reported that Institutional Research and Planning are going to run some alternative models. She stated that the model being used for the minority report will be looked at. She stated that a report on ethnicity has also been requested.

Beck stated that there will be two meetings in the spring. The first will be to discuss the data from the various reports and the second one will be to discuss the recommendation that will be made to the Chancellor on how faculty salaries should be distributed.

Bradford noted that there will also be a comparison report on retirement data.

Beck stated that SVCAA Couture indicated that there is the possibility that a proposal will be made to award promotions to faculty members differently than the flat rate they have been receiving. Bradford noted that one proposal is to protect lower paid faculty members and will be based on either a minimum or a percentage increase, whichever is greater. Beck pointed out that UNL stacked up well against our peer schools in terms of promotion raises. She stated that it used to be that raises were given if a college could afford it but now it is taken out of the salary pool.

5.4 General Education Open Forums

Moeller stated that the General Education Forums will be held from 10:30 – 12:00 on City Campus at the Union and from 1:00 – 2:30 on East Campus at the Union this Friday, October 27th. She encouraged Committee members to attend one of the forums.

5.5 NCA Accreditation Team Meeting

Moeller reminded the Committee that they will be meeting with the accreditation team on Monday, November 6th at 3:30 in the City Campus Union, Room 213.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, November 1st at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 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, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alexander, Bolin, Rapkin, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, November 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

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

2.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

3.0 Approval of 10/25/06 Minutes

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

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Diversity Plan

Stock reported that he is bothered by the limited process that was used in creating the plan. He noted that the language used in the plan is smug and pompous and in some instances is dangerous. He stated that the merits of diversity identified in the plan are superficial. He noted that objective 1.1 could be interpreted as opposing those instructors who take a provocative stance in teaching in order to challenge and make students think. He pointed out that the plan does not address diversity of ideas or awareness of political or philosophical ideas. He questioned the procedures and wondered what the next stages are for the plan.

Bradford noted that there appears to be some discrepancies with what the administration is saying regarding the plan. He noted that the deadline date for comments was set for October 31st yet the Chancellor stated that the plan was just a draft for discussion.

Stock noted that many departments are already doing some of the things that are mentioned

in the plan. Bradford pointed out that the Chancellor stated in the October 18th Executive Committee meeting that there is a diversity policy but it is not working well. Bradford stated that the Chancellor indicated that he is not expecting to adopt a plan right away.

Bradford pointed out that there were hardly any faculty members on the committee that wrote the report. Flowers noted that what is missing from the plan is how it works with academics.

Moeller asked how the Committee wants to respond on the plan. Ledder stated that Professor Moshman's critique was very good and suggested that the Committee endorse it. He noted that the Committee should focus on the process and the structure of the committee that wrote the report. Bradford pointed out that it is unclear whether the writers of the report are involved in entire the process. He noted that, as he understands it, the comments are to go to the Chancellor and the Chancellor is supposed to make the adjustments to the plan.

Moeller noted that the Committee is scheduled to meet with the writers of the plan on November 29th.

Ledder suggested that the Senate could take a position on the process that was used to write the plan. He noted that there could be a motion calling for full dialogue on the plan.

Ledder stated that there should be more faculty members on the committee. Beck stated that there are a number of groups on campus, such as the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women, who should be interested in the plan.

The Committee agreed that a letter should be sent to the Chancellor explaining that we have some serious concerns with the plan. Moeller stated that she would draft a letter and send it to the Committee for input.

Bradford pointed out that the document clearly needs more academic viewpoints. Ledder stated that it would be helpful to have someone on the committee whose teaching program addresses the issue of diversity in the classroom.

Zimmers asked if the plan is based on plans at other universities. Stock stated that he guessed that it was assembled from some existing documents somewhere.

Alloway noted that it is the mission of the Senate to encourage discussions on things such as the diversity plan. Bradford suggested inviting Professor Moshman and the members of the committee that wrote the plan to the November 7th Senate meeting where the plan will

be discussed.

4.2 Opinions on Strategic Planning

Beck noted that members of the Committee are meeting with the NCA accreditation team next week and it would be helpful to know what people are thinking regarding how the strategic planning is being handled in their units. She asked if the process is working.

Beck noted that she has not seen any real planning being done. Ledder stated that the Mathematics department has a strategic plan that it uses regularly.

Beck asked how the strategic planning process is going campus wide. Bradford noted that the Dean of the Law College created a plan and discussed it with the faculty. Flowers stated that in Psychology a lot of time was initially spent on the strategic plan but not so now. He pointed out that the strategic planning was supposed to be an iterative process that was based on feedback but no one has seen any of the feedback. Moeller stated that the strategic plan in her college was built off of the accreditation of the college two years ago. She noted that the faculty members reviewed the plan in a faculty meeting but she has not heard of any feedback about the plan. Alloway and Hachtmann stated that they have not heard anything recently about the plan.

Ledder stated that he has a sense that resources, to a certain extent, are tied into the strategic plan. He noted that if a chair wants to hire a new faculty member he/she has to demonstrate how this hire fits into the strategic plan.

4.3 Changes to Employee Benefits Committee

Beck stated that the main change to the Employee's Benefits Committee is to have five of the faculty members on the committee include the Past President of the Senate and the four other faculty members appointed to the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee. Bradford moved that the changes to the committee be accepted. Ledder seconded the motion. Griffin asked if the changes would take effect next September. Bradford stated this is correct. Motion approved by the Executive Committee.

4.4 Draft Motion on General Education Outcomes and Structural Criteria

Moeller noted that good points were raised at the open forum on general education. Beck stated that the open forum on east campus was not heavily attended with only about six faculty members present. Moeller noted that some departments are actively meeting and discussing the program.

Ledder stated that many of the courses are already doing what is required to meet the general education courses. He pointed out that there is no definite statement about what

portion of the course has to meet an outcome. He stated that the proposals going to the colleges should include a section of frequently asked questions. He noted that the general education committees are working on this.

Ledder stated that there are some concerns from faculty members that the Senate is pushing the general education program. He asked if it isn't better that the Senate, which is composed of faculty members from all of the colleges, pushes this rather than the administration? Moeller pointed out that it is better if the faculty does this before someone else does it for us. She noted that the campus is acting on what is occurring across the country at other universities dealing with revising their general education programs.

Ledder noted that the motion will be presented to the Senate but not voted on until December. He suggested that the Senate should discuss the motion in November so people can talk about it with their colleagues in their departments. Moeller proposed having small group discussions at the Senate meeting. Ledder stated that perhaps questions that were raised at the open forum can be introduced at the Senate. He offered to put together a brief list of minor clarifications on the proposals.

Ledder pointed out that the current ES/IS program is something that is in between a university-wide general education program and each college's program. He stated that the new program has components that are university-wide but individual colleges could then expand the requirements for graduation in that college. He noted that there will not be an exhaustive set of requirements for the program. He stated that the committees did not want to make a program that was so big that the colleges could not add their requirements to it.

Ledder made the motion to accept the resolution, Beck seconded the motion. Motion approved.

4.5 Senate Survey on General Education Outcomes and Structural Criteria

Moeller asked if we should conduct a survey on the outcomes and structural criteria similar to the survey that was conducted on the institutional objectives. Ledder stated that he thinks a survey should be conducted but he is not sure what questions should be asked. He pointed out that it would be nice to know if the faculty members are aware of what is going on with the proposed program. He stated that approving the outcomes and structural criteria is just approving the first two elements of the program and it does not mean that the program will go into effect. All four proposals will need to be approved by the colleges before a new general education program is in place. Flowers pointed out that he does not think this information is getting through to the department level although there have been some discussions in some departments.

Ledder suggested that the Senate conduct a simple survey asking how conversant the faculty member is on the general education program. Other questions could be whether the faculty members think they have enough information on the program, whether they plan to vote, and whether they have participated in conversations related to the new program. He stated that the survey would be designed to get information out rather than to get people's opinions.

4.6 Reduction in Force Procedures

Beck stated that she will be getting a message out to the committee that worked on the reduction in force procedures to schedule a meeting. She noted that she hopes the committee can have a revised draft some time in December. She pointed out that there needs to be good procedures in place, especially should Amendment 423 pass.

4.7 Meeting with Members of the Press

Alloway reported he recently met with colleagues in the news-editorial discipline to discuss the idea of the Committee meeting with some Lincoln and Omaha newspaper reporters to discuss the work of the faculty. He noted that they were in favor of this and that they suggested we also ought to contact newspaper editors and broadcast news directors from smaller communities across the state, since they are often looking for stories. Ledder stated that he thought anything that combines service with teaching should be a good thing to report. He noted that students from particular areas of the state could be highlighted.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Senate Meeting

Moeller noted that the Senate meeting will be on Tuesday, November 7th in the City Campus Union. The Committee discussed how to address the general education outcomes and structural criteria at the meeting under section 4.4.

5.2 Parking Privileges for Emeriti Professors

Moeller reported that she received an email message from a faculty member who was concerned with parking for emeriti professors. She noted that Griffin communicated with Dan Carpenter, Director of Parking and Transportation Services, and provided information about the parking policy for emeriti professors. This policy can be found on the web at <http://parking.unl.edu/permits/index.shtml#Permittypes> under the Special Parking Permits section. Moeller pointed out that emeriti professors can get special parking permits.

5.3 Report on Meeting with President Milliken

Moeller noted that the presidents of the faculty senates from each of the campuses meet twice a year with President Milliken. She reported that information on the university strategic plan was distributed at the meeting. She noted that President Milliken stated that

the university plan will not compete with the campus plans but it will be a cohesive plan for the university based in part on the campus plans. Beck stated that President Milliken's presentation to the Board of Regents in the spring linked the budget and strategic plan together very well. She noted that it was very instructive to see how everything was pulled together to form a cohesive plan.

Moeller reported that other topics of discussion were the general education program and the recent events that occurred at the UNO campus. She stated that UNK has already started their new general education program. She reported that it was enlightening to hear what was going on at the other campuses and she is planning to meet with the other presidents periodically.

Beck asked if President Milliken discussed the Programs of Excellence and how he intends to coordinate them. Moeller stated that this was not discussed. She noted that President Milliken wants to come to each of the campuses to visit with the faculty senates.

Moeller reported that President Milliken wants to see a cohesive climate survey for each of the campuses and would like to do an overall climate survey. Beck noted that the Cooperative Extension service in Washington DC has a very good survey tool to look at climate issues. She suggested it might be worth looking at.

5.4 AAUP Report

Moeller stated that Professor Haller, English, sent an email message with a link to the new AAUP report on gender equity. She noted that the report provides four measures of gender equity. The report can be found at: <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/research/geneq2006>

Beck stated that the report provides tables that break down the figures between part-time and full-time faculty members and by tenure status. She noted that the report shows that overall women's salaries at UNL are 78.5% of the men's salaries. She stated that the percentage is better for assistant (92.9%) and associate professors (96.8%). Ledder pointed out that the figures have to be weighted by the number of people that are in the categories.

Bradford stated that the university's statistical model shows there are no significant differences between the salaries at UNL. Beck stated that the university's model does not take into account several factors. She stated that the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee wants Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) to run some other models and to do a longevity study.

Ledder stated that another problem with the data is that a correction has not been made for

the department that a person is in. He stated that it is a fact that there are more women in English than there is in Electrical Engineering. He stated that the question needs to be asked whether a faculty member is getting paid more because of the department they are in. Beck stated that IRP will run the study on some units but won't do it on the small units because it is easy to identify individuals' salaries. Bradford pointed out that the faculty salaries are public information anyway and this should not stop IRP from doing a study on all units.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:56 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, November 8 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Beck, Bolin, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alexander, Rapkin, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, November 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

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

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Email Message about Committee Changes

Moeller reported that she received an email message from a senator asking if the Committee on Committees had a chance to review and approve the proposed changes to the Commencement and Honors Convocation Committees and the UNL Employee Benefits Committee. The senator pointed out that the Executive Committee should not bypass existing committees in order to get things done quickly. Moeller stated that she informed the senator that the changes to the Commencement and Honors Convocation Committees were approved by the Committee on Committees but it is not clear whether the committee reviewed the changes to the Employees Benefits Committee. She stated that the Committee on Committees is meeting on November 17th and will review the changes to the Employee Benefits Committee.

3.0 Approval of 11/1/06 Minutes

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

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Comments on Diversity Plan

Moeller noted that the discussion on the diversity plan went well at the November 7th Senate meeting. She reported that she received an email message from the Chancellor stating that the plan was only a draft and was subject to change.

Bradford stated that the Committee needs to think about what procedures we want to have for dealing with the revision of this plan before we meet with the Chancellor. Ledder stated that a committee that works on the revision should include representatives from all of the different bodies that the plan will affect. Moeller stated that experts in the field of the diversity, such as Professor Moshman, should be included as well.

Bradford asked how the committee should be chosen. He stated that he thinks there should be a separate plan for faculty members because the staff does not have to deal with issues of academic freedom. He pointed out that climate is a big issue for staff. Ledder observed that the draft plan appears to have been designed without the understanding that there are different models that are needed for the many different positions on campus.

Ledder stated that there need to be three different policies on diversity: one for personal interaction, one for classroom and curriculum, and one for hiring policies. Bradford pointed out that the classroom policy needs to cover research as well.

Bolin noted that there is a diversity policy already but asked what the motivation is for creating the draft diversity plan. Moeller stated that it is her understanding that the Chancellor wants to formulize a plan.

Alloway stated that the Committee needs to ask the Chancellor what structure will be used in the process. Bradford stated that he would like to see a committee of faculty, and maybe administrators, working on the plan. Moeller stated that she does not think the timeline is pressing on the matter.

Ledder stated that an adequate first step would be to have an accurate description of diversity. Beck suggested that Moshman be contacted to see if he knows of any good diversity plans at other institutions. She stated that she asked Moshman that question already and he is unaware of any other diversity plans.

Alloway stated that the plan should be written in more of a broad scope rather than defining too many specific objectives. He asked if the Committee wants to first discuss with the Chancellor the structure of the committee or content of the plan. Moeller stated that the structure of the committee should be dealt with first. This includes who is going to be on the committee and how they would be appointed. The Committee recommended that Professor Moshman, Educational Psychology, Professor Ball, Marketing, and Professor Moore, Sociology serve on the committee if they are willing. Moeller stated that there should be a plurality of faculty members on the committee. Bradford pointed out that the faculty members should be knowledgeable about academic freedom and diversity issues.

Beck stated that she will look at diversity plans at other universities. She noted that Purdue University did a very good job of increasing the number of female faculty hires and their plan might be a good one to look at.

4.2 Senate Survey on General Education Outcomes and Structural Criteria

Ledder pointed out that there may not be enough time to wait to send a survey out after the proposals have been sent to the colleges. He suggested that a survey be conducted that doesn't depend on the language of the proposals. For instance, "what extent have you participated in discussions on the proposed general education program?"

Beck questioned how likely the proposals are to change. Ledder stated that there will probably be only minor changes. He noted that the goal of the survey is to get people to think about the proposals. Flowers pointed out that it would be helpful to see if some colleges are pursuing the general education process better than others.

Moeller asked what will be done with the information gathered from the survey. Ledder stated that the information could be given to the general education committees so they know where to focus their efforts. He pointed out that it would be another opportunity to get information out about the general education proposals.

Bradford noted that it might be only those people who are informed about the process who might respond to the survey. Moeller stated that she recently spoke with two well known faculty members on campus who are unaware of the general education proposals.

Ledder stated that the message that needs to get across to the faculty is that approving the two proposals in December is not going to lock us into anything. He pointed out that the details of the general education program will be voted on in a separate document, probably in the spring.

The Committee discussed specific questions that should be included in the survey. The Committee agreed that they would attempt to get the survey out before the Thanksgiving break.

4.3 Status of Changes to the Senate

Alloway asked what the status is of the changes to the Senate that were approved by the Academic Assembly in September. Griffin reported that the Chancellor has received the changes. The next step is that ASUN must approve the changes and then the changes will be sent to the Board of Regents for their approval.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Report on Meeting with NCA Team

Moeller reported that members of the Committee had a good meeting with the NCA team. She noted that the main topic of discussion was about general education but the Committee did discuss the concerns raised by faculty members over the paragraph relating to the firing of tenured faculty members. She pointed out that the Committee talked with the team about what actually transpired during the budget crisis. Beck stated that the NCA team thought that lessons were probably learned during the budget cuts and they understood the context of what happened. Flowers noted that the team was able to tie into how the budget cuts influenced the strategic planning process.

5.2 Senate Meeting Follow Up

Beck stated that people need to introduce themselves before speaking at the Senate meetings, particularly new members or people who do not speak often.

Bradford asked for clarification on the issue raised by the Research Council concerning arts and humanities representation on it. Moeller stated that the report by the Council requested that there be more faculty members appointed to the Council from the Arts & Humanities discipline. She stated that she spoke with another member of the Council and they did not feel that there is a need to increase the number of faculty members on the committee.

Griffin noted that the syllabus requires three faculty members from each of the four disciplines (physical sciences, biological sciences, business and social sciences, and arts and humanities) to be on the Council. She stated that the current membership reflects this division of the disciplines.

Beck moved that the membership on the Council remain the same. Stock seconded the motion. Motion approved. Moeller stated that the Committee on Committees will be asked to review the request and will be notified of the Executive Committee's vote.

5.3 Report on the Board of Regents Meeting

Moeller stated that the meeting was occupied predominantly by the strategic plans of the University as presented by President Milliken. She reported that the position "Professor of Practice" was approved by the Board.

5.4 Changing the Location of December Senate Meeting

Griffin reported that a senator requested that the December Senate meeting be moved from the East Campus Union to another location because his department is holding its annual open house and student project exhibition and would like to use the Great Plains Room. She noted that the City Campus Union is available on December 5th for a meeting. The committee agreed to move the meeting with the understanding that the next two meetings

will be held on East Campus if possible.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:18 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, November 15 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Beck, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alexander, Bolin, Rapkin

Date: Wednesday, November 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

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

2.0 Draft Diversity Plan (Linda Crump, Assistant to the Chancellor, Equity, Access and Diversity Programs)

Moeller stated that the Committee wanted to know if there is an original plan currently in place. Crump reported that there is a fairly long comprehensive plan that includes initiatives but there is no level of responsibility included in the plan. She stated that the plan was originally started under former Chancellor Moeser. She noted that the committee that worked on this original plan surveyed the diversity efforts that were already taking place on campus and compiled a list of these efforts. The committee then looked at what was missing and tried to work this into a plan. She pointed out that the plan was not bad but it had no impact and lacked a level of responsibility. She stated that the original committee members were appointed by the Vice Chancellors. She noted that the current committee was also appointed by the Vice Chancellors. She pointed out that getting the draft plan out is the first phase of the process.

Ledder stated that one thing that is confusing is that there is reference to a 1997 document that we haven't seen, but we have a 1999 document. Crump stated that she is not familiar with the 1997 document and noted that there may be documents out on the web that need to be removed. She stated that the committee that worked on the original plan was not a broad committee. She noted that the original plan was started under one Chancellor (Chancellor Moeser) and worked on again under another Chancellor (Chancellor Perlman) and the 1997 document might have stayed in limbo. Ledder asked if the 1999 document was a draft because it was never approved or whether it was not developed. Crump stated

that it was not fully developed.

Crump reported that the current committee looked at the 1999 document and tried to move forward with it. Moeller asked how the latest draft differs from the 1999 plan. Crump stated that the goals are the same but the latest draft includes a list of responsibilities. Bradford asked if the Executive Committee could get a copy of the 1999 plan. Crump stated that she will try to get a copy of the plan. She pointed out that the 1999 plan would not be a bad plan if there were unlimited resources available to carry it out. She stated that after the plan was revealed town hall meetings were held and these turned out to be sessions where frustrations were vented but no ideas were put forth that would move the plan forward. Flowers asked if the complaints were because policies weren't being followed in order to promote diversity or whether the complaints about the plan itself. Crump stated that the complaints were more on the line that the university was not committed to diversity rather than complaints about the plan.

Crump reported that the current committee examined diversity plans at other institutions. She noted that some of the plans were very resource intensive models and UNL is looking for something not so resource intensive and one that would use existing reporting mechanisms so additional reports do not have to be created. She stated that the first phase of the plan is to create a draft and get it out to the campus for feedback. She noted that the committee is now trying to gauge what the themes of the plan should be. She noted that the Chancellor would like to see more organized campus groups having a dialogue about the plan and its themes. She stated that the scheme is to go to the normal governance groups on campus to have them review the final plan.

Moeller asked if the committee read Professor Moshman's comments on the plan. Crump stated that Professor Moshman's comments were read. She noted that he addressed rights of individuals and pointed out that the university has always needed to balance these rights.

Ledder stated that he gets the sense from his colleagues that phase one of the process should not be thought of as completed. He stated that the plan needs to be reconsidered. He pointed out that the current draft is more for staff members and is not appropriate for academics. He stated that there does not seem to be enough diversity of views on the current committee and there is a lack of faculty members on the committee. He stated that there is no representation from faculty members with diversity experience on the committee. Crump pointed out that it was the Vice Chancellors who appointed people to the committee.

Bradford stated that the whole process seems backwards. He pointed out that the academic

component of the plan should have been focused on first. He stated that the academic mission of the university needs to be considered first and the committee has not given due consideration to this area. He noted that the committee should have had full-time tenured faculty members on the committee during the initial stage. He stated that the administrative components of the plan should be considered later.

Moeller pointed out that there are people with diversity expertise on campus. She suggested that the committee should be expanded to include some of these faculty members. Crump stated that she will notify the Chancellor of this request.

Flowers stated that an administrator that should be on the committee is Vice Chancellor Franco who would be an excellent choice for the committee. Flowers pointed out that staff relationships with diversity and hiring diversity issues can often be quite distinct from the academic issues of diversity. He stated that a one size fits all plan might not work and that there may need to be components in it that can differentiate the issues that arise with different groups on campus. He suggested that the process of the plan be similar to that of the general education process where faculty members are being informed throughout the process.

Ledder stated that the Executive Committee is looking for faculty representation on the committee. He pointed out that someone who is a department chair might not be the best representative for the faculty and a new faculty member might not have enough experience. He stated that it would be good to have someone on the committee who teaches a course on race relations.

Stock stated that the sense of the Executive Committee and the Senate is that the plan needs more than just tweaking. He noted that of particular concern is how diversity is being defined in the plan. He stated that there is widespread concern about the draft as it exists now. He pointed out that it would be a good idea to have a reconstituted committee and re-examine some of the commitments of the university.

Bradford stated that regardless of the substance of the plan, there are a lot of people who feel that the plan is tainted by the process that was used and the way that it was presented. He stated that the best thing to do would be to reconstitute the committee and basically start over. He stated that good parts of the existing draft could be used but a new plan should be written. He pointed out that compared to the general education process, a diversity plan suddenly appeared and people felt there was no input into it. He noted that the general education process allowed input even before a plan surfaced. He stated that he has concerns about the merit of the plan.

Alloway stated that the Executive Committee spent most of the summer methodically reviewing the accreditation draft report and the general education proposals. He pointed out that the diversity plan came through as almost a finished plan and there was no mention that there was going to be a three phase process to developing the plan. He suggested that the Executive Committee should be given the opportunity to review the plan like it did with the general education proposals before they were sent out to the campus.

Ledder stated that he is not comfortable with the idea that the process is in phase two. He stated that he thinks the process is at the beginning of phase one. He pointed out that a document is needed where the fundamentals are agreed upon consensually.

Crump stated that she believes there may be a lack of understanding on the governmental responsibilities of affirmative action that the university needs to adhere to. She noted that because we are a federal contractor and accept federal contracts the university has certain federal obligations that must be followed. She pointed out that part of the current draft document deals with these federal obligations. She stated that if the obligations are not followed, the university could lose federal funding for grants and contracts.

Bradford stated that the plan does not have to include the federal requirements. Crump pointed out that the university needs to be careful about what we can and cannot do. She stated that the university does not collect a broad spectrum of data. Moeller asked if the university must measure gender and race. Crump stated that this is correct. She noted that there are different profiles between students and employees and different demographics are collected.

Ledder questioned whether the plan was created merely to satisfy federal authorities. He noted that it is not the plan we would choose if the goal were to benefit the university as much as possible. Crump stated that the federal requirements might be misplaced in a diversity document. She suggested that the requirements might be better if they were in their own entity.

Ledder stated that the definitions of diversity should include different political views. Crump pointed out that the university does not want to keep this kind of data. Ledder asked if the purpose of the plan is to promote real diversity, why something should be left out just because we don't collect data on it.

Alloway stated that another concern with the plan is that evaluations could be effected if the person is not involved in diversity plans. Stock stated that objective 1.1 regarding evaluations is a concern because it is quite prescriptive.

Bradford stated that the main problem is the substance of the plan and how it might be used for evaluations. He pointed out that the plan sounds like a quota system which is illegal. He noted that the plan states that administrators are going to do a report in terms of how many women and minorities are hired. He noted that the plan suggests that if numbers are not met, a faculty member or administrator could be subjected to discipline. He stated that the implementation of these objectives could be used in a way that would cause problems in the academic environment.

Crump asked if the plan needs to start over with a broader committee. Ledder stated that he did not think that the current members should be removed from the committee but it should be made broader. Moeller stated that faculty members with expertise in the area of diversity should be on the committee. She stated that a representative from UNOPA and UAAD should be included as well since staff members deal with different issues than faculty members. Bradford noted that parts of the draft can be used for a new plan.

Moeller stated that the Executive Committee has worked well with the general education committees and the Committee should have a look at the revised draft before it goes out to the campus community. Ledder pointed out that it would be easier to get feedback from the Executive Committee before the document goes out to the entire campus.

Flowers stated that if the plan involved academic policy, that component of it would need to be approved by the Senate because the policy would affect all of the colleges. It is the Senate's purview to act on matters that affect all colleges.

Zimmers asked if there are any federal regulations that there has to be a diversity plan at an institution that receives federal contracts. Crump stated that a diversity plan is not needed but an affirmative action plan is needed. She noted that the institution does have to have targets for its demographic profile. She stated that we have an affirmative obligation to increase the number of minorities and women on campus. She stated that units that have not been able to hire in 20 years do not have good profiles. She pointed out that it is hard to change the demographics when you can't hire someone new. She noted that when it comes down to particular hires the campus has to adhere to Title VII and not discriminate against candidates. She pointed out that the State Legislature has added a factor because they feel that we need to have so many women and minorities on campus. She pointed out that the university must have a good explanation if qualified women and minority candidates for positions are passed over.

Crump noted that the mathematics department has been doing an amazing job of recruiting women into their graduate and undergraduate program. Ledder stated that he wished the department would get more credit for its work in increasing the national pool of female

applicants for math positions. He noted that when faculty diversity is discussed the department only hears how they haven't been able to hire a diverse enough faculty. Crump stated that any applicant that turns us down is still counted in the demographics unless it turns out that discrimination has occurred. She pointed out that the government has changed greatly in the way it audits universities. She stated that a team from across the country is now brought in to conduct an audit where before it was the regional director.

Beck stated that the evaluation section of the draft may not be a bad thing. She noted that there have been complaints about unit heads over the years and yet the person is still in that position. She noted that requiring department heads to adhere to guidelines might be a good thing. Crump stated that there needs to be some guidelines for evaluations. She stated that the question is how to normalize the evaluation process.

Crump stated that she will take the concerns of the Executive Committee back to the Chancellor.

3.0 Graduate Student Association [GSA] (Tonia Compton, Amber Epp, Frank Moore)

Compton stated that she wanted to meet with the Executive Committee to make them aware of the newly formed Graduate Student Association. She stated that some of the members of the GSA would like to talk about how the GSA and the Senate could work together on similar issues.

Compton stated that the GSA was formed because there was no organization and a lack of community for graduate students. She stated that after spending a year researching other graduate student organizations at universities across the country the GSA met and elected their executive officers in June. She noted that the GSA has had three campus wide meetings to date and have had a few social events. She stated that the purpose of the GSA is to facilitate a community for graduate students by sponsoring opportunities for professional development, creating opportunities for social interaction among graduate students outside of their discipline, and advocating issues relevant to graduate students and graduate education. She noted that members of the GSA have met with SVCAA Couture, VC Paul, and VC Franco.

Compton reported that the GSA wants to identify key issues for graduate students. She reported that two issues that have emerged are the cost of health insurance and parental leave for graduate students.

Epp stated that one of the things that the GSA wants to develop is having regular contact with the Senate. She noted that the GSA would like to arrange meetings with the Senate Executive Committee and to get a representative on the Senate, similar to the ASUN

representative. She stated that the GSA would like to have representation on campus committees that have ASUN representation.

Epp stated that the GSA would like to request having the syllabus of campus-wide committees amended. She noted that ASUN is currently in charge of appointing students to committees but the GSA would like to appoint their own representatives. She pointed out that the GSA has representation from almost all departments that have graduate programs. With 40 representatives there would be a large pool for committee members from a variety of disciplines. She noted that President Schaefer of ASUN supports the GSA and having them appoint representatives to the various committees.

Epp pointed out that there are several committees that currently do not have student members but the GSA would like to have graduate students on them. These include the Libraries, Commencement, and Convocations Committees. She noted that the GSA wants to be the body that appoints graduate student representatives to committees. Moeller stated that this would be ideal. Griffin reminded the Committee that any changes to committees need to go to the Committee on Committees first for their review.

Bradford asked if professional students are included in the GSA. Epp stated that the professional students were invited to become members but they declined because they have their own organizations however they are willing to work with the GSA. Compton noted that when she first began working with Executive Associate Dean Weissinger on creating the GSA, the membership was kept strictly to those departments that offer graduate degrees. She stated that the GSA checked with the Law College students but they felt that they have an organization that is effective.

Ledder asked if it would be possible to have the Senate vote on one proposal that incorporates the various committee changes. Moeller stated that this could be done. Bradford pointed out that a Senate member could request that each change be voted upon separately.

Beck pointed out that the Senate will vote in December on whether to combine the Commencement and Honors Convocation committees. Compton stated that the GSA would like to have a representative on the committee that deals with the doctoral hooding ceremony.

Beck stated that the GSA should also meet with VC Owens because there are many graduate students on East Campus. Compton stated that the GSA will be meeting with VC Owens and they have been working diligently on including East Campus graduate students in the association. Epp noted that two of the Executive Officers are from East Campus.

Moore stated that the GSA would like the Senate to consider recognizing Graduate Student Appreciation Week which is April 2 – 6, 2007. He stated that it would be great to get the Senate to celebrate this recognition in the spring. He noted that the GSA is planning events for this week and is working on bringing a guest speaker to campus as well as having a wine and cheese reception. Compton wondered whether the Senate could pass a resolution recognizing Graduate Student Appreciation Week. She stated that the GSA is working on putting together a pamphlet that would highlight the work being done by graduate students.

Moeller suggested that the GSA might want to get a profile started with the UNL Parents Association. She pointed out that this association honors faculty and staff for outstanding work and graduate students could be included.

Compton noted that the GSA is interested in family friendly events because a number of graduate students have children. She stated that they would like to get child care so graduate students can attend the GSA meetings but money is a big obstacle. She pointed out that the GSA has no independent funding. She noted that there is a request in to Student Affairs and some other places for funding but this will probably require long term discussions. Ledder suggested that they apply for funding from the Pepsi Student Events Fund.

Compton noted that ASUN gets \$13 per student to cover costs of operating expenses and legal services. She stated that the GSA would like to have a fund to provide travel grants for students attending conferences. She stated that the hope is to build a long term endowment. Moore stated that they have plans to speak to the Foundation to see if they can help with fundraising.

Compton stated that approval from the Board of Regents will be needed in order for the GSA to get a budget. She reported that they are currently working on building a dream budget based on what they would do if they received 20% of student fees. She noted that the dream budget is just to provide the Board with an idea of what would be done with the money if the GSA received funding. She noted that there are serious items that they would like to see accomplished but they will need the faculty support in order to help convince the administration that the GSA should receive funding.

Bradford stated that the organization should seek getting funding from the administration rather than taking a percentage of the student fees that already go to help support ASUN. Compton stated that they looked at the funds that ASUN gets first because the legal services are shared by both graduate and undergraduate students. She pointed out that the GSA is not opposed to ASUN but there is a lack of consideration of graduate student

concerns by ASUN. Epp noted that GSA has a good working relationship with ASUN but the graduate students are aware that ASUN does not serve the graduate students' needs.

Bradford stated that the Senate meetings are public and GSA members are welcome to attend the meetings. Moeller stated that the GSA could give a presentation to the Senate at the January meeting.

Bradford noted that the Executive Committee usually meets once a semester with ASUN and suggested that this could be done with GSA. Moeller stated that discussions during these meetings focus on things that we can work collaboratively on.

Flowers asked if the GSA has been appointed to other committees on campus such as the Institutional Review Board. Compton stated that they are working to get on other committees such as the Academic Planning Committee and Teaching Council. She stated that they already have a representative on the Graduate Council and Research Council. Ledder suggested that the GSA should try to get a non-voting position on the Board of Regents similar to the ASUN position.

Compton stated that the GSA wants to get support from all of the departments on campus. She noted that Texas Tech and Nebraska are the only schools in the Big 12 that do not have a graduate association.

Moore stated that on December 9th there will be a fundraiser at Barnes and Noble locations in Lincoln. He stated that graduate students will be handing out flyers at the stores and when the flyers are presented when making a purchase, 10-15% of the purchase will go towards the GSA. Bradford stated that this could be announced at the Senate meeting next Tuesday. Beck asked if this will go on all day. Moore stated that it will.

Ledder asked how a graduate student becomes a representative to the GSA. Compton stated that this process was left up to the departments. She noted that some departments held elections. Beck asked if there is one representative per department. Compton stated that there is correct. She noted that the GSA has 40 representatives on it.

Moeller stated that the Executive Committee looks forward to working with the GSA.

4.0 Announcements

4.1 Voting on General Education Proposals

Ledder reported that the College of Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee has approved proposals one and two. He stated that the faculty of the college will vote on December 7th on the proposals. Flowers stated that Dean Hoffman's memo was not clear about whether

the faculty of the college would vote on the proposals. Ledder stated that he sent an email message to Assistant Dean Goodburn who clarified that the faculty of Arts & Sciences will vote on the proposals.

Beck stated that there will be a full faculty vote in CASNR on the proposals. She stated that the vote will be on whether the faculty supports the new proposals or wants to stay with the current program.

5.0 Approval of 11/8/06 Minutes

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

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Senate Survey on GE Outcomes and Structural Criteria

The Committee agreed not to conduct a survey on the outcomes and structural criteria. Ledder pointed out that the Senate will vote on endorsing the proposals at the December 5th Senate meeting.

6.2 Family Friendly Policies – Extension of Probationary Period for Tenure

Moeller stated that she heard back from Professor Haller about AAUP's stance on extending the probationary period for tenure. Jonathan Knight of the AAUP national office stated that the "probationary period could be extended by whatever period of time a probational faculty member was part time. Thus part time one semester makes the whole year not full time. It is up to the institution to decide whether this could be done."

7.0 New Business

7.1 December Senate Meeting

The Committee prepared for the December Senate meeting. Beck suggested that Moeller report to the Senate that the Committee met with Crump to discuss the diversity plan. She stated that the Senate should be informed of the concerns that were given to Crump about the plan.

7.2 University Prescription Plan & Walmart

Bradford stated that he is going to present a motion at the Senate calling for Caremark's plan to match the minimum price offered by Walmart for generic drugs. Alloway noted that Caremark is looking at a possible merger with CVS to help control costs.

7.3 January 3rd Meeting

The Committee agreed not to meet on January 3rd because many people will be out of town.

7.4 Letter on Staff Salaries

Moeller stated that a letter concerning the percentage of staff increases the past two years was sent to the presidents of UAAD and UNOPA and passed on to the Executive Committee. Moeller noted that the letter points out that in the past staff and faculty members received the same percentage of increase but for 2005-2006 the faculty pool was 3.95% and the staff received 3.00%; for 2006-2007 the faculty pool was 3.95% and the staff pool was only 3.25%. The letter pointed out that it is unfair for the staff to receive less of an increase particularly with the increase in health care costs and parking. Moeller stated that the Senate is being asked to support staff receiving the same percentage of increase as the faculty.

Griffin thought that the percentage difference was mandated either by the Board of Regents or the Legislature. Moeller stated that she recollected the Chancellor making comments referring to this.

Bradford questioned whether this was something that the Senate should take a position on. He noted that UNOPA and UAAD represent the staff and managerial/professional employees and they should not be taking a position on faculty salaries. He stated that he is sympathetic but is not sure if it is an institutional concern.

Moeller pointed out that the staff members are intimately linked to the faculty because they support the work that the faculty does. She stated that she wants to support the request and feels that there should be more equity. She pointed out that the staff earns less and therefore their increases amount to considerably less than the faculty members.

Bradford noted that as a practical matter giving equal percentage of increase will give less support for the faculty because there is no extra money available. He stated that he would like to see the additional increase be taken out of some other pool. He pointed out that he would like to see what the administrators' salary pool is. He noted that this is something that we don't hear about.

Ledder stated that he would vote in favor of supporting the request. Bradford noted that the Senate has supported something similar in the past. Ledder noted that there may be individuals who will vote against it but the Senate as a whole should decide if it supports the request.

The Committee agreed that a motion to support equal salary percentage increases should be presented to the Senate in the spring.

7.5 Search Committee for Dean of Arts & Sciences

Moeller provided the Committee with a list of the members of the search committee for the Dean of Arts & Sciences. The Committee agreed that the search committee consisted of strong and representative faculty members and administrators.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, December 6th 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, Bolin, Hachtmann, Flowers, Ledder, Moeller, Scholz, Zimmers

Absent: Rapkin, Stock

Date: Wednesday, December 6, 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 3:04 p.m.

2.0 Melissa Lee, Lincoln Journal Star, Jordan Demmel, Daily Nebraskan

Moeller stated that the reporters were asked to meet with the Committee because the Committee wants to find better ways to reach the citizens of Nebraska about work that is being accomplished by the faculty. Bradford noted that the primary contact source for the press is the Office of University Communications but the reporters probably do not have much direct access to the faculty. He stated that the Committee is trying to improve relationships between the faculty and the press.

Alloway pointed out that with Amendment 423 on the ballot in the recent election the Senate heard concerns that some of the state's citizens might not fully understand what contributions the faculty and staff make to the state. He noted that while there are press releases on large grants awarded, some of the day-to-day things that the university does to make things better for the state are not covered by the media as often. He stated concern that the public may not understand what the faculty gives back to the community with the work that they do. He noted that the Committee is just wondering what more the faculty can do to open dialogue with the press. He stressed that the Committee is not trying to supersede the work of campus media professionals.

Lee stated that she prefers to go to the faculty directly when possible. She pointed out that accessibility of the faculty can be an issue sometimes. She noted that there are times when she calls and leaves a message but does not get a call back from a faculty member. She stated that it would be nice to be able to reach people. She pointed out that she would like

to do more stories on faculty members. Griffin stated that it is usually easier and faster to contact faculty members through email.

Moeller asked how this could be done. She asked what would be a good process to put into place to facilitate communications. She wondered if there was a way to establish a mechanism for giving regular kinds of features. Lee stated that people can always contact her by email (mlee@journalstar.com) by phone at 473-2682, or by cell phone 580-3297.

Moeller asked what kinds of stories the citizens of the state would be interested in. Lee stated that research stories are particularly interesting, and if faculty members are doing anything related to the war. Ledder asked about stories that involve faculty members and students working with the community. He noted that there is a cross-referenced course between Architecture and Construction Management that goes into the community to work on buildings that need to be renovated. Alloway stated that the Committee would like to help generate coverage that makes the connection between the university and various communities across the state.

Zimmers noted that there are many extension faculty members who are involved in a lot of different programs in communities across the state. He pointed out that there are extension faculty members working in every county in the state and research projects are going on throughout the state. He suggested that Lee might want to contact any extension office to get more information on what is going on in that county.

Alloway asked what specific challenges the reporters face. Demmel stated that generally it is difficult to get in touch with some people. She pointed out that the Daily Nebraskan is more student oriented and they may be more interested in reading stories about students working on particular projects with faculty members. Demmel stated that student/faculty projects would be good to focus on.

Bradford asked if the press would be interested in stories that are about unusual things that faculty members are doing in their courses. Ledder wondered whether it would be interesting to include things that faculty members do outside the university. He noted that Professor Fowler, Teaching, Learning & Teacher Education, has won numerous fiddling awards around the country. Demmel noted that there was an article recently on a faculty member in music who teaches the cello but is a bodybuilder as well. Alloway pointed out that the focus should not just be on faculty members but on student projects as well.

Scholz asked how the decision making process occurs at the papers. He asked if the decisions are made top down or do reporters have the flexibility to come up with ideas. Lee stated that her editor is very good and gives lots of flexibility to her so she usually

comes up with the ideas herself. She noted that she tries to talk with people on campus and does read the Senate Executive Committee minutes on line. Scholz asked if there is a quota that she must meet. Lee stated that there are no quotas but she usually writes about four stories per week. Scholz asked if there is some kind of protocol within the university that reporters must follow. Lee stated that if she has an idea she does not need to go through University Communications. She noted that some faculty members are unsure whether they can talk directly to the press or whether they should go through the Communications Office.

Alexander asked if they have any contact in the Engineering College. Lee stated that Associate Dean Ballard is one contact that she has. Alexander pointed out that there is a lot of exciting research going on in the Engineering College. He suggested that she contact the department chairs or faculty members themselves. He noted that department chairs are generally excited about getting news out about what the faculty members are doing in their departments. Moeller suggested that the reporters can also contact the members of the Executive Committee as well for contact information.

Bradford asked how reporters develop a list of people to contact when they want to hear someone's reaction to a story. Lee stated that reporters have a tendency to go to the same people because they know the person will be a good quote. She noted that the paper has a source list of who to go to for comments. Ledder suggested that she contact Moeller to recommend someone to talk to on a particular topic.

Demmel stated that she can be contacted at jordance1@msn.com.

Beck stated that she heard indirectly that a number of years ago the Executive Committee would meet with the Executive Committee of the Legislature several times a year for informational sessions. The meeting was to discuss what university projects were being conducted that benefited the districts of the legislators.

Zimmers stated that the Extension office still does this. He noted that the extension personnel meet yearly with their senators to discuss programs that are being done by extension personnel in the particular counties. He pointed out that it is a short meeting and is usually done early in December. He noted that these meetings have been very helpful to all of the parties in attendance.

Beck pointed out that meeting with members of the legislature for informational sessions is different from lobbying. Bradford noted that it would not be a good idea to meet with them while they are in session because they are too busy.

Alexander noted that in the past a lot of senators were brought into the College of Engineering for them to take a tour of the research facilities. He stated that used to be a very active program that helped educate the senators and the regents about the university and the college.

Moeller stated that several regents have expressed interest in coming to the campus to learn about what is being done here.

Beck noted that people have less time to meet these days but it may be worth looking into.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Faculty Hires and the Human Resources Web Site

Flowers reported that his department recently became aware that a faculty member applying for a position with the university needs to go through a human resources website to fill out a personnel application. He stated that it can take an hour or more to complete the procedure and it is not designed at all as being appropriate for hiring faculty members. He noted that the first year this website was in place it was mandatory that anyone applying to the university must fill out this form. He stated that faculty members can now opt out of it but many people may not be aware of this option. He stated that there are concerns that people may not be applying for a position because the procedure is so time consuming.

Ledder noted that in mathematics, most universities have applications sent to a search committee or department chair. He noted that in the mathematics field those jobs where a person must begin with a human resource form are usually at community colleges with no emphasis in research.

The Committee agreed to discuss the issue with Chancellor Perlman.

4.0 Approval of 11/29/06 Minutes

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

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Diversity Plan Process

Moeller reported that she received an email message from Linda Crump stating that the Chancellor would like to hear the Executive Committee's ideas on a process for the diversity plan. Moeller noted that Ledder sent an email suggesting that the process be similar to the process that has been used with the general education revision.

Ledder asked who would have to approve the diversity plan. Bradford stated that if part of it affects the faculty and curriculum, then the faculty would have to approve it. Moeller

stated that she is in agreement with the Academic Planning Committee's letter stating that they should have to vote on the plan.

Ledder suggested that a committee be formed, they draft a plan, it then goes to various committees and groups on campus for review and revision, and then approval would occur with the APC and/or the Senate. Bradford stated that there should be a standalone committee to draft the plan but there shouldn't be multiple rounds of reviews.

Alloway asked if there would be a separate plan for faculty and one for the staff. Bradford and Ledder stated that the committee would need to decide this.

Bradford suggested that before the committee creates a draft they should solicit input from people. Ledder suggested that as President of the Academic Senate, Moeller should suggest faculty appointments to the committee to make sure different faculty viewpoints are represented. Bradford stated that the committee should be composed of a majority of faculty members. Ledder argued that members who are also administrators should not be counted toward the faculty majority. Bradford stated that there should be voting members and perhaps non-voting members on the committee. Beck pointed out that the details of the committee can wait until after a process has been agreed to.

Scholz suggested that there be student representatives, both graduate and undergraduate on the committee. Ledder wondered whether we could recommend that ASUN appoint at least one minority student to ensure some diversity on the committee. He noted that there are minority student organizations on campus who could suggest representatives. Bradford stated that this should be left up to ASUN but he hopes they would consider it.

Moeller asked what the formal procedure is for voting on the plan once it has been developed by the committee. Bradford noted that part of the existing plan has an academic component and faculty members must vote on this. He stated that unless the committee is willing to exclude the academic proponent from the plan then the APC should vote on it.

Ledder pointed out that the plan should have two distinct but mutually supportive aspects. He stated that the plan needs to be in compliance with federal regulations but it also needs to be good for the university. Alloway noted that this would mean a plan that is much broader than just gender or race. Moeller stated that the plan would then be going beyond compliance.

Beck pointed out that without the vote of the APC or the Senate it would be a mistake to try to adopt a plan that the faculty does not support. Bradford suggested that the Senate should vote on the plan.

Moeller asked the Committee to think of faculty members to serve on the diversity plan committee.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Questions on 15th Week Policy

Alloway reported that there are still questions being asked about the 15th week policy. He asked who deals with questions on the policy, particularly what can and cannot be done during the 15th week. He stated that in his college, some classes without final exams used to offer their last unit exam the Friday of 15th week. He and other faculty members stopped doing that out of concern that violated the new policy that no tests be given during 15th week, but he was unsure to whom these types of questions should be asked. Beck pointed out that this is in violation of the 15th week policy. Ledder noted that the finals week policy states that finals are only to be given during finals week.

Bradford stated that it should be up to Academic Affairs. Griffin pointed out that when people call Registration and Records about policies approved by the Senate, that office always refers the phone calls to the Senate Office. She then reads them exactly what the policy states that was approved by the Senate and points out that if they do not adhere to the policy then they are in violation of it.

Beck stated that the Committee should follow up with ASUN to see if the new 15th week policy has reduced the stress level for students at all. She stated that she does not think much has changed with the new policy because she is still hearing from students that this is still the most stressful week for them. Moeller stated that a lot of students are still taking finals during the 15th week. Ledder pointed out that it is up to ASUN to tell students that they need to report violations of the policy and finals week policy.

Alloway noted that he gets requests from students with conflicts during finals week who would like to complete their work in the 15th week. Beck pointed out that it was the students who really pushed to not allow any finals during the 15th week.

6.2 Classroom Regulation Policy

Griffin reported that she received a phone call from a faculty member asking if there is any written policy stating that an instructor can include in the course syllabus classroom regulations. She noted that the Student Code of Conduct states in very general terms "that the academic community should assure its members those opportunities, protections, and privileges which provide the best climate for learning."

Alloway stated that instructors can include this kind of information in their syllabus. Bradford stated that he does not think a written policy is needed because there is an understanding that faculty members have the right to regulate the classroom.

Ledder stated that he thinks classroom behavior has improved over recent years. He noted that he used to include information in his syllabus about classroom behavior but no longer feels that he needs to. Alloway stated that he does it for large classes.

6.3 Future Agenda Items

The Committee agreed to set up a meeting with the General Education Planning Team to discuss what is next for the revision process.

Moeller stated that she would like to see a copy of the accreditation team's review of the campus once it becomes available.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, December 13 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Beck, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alexander, Bolin, Rapkin

Date: Wednesday, December 13, 2006

Location: City Campus Union, Room 213

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 Chancellor Perlman

2.1 Diversity Plan Process

Moeller reported that Linda Crump, Assistant to the Chancellor, Equity, Access & Diversity Programs wrote to ask the Committee to recommend a process for reworking the diversity plan. Moeller stated that the Committee's recommendations are: 1) to work closely with the Academic Planning Committee because in large part it is in their purview; 2) reconstitute a new committee or build on the existing committee to include faculty with knowledge and expertise in the area of diversity; 3) submit a list of faculty members to serve along with the APC to work on a plan; 4) have the plan reviewed by major stakeholders such as the Senate Executive Committee, APC, ASUN; 5) have a vote by the APC and the Senate on the final version of the plan. Moeller pointed out that the process would be similar to the one being used by the general education committees.

Chancellor Perlman stated that generally he is fine with the Committee's recommendations. He pointed out that one concern is that the plan needs to have priorities and it must be a plan that can be used to accomplish things. He stated that there needs to be a meaningful plan of action with some central priorities and steps that the colleges and departments can take. He noted that the current draft can be used or the new committee could start over.

Moeller pointed out that there is great dissatisfaction with the draft plan but it can be used as a resource if the new committee decides to use it. She noted that the idea is to get a

plan that allows diversity to be addressed without dealing with a lot of bureaucracy.

Chancellor Perlman stated that like all strategic plans, this one is trying to get people motivated to address issues of diversity. He pointed out that there needs to be a realistic plan that people can do with their available resources. He noted that the conversation about the issue is as important as the ultimate document. He stated that one needs to focus on realistic and measurable priorities. Beck stated that the committee can draft a framework with certain priorities to be addressed first but that is flexible enough to allow new priorities to be added as progress is made on the first set without having to create a whole new plan. She pointed out that the plan should be dynamic.

Bradford asked what the next step is in getting this accomplished. Chancellor Perlman stated that the Senate needs to form a committee. Moeller stated that she will recommend a committee to Crump.

2.2 Budget

Chancellor Perlman stated that there are still some uncertainties with the budget this year and we still have not received the allocation for the utilities deficit from last year so he is unsure how everything will balance out. He noted that he does not see any major dislocations in the budget for this year but utilities are still a problem. He stated that the Board of Regents will be submitting a request to the legislature for a deficit appropriation.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the Governor has said several things that can have an impact on the universities budget. The good news is that the Governor has stated that education is a priority but the bad news is that all of the state agencies might be held to a 3% increase in their budget. He pointed out that this will not be good for the university, particularly when salary increases are added into the budget. He noted that many things will happen between now and the end of June and things can change.

Chancellor Perlman stated that there are many unknowns with the budget and the legislature. He stated that there are about 23 new senators this year and we do not know who will chair the appropriations committee. Moeller asked if the university is making an effort to get to know the new senators. The Chancellor stated that we are doing our best to meet and talk with them.

Moeller stated that the Executive Committee received a copy of a letter from a staff member complaining about the staff receiving less of an increase than faculty members for the past two years. She asked if the staff salaries come from a different source than the faculty. Chancellor Perlman stated that the staff salary pool is a different pool than the faculty pool.

Moeller asked if the staff salaries are determined by the legislature. Chancellor Perlman stated that the staff salaries tend to mirror the state employees salary increases. He noted that the process of determining the staff salaries is different than the faculty salaries. He pointed out that the market for faculty is national, for managerial/professional it is usually regional and for staff it is local. He pointed out that this can cause a problem for some positions. For instance, for some managerial/professional positions the market is local while for other positions it is national. He stated that he is seeing a lot of pressure from these ranks because of these variances in jobs. He pointed out that it might be difficult to get the legislature to give a higher increase to university staff than state staff.

2.3 Human Resources' On Line Application Process

Flowers stated that it was brought to his attention as chair of a search committee that candidates applying for faculty positions need to complete a human resources' form on the web. He pointed out that the information on the form is probably the university's attempt to collect data for equity and diversity issues. He stated that the problem is that the form on line is inappropriately designed and does not even reflect that it is a UNL document. He stated that candidates have stated that they have trouble up loading the form and getting instructions on it and it is not a neat, welcoming screen. He reported that two candidates called up asking for help in getting the form to operate properly. He pointed out that this form does not present a good front for the university.

Flowers stated that he has discussed the problem with Crump. He noted that the difficulty with this form could negatively impact things like diversity because people get frustrated trying to complete the form and wind up not doing it. He stated that the form does not apply well to candidates interested in faculty positions. He noted that a far better approach would be to have a separate form for faculty positions and it should be seamless, well designed, and attractive.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he will take a look at the site. Bradford suggested the search committees should take care of the applications although he acknowledged that they would not be able to complete the Equal Employment Opportunity information. Chancellor Perlman stated that he has heard some discussions about this and some people state that they think the form is great but he will look into it.

Ledder asked if it is common now for applicants to begin applying for a job by starting with a human resources webpage. He stated that he finds this troublesome because of the message it initially sends.

2.4 General Education Proposals – Voting

Ledder stated that there have been three votes on the proposals. He noted that the Senate voted to endorse the proposals at its December 5th meeting even though we do not have an official role in the voting process. He pointed out that the endorsement of the Senate sends a message to the colleges encouraging them to support the proposals. He reported that the Senate vote was 30 in favor to 8 opposed.

Ledder stated that Arts & Sciences met on December 7th and voted to approve the proposals after long discussions on them. He noted that the vote was 28 in favor to 22 against. He reported that there was a unanimous voice vote by the faculty for the dean to put together a committee that will draft an advisory statement about the proposals. He stated that this special committee will meet in January and the college will vote on an advisory statement at that time. If approved, it would be sent to the planning team.

Ledder reported that the College of Journalism and Mass Communications approved the proposals unanimously.

Moeller stated that the College of Education and Human Sciences met to discuss the proposals but voting will not take place until February. She pointed out that the voting will take place by an actual ballot.

Ledder stated that he believes that the process is generally viewed positively but he believes getting the other proposals to the colleges will take longer than the original timetable indicated. He noted that it is probably unrealistic to think that a new general education program will be in place by next fall. He opined that the work the general education committees are doing is outstanding and it may be worth taking the time to get the proposals right.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he is comfortable with how things are proceeding and he hopes that the new program will be a success.

2.5 Issues on the Horizon

2.5.A Update on Professor Belot

Moeller asked for an update on Professor Belot. Chancellor Perlman reported that he has filed a request with President Milliken to terminate Professor Belot. Chancellor Perlman stated that the procedures call for the President to have an investigation done by an independent attorney to see if there is cause for termination.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he met with the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Special Resource Committee after he met with the co-chairs of the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee. Chancellor Perlman stated that the ARRC has appointed

faculty members to advise Professor Belot and he has hired his own lawyer to deal with the criminal case and any university procedure.

2.5.B Policy on Accrued Vacation Time

Chancellor Perlman stated that the use or lose vacation policy was suspended as a result of a decision in the Nebraska Supreme Court. He noted that the legal case filed by a private firm stated that vacation pay was like wages and could not be taken away from an employee once earned. He reported that the Court decided that the use or lose policy could not be enforced anymore. He pointed out that the Board of Regents may amend the Bylaws by putting a cap on the amount of vacation time an employee can earn or otherwise try to address the issue. Under a cap, once this limit is reached, the employee would stop accruing vacation time. He stated that the reason for making this amendment is ultimately to protect the university financially otherwise the university could possibly have to pay out large amounts of money to people who leave or retire with a significant amount of accumulated vacation time. He stated that it was unfortunate that the use or lose notice on pay slips was omitted without notification. He noted that a message should be coming out shortly about the change.

2.5.C 2015 Visioning Group

Chancellor Perlman reported that the 2015 visioning group in Lincoln is getting behind a number of projects that will be exciting for the university. He noted that the 2015 group is interested in implementing these projects through the private sector but the group will also try to get the city government to implement their share of the projects. He noted that the projects are substantial in scope, scale, and cost. He pointed out that the most controversial of these projects is the idea of moving the state fair park.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the Lincoln community is serious about these projects and \$6 million has already been raised in private money to move the state fair. He stated that most of the projects have potential for university involvement and tentative plans are to create a research corridor along the Antelope Valley Project. He reported that another idea is to develop an arts and humanities center in the Haymarket area resulting in a creative center for Lincoln. He noted that money needs to be raised for this and shareholders need to agree on this project.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the RFP for the starship block downtown will probably come out in the next two weeks. He stated that this is really exciting for the university and one proposal in particular calls to make P & Q streets a “university street” lined with little shops, similar to areas around other universities. He noted that there is a lot of energy in the community now and the membership of the group is now at 150 and growing.

Beck asked whether the proposed Whittier building renovation would help with child care. Chancellor Perlman stated that it would help if funding is provided to renovate the building because it would include the north side where the university would like to place the child care facility

Alloway asked if the reaction of the state fair board to relocating the state fair grounds was anticipated. Chancellor Perlman stated that it was anticipated because the 20-15 group knew it would be a hard sell. He pointed out that the decision is not just up to the state fair board.

Chancellor Perlman stated that another part of the vision is to build an events arena and expanding the Haymarket parks to create a recreational center. He noted that the university might be interested in being a partner in the creation of the recreational fields. He stated that the projects are all very exciting and ambitious and there is real optimism about doing these things.

2.5D Communicating with New State Legislators

Alloway asked if there is anything that the faculty can do to help with the transition of the new legislators. Chancellor Perlman stated that the faculty has always considered that they are independent from the administration and they should not hesitate to engage with the new legislators. Moeller asked if the Executive Committee can meet as a group with the legislators. She noted that there is some question whether the Committee can do that legally. Chancellor Perlman stated that the Senate is sufficiently independent but recommended it act carefully. He suggested that it would be good for the Committee to let Michelle Waite, Assistant to the Chancellor for Community Relations, know what is going on. He stated that he did not think the Committee had any restraints on who they can meet with.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Safe Assignment Committee

Flowers reported that the Committee met for its final meeting this semester and has put together a proposal on policies for using the Safe Assignment program. He noted that the proposal will go to the Senate Executive Committee and to others on campus to get feedback. He stated that there is some additional legal information that needs to be determined yet in regards to proprietary issues regarding students' papers being kept in a database.

Moeller stated that she has been letting the students in her courses use the Safe Assignment program and she thinks students are being more careful with citing their

references. She pointed out that there are however, still some kinks with the program. Flowers acknowledged that there are some glitches with the program that need to be worked out.

Flowers stated that the policy will probably recommend an open lab for undergraduates to use the program on their own. He pointed out that the lab would not give access to the local database of papers. He noted that now students can only check their papers if the instructor allows it. He stated that the policy will also have guidelines for courses dealing with sensitive issues. He noted that another question is what to do with courses that aren't your typical standard course such as honor's thesis or master's thesis. He stated that the policy will recommend that faculty advisors to graduate students will be considered equivalent to an instructor.

Moeller stated that she heard that the program costs \$100,000 a year. Flowers stated that he does not know the exact amount of the program but it is certainly not cheap.

3.2 ASUN on Graduate Student Association

Moeller stated that she received a phone call from President Schaefer of ASUN and a message from Associate to the Chancellor Howe pointing out that the only recognized student body on campus is ASUN. The Board of Regents will have to approve a change to the student governing organization in order for the Graduate Student Association (GSA) to be recognized. ASUN is not delineated between graduate and undergraduate students.

Alloway asked if the Graduate Student Association has the right to pursue the recognition of their association with the Board of Regents. Moeller stated that she would suspect that the GSA would have to work with ASUN. Beck stated that Vice Chancellor Franco might be able to assist the GSA but she thinks they would make faster progress if they carved out a niche within ASUN.

3.3 Meeting Academic Rights & Responsibilities Co-Chair

Beck reported that she met with one of the co-chairs of the ARRC to clarify suspension procedures and the process required to terminate a tenured professor. She noted that they are separate issues that have a different process.

Beck stated that when termination of a continuous appointment is deemed necessary by the administration, the request is made to the President of the university who orders an investigation of the case by an independent attorney to see if termination is warranted. If termination is found to be warranted, an Academic Freedom and Tenure complaint (AFT-B) is sent to the ARRC. Upon receipt of the complaint, the ARRC sets up an AFT-B

hearing committee composed of six elected, tenured faculty members. She noted that the hearing is conducted following the rules of evidence of the district court of Nebraska, with the attorney, an attorney for the university, an attorney for the faculty member, and an attorney for the ARRC are present. The hearing is transcribed verbatim and after the hearing the AFT-B hearing committee makes a determination on the case but ultimately the final decision on whether to terminate a tenured faculty member is made by the Board of Regents.

Bradford asked if the Chancellor and Board of Regents are limited to the recommendations presented in the report. Beck stated that she does not think they are but she knows that in all of the cases involving termination of a faculty member of which she has first-hand knowledge, the panel recommended termination and that recommendation was accepted.

Beck reported that a faculty member can be suspended from their duties if a situation arises that creates an immediate threat to the university community, to the person themselves, or a serious disruption of university programs. She pointed out that the actions of the faculty must be severe. She stated that the Chancellor can then suspend someone from their duties. She stated suspension occurs due to an emergency situation and should be used rarely. She noted that the Chancellor can suspend a faculty member only after he/she has met with a three-person Special Resource Group appointed by the chair of the ARRC or, if that is not possible, the meeting must occur within 48 hours of the suspension. The special ARRC resource group will meet with the faculty member to advise him/her of what their rights are. She pointed out that the special ARRC resource group is composed of elected faculty members selected from the ARRC panel. She noted that these procedures apply to all faculty members, regardless of tenure status, including extension educators as well. She stated that the paragraph on suspension of faculty members in the Bylaws states that if possible, the faculty members should be reassigned to other duties.

Alloway asked if the findings of the investigation for suspension are included in the investigation for termination. Beck stated that she believes the information would be included but the independent attorney still needs to conduct another investigation.

Beck stated that she is working with co-chair Professor Bryant of the ARRC to develop a flowchart of procedures and she is going to generate a list of frequently asked questions to help faculty and staff members determine whether, how, and for what reasons they can access the ARRC.

4.0 Approval of 12/6/06 Minutes

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

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 15th Week Policy

Alloway reported that he has been in communication with President Schaefer of the ASUN about complaints regarding the violation of the 15th week policy. Alloway pointed out that it is still unclear who makes the decision on questions regarding the policy. He recommended that the ASUN should revisit this issue.

5.0 New Business

No new business was discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:26 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, January 10th 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: Alloway, Bolin, Bradford, Flowers, Ledder, Moeller, Rapkin, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alexander, Beck, Hachtmann

Date: Wednesday, January 10, 2007

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 Draft Driving and Motor Vehicle Policy (Kim Phelps, Associate Vice Chancellor Business & Finance, and Patrick Barrett, Director, Transportation Services)

Phelps stated that Transportation Services oversees about 440 vehicles and there are high stakes in maintaining the safety and operation of all of these vehicles. He reported that the draft policy is to insure that safe drivers are operating university vehicles. He noted that seven other institutions in the Big 12 have similar policies. He pointed out that the main difference with this new policy is that it requires that a driver's record be obtained for each person requesting use of a vehicle.

Phelps stated that the draft policy is based on the University of Wisconsin's policy. He noted that the policy is not a response to negative problems or accidents but is being done as a precautionary measure. He reported that the process of developing the policy was done by the Business and Finance office. He stated that the draft policy has been shared with the Deans' Council, who provided input, but both SVCAA Couture and VC Jackson felt that it should also be shared with the Senate Executive Committee to get feedback and address any questions. He stated that the next stage will be to take the draft policy to the Senior Administrative Team. He noted that once the policy is approved, it will be put into place possibly by the end of the semester or during the summer.

Bradford stated that he had questions on the wording of the authorized requirements section on drivers. He noted that the student section states that student drivers must have a valid driver's license and that international licenses are not accepted, but the same

wording is not found in the faculty/staff section. Phelps stated that the language should be in both the student and faculty/staff section.

Moeller asked if the draft policy is a change to an existing policy. Barrett stated that there is a current policy but it does not require that driving records be checked. Phelps noted that the current policy only states that the driver must have a valid driver's license. Barrett stated that when a person picks up a vehicle a person's license is checked to see if it is valid. He noted that there is an on-line training program but there is no test of actual driving skills although training is available for some vehicles if requested. Barrett stated that the on line training program is available on Blackboard.

Bradford asked if there were any circumstances where a driver would need a commercial license to operate university vehicles. Barrett stated that a commercial license is needed for vehicles weighing over 26,000 pounds, if hazardous materials are being transferred, or if the vehicles hold more than 16 passengers. He reported that there are 175 different commercial license holders in the system.

Scholz asked if some of the verbiage in the policy is already in existence or whether the draft policy is an entirely new policy. Barrett stated that some of the policy is already in existence.

Scholz noted that the draft policy makes reference to departments being billed for obtaining the driver's records of authorized personnel. He asked if the charges will be done annually. He pointed out that departments may need to project who will be using the vans in order for them to be authorized in a timely manner. Barrett stated that a large number of records will need to be checked initially but in the future the records will probably be checked in the beginning of the month of the driver's birthdate.

Scholz asked what the cost will be. Barrett stated that for Nebraska licenses the cost is \$3 per license for any individual. He noted that for an out of state license Transportation Services charges \$15, plus any additional costs that may be charged by the state from which the license is authorized. Scholz asked how long it takes to get a copy of the driving record. Barrett stated that in Nebraska it does not take more than a day but for out of state licenses it could be longer. Phelps and Barrett stated that it would be best for people to plan ahead of time if they need to use a university vehicle. Phelps stated that departments will need to absorb the cost of obtaining the records.

Scholz asked if a check of the driving records of people has to be done annually. Phelps stated that if a person is an occasional user, less than five days a year and/or if they user makes trips that are less than 250 miles a year from Lincoln, the record would probably

not have to be checked each year. He stated that the policy is more for a person who has to travel more often throughout the year and on a regular basis.

Zimmers asked if the faculty and staff in the County Extension offices that lease and use vehicles would be included under this policy. Barrett stated that they are included as well.

Scholz asked if formal communications will be sent to departments about the policy. Barrett stated that information will be sent out through email and probably through a direct mailing as well.

Moeller asked if the policy has been approved by VC Jackson. Phelps stated that it has and those departments with high usage of the vehicles have been contacted as well. He noted that the departments provided useful input on the policy. He pointed out that it is felt that it would be easier to implement the policy during low usage times.

Barrett stated that the drivers' records will be checked for the past 36 months. He pointed out that his office will be looking to see if there are any moving violations of 2 points or greater, driving without authorization, willful or wanton disregard of the safety of persons or property, and other major traffic offenses.

Scholz asked if the university is self insured and whether the university is now adopting the practices of the insurance industry with this Driving and Motor Vehicle policy. Phelps stated it is and that the university also has an umbrella insurance policy for losses over \$100,000. He pointed out that when an employee or student drives a university vehicle that person's personal insurance is not in effect but the university insurance is.

Scholz asked if people outside of the university can ride in the vans. He noted that the College of Architecture works on community projects with people outside of the university but who are connected with the project. He asked if these people could ride in the van. Barrett stated that as long as they are connected with a university project they can ride in a van but someone not involved in a project cannot ride in the van.

Ledder pointed out that under the section "Unauthorized Use of University Vehicles", point 10 "extending the length of time the vehicle is in the driver's possession beyond that which is required to complete the official purpose of the trip" seems a bit harsh. He asked if this policy is strictly enforced and what is considered a reasonable amount of time. Barrett stated that keeping the vehicle an extra day for someone's pleasure would be in violation of the policy. Alloway pointed out that Transportation Services prefer that the vehicle be dropped off as soon as possible, even when it is late in the evening. Barrett

agreed.

Barrett noted that his office has occasionally received false complaints about how university vehicles are being driven. He stated that the vans have data recorders on them which records the speeds at which the vans are driven. He noted that if a complaint is received the data recorder is pulled and verified whether the van was speeding. He noted that rarely is a vehicle recorded as going over the speed limit. Phelps stated that the vehicles are like moving billboards for the university and people need to use caution when driving them.

Moeller asked the Committee if there were any other concerns. The Committee agreed that the policy makes good sense.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Safe Assignment Policy

Flowers reported that a draft safe assignment policy will be coming to the Committee for their review. He noted that the draft is close to being complete and hopefully will be distributed in about two weeks. Moeller asked if Flowers knows how much the program costs. Flowers stated that he is not aware of the cost.

4.0 Approval of 12/13/06 Minutes

Zimmers moved and Bradford seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Diversity Plan Committee

Moeller stated that she will be contacting Professor Harvey, chair of the Academic Planning Committee, to consult with him about who should be on the committee. She stated that we need to proceed quickly on the plan.

5.2 General Education Proposal Voting

Moeller stated that several colleges will not be voting on the proposals until February. Scholz reported that the College of Architecture met and voted on the proposals last week. He noted that one of the problems that faculty members seem to have is that there is a lack of clarity of where the program is going. Moeller stated that there was a similar response in her college.

Moeller suggested that Associate Vice Chancellor Wilson and a college faculty representative knowledgeable about the general education proposal should be at the meetings when the colleges vote to answer any questions. Moeller stated that she will

email SVCAA Couture and Professor Janovy to suggest that Wilson or someone else who can articulate the proposals be present at these meetings.

Scholz pointed out that one of the questions being asked is whether the campus is really moving forward in general education or whether the proposed program will be even more difficult to administer than the present one. Stock noted that people are being overwhelmed by the complexities of the program and what they really want to know is what the implications are for teaching their classes.

Ledder pointed out that the faculty in the College of Architecture may not see as many drawbacks to the current program as some other colleges. Moeller noted that the architecture program is already based on outcomes. Ledder stated that the new program will not be as restrictive for students as the current program.

6.0 New Business

No new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:09 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, January 17 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, Bradford, Hachtmann, Flowers, Ledder, Moeller, Rapkin, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Bolin

Date: Wednesday, January 17, 2007

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

No announcements were made.

3.0 Approval of 1/10/07 Minutes

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

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Meeting with ASUN President

Moeller reported that she met with Matt Schaefer, President of ASUN, to discuss concerns they have with the Graduate Student Association (GSA). She noted that GSA has not applied as a registered student organization yet. She pointed out that the ASUN does have seven graduate student representatives on it. She suggested that she and Bradford meet with VC Franco, ASUN and GSA to help facilitate discussion.

Scholz asked whether Graduate Studies is taking an active or passive role in the formation of the GSA. Moeller stated that it is taking an active role. Scholz suggested that it might be more fruitful to have a conversation with Graduate Studies first.

4.2 Providing Information to Reporters

Alloway asked if there was any further contact from the Lincoln Journal Star and Omaha World Herald reporters particularly since the release of the Governor's budget proposal

for the university. Moeller noted that the budget puts the university in competition with funds for K-12. Bradford pointed out that one of the legislative proposals would give K-12 a bigger chunk of the funds.

Alloway suggested that we should be in contact with the reporters. Bradford stated that he has had several contacts with Melissa Lee from the Lincoln Journal Star. He suggested that we invite Matt Hansen from the Omaha World Herald to a meeting since he was unable to attend the meeting in the fall.

4.3 General Education Update

Moeller reported that she recently met with Dean Drummond from the College of Architecture who felt that the meeting on the general education proposals in the college was very positive. She reported that Dean Drummond felt that two areas of concern on the proposals were the lack of an international global perspective and a lack of a real emphasis on communication skills. Scholz noted that the lack of a visual communication skill requirement in the general education proposal was a big issue for the Architecture faculty.

Moeller asked if there is going to be another meeting in the college to discuss the concerns of the proposal further. Scholz stated that there will be another meeting but he does not know if it has been scheduled yet. He noted that after the college vote there was a meeting of Dean Drummond and the program administrators in the College of Architecture with John Janovy, Associate VC Wilson, and Dean Kean, and the main thing that was agreed upon in the meeting is that the college needs to revisit the proposals.

Moeller stated that she did send an email message to Professor Janovy and Associate VC Wilson suggesting that someone like Wilson from outside the college should attend the college meetings to help clarify and answer questions. She noted that she had not received any messages back about this suggestion.

Moeller stated that the College of Education and Human Services will not vote on the proposals until early February. She noted that the meeting will be an open meeting.

Alexander reported that the faculty college meeting was cancelled in the fall but he thinks the proposals will be taken up at the spring meeting. He pointed out that it is difficult to get a quorum at the college meetings.

Alloway asked if the College of Architecture has a large visual literacy component to their program. Scholz stated that they do and the thought is that with more work and communications being done in the world with visualization and graphics, especially

through technology, this should be a necessary part of the general education program. He noted that several Architecture faculty also believe that the new general education program needs to be more forward-looking and address what will happen in the future rather than just focusing on what is being done now. Moeller stated that she has heard this concern from others as well. Scholz stated that in the meeting following the college vote it was explained that the proposed revisions to the general education program have resulted from a process of compromise among members of the general education committees.

Ledder asked if the focus of the college meeting was on Architecture students or students in other colleges as well. Scholz stated that it was on students overall.

Ledder noted that one of the problems is that each college wants to establish requirements for the program. He pointed out that a lot of the things that colleges are wanting are really options in the program, not requirements.

Scholz stated that there is frustration with the lack of clarity in the process of reviewing and voting on the general education program proposals. He pointed out that there was no clear explanation of what would happen if there is a negative vote. Ledder stated that this is not a problem in Arts & Sciences. Scholz noted that Arts & Sciences has formed an advisory group to address some of their concerns. He stated that the process seems to have been designed incrementally and that many faculty are not fully aware of the implications of “yes” or “no” votes at this stage of the process or whether concerns and input submitted at this time, along with or instead of votes, will be used by the committee to modify and further develop the proposal. Ledder pointed out that a vote of yes just authorizes the committees to continue working towards a level of detail and a no vote means we stick with the current ES/IS program. Scholz noted that it was not explained like this at the College of Architecture meeting. Ledder stated that it might be because the administrators are not understanding some of the arguments being presented whereas the Executive Committee has already heard many of the arguments.

Moeller noted that there needs to be a record of the concerns that are emerging in the colleges. Ledder stated that this is already being done. He noted that Associate VC Wilson’s frequently asked questions document addresses many of the concerns. He pointed out that someone needs to be at the college meetings who knows these frequently asked questions and can address the concerns.

Moeller thought that a written summary should be provided to the faculty before the meeting along with a copy of the frequently asked questions. Scholz speculated that faculty members might oppose the proposal simply because they are not thoroughly

informed about it or because some faculty in a meeting might express concerns that are not adequately addressed and thereby attract additional doubters before a vote is taken. Moeller suggested that some of these concerns could be avoided if people more knowledgeable are there to explain some of the concerns.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Review of Senate Goals

The Committee reviewed the goals. Moeller stated that Beck is still working on the reduction in force procedures. Bradford pointed out that these procedures may be very important if the university faces budget cuts again because of the Governor's budget proposal.

Moeller asked what our venue is for providing input on the web pages. Flowers pointed out that the Committee has directly related concerns with the Chancellor about the employment web page. Ledder stated that the level of responsiveness in getting help with the web pages resembles that of the White House.

Ledder stated the once the guidelines for the web pages has been approved the Senate could do a survey, referring to a web site with the standards, to see what the faculty thinks of it. Bradford pointed out that when the web site format starts being enforced there could be problems for faculty members who have their own academic web site.

Alloway noted that one of the concerns raised about the web sites is who is available to help create them and whether some departments are being charged for the service. He remembered having heard concerns at earlier Executive Committee meetings about some departments being charged for web consultation while others were not. The Committee agreed to invite Robert Crisler, Internet and Interactive Media Manager to a meeting to discuss some of the concerns.

The Committee agreed that Goal 2, working with the Administration and ASUN to streamline academic procedures, has partially been met with the approval and implementation of the 15th week policy. Ledder pointed out that the Committee has also worked with ASUN on suggesting requirements for course syllabi. He noted that ASUN is supposed to be working on a syllabi resolution that they will give to the Committee for input.

The Committee felt that further work needs to be done to on Goal 3, addressing concerns about academic dishonesty. Moeller stated that she will draft a definition of academic dishonesty. The Committee decided that a draft resolution proposing the X grade for academic dishonesty needs to be written. The Committee agreed to revisit this issue at

the next meeting.

On Goal 4, increasing faculty benefits and compensation, the Committee agreed that some work is being accomplished. Moeller noted that she is working with the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women to conduct a survey regarding childcare on campus. She pointed out that the Committee also encouraged the Chancellor to continue working on resolving this problem.

Moeller stated that the Committee discussed the changes to the vacation policy with the Chancellor. The Committee agreed that further works needs to be done to improve salaries and noted that the Chancellor has made arguments to support this as well. Bradford pointed out that President Milliken has also been working on improving salaries.

Alloway wondered whether the University's hesitancy to act on domestic partner benefits is due to financial constraints or political constraints.

The Committee discussed other benefits such as the cost of belonging to the campus recreation center and the cost of Lied Center tickets. Ledder pointed out that giving faculty and staff free membership to the recreation center would not cost the university anything. Moeller noted that at other universities it is part of the benefits package. She stated that free membership should be considered part of the wellness program. She suggested that the Committee discuss this with the Chancellor. Bradford stated that Deb Thomas, Assistant Vice President for Administration, is working on the committee looking at a wellness program and she should be invited to meet with the Committee to discuss this benefit. Ledder noted that free membership to the recreation center could be used as a recruiting tool.

Bradford suggested that the Committee might also want to explore having a discount at the Lied Center for faculty and staff. He noted that Charles Bethea was contacted at one time by the UNL Employee Benefits Committee about this and he seemed to be receptive to the idea at the time. The Committee agreed to invite Bethea to a meeting.

The Committee agreed that some work has been done on Goal 5 which is to increase public awareness about what the University does and the work of the faculty. It was noted that reporters from the Daily Nebraskan and Lincoln Journal Star have met with the Committee.

Alexander stated that he has been disappointed that none of the reporters have approached the College of Engineering for stories on work the faculty are doing. Moeller suggested

that Alexander write or call Melissa Lee from the Lincoln Journal Star and invite her over to show her some of the exciting things that are occurring in the college.

Bradford reported that he received a phone call from Lee over the break to discuss the Law College students that went down to New Orleans to do work. He stated that what he finds worrisome is that the effects of the proposed budget for the university are not being done by the university reporters. He suggested that information needs to be given to the reporters about the effects.

Moeller suggested that the committee should meet with Matt Hansen from the Omaha World Herald since he was unable to attend the fall meeting. She suggested that people prepare a one page summary of the work they are doing to give to Hansen. Zimmers noted that the people in the County Extension offices have a good relationship with the local papers.

Scholz pointed out that some faculty members are very modest about the work they do and might not feel comfortable personally calling the news media to highlight their work. He suggested that there should be someone in each of the colleges targeting these kinds of news stories. Alexander stated that his college has a liaison to the papers. He stated that one of the problems with this is that they usually want to have a faculty member posing for a picture. He noted that not many faculty members want to have to pose for a picture, rather they want to get general articles out that highlight the work that they are doing.

Stock stated that faculty members used to get a request, perhaps from Public Relations, about the work they are doing. Moeller stated that she just received a message from Vice Chancellor Paul asking the same thing.

Griffin suggested that the Committee send a message out to the Senators encouraging them to submit a one page summary about the work they are doing to the reporters.

5.2 Safe Assignment Policies

Flowers reported that last fall a committee was convened to develop guidelines and policies for the use of the Safe Assignment program. He noted that a copy of the draft policies was distributed to the Committee. He stated that a separate committee is working on instructional use of the program.

Flowers stated that the committee members representing both the faculty and administration was concerned that the software has a provision for checking against locally submitted papers. He noted that this is an issue of fair use and how long the papers can be kept. He stated that the papers will be removed from the system six years

after the semester they were submitted. He pointed out that the papers will be archived and kept locally and does not go out to the general public.

Flowers reported that the one concern initially was that students be allowed to use the program to test their draft papers. He stated that the proposed plan is that the Libraries will set up a laboratory where students can come in and use the software to check their paper. He pointed out that the papers will not check against the local database and draft papers will not go into the system.

Flowers stated that the draft policy will be going to the Vice Chancellors and others for their input.

Flowers stated that the committee considered the issue of student papers that included sensitive personal information being submitted to the local database, and is proposing that there be a policy by which students may request that such papers be excluded from being added to that database. The current draft includes language that allows a student to make such a request to an instructor, with right to appeal the decision through the UNL grade appeals process.

Alloway stated that it is hard for instructors to see what students see when they use Safe Assignment. He asked if it is ambiguous to them whether an assignment is a safe assignment project. Flowers stated it is his understanding that this is apparent and all instructions should make this clear.

Flowers reported that another issue that needed to be clarified is the use of Safe Assignment for non-course academic assignments such as master's thesis or doctoral dissertation. He stated that in these cases the graduate committee chair would submit the paper into Safe Assignment.

Bradford noted that in the appeal process for exempting a paper into the local database there is no indication of a standard that will be used to override the instructor's decision. He noted that the instructor is given complete discretion about making this decision and if this is the case, why is there even an appeal process. Flowers agreed and stated that he will pass this on to the committee that wrote the draft.

Alloway asked if the six year limitation is due to the amount of server space. Flowers stated that the policy resulted from a combination of issues, including those of server space, typical resident time of a given cohort of students, and the time window of previous works within which plagiarism would be most likely to occur.

5.3 Exemplary Service to Students Committee

Moeller stated that she received a message from Stan Campbell, Director of Campus Recreation, stating that the Senate needs to appoint a faculty member to serve on the committee. Rapkin volunteered to serve on the committee.

5.4 Accumulated Vacation Time Policy

Bradford stated that it is not clear to him that the university is giving people what they are entitled to in regards to accumulated vacation pay. He noted that the Nebraska Supreme Court decision states that employees earn vacation time and it cannot be taken away from them if they don't use it within a given year. He stated that it is not clear but an employee should be able to accumulate their vacation time from past years although there is probably a statute of limitations. He pointed out that this needs to be pursued with the administration because there are 12 month appointed faculty members and staff who this would affect.

Moeller asked if there will be a lid placed on how much vacation time an employee can accrue. Alloway noted that in some businesses there is a mandatory vacation policy that employees must take vacation time within a given year. Griffin pointed out that there are employees at the University who are unable to take some of their vacation time because they cannot get approval from their supervisor.

Alexander noted that it will be the units that will have to foot the bill when an employee leaves the university with a large amount of vacation time accumulated. He stated that this will be particularly hard for the centers.

The Committee agreed to discuss the issue further with the Chancellor.

5.5 MBA Gallup Program

Bradford asked if the Academic Planning Committee had the opportunity to approve the MBA Gallup Program. Moeller stated that she will check with Professor Keown, the Senate's designee to the APC, about this.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, January 24, 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, Beck, Bradford, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Rapkin, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alloway, Bolin, Flowers

Date: Wednesday, January 24, 2007

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 Postpone Committee Report

Moeller stated that she received a request from Professor Walklin, co-chair of the Honorary Degrees Committee, asking that the Committee report be postponed until the March Senate meeting because the committee has been unable to meet. Moeller noted the message also stated that the committee has great nominees for the Pound Howard award.

2.2 Meeting with Executive Director Charles Bethea

Moeller reported that Lied Center Executive Director Bethea will be meeting with the Committee on February 21st to discuss possible faculty discounts at the Lied Center.

3.0 Approval of 1/17/07 Minutes

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

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Academic Dishonesty

Moeller reported that she is gathering the documents on academic dishonesty and the item will be on the agenda next week.

4.2 Media Letter

Bradford stated that he has concerns with asking the faculty to submit to the Executive Committee a one page summary of noteworthy research work for the reporters. He stated

that he does not think the Executive Committee should be responsible for filtering these summaries to the reporters. He suggested that the Executive Committee should give the email addresses of the reporters to Senators and suggest that the faculty contact the reporters directly.

Moeller stated that a brief summary of work conducted by faculty that impacts the state might be one venue for wider coverage through the media. The media could contact the faculty member directly to further discuss their work. She stated that this is akin to a press release and it is up to the press to pursue those topics of interest to them and the state.

Moeller stated that it would be beneficial to become better acquainted with the new 23 state legislators in order to inform them of the good work at the university and how daily life in Nebraska is impacted by the university. She noted that in the past there was an effort to adopt a senator by having a faculty member contact and talk to the legislator. She suggested that a luncheon on a topic of mutual interest for a small group of legislators and faculty may be a good beginning. She pointed out that the budget is going to be a major issue and we need to get the support of the legislature. She stated that she would inquire regarding possible funding for such an undertaking.

Bradford pointed out that it sounds like lobbying. He asked whether the foundation fund would cover these kinds of activities. Moeller stated that the funds were used to have luncheons in the past.

Rapkin suggested inviting Bill Avery to come speak with the Executive Committee. He stated that Avery might have insights on how best to approach the legislators. Beck suggested contacting Ron Raikes, DiAnna Schimek, or Ernie Chambers since they have served on the legislature for some time. She stated that she thinks a two prong approach would be great to do.

Zimmers pointed out that Extension basically does this kind of thing already. He noted that there is a committee that keeps track of the different counties and which legislators Extension people meet with. He stated that the meeting is usually a breakfast or a luncheon and the Extension faculty members will give a brief presentation about their programs and what is coming up in the near future. Moeller asked how the legislators are contacted. Zimmers stated that the senators or their staff members are usually called. He stated that they usually hold these meetings in December.

Moeller suggested that the Executive Committee could have a breakfast meeting in the union and invite two or three legislators. She stated that she will try to set something up

in the next three or four weeks. She stated that the other way to get information out to the new legislators is through the media. Bradford recommended informing Michelle Waite, Assistant to the Chancellor for Community Relations, and Ron Withem, Associate Vice President of University Affairs, about the Committee's plan to meet with legislators.

4.3 Update on Diversity Committee

Moeller reported that she spoke with Bill Nunez, Director of Institutional Research and Planning, who stated that he will discuss the diversity committee with the Academic Planning Committee. He stated that the APC will recommend someone to work on the committee. Moeller suggested that the diversity committee should include someone from stakeholder committees such as the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women and other similar groups. She stated that she has a tentative list of people but she does not think the committee should be too large.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Review of Board of Regents Meeting

Moeller stated that it was a fascinating meeting with demographic information being provided on students and their families. She noted that U.S. Census Bureau information was distributed which showed that Nebraska ranked number six in the country in terms of the state/local tax burden as a percentage of income. She pointed out that Kansas ranked 18th, Iowa 26th, Wyoming 33rd, Missouri 34th, Colorado 38th, and South Dakota 45th.

Moeller reported that need-based financial aid information was also presented. She stated that overall college continuation rate by state in 2004 ranked Nebraska as 16th. She noted that she was surprised to see that 20.3% of Pell grants in Nebraska went to students in private universities. She stated that UNL had the highest proportion of Pell recipients for the NU campuses.

Moeller reported that in the Nebraska Measure Up 2006 Affordability Data the percent of income needed to pay for college expenses minus financial aid at public 4-year colleges increased from 17% in 1992 to 27% in 2006.

Moeller stated that for the 20% of the population with the lowest income, 64% of their income is needed to pay the net cost for going to a public four year university as compared to 6% for the 20% of the population with the highest income.

Moeller stated that the information provided shows that the trend is that state support for operating expenses for the university has decreased significantly leading to increased institutional reliance on tuition and fee income.

Moeller reported that the average loan indebtedness of NU undergraduate students is very close among the four campuses. She noted that the average student at the university leaves with an indebtedness of \$16,872. She noted that the highest number of students with loans was at UNK. She stated that the highest percentage of financial aid came from loans and Pell grants.

Moeller stated that need-based aid as a percentage of undergraduate tuition and fees shows UNL at 79.1% compared to 87.5% for Colorado, 88.4% for Colorado State, 50.2% for Illinois, 48.9% for Iowa, 95.8% for Iowa State, 42% for Kansas, 90.2% for Minnesota, 58% for Missouri, 67% for Ohio, and 69% for Purdue. She reported that overall 40% of Nebraska students do not continue on to college, 60% of low income students do not continue to college, and 60% of Nebraska families need financial assistance.

Moeller stated that all of the information reported is tied to the university's strategic plan. She stated that information on graduation rates was also provided. She noted that the strategic plan calls for an increase in graduation rates to match our peers. She pointed out that the six year graduation rate for the university system increased from 42.3% in 2000 to 55.8% in 2005. She stated that UNL's graduation rate is 63% and our peers' graduation rate is 67.7%. She pointed out that the retention rate for UNL freshman is 84% compared to our peers' retention rate of 85.7%.

Alexander asked what the overall goal was of the presentation. Moeller stated that with the strategic plan includes accountability measures that must be addressed. She stated that the Board of Regents will be looking at one of these measures at each of their meetings. The information provided at this meeting was to look at the accountability measures for six year graduation rates and how well we are doing.

Moeller stated that another thing that was discussed was how much off campus work students are doing. She reported that the National Survey of Student Engagement showed that 79.6% of first year UNL students worked 0 – 10 hours per week. She noted that only 1.7% of first year UNL students worked 30 or more hours per week compared to UNK's 7% and UNO's 14.8%. She pointed out that students who work approximately 10 -15 hours per week off campus typically are more successful students because they become more organized with their work. She stated that there is a big increase in the number of hours worked off campus for senior level students. She stated that for UNL 11.5% of senior students work more than 30 hours per week.

Moeller reported that measures were presented as to how the administration plans on publicizing how students can get through the academic experience quicker.

Bradford noted that our students are working significantly more than the national average.

Scholz asked if specific recommendations are made by the Board of Regents when this kind of information is presented. Moeller stated that the Regents can interrupt and ask questions for discussion during the presentations. She noted that the Regents are very informed about the information they are looking at.

Alexander pointed out that in looking at the data the figures may be skewed somewhat because students coming from divorced families may put down the lower income of the two parents when applying for grants. Bradford stated that the applications require that the custodial income must be indicated unless there is joint custody.

Moeller stated that the university is trying to find innovative ways to get more money to help students. She noted that private sources are being explored to assist students in need. Bradford asked if the information provided included foundation scholarships. Moeller stated that the information was just based on government funding.

5.2 Report on Liberal Education

Moeller noted that she forwarded the AACU report on liberal education to the Executive Committee. She stated that it is a wonderful document that addresses general education issues and provides a framework. She stated that she would like to have the Committee read the report for discussion at the next meeting.

Moeller reported that she received an email message from Associate Vice Chancellor Wilson who stated that the College of Business Administration's curriculum committee passed the general education proposals unanimously and they are recommending that the college faculty approve the proposals.

Scholz stated that there has been a lot of discussion in the College of Architecture on the proposals. He stated that the College's representative to the General Education Advisory Committee is working to get the concerns of the College sorted out and there may be another meeting for the College to reconsider the proposals.

Moeller reported that the College of Education and Human Services is meeting on Friday to discuss the proposals. She asked when the College of Engineering will be meeting on the proposals. Alexander stated that he thinks there will be a meeting sometime in the spring.

Ledder reported that two proposed amendments were made to the Arts & Sciences draft

advisory statement but both of the proposed amendments failed. He stated that the college faculty overwhelmingly approved the draft advisory statement. The three comments about the outcomes recommend a course with a historical perspective, having more than one writing course, and rephrasing the oral/visual communication outcome.

The first two of these could be addressed through guidelines interpreting existing outcomes.

Ledder stated that a key recommendation is for a statement of guidelines that should be used to determine whether a proposed course satisfies some outcome(s). He pointed out that with the current ES/IS program, courses can change every year. He stated that there is a feeling that guidelines should be in place that would serve as criteria for college curriculum committees when they judge whether a proposed course should be added to the general education program.

The final recommendation is for the GEPT and GEAC to create a rigorous and continuous approval process for courses. He noted that faculty members feel that courses must really demonstrate that they should be added to the program.

Moeller asked whether the statement is moving forward. Ledder stated that they are and they are now official recommendations to the committees. He pointed out that the GEPT and GEAC committees can ignore the recommendations or to accept any portion of them. He stated that he believes the purpose of the statements will be to give the general education committees an idea of what to expect for the next vote at Arts & Sciences. He surmised that if the general education committee incorporates the recommendations into the next set of proposals they will probably be approved. If not, they could get voted down.

5.3 Gallup Program

The Committee agreed to discuss the Gallup program with the Chancellor to see who the faculty members were that made the decision to have the program. The Committee noted that there did not seem to be any knowledge of the program until the recent announcement. Moeller questioned who would be driving the agenda of the program, the university or Gallup?

5.4 Professor of Practice

Stock reported that the professor of practice position continues to be controversial in some areas. He noted that some people are concerned that the creation of these positions is a move away from tenured positions. Bradford stated that when the presentation was made to the Senate on the positions it was pointed out that the positions would not make a lot of changes on campus. Beck stated that the Executive Committee had numerous discussions

about the positions. She stated that she believed it was an effort to try to equalize a position for teaching similar to the current research professor position. Moeller noted that it was an effort to deal with the senior lecturers position by building in a career ladder that allows these individuals to be promoted in rank from Assistant to Full Professor of Practice. She stated that some departments are jumping in on it and others are not.

Beck stated that there are only a few senior lecturers. She stated that most non-tenured positions are lecturers. Moeller suggested that the Committee ask the Chancellor how many professors of practice positions have been created.

Scholz stated that his program has been having some experience with the position. He noted that one of the issues with these positions is whether they can become graduate faculty associates. He pointed out that criteria listed on the Graduate Studies nomination form for graduate faculty associate do not acknowledge the professor of practice; the criteria just refer to senior lecturers, a title that is being abandoned by the University. Scholz stated that on the Academic Affairs website there are some criteria for each rank.

Stock stated that his department has been looking at the criteria. He noted that one of the issues that arise is that often people in these positions develop leadership and can wind up getting publications. He pointed out that there could be fuzzy distinction between tenured ranks and the professor of practice if professors of practice start getting publications.

Moeller stated that there appears to be a national trend, particularly in the Ivy League schools, to have professors at non tenured ranks. Ledder stated that it would be nice to have a rule that only a certain percentage of the faculty in a department can be hired off tenure lines.

Rapkin pointed out that having faculty members without tenure gives the administration a lot more flexibility when budgetary times become tough. Bradford stated that it is for this reason that the Reduction in Force Procedures needs to be revised quickly. Moeller pointed out that the revisions should be simple and not mired in bureaucracy. Beck stated that she has a good idea on how to make revisions to the procedures without making major changes.

Beck suggested that Moeller get information from Bill Nunez on the number of lecturer, senior lecturer, and professor of practice positions.

Stock noted that one of the questions that came up when the position was first being considered is whether a professor of practice faculty member could apply for a tenured faculty position. Ledder pointed out that there were two different concerns. He stated

that if a person is hired as a professor of practice the department cannot vote to then change that position to a tenured position. However, if a tenured faculty position becomes available, a person who is a professor of practice could apply for the job.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, January 31, at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Rapkin

Absent: Alloway, Beck, Bolin, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2007

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 3:07 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 College of Engineering Vote on the General Education Proposals

Alexander reported that the College of Engineering Curriculum Committee voted to recommend the gen ed proposals and encourage the faculty to also approve them. He stated that the faculty of the college will vote during the next two weeks by email. Details are on the Curriculum Committee's link on the Engineering College's website.

2.2 Syllabus Policy

Moeller reported that she received an email message from Associate Vice Chancellor Wilson concerning the Board of Regents' syllabus policy. She noted that the message stated that Regents' Bylaw 4.1 requires faculty to "inform students concerning the requirements, standards, objectives, and evaluation procedures at the beginning of each course." UNL requires that this information be conveyed to students via a written syllabus at the beginning of each course. Any syllabus should also clearly communicate the instructor's name, office location, contact information, and office hours. She stated that a copy of this policy can be found on the Academic Affairs website. The message also stated that Academic Affairs has sent a message to the faculty before the semester begins reminding them of this policy and the information is also given at new faculty orientation meetings.

Flowers pointed out that in the Executive Committee's discussion with ASUN about a syllabus policy the Committee felt that having a written syllabus was not always

appropriate. Ledder stated that ASUN agreed with the Committee that more work needed to be done before the Senate should look at a UNL policy. He stated that he will contact ASUN to see what the status is of the proposed policy. He noted that the draft policy presented by Associate VC Wilson had some problems with it such as requiring office hours. He pointed out that it is not always possible to know when office hours will be held when the syllabus is written. Alexander stated that this is particularly true for arranged courses that faculty have yet to arrange until after the semester starts.

The Committee agreed that the Senate needs to vote on any UNL policy before it can be put into place.

2.3 Meeting with the Chancellor

Moeller reported that she will be meeting with the Chancellor tomorrow because the Committee will not be able to meet with him again until March 28th. Ledder suggested that she ask for an update of what is happening with the Chemistry professor. Alexander pointed out that the athletic department is sending out a lot of email messages to the general faculty and wonder if this was really needed (example: the email on the football recruiting class) and suggested that Moeller discuss this with the Chancellor.

3.0 Approval of 1/31/07 Minutes

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

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Professor of Practice Positions Update

Moeller reported that she contacted Bill Nunez, Institutional Research and Planning, to ask if there are any Professors of Practice on campus. She stated that Nunez reported that there are currently two Professors of Practice and forty five Senior Lecturers. Flowers noted that it would be interesting to see the distribution of the Lecturers and Senior Lecturers to see if they are clustered in certain disciplines.

4.2 Plans to Meet with Legislators

Moeller reported that she spoke with Michelle Waite in the Chancellor's office about meeting with some of the legislators. Moeller stated that the Chancellor's office has a number of things planned and they are developing a strategic plan of when to include faculty members at the meetings. Moeller stated that Waite will make all of the arrangements and will get back to the Committee.

4.3 Meeting with Human Resources

Moeller stated that the Committee will be meeting with Assistant Vice Chancellor Currin

on March 7th to discuss concerns with the on-line job application form for faculty positions. She noted that the Chancellor had the Senior Administrative Team try out the website and did not see any problems with it.

4.4 Reduction in Force Procedures

Moeller reported that Beck stated that she will have a draft of the proposed reduction in force procedures by next week.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Committee on Distinguished Teaching Award

Rapkin volunteered to serve on this committee.

5.2 Faculty Salary Compressions

Moeller stated that she was asked to bring this issue up at the meeting. She pointed out that in some departments new assistant professors are being hired at higher salaries than associate professors. She noted that this can be quite demoralizing for faculty members who have accomplished records and have chosen to do their work at UNL.

Flowers stated that there are some chairs in the College of Arts & Sciences who have been direct about needing guidelines for dealing with salary compression issues. He noted that the current system requires departments to take money away from faculty within their own department. He pointed out that internal redistribution does not help with compression issues. Ledder agreed and stated that if a department wants to award someone for doing outstanding work they have to take funds from those in the department who may have had an average year.

Ledder noted that there is not enough money available to resolve the compression issue in departments. Bradford stated that the Chancellor could give chairs the discretion to address the compression problem. Ledder suggested that guidelines could be written stating that half of the salary pool would be used to address compression and the other half would go towards merit increases. Any other fracture could be just as easily chosen. Alexander pointed out that merit raises can be very political. He stated that he has witnessed very productive faculty members not being given a merit raise when it was definitely warranted.

Ledder asked if the colleges receive an overall salary increase pool. Bradford pointed out that the Vice Chancellor's office always holds back some money.

Ledder asked if the college executive committees review the guidelines on salary distribution. Alexander stated that in his college only the chair decides how much people will get for a raise. Flowers reported that in his college the dean keeps a database on salaries and the executive committee of the department grades people on their performance. Moeller asked what criteria are used in grading. Flowers noted that grading is based on research, teaching, and service. Ledder stated that the campus tries hard to rank people according to merit even though it is not really possible to do that. We don't rank people according to structural inequities, even though that could be done more easily.

Alexander pointed out that oftentimes the faculty members receiving large salary increases end up staying four or five years and then are leaving the university. He wondered what is really being accomplished by this strategy in giving pay raises. In addition, these same faculty members have been allowed to take equipment with them. Thus, he stated that the university is not really investing in long term, excellent people who often have devoted their whole careers to improving the institution but investing in people just to have them come for a short period of time and then leave. Moeller agreed and stated that faculty members who are here for a long time are not rewarded for loyalty and high achievement. Bradford stated that losing people to other universities, particularly less prestigious institutions, is a concern.

Alexander stated that in relation to this topic is the issue of graduate scholarships. He pointed out that if the university wants to make a name for itself in research it needs to have scholarships for graduate students. He noted that the top research schools have a lot of fellowships for graduate students who in turn provide support for the faculty members conducting research. He stated that in recent years the amount of scholarships has been reduced. He pointed out that we could lose faculty members if they are not getting graduate students who are supported. He stated that this is a major issue in terms of future institutional quality and retaining faculty members.

Flowers noted that a couple of years ago the Othmer fellowships were drastically cut back but they have now been added back. Moeller stated that this is true but departments still have to cover the first \$10,000 of the fellowship.

Alexander noted that the Research Office is now taking back an additional 3% of overhead that is being taken out of grants. He stated that this provides even less money for the colleges. Bradford asked what the justification is for doing this. Alexander stated that to his knowledge the additional overhead charge has not been discussed. Moeller stated that the Office of Research would claim that it is needed to support their offices.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:06 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, February 14 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: Bolin, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Rapkin, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alexander, Alloway, Beck

Date: Wednesday, February 14, 2007

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 3:04 p.m.

2.0 Robert Crisler, Internet and Interactive Media Manager, Heather Dahm, CIT, Ned Hummel, Mathematics, and Aaron Grauer, Housing

Crisler stated that in 2004 the redevelopment process of the UNL websites began with the assistance of Professor Moore from the School of Music. During the time since then a Web Developers' Network has been formed to assist and give support to the numerous web developers on campus. Monthly meetings, a bulletin board, and chat rooms are all being used to allow the developers to communicate and provide support for each other.

Crisler stated that the ideas behind the redevelopment process were to make the UNL websites more consistent, easy to use, to provide the same look, to be accessible, and to be flexible and dynamic. He reported that more than 50 web site designs were initially created. He stated that those designs were then ranked in a meeting of the Next Generation Web Committee. The ranking identified three personalities of the websites and people within the committee split to form three different groups to continue working on developing websites based on the three different personalities. The Next Generation Web Committee also developed recommendations that were stated in a white paper (http://www.unl.edu/webdevnet/downloads/NGWC_White_Paper.pdf).

Ledder asked if any visually challenged people were invited to be a part of the committee or other web developer groups. Crisler stated that he did not think so.

Crisler reported that audience testing of the websites began in May 2006 and in August

2006 the template selected went live. He noted that all UNL websites are supposed to be transferred to the new UNL template by August of 2007. He pointed out that this is a deadline set by Chancellor Perlman.

Crisler stated that his office welcomes feedback. He noted that evolutionary changes can be made along the way but wholesale changes will not be applied until 2009. He stated that the plan is to redesign the website in three year intervals.

Crisler stated that the Web Developers Network reports on how the transitions to the UNL templates are progressing. He noted that unl.edu is one of the top 10,000 web sites worldwide.

Moeller asked if help is available on line for people working on transferring web sites to the UNL template. Crisler stated that there are many different ways people can get help. He noted that the Web Developer Network site has many links for help. Moeller asked if all websites associated with the university must be on the template by August. Crisler stated that anything at the unit level and above must be on the template.

Bradford asked if everybody within the university has to have their webpage on the templates. He asked if this includes class websites and personal faculty websites. Crisler stated that it is his understanding that these do not have to be on the templates.

Crisler reported that all sites will be machine tested. He noted that the web sites are designed to meet Section 508 of the federal accessibility guidelines. He pointed out that UNL is the first university in the Big 12 and in our peers to achieve conformance with Section 508 standards for accessibility and first in this group to achieve machine-testable conformance with the more extensive Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG). Ledder stated that he checked out the WCAG and pointed out that the contrast on the bottom of the templates is not great enough to provide good visibility. He stated that his daughter, who is visually challenged, cannot read 59 parts of the UNL templates. He noted that he sent an email message to Crisler pointing out this concern but the response was that compliance with the standards is sufficient.

Crisler reported that he spoke with Christy Horn, Compliance Officer, about the templates. Crisler noted that the templates have been tested with a screen reader. Ledder stated that he has no doubts that the website would work with a screen reader but he asked if anyone who is actually blind had a chance to provide input on the screen. He pointed out that it would help to get the actual opinions of blind people on the templates. He cited the following statement from the World Wide Web Consortium: "Broadening evaluation to involve people with disabilities helps better understand accessibility issues and

implement more effective accessibility solutions.” Crisler pointed out that it is not possible to create screens to accommodate everyone’s special need. He stated that the screens are designed to meet the standards. Ledder noted that the standards are not perfect and stated that he is only suggesting that input be gathered from some blind people to get their review of the web site as suggested by the consortium. Moeller suggested contacting Stephen Panarelli, Systems Manager from the College of Education and Human Sciences, who has sight difficulties.

Moeller noted that in the Deans and Directors meeting that morning Professor Lauerman spoke of a group conducting quality assurance evaluations on the website. Moeller wondered if there are any visually impaired people in this group.

Ledder stated that it is hard to have respect for standards when there are problems with contrast in the standards. Crisler pointed out that the standards are based on a mathematical formula. Flowers noted that font size and contrast are very important on websites and he is not sure whether mathematical formulas take these into consideration. Bradford asked if changing the font size can be done by the web user. Crisler stated that it can. Bradford noted that not just the size of the screen but the resolution is important as well.

Crisler stated that UNL is using the international standards for contrast. Ledder noted that he is not saying that the standards are of no use. He stated that he is merely suggesting that best results require a combination of input from users and the standards. He pointed out that he gets the sense that the web developers do not care about the users. Crisler reminded the Committee that UNL is the first university in the Big 12 to adhere to the standards.

Grauer noted that testing on the standards was done before they were set. Hedges pointed out that the initial design of the website needed to meet the minimum standards. He stated that it is possible to make changes to the websites down the road. Crisler stated that the web developers have worked hard to make sure that the standards are met. Ledder stated that meeting standards and providing accessibility is not necessarily equivalent. Standards are based on experiments performed with specific test web pages. They are only guidelines when used for a web site not tested in the creation of the standards. The standards should not be taken as absolute truth, but as approximations.

Grauer stated that no one is saying that the web developers are refusing to do tests with visually impaired people. He pointed out that the websites have been tested on many individuals. He noted that it is not much trouble to do further testing but he asked when does the university need to stop trying to make the website accessible to everyone. He

pointed out that at some point the user needs to take some initiative in enhancing their monitor in some way so they can read the website. He noted that the burden has to shift over to the user because it is impossible to accommodate everyone's needs. Ledder agreed with the shift in burden but not with using randomly selected test subjects alone. It would be easy to get volunteers from the campus organization of blind students. Suggestions made by these students would not necessarily have to be implemented, but an attempt should be made to get the opinions of actual visually-impaired students.

Moeller stated that essentially the university has met the top end of the standards for websites. She stated that the Committee would just like to recommend that the websites be reviewed for input by some of the visually impaired people on campus.

Griffin stated that an issue that was mentioned in previous meetings is that some departments on east campus are being charged for having their websites changed by CIT but departments on city campus are not being charged. She asked for clarification on this. Dahm reported that departments can have Communications and Information Technology (CIT) set up a website for the fee of \$800 - \$1000 per site. She noted that the entire website is set up by CIT and units do not have to worry about maintaining the sites. Ledder asked if this is optional for all departments. Dahm stated that it is. Scholz asked if the fee is an annual charge. Dahm stated that there is an annual charge for this service.

Zimmers asked if the county extension offices will be required to change their websites. Dahm stated that all of the university associated websites will be required to comply with the standard UNL template.

Scholz asked if the Web Developers Network is a fixed number of members or whether other people can join. Crisler stated that anyone who works on websites can register on line. He pointed out that there is free training on the templates that is available to members.

Bradford asked if there are standards for the hearing impaired. He noted that he does a lot of podcasting. Crisler stated that there are standards and pointed out that there should be text to accompany the podcast.

Crisler pointed out that the university does care about accessibility of the websites. He noted that the standards might not be the Holy Grail but UNL has come further than any of the other institutions in the Big 12. Ledder pointed out that being faster than 86% of other sites is a credit as well. He noted that having a fast website is a very positive thing.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Faculty at 5 Event

Moeller announced that there will be another Faculty at 5 Event on Friday, February 23rd. She asked that people please come to the event and noted that the concert afterwards have been great.

3.2 Annual Big 12 Conference on Black Student Government

Moeller reported that the campus will be hosting the Annual Big 12 Conference on Black Student Government on February 15 – 18. She noted that over 1200 students are expected to attend. She pointed out that this is the first time UNL is hosting the event and there will be a gospel performance at the Pershing Auditorium on Friday evening.

3.3 Ninth Annual Nebraska Conference for Undergraduate Women in Mathematics

Moeller reported that she attended the Ninth Annual Nebraska Conference for Undergraduate Women in Mathematics last weekend. Ledder noted that over 200 undergraduate students from across the country, and three from Ireland, came to the conference. He noted that the program allows undergraduate women to meet and discuss their own research and interest in mathematics. The conference also provides information for the women on what life is like in a graduate program in mathematics. Moeller noted that the mathematics department has received a huge grant for their work in promoting women in math.

4.0 Approval of 2/7/07 Minutes

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

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Report on Meeting with Chancellor Perlman

Moeller stated that she had an excellent meeting with the Chancellor and addressed the issues that the Committee requested be raised. She noted that the outside attorney has completed his report on Professor Belot of the Chemistry department and President Milliken is recommending termination. She pointed out that the next step in the process will be to have an Academic Rights & Responsibilities hearing committee conduct an investigation.

Moeller reported that she asked the Chancellor what he had in mind if budget cuts are needed. She stated that the Chancellor made it clear that these would be vertical cuts because any other cuts would affect the quality of the institution.

Moeller stated that she raised the salary compression issue. She noted that the Chancellor

agreed that there is a problem that must be looked at and it will be raised with the deans and chairs. Ledder pointed out that the chairs have no power to deal with the issue.

Moeller reported that she discussed the structural inequities in laboratory facilities issue that was raised in an Academic Planning Committee meeting. She stated that the Chancellor stated that he has no control over this and it is strictly up to the department chairs.

5.2 General Education Update

Ledder reported that there has been some discussion about what is coming up next in the process. He stated that he is bothered by the lack of interest by GEPT in having faculty discussions prior to the next set of proposals being written. He noted that an example of an issue that should be discussed is what kind of guidelines should be written for the outcomes. He pointed out that some kind of structure is needed to monitor the courses for the program and that some group will be making the decisions on these courses. He stated that this group should have some kind of written guidelines if there is to be stability throughout the years in the program.

Ledder stated that it would be helpful to have some discussions on the guidelines before the proposals are written to get the opinions of the faculty. The guidelines could be minimal or extensive, and this general issue ought to be discussed before the proposals are written. He stated that there is concern among some faculty members that the guidelines will be too flexible and there is a strong likelihood that the faculty in the College of Arts & Sciences would not approve the proposals.

Ledder stated that recent email exchanges with Professor Janovy indicate that the program might be governed by the contracts and a campus-wide committee would review these contracts. An assessment is needed to determine if the course is meeting the outcomes of the program. Ledder pointed out that contracts may be a good thing, but someone is still going to have to decide what is acceptable and what is not. If done without guidelines, the program could change substantially depending on who was making the decisions. Moeller reported that she is hearing some of the same concerns from other faculty members.

Ledder stated that he is toying with the idea of presenting a resolution to the Senate suggesting that there be some discussions with the faculty to gather input before the process of writing the guidelines begins.

Flowers pointed out that there are two different approaches to the problem of how one might establish structure for evaluating general education course proposals. He stated that

one is to establish contracts with instructors for specific courses, establishing how objectives would be fulfilled and assessed. This might be viewed favorably by a large number of faculty members, because it gives a bit more flexibility and some people would be more willing to accept it. However such an individual course contract system risks lack of consistency over time and over committee changes. The other approach is to have specific guidelines for a committee to adhere to when evaluating whether a course meets general education criteria. This approach might ensure greater oversight and consistency over time in maintaining general education objective (something that some faculty members have felt has been lacking with our current Gen Ed system), but such an approach might initially present more challenges to gaining broad support across the university. He noted that these approaches are quite fundamentally different but try to address the same problem.

Bradford pointed out that there are two issues. One is the substantive issue of what the guidelines should include and the other is whether a resolution should be presented to the Senate stating that the faculty should have discussions before any proposals are written. He noted that otherwise we could have the same problems as with the draft diversity plan. Moeller suggested that the Executive Committee talk with the GEAC about these concerns. She pointed out that in order for the next round of proposals to pass investment in the program from the faculty is needed. Ledder pointed out that he thinks tremendous progress has been made, but he is concerned with the next phase of the process.

Scholz reported that the College of Architecture held a meeting yesterday about the first proposals. He noted that Professor Janovy attended the meeting to answer questions. Scholz stated that the latest news is that Professor Janovy has reported to the GEPT the major concerns that he heard from the Architecture faculty members. These concerns are that more writing is needed, the lack of American history as being a specific requirement for the general education program, and the issues of visual communication and computational skills. The email message stated that Janovy assured the Architecture faculty that the GEAC and GEPT are going to take all comments into account with the development of the next two proposals and that there may be some adjustments to the wording of proposals 1 and 2 in response to the campus-wide comments made during the recent voting process. Ledder stated that it is interesting to note that the faculty of the College of Arts & Sciences felt that the two prominent concerns with proposals 1 and 2 were the same as that of the faculty of the College of Architecture. He suggested that it was unlikely that the Architecture opinions were influenced by the prior Arts & Sciences statement, which nobody in Architecture was likely to have seen.

Scholz reported that there is still concern from the faculty members with the clarity of the process and what it means to vote on the four proposals. He stated that there is still a lot

of confusion as to what the significance is for the votes. Ledder asked if Janovy made it clear in the meeting that proposals 1 and 2 are not binding. Scholz stated that he was unable to attend the meeting because he had a class to teach. He noted that electronic voting of the Architecture faculty will be done by faculty this week. The Architecture resolution is to endorse the proposal but retain the right to remove that endorsement after seeing the next round of proposals.

5.3 Update on Syllabus Policy

Ledder stated that he has contacted ASUN member Greg Gifford and ASUN has written a revised policy which Gifford will be forwarding to him. Ledder stated that he will present the revised ASUN policy to the Committee next week.

5.4 Professor of Practice Positions

Moeller distributed information provided by the Institutional Research and Planning Office indicating that there are now two Professors of Practice on campus. She noted that there are also 45 Senior Lecturers on campus spread across 30 departments.

Ledder asked where the two Professors of Practice are. Ledder asked if some Senior Lecturers are full-time employees. Moeller stated that they are and they have an option of moving into a Professor of Practice position.

5.5 Diversity Task Force Committee

Moeller reported that she has almost all of the committee members appointed to the task force. She stated that she has sent the members of the committee a copy of the process that she outlined for the Executive Committee recently.

Moeller stated that she is thinking that the Academic Dishonesty Committee will be co-chaired. She noted that President Matt Schaefer of ASUN has suggested that his successor be on the committee instead of him since his term as President will end soon.

5.6 Safe Assignment Policies

Flowers reported that he sent Dean Giesecke a copy of the minutes of the meeting when the Committee discussed the Safe Assignment policies. He noted that the substantive concern was with the propriety of a student's work and putting it in the local database. He stated that he wrote a paragraph suggesting how the policy should be written to address the issue of a student being able to appeal his or her paper being put into the local database because of personal information included in the paper. He pointed out that students and instructors need to know that there is an option excluding a paper from entry into the local database, even if a paper is screened with Safe Assignment software.

Ledder suggested that the policy needs to be clearer on this issue so that if a student does not want a paper submitted to the local database they can appeal it. He stated that it should be difficult for an instructor to over rule the request of a student asking that a paper not be included in the database.

Flowers stated that he will report the concerns of the Committee to Dean Giesecke.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Distribution of Executive Committee Minutes

Zimmers reported that faculty members in IANR are stating that they are receiving several copies of the Executive Committee minutes. He asked whether the minutes can be sent out only through the all faculty list serve.

Bradford stated that he objects to this. He pointed out that faculty members already receive a lot of email messages and he did not think they should be burdened with more. He noted that the minutes are posted on the web. He suggested that an RSS feed could be set up on the Senate webpage and those interested in getting the minutes could subscribe to it.

Griffin pointed out that the extension faculty members are probably receiving multiple copies because each of the Senators from the districts is sending them out. She asked if it is possible for only one person to send the minutes out. Zimmers stated that he will speak with the other extension faculty members to see if this would work.

6.2 On-line Training for Search Committees

Zimmers stated that extension faculty members are asking why there isn't on-line training for people to be on search committees. He pointed out that currently extension faculty members have to travel to Lincoln in order to get the training.

Moeller stated that it was reported in the Deans and Directors meeting that there is a subcommittee working on getting the training on-line and it will eventually take place.

Moeller noted that at the meeting Michelle Waite from the Chancellor's Office reported on the efforts that are underway to meet with the legislators about the university. She stated that there are overt efforts being made to meet the new senators and this is being done in a variety of settings.

Moeller noted that it was announced at the meeting that the university is recommending salary increases of 4% for UNL although there are restraints on what can be done with the money that the legislature has to work with. She stated that it was reported in the meeting

that there are discussions in the legislature that the excess money that has been accumulated be given back to taxpayers in the form of property tax relief. She stated that the university's budget is due to the legislature by April 25th and it will be discussed by May 31st.

Ledder stated that he wonders at what point the campus will have to deal with the vertical cuts mentioned by the Chancellor as possible if the university receives a 4.2% increase in its budget. Bradford noted that something will need to be cut if salaries are scheduled for a 4% increase.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, February 21 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, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alloway, Beck, Bolin, Rapkin, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, February 21, 2007

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 3:02 p.m.

2.0 Charles Bethea, Executive Director, Lied Center for Performing Arts

Moeller stated that Bethea was invited to talk to the Committee to discuss having more faculty involvement with the Lied Center. She noted that the Committee is interested in seeing if there can be a reduced price for tickets for faculty and staff members to get them more involved in attending events at the Lied Center.

Bethea stated that he welcomed the opportunity to speak with the Committee. He noted that until 2005 there were no programs in place for faculty/staff discounts at the Lied. He reported that a relatively new discount program is in place for faculty and staff.

Bethea stated that there has been a student discounting program where students get a 50% reduction in ticket prices. However, the discount program for students is funded through student fees. He noted that each year the Lied Center applies for funding from the ASUN's Committee for Fee Allocations and the students have been quite supportive of the request. He stated that each year student usage of the Center is evaluated and the requested amount is based on this usage. He noted that last year and this year the Lied Center received \$105,000 from student fees which resulted in a discounting ratio of 80/20 for student tickets. He pointed out that the reason that there have not been other discounts is because the students are basically paying for their discounts and the Lied Center wanted to be sensitive to the students.

Bethea reported that the other campuses in the NU system do not receive a discount but other schools such as Doane and Wesleyan do because they escrow money each year to

the Lied Center and in turn a discount on tickets is available for their students.

Bethea stated that he has been thinking about offering a discount for the faculty and staff for a long time. He noted that his desire is to make it more possible for faculty and staff members to take advantage of attending events at the Lied. He stated that there is now a discount program in place for the faculty and staff. He noted that they can now purchase tickets for single events at 10% off. He pointed out that if the faculty or staff member is a season ticket holder and purchase tickets for a number of events can receive a 20% discount.

Ledder noted that he would like to attend a number of events at the Lied Center but the cost prevents him from doing so.

Bethea stated that he recognizes that attending events at the Lied Center can be costly. He stated that this unfortunately is due to the price of the arts these days. He noted that artists' fees and other associated costs continue to rise rapidly and keeping ticket prices from escalating is challenging.

Bethea reported that last year about 300 faculty and staff members purchased tickets for the Lied Center. He stated that currently about 58% of the season is completed and already 280 faculty and staff members have purchased tickets. He thinks the increase in attendance could be a result of more faculty and staff members being aware of the discounts.

Stock asked if the single ticket purchase applies to spouses of faculty and staff members. Bethea stated that this is not available yet although it has been discussed. He admitted that it would probably be an incentive to get more people to attend events at the Lied Center if faculty and staff members could purchase more than one ticket at 10% off. He stated that he wants to roll out the discount plan thoughtfully and to wait and see what faculty and staff do with it. He noted that the Lied Center was hoping to be able to provide faculty and staff with the option of paying for season tickets through payroll deduction but he was told this is not possible.

Ledder stated that if the Lied Center intends to allow the purchase of tickets for a spouse it should be made so faculty and staff members can buy two tickets at the discounted rate. Bethea stated that if a student purchases tickets they need to produce a student ID and as long as the person buying the ticket is a student, the Center really doesn't care who the other ticket goes to. The same thing would work for faculty and staff members. Ledder suggested that faculty and staff members should be allowed to purchase tickets for other people up to a limit of two. Bethea stated that this has been discussed. He pointed out that the Lied Center wants to roll out the discount program in measured steps because it

wants to be respectful to the students but so far there has not been any resistance. He noted that he believes the discount program will be fine for the faculty and staff. He stated that he definitely wants to encourage participation in the Lied Center.

Moeller noted that the Free at 6 concerts are well attended. Bethea stated that the Lied Center is doing a number of different things to change its audience. He stated that the Lied Center is part of a consortium of presenters in the research one tier group of universities. He reported that the members of the consortium are investing in a major impact study that looks into what engages audiences. He stated that the data is just coming in now on the study and there will be a complete analysis some time this year.

Ledder asked how many performances sell out. Bethea stated that only 5% are true sell outs. He pointed out that a true sell out is hard to achieve and not always the most desirable thing. He stated that in terms of budget projection, the Center budgets conservatively.

Ledder asked if there are times when the audience is less than half full. Bethea stated yes, depending on the event. He noted that an audience of 1100 people is considered less than half full. He pointed out that about 60% of the venues are less than half.

Ledder asked if attendance would be improved if the price were lowered for these events. Bethea stated that he is not sure whether this would bring more people in. He stated that the programs are negotiated at a certain price. Ledder pointed out that if you could fill the seats at a lesser price you might collect more money than if the seats were empty.

Bethea stated that the other side of the argument is how much the venue is valued. He noted that there are certain psychological values involved in the decision whether to offer tickets at a reduced price for shows that are less than half full. He stated that some people feel that the tickets should be given away in these cases but he pointed out that you don't give away a car because it is no longer that year's model. Ledder pointed out that the analogy is flawed since you cannot sell tickets for an event that has passed.

Moeller asked for further information on the study that is being conducted. Bethea stated that the study is about value impact, the value of what is done and the kind of interaction with the audience that occurs during a performance. He stated that he believes the findings of the study have the potential to affect the way the Lied Center approaches and engages audiences. He noted that comprehensive steps were done to conduct the study including surveys taken by the audiences and intensive focus group discussions.

Bethea stated that the world of entertainment is changing rapidly and the whole approach

is changing radically. He stated that audiences today are drawn to different things than they used to be. He noted that some people believe the Lied Center should be recreating audiences for classical music, dance or chamber music but the Center needs to be respectful of new audiences as well.

Bradford asked if the discount for faculty and staff members is publicized. Bethea stated that it was publicized in the first advertisement and in the Scarlet and through email messages.

Bradford asked if people buy the \$10 or family events to get the total number of their events up to eight so they can get the 20% discount. Bethea stated that there is no question that people buy tickets for the less costly events but he is glad to see people coming to any of the events.

Bethea stated that one thing that is not put on the season for ticket holders is Club Carson. He noted that this is geared towards a target audience, young professionals and students and there are usually two performances. He stated that these performances are in a small theater with drink and food available and tickets are \$15.

Bethea stated that there are also east campus events which are priced more in the middle range. He noted that there are a fair number of season ticket holders who will grab these events as well.

Bethea stated that the Lied Center wants to be as accessible to the community as it can be. He noted that recently there was a mini hip hop event at the Center. He stated that there were clearly people there who have probably never been in the Lied Center before. He stated that this was an opportunity to draw in a new audience and to work with organizations in the community.

Bethea stated that there are about 50 events a year that are outside rentals which is the primary source of income for the Center. He pointed out that the Lied Center does not get any university or state funding. He noted that the standard rental income is \$30,000. He stated that dance recitals are a big production and take a lot of time and a lot of resources are needed for them.

Bradford asked if the proposed new civic arena would have an impact on the Lied Center. Bethea stated that he did not think it would because the acts would be so different. He pointed out that the gross capacity of attendees makes a difference in what venues would go to the arena. He stated that the Lied Center will be watching to see if there are any impacts if the arena is built. He noted that the Qwest Center has not impacted the Center

and less than 1% of the business is from Omaha.

Bethea stated that the Broadway productions used to be the cash cow but they are not any longer. He noted that Lincoln gets the second generation touring shows of Broadway productions while Omaha gets the first generation.

Bethea stated that he would welcome and values any input that can be provided and he urged people to contact him by email.

3.0 Professor Moore, Sociology and Jan Deeds, Assistant Director of Student Involvement

3.1 Violence Against Women on Campus Grant (VAWOC)

Moore reported that the campus previously had a VAWOC educational grant and the campus is in the process of renewing it. She stated that we have run into some challenges from the federal government because they did not see enough administrative support of the grant to warrant further funding. As a result, the campus is looking for some new ways of approaching the educational processes here on campus to inform students of the key elements of the UNL student code of conduct. She noted that there is a coordinating committee that meets monthly which has representation from the faculty, housing, student involvement, athletics and the police working on developing the educational processes.

Moore reported that Deeds is spearheading an effort to develop an entry way for new students. This entry way is for students who have not had access to educational programs and it would inform them of what is expected of them as members of the UNL community. Moore stated that these students would include first time resident hall students, transfer students, those living in Lincoln, and international students.

Moore stated that what the coordinating committee is proposing is developing several compliments. The module would be accessible on-line and it is hoped that those faculty members who work with first year students will embed it. She pointed out that the effort is to orient students to campus communities that deal with key citizenship issues. She noted that they began thinking about the possibility of modules being broader with student codes of conducts.

Moore stated that the hope is to develop a collaborative planning group composed of faculty, staff, and students drawing on faculty with expertise on content area. She stated that the idea is to have people think about how to develop an integrated network of modules dealing with violence but including alcohol, hazing, academic dishonesty and plagiarism, and cultural competency. She noted that independent funding might be available for the alcohol and drug issues. She stated that she believes there is a good

opportunity to develop the modules.

Deeds stated that she has had to write letters for students who have been victims of violence or sexual abuse because of the impact it has had on the students' academic work. She pointed out that there is no one orientation course that all students take when they come to campus. She stated that the idea is to develop something that colleges can use as a tool to help students.

Ledder asked how a transfer student or international student would know about this module. Deeds stated that this is one of the things the collaborative group will be working on.

Moore stated that there are clearly processes in place now that can provide this information. She stated that there is peer networking with organizations such as the non-traditional student organization. What is being proposed is a resource that would be consistently made available to students but with faculty and staff input.

Moore stated that the proposed module would be part of building a civil society on campus. She noted that things such as cultural competency or knowledge about what is considered sexual harassment are not addressed in freshmen seminar classes. She stated that the plan is to develop a consistent resource for instructors who might want to address these kinds of issues further. Moeller noted that it would be helpful in her class when she is teaching future students. Moore agreed and said that it could also be linked to academic dishonesty. She stated that the list of student codes of conduct could be added over time. She stated that the coordinating group will initially work on relationship issues and probably one other model.

Flowers asked if other groups on campus have discussed the idea of developing the modules. Deeds stated that there have been discussions and there has been a good response from everyone. Flowers noted that the module could help the campus get support for other things as well and it might be unique for us to have this kind of system in place. He pointed out that the difficulty with a lot of these topics is that information on them is not easily accessible. Moore agreed and stated that information on these topics is not coordinated.

Moeller asked how the Senate could help. Deeds stated that an internal agreement to assist in the collaborative planning group is needed. She noted that if each college could agree to help that would strengthen the chance of getting the grant. Moore noted that the group will work with the advising offices of each college.

Deeds pointed out that the deadline for the grant is March 1st. The grant is already written but the internal memos agreeing to assist in the process are needed. She stated that the memo just needs to be an agreement to participate. Moore stated that she is aware that the Senate will not have a meeting in time to vote on this but she wondered if the Executive Committee could write a letter for the Senate. Ledder moved that the Executive Committee write a letter of agreement. Motion seconded by Flowers. Motion approved.

Moore noted that the initial grant was developed by a liaison person working between the Rape/Spouse Abuse Crisis Center and the campus. She noted that the funding ran out but ASUN was so in support of the liaison person that they are now paying for the position out of student fees. She noted that there is a huge compliment here that requires contact with community resources.

4.0 Announcements

4.1 Safe Assignment Policy

Flowers reported that the Dean of Arts & Sciences has distributed a draft of the policy. He stated that he is not sure whether they are looking for feedback on the policy or how it is being handled.

Griffin asked if the Senate will be voting on it since this is an academic policy that applies to all of the colleges. The Committee agreed that the Senate needs to vote on it. Moeller stated that she will send an email message to Dean Giesecke, chair of the committee working on the policy, and SVCAA Couture asking when the policy will be ready for the Senate to vote on since it is clearly an academic issue.

4.2 Legislative Hearing on the Retirement Cap

Moeller reported that there will be a hearing at the capital on LB 679 on February 27th at 12:15 in Room 1525. She noted that this is the bill that will eliminate the current restriction of the retirement cap for the university. She stated that currently the university is restricted to contributing only 8% towards retirement. The bill would just remove the cap so that if, in the future, the Board of Regents wanted to raise the contribution rate they would be free to do so.

4.3 National Graduate and Professional Student Appreciation Week

Moeller stated that she received a request asking that the Senate recognize the appreciation week which is April 2 – 6. Ledder stated that it would have to be declared as an emergency motion. Bradford stated that he was opposed to making a motion because it could open the door to all other kinds of groups wanting recognition. The committee agreed that an announcement should be made at the March Senate meeting.

5.0 Approval of 2/14/07 Minutes

Bradford moved and Zimmers seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Reduction in Force Procedures

Moeller reported that she received an email message from Beck with suggestions on how to handle the revision of the RIF procedures. The Committee agreed to discuss the issue at the next meeting so members have an opportunity to review Beck's suggestions.

6.2 Diversity Committee

Moeller reported that all members are now in place for the committee and she sent them steps on how they are to proceed with it. She noted that Professor Haller, English and Academic Planning Committee members, will be chairing the committee.

6.3 Academic Dishonesty Committee

Moeller announced that everyone who was asked to serve on this committee has agreed. She reported that the co-chairs of the committee will be Flowers and Ledder. Other members will be Greg Gifford, ASUN graduate student, Matt Hecker, Director of Student Judicial Affairs, Professor Tracy Bicknell-Holmes, Libraries, and Vice Chancellor Franco. She stated that another student from ASUN will serve on the committee once the new officers have been elected.

6.4 Update on Syllabus Policy (Ledder)

Ledder distributed the most current draft of the policy. He noted that the draft has been written by Greg Gifford, ASUN graduate student representative, and then edited by Ledder with input from Bradford.

Ledder stated that two things need to be addressed. He noted that one issue that needs to be addressed is whether syllabi need to include references to policies. He stated that the students feel that there needs to be some policies recognized but the difficulty is finding some of these policies on the web. Bradford stated that the policies should be right there on the student webpage. Ledder stated that there should be one website with all of the links to policies on it. The Committee agreed that this should be approached with the administration.

Ledder noted that the policy states that a syllabus can be disseminated in a variety of ways but in a manner that it can be read. He stated that there needs to be discussion about whether to include two issues: what are instructors going to collect from students to determine their grade and how the grades will be determined. Should papers, exams, and

other materials, along with the approximate value of these items be posted on the syllabi? He stated that he thinks students need to be protected and these kinds of items should be included in all syllabi.

Ledder stated that the policy draft is much less specific on how students are going to be assessed. He pointed out that it is up to the instructor to determine how a student is going to be graded. He noted that the students tend to think of college courses like a contract and this might work for some courses but not for all. He stated that an instructor cannot necessarily state in advance what A work will be like. Moeller pointed out that students sometimes do not understand what quality work constitutes and need rubrics to assist them in defining quality work. Ledder stated that some things might be different for different assignments and some instructors do not use a point system when grading.

Stock stated that the item about the grading scale would be ignored by his department. He stated that he believes that providing percentages of the grade to assignments is okay on the syllabus.

Bradford suggested that the item dealing with grade scales be placed under the section where applicable. He stated that he prefers more general language on the syllabus. Alexander pointed out that creating a syllabus based on this policy for an independent study course would not be possible. Ledder stated that due to the nature of some courses, it is not possible to adhere to a schedule.

Bradford noted that there is a potential problem with scheduling required exams. He pointed out that some courses are more fluid than others in what the course is going to do. Ledder stated that required text, if applicable should be on the syllabus. Flowers stated that instructors need the ability to assign readings to a course if they come up during the semester.

Ledder stated that instructors cannot be forced to follow the syllabus policy but students can make a formal complaint if a situation arises regarding the lack of a syllabus.

Ledder stated that he will discuss the proposed policy further with Gifford. Ledder stated that his goal is to present the policy to the Senate at the March meeting.

6.5 General Education Discussion

Ledder stated that he thinks the Committee needs to start discussions for the next phase of the Gen Ed revisions. He suggested four possible ways of getting faculty input to the Gen Ed committees.

Flowers noted that one of his concerns is that if the Gen Ed courses are based on individual contracts we could run into the same problem that we have now with not having oversight of the program. Ledder agreed and stated that contracts do not solve the problem of consistency with the courses because it is not possible to compare the courses. He pointed out that there could be a rush by departments and colleges to offer the easiest way for students to get through an outcome so the departments could have more credit hours produced.

Bradford noted that colleges could say that they accept any courses approved by the curriculum committees. Ledder pointed out that some faculty members are not comfortable with this idea. He stated that he thinks the current idea is that each college would have a representative on a committee and would have veto power. This way each college wouldn't have to take courses they did not want to include in their requirements.

Alexander stated that another issue is that ethics doesn't come under once course. He noted that one of the problems is that the language of the outcomes states that an outcome has to be completed in one course, for example writing. He noted that many courses require writing and these would meet the requirement of the outcomes. Ledder stated that this is why guidelines are needed. Otherwise you could have someone saying that writing courses only count if they are in an English class. The guidelines would say how much writing a course should have. He pointed out that the guidelines that specifically explain the outcomes are needed. Ledder stated that he would like to see the whole faculty weigh in on these issues before the Gen Ed committees present a proposal. Moeller stated that the members of the GEPT and GEAC see themselves as representatives of the faculty. Ledder asked how these people were chosen to be on the committees.

Ledder stated that the Senate could influence general education in different ways. He noted that the Senate could hold an open forum devoted just to the issues. A Senate resolution could be passed that would address some of the concerns. There could be a Senate debate. He pointed out that any motions made by the Senate would need to be done in March.

Alexander pointed out that one of the issues that the Gen Ed program needs to address is how to make it easier for transfer students coming into the university. He asked how a transfer student's transcripts would be evaluated as meeting the guidelines of the Gen Ed program. He pointed out that this needs to be discussed extensively. Ledder stated that there would need to be a committee that would evaluate the student's program and the student would have to provide evidence of meeting the outcomes.

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

6.6 Vacation Leave Policy

Zimmers asked if there has been anything done further on the vacation policy. He noted that some faculty members are concerned that if the Board of Regents put a cap on the amount of vacation time employees can earn that it will be a reduction in benefits.

Bradford stated that he thinks the Board will rephrase the carryover restrictions but they will not change the amount of vacation time that employees can earn according to their length of time employed at the university.

7.0 New Business

7.1 University Use of Optional Evaluation Forms (Bradford)

Bradford stated that due to lack of time he would email the Committee about the issue.

7.2 Report on UNL Employee Benefits Meeting (Bradford)

Bradford stated that due to lack of time he would email the Committee about the issue.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, February 28 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Academic Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Bolin, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alexander, Beck, Rapkin, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, February 28, 2007

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 3:03 p.m.

2.0 Michelle Waite, Assistant to the Chancellor for Community Relations

Moeller stated that several faculty members have indicated that they want to help the university in spreading news about the good work that is being done here. She asked what the Executive Committee can do to help assist in getting this information out.

Waite stated that UNL works in conjunction with the other campuses and with central administration to interact with the legislature. She noted that central administration distributes message points about the university. She stated that the current message points are very general and very broad. She stated that there may be another message point coming out soon, which she will share with the Executive Committee that discusses UNL's efficiencies.

Waite stated that it would be very helpful for faculty members to contact senators on the Appropriations Committee. She noted that the timing of this is critical since the university's budget is still under recommendation. During the next week (March 5th) the university's budget hearing will take place. She pointed out that UNL gets half of the university's budget. Waite stated that the members of the Appropriations Committee are: Senator Lavon Heidemann, Senator Lowen Kruse, Senator L. Patrick Engel, Senator Tony Fulton, Senator John Harms, Senator Danielle Nantkes, Senator John Nelson, Senator John Synowiecki, and Senator John Wightman.

Waite pointed out that the legislature is very different now with all of the new senators.

She noted that the new class of senators is very good and very bright. She stated that it would be helpful to have someone who can speak on behalf of the faculty to meet and speak with the legislators.

Waite reported that central administration is coordinating who will be speaking to the Appropriations Committee on the university's budget. She stated that she thinks some faculty members may be speaking.

Waite stated that between March 6th and 26th are all of the bill hearings followed by the post hearing reviews. She noted that the Appropriations Committee has to give its final recommendations to the full legislature by April 25th and the legislative session will end on May 31st. She noted that currently the Committee's recommendation on the university budget is not too bad.

Ledder stated that two of the four campuses in the system have collective bargaining units. He asked what affect this might have on the university's budget. Waite stated that in this particular case it might be good for UNL. She stated that probably faculty and staff members at UNL and UNMC will be given a similar increase as those at UNK and UNO. She stated that she does not know whether being unionized works for or against us with the legislature.

Waite stated that once the recommendation makes it to the legislative floor individual senators can be contacted. She noted that once the budget is drafted amendments can be made to it by members of the legislature. She pointed out that it is common for people outside of the Appropriations Committee to make changes to the budget but it is easier to make changes when the bill is still in the committee.

Moeller asked what would be the best format for meeting with some of the legislators. Waite pointed out that the legislator's calendars are packed because so many of them are new this year. She stated that it would be better for people to go over to the capital to talk with the legislator. She also suggested talking to the administrative aides. She stated that it would be helpful to get information about the senator, his/her district, personal interests or their business when talking with them. She stated that discussing successes the university has had in areas of interest to the senator would be particularly helpful.

Waite stated that the university definitely wants to give the legislators a faculty perspective. She pointed out that some legislators may not understand the importance of national and international recognition for the university. She noted that students are also very effective in talking with senators.

Waite stated that with the Appropriations Committee's current recommendations, \$10 million will still be needed for salaries. She stated that there is \$8 million in utilities cost that needs to be covered due to the shortage from last year. She noted that there will be a \$23 million shortfall even with the Appropriations Committee's current recommendation.

Waite stated that each 1% of tuition increase raises \$1.7 million. A 5% increase would raise \$8.5 million but she does not think that the Board of Regents will raise tuition by 5%. She pointed out that even with a 5% increase there would still be a \$7.5 million shortfall for UNL. She suggested that faculty members who were here during the recent budget cuts can tell the legislators what happened with the cuts.

Waite stated that some of the new senators may not understand how the money is used by the university. She noted that there are some people who think there are a lot of wastes at the university.

Waite stated that in previous years the Governor has been good to the university. She pointed out that there is money available so she is not sure what is going on with the Governor's thinking. Ledder stated that he believes the governance community has become stuck on the idea that we are over taxed. He pointed out that people will always complain that taxes are too much no matter what they are. Waite stated that many of the new legislators are hearing people complain about property taxes. She pointed out that Nebraska does not have a tax base here so the tax burden falls on the property owners.

Waite stated that almost every state around us is putting in significant amounts of money into higher education. Moeller pointed out that there is a correlation greater investment in higher education and quality of living for the people of the state.

Alloway asked if most of the legislators understand the difference between funding for athletics versus the university. Waite stated that she believes most of them do understand this. Zimmers noted that the recent Battelle report shows that for every \$1 that goes into IANR, \$15 goes back to the state. Waite suggested that faculty members discuss what the impact of a budget shortfall will do to the senator's constituents if they have or are going to have a family member in college.

Waite stated that central administration is doing weekly updates on what is going on at the capital. She noted that she will probably forward this information on to Moeller who can then forward it on to others if she likes.

Bradford stated that he gets the sense that the Governor is going to line item veto anything that goes over his budget. Waite stated that this could happen. She noted that President

Milliken is working very hard for the university.

Moeller stated that she will ask faculty members at the Senate meeting on Tuesday to talk with their legislator.

3.0 Professor Eckhardt, Chemistry

3.1 Laboratory Issues for Professors

Eckhardt stated that as a member of the Academic Planning Committee he brought to the Committee's attention the issue of inequities in laboratories for faculty members in the Chemistry department. He reported that Chemistry has undergone an extensive remodeling of Hamilton Hall and refurbishing the ventilation system. He stated that only the top research floors were renovated and the other floors were left to their prehistoric conditions. He stated that as a result the department has become ghettoized with some faculty members having very nice new laboratories and others left with old, outdated laboratories. He reported that it is the Dean's policy that new hires will get the new research laboratories while those who have been here are left with the old laboratories.

Eckhardt stated that in order for faculty members to survive in the hard sciences two things are needed, students and grant money. He pointed out that without good research facilities you cannot attract the students who are needed to help conduct the research. This in turn leads to less writing and less publications which in turn can lead to fewer grants which can then lead to less of a merit increase. As a result merit raises become differentiated and those in the poor laboratories will get further and further behind.

Ledder asked when the old laboratories were considered state of the art. Eckhardt stated it was in the 1970's. He pointed out that these facilities show 40 years worth of wear. He noted that it would be different if everyone was in the same situation but this current situation is unfair. He stated that the university is not addressing the problem and will lose more people as a result. He noted that at least eight people have left the department.

Ledder asked why some research floors were renovated and some not. Eckhardt stated that some of the funding came from the National Institute for Health so those conducting research in the biosciences were renovated first. He pointed out that the plan was to remodel the other floors but the money has not been made available for renovation.

Moeller asked if the decision to give the new incoming hires the good research facilities is an age issue as well. Eckhardt stated that in some ways it is because it affects faculty members who are middle aged or older. He pointed out that this could be quite damaging because there is a greater risk of losing those faculty members who are middle aged.

Moeller stated that the situation is similar to the salary compression issue which she discussed with the Chancellor. She noted that she did discuss the Chemistry department problem with the Chancellor as well. She reported that the Chancellor stated that the decision about renovations of facilities is a departmental and college decision.

Eckhardt stated that the department has taken the issue to the Dean. He noted that the department does not have control of the money that is needed to renovate the other laboratories. He stated that the Dean has stated that the renovations would have to be done piecemeal because of the lack of funding and the new facilities would go to the new faculty members.

Ledder noted that Dean Hoffman will be stepping down. He wondered whether the policy of giving the new faculty members the new facilities will still exist once Dean Hoffman is no longer in that position. Eckhardt pointed out that the problem goes deeper and there need to be institutional policies. Ledder stated that guidelines would need to be written very carefully. He pointed out that a faculty member who receives a grant should not be penalized for renovating their laboratory with that grant money because the department as a whole is not being renovated. Eckhardt stated that if an individual does the renovation it is not so much of a problem but when an institutional renovation occurs it needs to be fair.

Ledder noted that the School of Biological Sciences is split between older facilities in Manter and new ones in Beadle. He wondered if they are having any similar problems. Eckhardt stated that he thinks there may be a similar problem in a department on east campus. He pointed out that the situation is very destructive to the department morale.

Bradford asked what else the Senate can do on the issue. Eckhardt stated that he is not familiar enough with the Senate structure but he knows that it is an equity issue because some people are automatically being disadvantaged. Moeller stated that it is an access issue as well and that some faculty members are unable to do good work. Eckhardt pointed out that it is de facto age discrimination. Moeller asked if this is affecting mainly senior professors. Eckhardt stated that it is.

Moeller stated that the Committee can raise the issue with the Chancellor when it meets with him on March 21st. She noted that the Chancellor did state in her meeting with him that these kinds of inequities need to be resolved.

Ledder suggested that in the course of pursuing a resolution to this problem it might be helpful to check with our peer institutions to see how many of them have research facilities that are 40 years old. Eckhardt pointed out that across the nation there has been

a huge boom in building new chemistry buildings.

Moeller stated that the Committee will discuss the issue with the Chancellor and will inform Eckhardt of the discussion.

4.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

5.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Reduction in Force Procedures

The Committee agreed to postpone the agenda item until clarification is received by Beck on the documents she forwarded.

6.2 Syllabus Policy

Ledder presented the Committee with a new draft of the policy. He noted that included was a draft resolution that can be brought to the Senate. Ledder pointed out some of the changes that were made from the previous draft policy. He noted that examples are now included in the policy.

Bradford pointed out that the Senate will need to vote on this policy since this is an academic policy that affects all of the colleges.

Ledder stated that ASUN has looked at the policy but needs to look at this latest revision. He stated that the policy will not be in its final form to present to the Senate until he has heard back from ASUN.

6.3 General Education

Ledder asked if we know more about the colleges' approval process of the first two proposals. Moeller stated that they passed in the College of Education and Human Sciences by a huge margin. She stated that she will contact Associate Vice Chancellor Wilson to see what the status is of the voting in the remaining colleges.

Ledder noted that he and Janovy have been corresponding again but Ledder stated that he is pleased to see that the conversation has been expanded to others on the GEPT and GEAC. He noted that the main thing that he finds irritating is that the committee claims that they are open to faculty input but they appear to be doing things to hinder that discussion.

Ledder stated that it is his understanding that GEAC member Professor Goodburn wants

an even more openness than he has suggested. He noted that Goodburn has suggested posting the minutes of the meetings on the web. He stated that he believed that this was a good idea because people would know the nature of the discussions which could help quell rumors and speculations.

Ledder stated that the GEPT and GEAC are planning to hold an open forum discussion on March 26th. He pointed out that if this does not happen the Senate should have an open forum discussion at the April Senate meeting.

Moeller stated that the GEPT has asked to meet with the Committee. Griffin stated that members of the GEPT will meeting with the Committee on March 21st at 3:45.

6.4 Driving Policy

Zimmers asked if the faculty will see the proposed driving policy before it is approved. Griffin stated that she sent an email message to Kim Phelps, Associate Vice Chancellor for Business & Finance, about this but never received a reply back. She stated that she will try contacting him again.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Salary Increase Parity

Moeller reported that an email message was sent by a faculty member regarding concern over salary increase parity. Moeller stated that she discussed the issue with the Chancellor who stated that if these inequities exist he would have a look at them.

7.2 Beck's Eligibility to Serve as Chair

Bradford stated that he questions whether Beck should serve as chair of the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee since she is no longer an active faculty member. Moeller noted that Beck is an Emeritus faculty member.

Bradford stated that the problem is that the committee syllabus does not state that members of the committee need to be an active faculty member. He pointed out that he discussed the issue with Associate to the Chancellor Howe who shared his concern. Bradford reported that Beck stated that she will discuss the issue with the university's general counsel office.

Bradford stated that the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee will need to deal with this issue. He pointed out that he is impressed that Beck is still willing to do the work of being chair but he is worried about setting a precedent.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be

on Wednesday, March 7th 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, Rapkin, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Bolin, Moeller, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, March 7, 2007

Location: Academic Senate Office

Note: These are not verbatim minutes. They are a summary of the discussions at the Executive Committee meeting as corrected by those participating.

1.0 Call to Order

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

2.0 Assistant Vice Chancellor Currin, Human Resources, and Layton Brooks, Senior Human Resources Facilitator

2.1 On-line Faculty Application Form

Currin stated that Chancellor Perlman asked him to come over and walk through the on-line application process for faculty positions. He noted that he has heard that there are some concerns and assured the Committee that if corrections are needed to the web page they will be made.

Alexander asked why the process was changed from the old system when the search committee went through the applications. Currin stated that the current system was initiated because the old system was more labor intensive. He pointed out that if a department decides that they don't want to use this new system it is not a problem. He stated that the new system allows applicants to send vitas and other information electronically.

Brooks noted that representatives from Academic Affairs and IANR were involved in assisting with the creation of the on-line form. He pointed out that the process is basically the same it is just done through a different medium. He stated that the new process is a paperless method but departments and search committees have the option of printing out documents if they wish to. He noted that the on-line process gives the university a central location for storing information on applicants.

Currin pointed out that most of the process, particularly the cards that used to be sent out to gather demographic information on applicants, is now automated. Flowers stated that he heard that it was because of the failure of the post card system that there has been a shift to the on-line form. Currin stated that the major issue was that the old post card system was labor intensive. He noted that a staff person had to make copies of vitas, facilitate communications and set up meetings but this can now all be done electronically.

Rapkin asked if it is mandatory that applicants apply electronically. Currin stated that applicants need to fill out the electronic form.

Brooks stated that there are two options available. He noted that departments can elect to have an applicant attach a vita and all other relevant material to the electronic form although most departments opt not to do this.

Brooks stated that when a faculty position is posted and an ad is produced the ad requires that a web address be included along with a requisition number. He stated that the job listing can be retrieved by simply entering the requisition number. He noted that most of the system is intuitive but there are instructions that people can follow if needed. He stated that if someone has a question on the position they can contact the person listed in the job posting. He noted that the system will prompt the user and highlight the area if there is an error. He stated that the faculty information form requires basic contact information and is very brief.

Flowers asked if the system will allow phone numbers outside the U.S. to be listed. Brooks stated that the on-line form is a formatted system so it requires a basic area code number. He pointed out that in most cases the form will also indicate contact information for an applicant. He noted that some applicants also send an email message to the department letting them know that they have a phone number outside the U.S.

Bradford asked about the question regarding relatives. Currin stated that this is required because of the University's nepotism statute.

Flowers stated that the question regarding eligibility to work caused some confusion for a recent applicant because they were unsure whether they could work in the U.S. or not. He suggested that the wording be changed on this question to alleviate any misunderstanding.

Brooks stated that the on-line form is voluntary demographic information that applicants do not have to fill out. He stated that only the areas where there are asterisks must be completed. Ledder asked if mandatory areas still need to be filled in even if they are not applicable such as the criminal history section. Brooks stated that in these areas the

applicant should put not applicable. He noted that the information entered can be reviewed by the applicant. Once the submit button is hit the applicant will be given a confirmation number.

Ledder stated that the process seems fine and is quick. Bradford asked if an applicant has to fill out the on-line form before the department search committee can talk to an applicant. Brooks stated that what is being required is to have the form filled out so that there is consistency in applying for positions. He stated that applicants can contact search committee members and the member can assist the applicant in filling out the form if necessary. Currin stated that outreaching with potential candidates is fine but if the process gets to the point where the search committee becomes involved then the on-line form needs to be completed. Bradford pointed out that he would rather that an applicant's first contact with the University be through the search committee rather than going through the on-line form. Currin stated that there are no restrictions on the committee talking to people.

Bradford pointed out that with the old system it was optional if the applicant wanted to fill out the post card that provided demographic information. Currin stated that with the new system the applicant will need to go to the website but they are not required to fill in the demographic information.

Flowers asked if the on-line form can be designed so an applicant can upload a vita or other material. He asked whether the department can control this option. Currin stated that the department has two choices, to upload or send the vita to the search committee.

Alexander asked if a prospective applicant can just review jobs even if they do not know the position or requisition number. Brooks stated that a person can do a search for jobs by entering keywords. He pointed out that when applying for positions there will be instructions which will tell the applicant if they need to do something further such as attaching a vita. Flowers asked if the system will take any format of the vita. Brooks stated that it will and a confirmation number will be provided along with a message stated that the application was successfully completed.

Flowers stated that he had an applicant complain that they did not receive confirmation. The applicant stated that they did not attempt to download material from the file because the applicant did not know how the file was set up. The applicant claimed that they could not get information from the administrators. Brooks stated that whoever in the department is responsible for setting up the requisition for the position would set up how applicants are to receive information.

Brooks stated that the application form went live in February 2005. He stated that there are a number of other options that departments can use when listing a job.

Flowers stated that one third of the people who contacted his department during a recent job search stated that they could not apply successfully through the website. He pointed out that this would result in an undercount of people who attempted to apply for the position. Brooks stated that the Office of Equity, Access, and Diversity Programs is making sure that the advertisements provide certain information. He noted that the administrative person from the department writes up the job description. He pointed out that the job description and instructions for applying for the position should be clear and specific.

Brooks stated that there is training on how to set up the advertisements or the Human Resources department can be contacted for help. He noted that Jelena Gude, Administrative Assistant in Academic Affairs, would be a good person to contact for help as well.

Flowers suggested that the members of the search committee should help set up the job advertisement. Currin stated that they should at least review the advertisement before it goes on-line.

Alloway asked if a person would receive a message if they tried sending the vita in a different format. Brooks stated that they will receive a message telling them that they need to put the vita in a particular format if it is different than a standard word processing of text file format. He noted that there is a signature chain in place for approval of a job requisition. He stated that the authorization of the search committee and the chair of the department are needed. He pointed out that the system is very easy to use but stated that people should not hesitate to contact the Human Resources department if they need any assistance.

Bradford asked if the advertisements include a contact phone number if the applicant runs into problems. Brooks stated that both a phone number and an email address are listed. He pointed out that an applicant can withdraw an application but if they do this they cannot reapply for the position. Bradford asked if a person can apply and then come back to the site to later attach documents. Brooks stated that this can be done.

Rapkin noted that the on-line process can do all of the work except for the letters of recommendations that are needed for an applicant. He pointed out that many universities have placement services and most of the work of searches will be going on-line.

Bradford asked what would happen if a person did not use computers. Brooks stated that the department could have someone from the office assist the applicant or they could ask a friend to help or go to their local library. Currin stated that someone from the university could help as well.

Ledder stated that he assumes there are directions for how to post a job position. Brooks stated that there is a manual of instructions and the Human Resources department will also walk through the process with an administrator. Ledder stated that once the requisition is completed the chair of the search committee could check the advertisement by applying for the position and then withdrawing the application.

Rapkin stated that he just attended a search committee meeting today and found out that one of the top three applicants failed to fill out the on-line form and was not included in the pool of applicants. Layton stated that generally the applicants would have contact with the administrator or whoever contacted them. He stated that he does not think the Office of Equity, Access and Diversity Programs would say that a person couldn't apply for a position if they did not fill out the on-line form. He stated that the simple solution is to contact the applicant and ask them to fill out the form.

Currin asked if there are deadline dates on the job positions. Brooks stated that a review date is listed. Currin pointed out that this is not a closing date for the position. Brooks noted that having a review date listed allows a search committee to continue the search if there are no qualified applicants. Currin stated that there is a legal requirement that all applicants must be reviewed if there is a closing date. He pointed out that putting a closing date limits a search committee from accepting any applications after that date.

Brooks noted that there are constant upgrades to the on-line website. He stated that these upgrades can include language changes but the basic interface remains the same. Bradford asked how frequently the system is backed up. Brooks stated that this is done daily.

Currin stated that faculty members should feel free to contact either himself or Brooks if there are any concerns or if anyone needs help.

3.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

4.0 Approval of 2/28/07 Minutes

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

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 RIF Procedures

Beck reported that she did not think it will be possible to get the reduction in force procedures changed. She noted that a committee worked on revising the procedures but the changes the committee wanted most strongly (i.e., supermajority requirements, formal debate within the Senate) were not acceptable to the Chancellor. She stated that when she and then President-Elect Moeller met with the Chancellor, he indicated that he had no problem with the Senate actively participating in budget discussions but that he did not want to have the proposed changes in the document. She suggested that one way to possibly deal with this is to have the Senate work within its own document and see how involved the faculty are willing to be; and then negotiate with the Chancellor to see how much faculty involvement is possible in the process from his perspective.

Beck reported that a timeline of the 2003 budget cuts is on the Chancellor's website but what was supposed to happen during the cuts did not entirely happen because the rules were not followed. She pointed out that the timeline indicates that there was a lot of faculty involvement in the budget cutting process but this did not happen. She sent the Executive Committee both the current timeline from the website and a modified version to show how the Senate might interface with the current procedures.

Bradford asked how the Senate could propose budget cuts on its own if the Chancellor does not agree to the procedures. Beck stated that the Senate President's designee to the Academic Planning Committee could provide input from the Senate. She stated that there could be ways to increase faculty involvement in the decisions or considerations and the faculty can always go to the Board of Regents with their own proposals if necessary. Bradford pointed out that the Senate would have difficulty getting some of the information that would be needed to make budget cutting decisions.

Bradford noted that there is some time because the budget that the legislature is working on is for the next biennium which means we could have a full year to deal with the budget cuts.

Ledder stated that Senate Executive Committee needs to assert its involvement in the process before budget cuttings decisions are made. He stated that one of the troubling things about the process is that it doesn't necessarily terminate. He noted that the Chancellor forwards his plans to the APC which then makes recommendations but it is not clear how the process ends after that. Bradford pointed out that this is what happened in 2003. He stated that the APC did not like the proposed cuts but it could not present alternatives because it was not given enough information.

Beck noted that prior to Chancellor Spanier, the APC made the decisions about which programs to cut and the Chancellor abided by the APC's recommendations. She noted that the language of the procedures was changed giving the Chancellor the power to make decisions. She stated that before Chancellor Spanier the power of what academic programs were to be cut was given to the faculty but this is now gone. She pointed out that the recent committee that worked on revising the RIF procedures tried to write it in a way that increased shared governance by allowing greater faculty participation and by proposing a way for both the Chancellor and the Senate to make recommendations on budget cuts but the Chancellor was opposed to this.

Ledder asked if the decisions are actually made by the Board of Regents. Beck stated that the Board makes the final decision. She noted that the Chancellor stated that the Senate could make any recommendations it wants on the budget but he is not willing to have that written in the procedures.

Beck stated that the APC was asked to revise their procedures for academic program reviews so that they could be more accessible and uniform. She noted that the academic program reviews will now be able to be used to see if a program warrants being cut.

Bradford stated that the key will be to get APC and the Executive Committee involved early on in the process. He pointed out that this is necessary if alternatives are going to be presented.

Beck suggested that the Committee might want to speak with Associate Dean Rosson about the budget cutting process. She noted that he was chair of the APC when the budget cuts occurred in 2003 and he was a member of the ad hoc RIF revision committee; he would be a good resource for the Executive Committee.

5.2 Safe Assignment Policy

Flowers noted that ASUN President Schaefer stated in an email message that ASUN would vote on a resolution against the Safe Assignment policy. Flowers pointed out that Schaefer never brought up any of the concerns mentioned in the resolution at any of the meetings the task force committee had on the policy.

Ledder asked if it is true that students cannot see the results of the report that the Safe Assignment program makes on a student's paper. Flowers stated that the program can be set up so that only the faculty member can read the report or it can be set up so the faculty and the student can see the report. He pointed out that this should be the instructor's purview.

Bradford noted that the policy does not have to be presented to the Senate until the April 3rd meeting. He suggested that Schaefer should be informed if the Senate is going to vote on the policy. He pointed out that there is no requirement that ASUN needs to approve the policy. It is a curriculum policy that needs to be voted on by the Senate.

Alloway asked if the policy as it now stands is the final draft. Flowers stated that he is not sure but that it is his understanding that if the policy is for the UNL campus the Senate must vote on it. Alloway asked if it is up to the task force committee or the Executive Committee to make final revisions to the policy. Ledder asked if the Senate has the capability of amending the policy. Bradford stated that the Senate can amend it.

Flowers stated that he will ask Dean Giesecke whether the policy is in its final draft form.

Ledder asked if it is true that the students may not be notified in advance whether an instructor will use the program. Flowers pointed out that if the program is used in the normal way it is shown on Blackboard as a Safe Assignment project. Alloway noted that the assignment has to be created as a Safe Assignment project. Flowers stated that a paper can be done as a quick submit.

Flowers stated that the privacy concerns do not appear to be finalized in the draft. He pointed out that the draft needs to make clear that instructors do not submit private and sensitive things to the program's database. He noted that the students want an appeal process but going through a grading appeals committee would violate a student's privacy. Ledder asked if the policy is clear that students can make an appeal to the instructor. He stated that he would like the policy to state that instructors must notify students in the beginning of the semester that they will use the program and that an instructor must honor an appeal by a student not to put the paper in the database.

Bradford stated that he is surprised that ASUN is calling for a resolution when the policy is still in a draft form and recommendations can still be made to it.

Alexander stated that he is having trouble using the program to check a master's thesis. Flowers stated that a quick submit can be done by adding the person to a course. Alexander stated that he tried doing this but it did not work. Flowers suggested using another course and adding Safe Assignment as a quick submit.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Pound Howard Award Procedures and Policies

Bradford reported that President Moeller received email messages from a faculty member

who nominated someone for the award. The faculty member states that the procedures of the Honorary Degrees Committee were not followed because the person making the nomination in this case was not allowed to make a presentation to the Committee about the nominee. Typically nominations go through the nominee's home college but in this case the nomination came from outside of the college. Bradford stated that since the nominee was from IANR, Vice Chancellor Owens made a presentation to the Committee, not the nominators.

Bradford stated that the nominator raised his concern with Professor Walklin, co-chair of the Committee. Walklin then asked the committee to review the situation and decide whether the nominee should be given the award. It was pointed out that there have been times in the past where the award was given to two people in the same year. Walklin responded back to Moeller and stated that the Committee was unanimous in their decision to give out one award and who that award should go to.

Alexander stated that the nominators felt they have more in depth information about the nominee and they should have been given the opportunity to make a presentation. He pointed out that the Committee did not follow its own procedures which they acknowledge. Ledder stated that he doesn't know why the Committee doesn't hear the presentation and they can then vote against the nominee if they decide to. Alexander pointed out that the nominators do not necessarily want to make a presentation now but they feel two awards should be given.

Ledder pointed out that the Executive Committee could make any decision because it does not have any of the nominations materials in front of it to judge. Alloway stated that the Executive Committee should not supercede the authority of its own committees.

Bradford pointed out that the Honorary Degrees Committee has admitted that it has made a mistake and the Senate has voted and approved the winner of the award. He noted that the co-chair of the committee has clearly conceded that the procedures were not followed carefully and a mistake was made this year but the Committee does not feel that two awards should be given. Ledder stated that it was unfortunate that the rules were not followed but doesn't recommend any redress. The Executive Committee agreed.

Bradford stated that he will send an email back to the faculty member to tell him of the Executive Committee's decision.

6.2 Executive Committee Elections

Bradford pointed out that the Senate elections are coming up in April. He stated that if any Senator knows of someone who they feel would be good to serve on the Executive

Committee they should contact them and persuade them to run for election.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, March 21 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Bolin, Bradford, Flowers, Ledder, Moeller, Rapkin, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alexander, Beck, Hachtmann

Date: Wednesday, March 21, 2007

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 3:04 p.m.

2.0 Chancellor Perlman

2.1 Budget

Chancellor Perlman stated that there is not much new yet on the budget but if the Appropriations Committee's 2.1% budget increase for the university holds this will have serious, negative impacts for UNL. He pointed out with only a 2.1% increase and including a 5% tuition increase UNL would have to cut \$8 million from its budget. He noted that there is \$34 million worth of mandatory expenditures that cannot be avoided under any reasonable circumstances. He stated that the Appropriations Committee's budget recommendation would provide for only \$9 million of these expenses.

Chancellor Perlman noted that initially the university requested a 5% increase not including salaries.

Bradford asked what is included in the mandatory expenditures. Chancellor Perlman reported that it includes a 4.4% increase for all classes of employees at three of the campuses (the collective bargaining unit of one of the campuses negotiated for a 4.3% increase). A special master has ordered 4.4% increases for the other unionized campus and UNL and UNMC are further behind their peers. He noted that some staff members and managerial/professional employees are also further behind our peers in salaries than some faculty members.

Chancellor Perlman stated that there is no request for an increase to cover health

insurance. He pointed out that the steps the university has taken over the last year will not require any increases in health insurance costs for this year and if things hold, only a small increase next year.

Chancellor Perlman reported that one option the legislature can do is to delay or avoid the \$3.9 million payment that is due from the university on deferred maintenance. He noted that utilities cost still need to be dealt with. He pointed out that the legislature put money towards these costs last year but the money was not put into the university's base budget.

Chancellor Perlman stated that another mandatory expense is covering the operation costs for new buildings. He noted that this amounts to approximately \$1.4 million. He pointed out that there is not much control over the mandatory expenses.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he is meeting with legislators, particularly the new legislators, to let them know how UNL was affected by the 2001-03 budget cuts and how we are working to be efficient. He stated that 84% of the budget is in payroll but people need to remember that the university is a service industry and the raw material we work with is people. He pointed out that although there is some concern about the total number of employees in the system across the state, only about 33% of these people are in teaching and research and 17% are in cooperative extension.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he also provides information to the senators on student census figures and what part of the state the students come from.

Chancellor Perlman stated that information is provided about how UNL has cut almost \$31 million from the base budget in the last five years.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the legislature wants to know that we are spending the money correctly. He noted that some of our cuts did achieve efficiencies. He pointed out that we merged two colleges, eliminated the teaching and learning center, closed the hotel, closed research components of the museum, just to name a few things.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the report on efficiency provides some interesting information. He noted that a chart is provided which shows the number of tenure track faculty members from 1996-2006 relative to enrollment. He pointed out that the number of tenure track faculty members has gone down considerably although it is starting to rise a little. He noted that the enrollment figures have basically stayed the same so the campus is doing more or the same with fewer resources yet we have been able to increase retention and graduation rates.

Chancellor Perlman stated that financial transactions for the campus have increased by 8.6% but the staff needed to monitor these transactions has decreased by 20%. He pointed out that the number of campus facilities has increased but the percent of staff needed to maintain these facilities has decreased.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the Appropriations Committee has completed hearings and will now be working privately to develop their budget. He stated that the Appropriations Committee budget goes to the floor of the legislature sometime during the second week in April.

Ledder noted that one of the problems seems to be that there is an assumption that we are over taxed in Nebraska but Nebraska money is very well spent. Chancellor Perlman stated that there are two different points here. He stated that one report shows that we are 6th in the country in terms of tax burden because the per capita income is compared with property and state taxes. When this is done we will always come out higher on the scale but the Standards and Poor's study shows Nebraska to be in the top 10 states for business opportunities.

Moeller noted that the Executive Committee has met with Michelle Waite to see how faculty can help in contacting legislators and how we can spread the word about the work of the faculty.

Chancellor Perlman stated that another point to make is that the university has been able to accomplish what it has in recent years because the faculty has stayed with him through these difficult times. He noted that the faculty recognized that cuts had to be made and public education around the country was going through the same difficult times. However, he does not know to what extent the faculty will stay when they hear that governors in many other states are making significant investments in higher education and knowing that Nebraska has a large surplus in its budget yet will not provide the university with the needed increase for its budget.

Moeller stated that recruiting new faculty members could be difficult as well if the university is forced to make large budget cuts again. Ledder stated that it has not been difficult to attract new assistant professors in Mathematics but the department is offering market salaries to these people. Chancellor Perlman stated that there was a recent article that talked about the brain drain that has occurred at the University of Iowa and Iowa State University because of the lack of salary increases due to poor increases in Iowa's higher education budget.

Bradford asked if the university has considered what would happen to enrollment if there

is a 5% tuition increase. Chancellor Perlman stated that there has not been a lot of discussion about it but a 5% increase will probably not have an impact but if there is an increase above that we could start seeing a drop in enrollment rates.

2.2 Budget Reallocation Procedures

Moeller asked how the Chancellor will proceed if the university gets a very small budget increase. Chancellor Perlman stated that he hopes that we will not get to this point but we would be in the same situation as before. He noted that we will not know about the budget increase until May. He stated that not much can be done for the next year except to manage the cash flow.

Chancellor Perlman stated that his intention would be to have vertical cuts. He noted that if this is done he would comply with the procedures that are in place. He noted that the process of making cuts will take awhile.

Bradford asked if there would be something like the assigned minus budget that was recently done. Chancellor Perlman stated that he would not be in favor of across the board cuts except perhaps if necessary for cash flow purposes until the permanent cuts could be made. He pointed out that he would certainly have a conversation with the Executive Committee before anything would happen.

2.3 Salary Parity Issues

Moeller noted that this has been discussed before. She stated that new professors are being hired at the market rate while those professors who have been here for a long time have a lower salary. She pointed out that this can be very demoralizing for people who have been loyal to the institution. She stated that several faculty members have now raised this issue.

Chancellor Perlman stated that one way the administration addresses this issue is to hold back a certain percentage of the increases for the Vice Chancellors and Deans to use to help deal with these kinds of issues. He pointed out that there are hard choices that have to be made by the Deans and Chairs when dealing with these cases. He noted that it is not possible to correct these issues from his level because he does not have all of the information to determine whether an increase is meritorious or not.

Ledder stated that, although he has never been involved in the department evaluation process, it is his understanding that an instructor is evaluated according to merit and then the merit rating is used to determine a percentage raise without regard for where the current salary lies relative to market value. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that how this is done varies greatly from department to department, even within the same college.

Flowers stated that within some colleges there are some constraints for Chairs getting access to the Dean's allotment of salary money. He stated that the Chairs feel that the rules that are imposed on them by the Dean restrict them from addressing salary parity issues. He noted that the difference in salaries can end up being a significant amount when the salary parity occurs over a period of years. He stated that some departments feel they cannot equitably balance out the salary issue. Chancellor Perlman stated that this is the reason why the administration holds back a certain percentage of the increase. The amount a department may receive for salary increases might be subject to negotiation depending on how things happen at the department level. He stated that he expects the Deans and Chairs to help solve the problems they see.

Ledder stated that he remembers when a certain portion of the salary increases was given to deal with salary compressions. Chancellor Perlman stated that he remembers this as well but noted there are a series of issues with salaries that are complex and each department handles it differently. He pointed out that he cannot manage each department and the decision whether it would be better to do merit increases or compression increases must be decided at the department level.

2.4 Diversity Plan

Moeller stated that she received an email message from the chair of the committee asking if the plan is to be a comprehensive plan for both faculty and staff or whether there should be separate plans. Moeller asked if there is a timeline for the committee as well.

Chancellor Perlman noted that a committee was formed and produced a draft document which was distributed to the campus. He noted that the Senate raised concerns about the draft and as a result he turned the whole process of developing a new draft to the Senate. He stated that the new committee will need to decide whether to write two separate plans or develop a comprehensive plan. He stated that the process will be the same in that the plan will need to be taken to the campus for discussion.

2.5 Department Management Concerns

Moeller noted that complaints have been made against some department chairs. She stated that Senior Vice Chancellor Couture will be consulted about the problem and what can be done. Chancellor Perlman stated that the Office of Equity, Diversity, and Access has access to outside mediation services and this might be considered.

2.6 Issues on the Horizon

Chancellor Perlman stated that Vice Chancellor Paul's five year evaluation will need to be conducted this year. He reported that Vice Chancellor Paul has provided the necessary

information for the evaluation but consideration needs to be given about what faculty committees should be involved in the evaluation. Chancellor Perlman noted that Vice Chancellor Paul is in a unique situation because he does not have faculty members who report to him yet in another way he works a lot with faculty members. Chancellor Perlman stated that he is thinking of having Professor Van Etten serve as the liaison person for the evaluation. Chancellor Perlman stated that he is inclined to use the Research Council and Research Advisory Board for the evaluations.

Chancellor Perlman reported that some interesting things may develop for the university with the former Starship 9 lot downtown. He noted that no public announcements have been made yet.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the 2015 Visioning Group is moving forward. Moeller asked if there was a price tag attached to the numerous things the Group wants to do. Chancellor Perlman stated that building an arena would be over \$200 million and the other plans would be additional money. He noted that the original proposed budget for the Antelope Valley Project was over \$200 million and it is now being worked on. He pointed out that most of the money for the 2015 Visioning Group projects would be from private sector dollars and hopefully federal dollars. He stated that things are moving along with the Group and there was a lot of enthusiasm at the meetings held in town about the Group's goals.

Chancellor Perlman reported that a consultant has been hired by central administration to look into distance education and how the university might better position itself in this area.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he is leaving for China where he hopes to establish some programs between institutions there and UNL. He stated that establishing these programs could result in UNL getting an additional 200 – 300 students.

3.0 General Education Advisory Committee Members (Professors Janovy, Peterson, Mitchell, Fuess, and Woodward)

Moeller stated that the Committee wanted to meet with the General Education Planning Team (GEPT) to make sure that both groups are progressing on the same page and to get an update on what is happening next with the general education revision. Peterson stated that it is the GEPT's interest as well to meet and discuss what is going on. He noted that it is extremely useful to get input from the faculty and having the discussion in the Executive Committee minutes is helpful.

Peterson noted that the general education committees were charged with developing four

proposals. Two of these have been developed and approved by all colleges. He noted that the first two proposals are contingent on the remaining proposals being approved and nothing will be changed with the current general education program until the full package is approved.

Peterson stated that the committees have been identifying some key issues that need to be discussed. Some of these key issues are what an agreement between an Achievement Centered Education (ACE) committee and a department would look like; what would a course proposal form look like. He noted that drafts of these forms can be found on the general education website (<http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/gened/>). He stated that the committees have also spent time talking about an ACE oversight committee. He noted that the committees have tentatively decided that the third proposal will deal with a list of courses for the general education program and the fourth proposal deals with governance and assessment. He pointed out that Assistant Vice Chancellor Wilson has suggested that the committee's concentrate on the fourth proposal before tackling the third proposal. Ledder suggested that the committees re-label the proposals switching three and four since the list of courses will probably be done last.

Peterson noted that one of the issues that must be considered is how to handle transfer students. He stated that there will need to be some sort of committee structure that would oversee the program and approves additional courses.

Peterson stated that the committees have heard that they are not getting as much faculty input as is needed for developing the next two proposals. He stated that they are trying to address this and they are considering putting the minutes from the meetings on the website. He noted that there is also an open forum being held on Monday, March 26th at 2:30 in the city campus union.

Ledder stated that he has not heard about the open forum and pointed out that a notice should have been sent to the whole faculty as soon as the forum was scheduled. Peterson stated that a message has been sent to the Deans and Chairs asking that each department have at least one representative at the open forum. Ledder objected that an open forum should be open to all faculty members regardless of whether they are picked as a department representative or not. Earlier, GEPT had asked Ledder what he thought the Executive Committee could contribute to the process--one possibility would be that the Executive Committee could make sure that information about an open forum was well publicized.

Moeller asked if there is a clear agenda about what the forum is about. Janovy stated that he assumed the publicity was being handled by the Academic Affairs office. Ledder

replied that in any case the publicity was insufficient.

Janovy stated that time and time again he has tried to keep the committees on track relative to the charge given to them. He noted that all of the input that has been received has been looked at by the committees and members of the committees have met with every conceivable group on campus.

Ledder stated that there are two different issues that need to be considered when thinking about the value of soliciting input from the faculty. He stated that the first is whether the committees need input to make good proposals. He indicated that he has no doubt that the committees will come up with good proposals; the other issue is whether the faculty will approve the proposals. He stated that in order for faculty members to approve the proposals they need to be able to provide their input. He noted that if the process does not appear to the faculty as being faculty driven, the faculty might feel that the proposals are being forced down their throats.

Janovy stated that there are campus wide representatives on the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC). Ledder pointed out that the GEAC members were appointed by administrators, not elected by the faculty so they don't necessarily represent all faculty viewpoints. Moeller stated that the perception is that the members on the GEPT and GEAC were appointed by administration. She noted that the bigger issue is how to make the process transparent so that everyone is informed so faculty members feel they are encouraged to come to the open forum. She suggested that getting the most exposure about what is going on would help create the ground swell that is needed from the bottom up so faculty members feel like they have been heard and are part of the process.

Woodward pointed out that it is difficult to get faculty members to attend open forums and they usually do not get involved until they are angry about something. He noted that the committees felt that they had to do an open forum quickly because it would be difficult to get people to come during April with the end of the semester approaching quickly.

Mitchell stated that there is some concern that if not all comments made by faculty members are addressed people will accuse the committees of not listening. She stated that the committees want to offer something that people can respond to. Ledder pointed out that this is the reason why faculty members are feeling they are not able to give input because they are not given the opportunity to provide input before the proposals are written. The perception is that by the time the proposals are made public the committees don't want to make changes to a document in which they are already heavily invested.

Janovy stated that this is the wrong perception. He pointed out that Assistant Vice Chancellor Wilson has asked the committees what is going to be done with all of the input that has been provided. Janovy stated that the input will definitely be taken into consideration but not all of it might be written into the proposals. He reported that he has heard from many faculty members that they do not want to vote on a proposal that could then later be changed. Ledder agreed that once the proposals go out to the colleges they should be very difficult to change. The problem was that the committees seemed very reluctant to consider changes offered in the period between the October open forum and the point at which the proposals were sent to the colleges. Mitchell stated that some changes have been made based on the feedback from a couple of colleges.

Ledder stated that his main concern is that the committees get input on the next two proposals before anything is put into writing. He suggested that some of the ideas of the proposals should be discussed at the open forum so that people can provide their input on them. He pointed out that in order to get someone to vote it helps them to understand the objections to some of the things they may want in the proposals. Controversial issues should be discussed in a public meeting so that the committees know what faculty members think about the issues and faculty members have a change to hear counterarguments to their views.

Moeller stated that suggestions from the faculty members should be introduced at the open forum as well as other issues that the committees want to discuss. Peterson stated that the committees have been thinking about the topics they want to discuss. He stated that an update will be given on what has been happening with the reform. He stated that the hope is to get input on the governance and assessment of the program. He noted that this could be a thorny issue. He stated that there has been discussion about whether there should be two ACE committees and what the makeup of these committees will be. He noted that there is some thought to having one representative from each college with each representative having veto power.

Peterson stated that another question that needs to be addressed with having governance committees is who should be on the committees besides the representatives from the colleges. He noted that the hope is that additions to the committee lists and the governance structure will not require approval from each college curriculum committees.

Moeller asked if the University Curriculum Committee should handle the governance of the program. Peterson stated that this was discussed but there is the thought that there should be a separate committee. The other question is where the committee would be housed. He suggested that the GEPT and GEAC might need to consult with Associate to the Chancellor Howe about the administrative structure of the committees.

Janovy noted that unless every college has a representative with veto power the colleges have given up some of the power over their curriculum but if there is veto power it could be a hostile working mechanism. He noted that the stickler is that the program is campus wide yet each college has power over its curriculum. He stated that if the current general education courses were reviewed there are probably only five or six of them that might cause problems. Ledder agreed that the rule that each college has power over its own curriculum makes it very difficult to get a general education program in place but it speaks well of us that we are trying to do it anyway. He pointed out that the colleges would only need to delegate a very small portion of their rights to the committee in order to deal with the general education program.

Fuess stated that the problem with this open forum is that it had to be done this academic year but it couldn't be done in April. He pointed out that there clearly needs to be a follow up to the forum after the input has been considered. Woodward stated that the committees are suggesting coming up a list of topics to discuss at the forum.

Bradford stated that one thing that should be done is to provide people at the forum with a contact name and email address so they can provide input after they have had time to consider what was said at the forum.

Ledder stated that one of the things that the committees should try to do is to get a sense if there is a lot of opposition to any particular idea that is presented. He noted that if there is a significant concern from a particular college this will need to be dealt with. He pointed out that without an open forum the committees will be able to estimate the extent of opposition or agreement with some of their ideas. He stated that just getting input from the GEAC is not enough.

Ledder suggested that the Senate could help after the forum by sending out a survey if the committees decide they want more feedback on specific ideas or concerns. Moeller noted that a survey can provide some encouraging data to the committees.

Woodward stated that one of the bigger challenges is how to populate the list of courses. Fuess stated that there is the expedited list which is the list of courses that are commonly accepted by all colleges. Ledder stated that he gets the sense in Arts & Sciences that if there is a proposal that puts a course into the program because it has already been accepted into the current program, the proposal won't pass. He noted that an issue that has to be addressed is what outcomes the course meets. He pointed out that the current courses in the program were approved because of their content, not student outcomes, so these courses would need to have their outcomes reviewed before anyone could judge

them suitable.

Woodward stated that the departments would have to be presented with the contracts to determine whether the current courses would work in the general education program. Mitchell stated that the departments would have to agree that the courses met the criteria of the outcomes. Ledder pointed out that the focus of the reviews does not have to be on the content but just whether it meets the appropriate outcomes.

Janovy reported that on the website is a summary of the March 9th meeting, the draft governance proposal sheet, the draft agreement form. He noted that there has not been much discussion on the department agreement form. He stated that the majority of the courses on the current ES/IS list should come through okay but he acknowledged that some will be questionable.

Griffin stated that she will make sure that an email announcement gets sent out to all faculty members about the open forum.

4.0 Announcements

4.1 Syllabus Policy

Ledder reported that ASUN was meeting this evening and will be voting on the syllabus policy. He stated that he has added a couple of footnotes to the policy. One clarifies the use of the terms syllabus and course documentation used in the title and content of the policy. The other footnote states “this document is intended to provide guidelines for instructors to follow in communicating to students about their courses. The lack of specific rules for determining course grades is not a valid argument for grade appeals.” He noted that the footnotes can certainly be amended by the Senate at the April 3rd meeting.

5.0 Approval of 3/7/07 Minutes

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

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Executive Committee Elections

Bradford noted that three members need to be elected to the Executive Committee as well as a secretary and president elect. The committee discussed possible candidates for the positions.

6.2 Safe Assignment Policy

Flowers stated that he will check with Dean Giesecke to see if the current draft is the final

draft that should be presented to the Senate.

6.3 Pound/Howard Award

Moeller reported that she has received more email messages from Professor Bahar. The committee agreed to have Moeller send out a letter explaining the Executive Committee's decision not to second-guess the Honorary Degrees Committee's decision.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Report on March Board of Regents Meeting

Bradford stated that he would report on the meeting next week.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, March 28th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alexander, Bolin, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Rapkin, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alloway, Beck, Scholz

Date: Wednesday, March 28, 2007

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 3:01 p.m.

2.0 VC Owens/SVCAA Couture

2.1 Department Management Issues

Moeller asked what the exact procedure is for faculty members to report if there is a repeated problem with department administration. She pointed out that waiting for the five year review is too long a time for people who are having problems with an administrator.

SVCAA Couture stated that complaints can be made to the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee or if it is a case of discrimination or harassment the Office of Equity, Access, and Diversity should be contacted. She stated that if there is a question about a tenure case or academic promotion the complaint should go to her or VC Owens.

Moeller asked what can be done if there is a repeated history of problematic behavior on the part of the administrator. SVCAA Couture stated that there could be an opportunity for an interim review of the administrator. She pointed out that faculty members always have the opportunity to bring up problems with management to either herself or VC Owens and action will be taken.

VC Owens stated that faculty members in the Institute are always provided with the opportunity for feedback on an administrator when annual evaluations are being conducted. He pointed out that the feedback is anonymous. He noted that there are usually not many responses but three or four years ago he learned of a serious problem

through this process and was able to take appropriate action.

2.2 Update on Strategic Planning

SVCAA Couture stated that all college and unit plans are in except for two areas. She stated that hearings on the plans will be held on April 25th and 26th. She noted that the structuring of the hearings will be different this year. The college deans and IANR will present their plans first. The directors' plans will be discussed at the May 1st Deans Council meeting. She stated that the reason for the change is that there was an imbalance of interest between the college plans and the plans for the academic units headed by directors. She noted that the directors of the academic directors wanted to hear the deans' plans first so they could adjust their strategic plans accordingly based on what the deans had to say. She reported that next year there will be a joint meeting of the deans and directors.

SVCAA Couture stated that the procedures are the same as last year. She noted that she, Chancellor Perlman, and Vice Chancellor Owens will respond in writing to all of the colleges' and directors' plans. She pointed out that last year the written responses were done in July and this is what is being planned for this year.

SVCAA Couture noted that related to strategic planning is the need to communicate a summary of the major emphases of the university. She stated that the Chancellor distributed a draft summary of these interests to department chairs at the Chairs Workshop in December 2006. The emphases on this list include excellence in undergraduate education, excellence in research, commitment to extension, economic development and quality of life. She pointed out that the core emphases are different than the core values. She stated that the core emphases are where we are putting our main resource efforts. She reported that the Chancellor felt that referring to the core emphases would help guide the chairs and deans in their strategic planning.

SVCAA Couture stated that the strategic plans came up through the departments and the colleges. She pointed out that we have no written "overall" UNL plan; the UNL plan is comprised of all of the plans. She stated that the senior leadership of the university has been hearing from our chairs that they would like to see the university's core emphases written down so they can check to see if they are on track with their department plans.

Moeller noted that a department's discipline will help determine their mission and strategic goals. SVCAA Couture agreed. She pointed out that the SAT does not expect every unit to tie into all of the campus core emphases as priorities because the university is a place of great diversity. She stated that making the statements more concrete could be an effective way of mobilizing our efforts, and we will be working on that. She noted that

having both core values and emphases defined also has important implications for fundraising.

2.3 Official Accreditation Report

SVCAA Couture stated that she thought the report was completed but there are two external readers who are auditing the process and have not reported their findings yet. She stated that her office is highlighting points in the report that will help guide the campus in responding to the report over the next ten years.

SVCAA Couture stated that the report discussed strategic planning and how the plans came from the bottom up and are representative of all areas. She stated that there probably needs to be a better connection made between the service areas of the campus and the academic areas in the strategic planning process. She noted that the report included some suggestions about Information Services and its relationship to the academic mission of the campus.

SVCAA Couture stated that we had a successful review and a good report. VC Owens stated that he was amazed how well the self study process of accreditation worked. He pointed out that SVCAA Couture, Professor O'Hanlon, and the team who prepared the plan worked hard to get the accreditation report written.

SVCAA Couture reported that the campus is currently involved in trying to bring the Confucius Institute to campus and the self study accreditation report helped to provide a useful summary of the campus for visitors from Chinese universities and government offices.

2.4 Battelle Report

VC Owens stated that he was interested in having a third party organization estimate the value of the work and staff of the Institute and he chose the Battelle Corporation, a non-profit science and technology corporation from Columbus, Ohio which operates five national laboratories around the country. He noted that it took Battelle over a year to finish the report but it finally came out this February.

VC Owens stated that the document gives the faculty and staff members of the Institute a positive report. He pointed out that for every state dollar invested into the Institute, fifteen are returned to the state. Ten of these dollars are in new discoveries and new knowledge and the other five dollars in indirect expenditures (salaries, benefits, capital improvements, etc.) which represents an additional leverage ratio of approximately five to one.

VC Owens stated that he is presenting the report in as many venues as possible around the state. He noted that the Research and Extension Centers work with the county commissioners and they have received information from the report.

Moeller asked if an editorial has been written by the Lincoln Journal Star on the report. VC Owens stated that there has been some regional coverage and the Omaha World Herald had an editorial about it but he did not think the Lincoln Journal Star has written anything about it.

Moeller asked if the organization was paid for the report. VC Owens stated that they were and with non-state dollars. He pointed out that people from Battelle made five or six visits to Nebraska to interview people across the state.

Alexander asked when the study began. He noted that 2005 figures are quoted in the handout material from the report. VC Owens stated that it started about a year and a half ago. He noted that it took some time to write, in part because of the Institute's complex structure.

Alexander stated that he read a similar report recently which stated that manufacturing is now the number one industry in Nebraska yet the Battelle report stated that agriculture remains number one. He noted that it is dangerous to put out conflicting stories. Ledder pointed out that it depends on what is being measured in the study; one study might look at which industry produces more revenue another might look at who employs more people.

2.5 Issues on the Horizon

VC Owens reported that he was in Mexico last week to work with the Northwestern Center of Biological Research (CIBNOR) an organization within the National Council for Science and Technology (CONACYT) that sponsors Mexican students working on their graduate education outside of Mexico. He noted that UNL used to be on the list of schools CONACYT sponsored students to but it fell off the list. He reported that he signed an agreement with them and was told that the relationship with UNL will be re-established. He stated that these are all very bright students who come with assistantships and stipends paid for. He pointed out that the disciplines can be any appropriate fields of study on the entire UNL campus.

SVCAA Couture stated that on Thursday, March 29th the Teaching and Learning Exhibition will be held. She reported that Professor Gallagher will discuss his work on assessment and there will be posters representing over 40 projects that have been funded. She noted that Chancellor Perlman has made his appeal for the Initiative for Teaching and

Learning Excellence grant to fund more projects.

SVCAA Couture reported that the Chancellor was currently in China to sign an agreement for the Confucius Institute. Ledder asked if the Japanese students who are here at UNL are coming over because of an agreement. SVCAA Couture stated that there has been a brokering agency that has been sending Japanese students to UNL but many are now going to UNK because of the tuition difference. She stated that UNL wants to establish a continuing relationship with Japanese institutions and may be interested in setting up a similar program to the one being worked on in China.

VC Owens stated that the Japanese program has approached the golf management program about having students enter it. He noted that at first the PGA which accredits the program did not want international students but now they are allowing up to 10% of the students to be international students. He pointed out that there will be approximately 150 students now in the program for the fall semester.

3.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

4.0 Approval of 3/21/07 Minutes

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

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Executive Committee Elections

The Committee worked on trying to find nominees to run for the Executive Committee.

5.2 Budget Reallocation Procedures

Bradford asked if the Committee wanted to act on Beck's suggestion of the Senate dealing with the budget reduction procedures. Rapkin noted that the revised procedures attempted to solidify faculty participation in more phases of the procedures. Bradford pointed out that there is faculty involvement in the existing document.

Ledder pointed out that it isn't clear that a large amount of faculty involvement in the process would be desirable because the faculty will have their own biases of what should and should not be cut based on their personal interests. Moeller pointed out that departments that were eliminated were not necessarily cut for economic reasons. She stated that the criteria for eliminating a program should be clear. Bradford stated that cuts, if any, should be based on the contribution that a program makes to the university.

Griffin suggested that the Committee invite Associate Dean Rosson in during the summer to discuss his experience and concerns with the budget cutting process when he was chair of the Academic Planning Committee. The Committee agreed to invite Associate Dean Rosson to a meeting.

Moeller noted that the procedures are complex and that the effort to revise them was to simplify the existing procedures. She stated that steps need to be taken to ensure that faculty input is given in a timely fashion if the university faces budget cuts again.

5.3 Pound/Howard Nomination Language

Moeller stated that she was asked by Professor Walklin, co-chair of the Honorary Degrees Committee, to review the call for nominations for the Pound/Howard award to see if it should be revised to avoid any confusion. Alexander pointed out that the Honorary Degrees Committee has its own set of procedures for reviewing the nominations.

Bradford asked why the Honorary Degrees Committee is not revising the language. He stated that this is one of the responsibilities of this Committee. Moeller stated that she will ask the co-chair to have the Committee review and revise the call for nominations.

Alexander pointed out that the procedures need to be clarified. He stated that it needs to be clear who will make the presentation to the Committee on the nominee. He asked why two awards are not given out if there is a strong pool. He noted that in the past there have been two times when more than one person was given the award.

Alexander asked why the call for nominations comes out of the Chancellor's office. He asked if it is because the office provides secretarial support for this award or if there are any other connections. Moeller suggested that the Senate office or the Honorary Degrees Committee should send the letter out in the future so that people do not think that the Chancellor's office has an influence in the decision making process.

5.4 Report on Board of Regents Meeting

Bradford reported that the changes to the Academic Senate Bylaws will be voted on at the April Board meeting. He reported that Dr. Linda Pratt has been appointed as the permanent Vice President and Provost. He noted that she was serving as the Interim Vice President and Provost.

Bradford stated that the vacation and sick leave policy was passed. He reported that this policy states that employees can earn up to 280 hours maximum vacation time. Zimmers noted that an email message came out about the policy. He stated that the IANR senators

will be meeting on Tuesday and he will get feedback about the policy.

Bradford stated that there was a lot of discussion about the budget at the meeting. He noted that the state appropriations and tuition only make up 40% of the university's budget.

Bradford stated that the Regents appear to be absolutely committed to a 4.4% salary increase. He noted that the salary increases are being included in the mandatory expenses for the university. He stated that at the meeting it was pointed out that UNL would need a 5.3% increase in faculty salaries over the next two years just to reach the midpoint of our peer institutions. He noted that UNMC is even further behind. He stated that Chancellor Perlman spoke about the budget shortfall.

Bradford stated that a report was made on housing fire protection. He stated that UNL has most of the risky resident buildings on campus because there are a lot of older wood structured buildings on campus, many of which do not have sprinkler systems. He stated that these are just university housing and do not include the Greek houses. He noted that funding is being set aside to resolve the issue of fire protection in these buildings. He stated that the Board wants the university to put pressure on the Greek houses to have them brought up to fire safety codes.

Bradford stated that there was a presentation on research rewards. He noted that UNL and UNMC met their goals but UNK and UNO both did not meet their goals. Alexander asked if they broke out the Plus Up research money. He pointed out that this is money that is allocated in a legislative bill but it is non-competitive money. He noted that this money can be easy to get but difficult to sustain and UNL is currently getting a lot of this kind of money. Bradford stated that only the total federal funding was provided in the report.

5.5 Safe Assignment Policy

Flowers reported that Dean Giesecke sent over the final draft version of the policy and it is ready for the Senate to act on. The policy will be presented to the Senate at the April 3rd meeting.

6.0 New Business

6.1 University's Cooperation with RIAA Pursuit of Students for Illegal Downloading of Music

Bradford stated that the RIAA is pursuing students illegally downloading music. He noted that the University servers keep information on downloading for 30 days. He noted that the University of Wisconsin is only providing the information if the RIAA gets a

subpoena.

He stated that the question is whether the university should be actively cooperating with the RIAA. He noted that President Milliken sent the RIAA a bill for the time and effort it took to identify the students.

Moeller asked why the university is doing this. Bradford stated that he did not know. Ledder stated that he agreed with what the University of Wisconsin is doing. He argued that such records should be protected by the university unless they are required by a court order.

Alexander noted that a lot of students use computer labs which a faculty member may be responsible for supervising. He asked if it would become a professor's problem if this was being done in a computer lab. Ledder pointed out that it can be done in the libraries as well. He stated that it is an invasion of records for the RIAA to request the information they are asking. He noted that all universities should raise the issue and should resist voluntarily giving the information without a subpoena.

Alexander wondered how long email messages are kept and whether the university can be subpoenaed for email messages. Griffin stated that the Computational Services and Facilities Committee is giving its annual report to the Senate on April 3rd and this would be a good time to ask this question.

6.2 Changes to StarTran Route

Ledder reported that StarTran is looking at changing its schedules and routes and they plan to eliminate the bus stop on Q Street between 13th and 12th streets. He noted that the closest stop would then be 11th and O Streets for university people on city campus. He wondered whether the university would possibly change its internal routes to help compensate for the loss of the bus stop on Q Street.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, April 4 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Rapkin, Stock

Absent: Alexander, Beck, Bolin, Scholz, Zimmers

Date: Wednesday, April 4, 2007

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 3:04 p.m.

2.0 Susan Poser, Law College, Candidate for Associate to the Chancellor

The Committee interviewed Professor Poser for the Associate to the Chancellor position.

3.0 Dan Duncan, IANR, Candidate for Associate to the Chancellor

The Committee interviewed Dan Duncan for the Associate to the Chancellor position.

4.0 Announcements

4.1 Article in Lincoln Journal Star on Nelnet Kickback

Moeller reported that she spoke with Vice Chancellor Jackson about the \$600,000 that UNL receives from Nelnet. Moeller stated that an agreement between UNL and Nelnet was signed in 2004. In the agreement graduate and professional students would first apply to Nelnet for student loans but Nelnet is presented as only one of many loan options for students. UNL has received \$600,000 from Nelnet. Moeller reported that the \$600,000 has gone directly into supporting student fellowships and assistantships.

5.0 Approval of 3/28/07 Minutes

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

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Executive Committee Elections

The Committee continued working on identifying possible people to serve on the

Executive Committee.

6.2 RIAA

Bradford reported that he has more information on how the RIAA works in going after students. He stated that the RIAA obtains the IP address of students that are illegally downloading music. The RIAA then gives the IP address to the university asking them to identify who the IP address belongs to. Alloway asked how RIAA obtains the IP address. Bradford stated that it is provided by companies such as Napster that allow the downloading.

Bradford stated that once the students are identified the university sends them a message provided by RIAA with a settlement offer stating that the students can pay off the illegal downloading by going to a website. He pointed out that the question is whether doing this is anonymous or whether the student winds up identifying himself.

Bradford stated that the problem is that the students are not being given any legal representation. He noted that there is probably an 80% chance that the students would not be sued but students are being pressured to comply. He stated that he has a problem with the university using strong arm tactics on the students. He pointed out that the University of Wisconsin is not cooperating with identifying who the IP number belongs to and is not sending a letter out.

Bradford stated that he has a problem with the university cooperating with the RIAA without a subpoena. He stated that the question is whether the Executive Committee wants to take a position on this issue.

Ledder asked if there is a Board of Regents policy about giving student information out. Bradford stated that there is no problem of a violation of a Regents policy as far as he knows.

Bradford stated that the MPAA is now starting to do the same thing as the RIAA.

Rapkin stated that the university should avoid giving any information out to the RIAA because the perception of potential students that the university is a place that would turn in their own students could be disastrous to our reputation.

Bradford stated that if the university is subpoenaed it would have to comply but we should not comply until we get a subpoena.

Alloway noted that the cost of obtaining the information per student is \$155. Ledder

pointed out that as stewards of state funding the university is incumbent to not waste money and this is something that could be considered wasteful. Moeller questioned how the university could continue to provide this kind of information.

7.0 New Business

No new business was discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, April 11 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: Alloway, Bolin, Bradford, Flowers, Ledder, Rapkin, Zimmers

Absent: Alexander, Beck, Hachtmann, Moeller, Scholz, Stock

Date: Wednesday, April 11, 2007

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

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

2.0 Interview with David Manderscheid, Dean of Arts and Sciences

The Committee interviewed David Manderscheid from the University of Iowa for the position of Dean of Arts and Sciences.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Meeting with New ASUN Officers

Bradford reported that he, Moeller, and Alloway met with the new ASUN officers. He stated that the students are interested in working with the faculty and want to meet with the Executive Committee.

Alloway stated that he asked the ASUN officers whether any faculty member from the Senate attends the ASUN meetings. Bradford stated that it might be interesting to have someone from the Senate or the Executive Committee attend the ASUN meetings, particularly if they are discussing something that the Senate is working on. He suggested that members of the Executive Committee could take turns attending the meetings. Alloway and Bradford both agreed that they would be willing to attend the meetings. Ledder pointed out that anything that would help promote a common sense of purpose between the faculty and students would be helpful.

Alloway stated that there is a lot of experience with the new ASUN officers as several of them served in the previous administration. He noted that the new officers understand the issues and process on campus.

Bradford reported that the ASUN officers stated that one of their priorities is to work on national issues. He stated that they want to work with Senators Hagel and Nelson on financial aid for students.

Alloway stated that the officers raised the issue of the RIAA going after students on campus for illegally downloading music. Bradford stated that he suggested to the students that they contact President Milliken because he is developing a policy on this issue.

Alloway stated that the ASUN officers still have concerns with the Safe Assignment policy. Ledder asked if students have to submit a paper in Word in order for Safe Assignment to work. Flowers stated that a pdf file would work as well.

Ledder stated that the hard part about using Safe Assignment is knowing whether students do not understand what constitutes plagiarism or whether they are just blatantly plagiarizing. He suggested that as a teaching aid a paper could be written using varying lifting techniques that students use and then run the paper through Safe Assignment. The paper, along with the Safe Assignment report, could be posted on a website so students have examples of what constitutes plagiarism.

Bradford stated that some students are not clear where the lines are when citing information. He stated that a revised academic dishonesty policy could provide examples of plagiarism.

Bolin stated that the libraries have an interest in plagiarism and instructors can bring classes over to the libraries to have the staff talk about plagiarism. She noted that Libraries 110 might be covering some of this.

Flowers stated that he recently encountered some problems with Safe Assignment. He submitted papers for the program to run a report but it did not catch all of the plagiarized passages but a search on Google identified the papers which the students used to plagiarize. Alloway asked if there was anyone on campus that communicates with the makers of Safe Assignment so this can be brought to their attention.

3.2 Sending out Executive Committee Minutes by Email Announcement

Zimmers asked if a link to the Executive Committee Minutes can be sent out in the general campus announcements. Griffin stated that she will check on this.

3.3 Library Service Quality Survey

Bolin reported that the libraries are conducting a service quality survey but those people

in the random sample were sent the wrong URL. She noted that the libraries might put a link to the survey on their home page and is notifying the people in the random sample of the error. She asked that those included in the random sample please fill out the survey. She noted that the survey will remain open until May 4th and takes only about 10 minutes to complete.

4.0 Approval of 4/4/07 Minutes

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

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Executive Committee Elections

The Committee discussed possible candidates for the Executive Committee and the possibility of needing to run an election in the fall if there are still open positions on the Committee.

6.0 New Business

No new business was discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:41 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, April 18th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in Academic Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Rapkin, Scholz, Stock, Zimmers

Absent: Alexander, Beck, Bolin

Date: Wednesday, April 18, 2007

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 3:02 p.m.

2.0 Interview with Barbara Romzek, Candidate for Dean of Arts and Sciences

The Committee interviewed Dr. Romzek, candidate for Dean of Arts and Sciences.

3.0 ASUN – Safe Assignment (Greg Gifford and Kyle Groteluschen)

Gifford stated that the students have concerns that there is limited protection for students with the Safe Assignment policy because it does not require instructors to follow the policy, that students must have approval of a faculty member to have access to the program, that they are not guaranteed the right to view the results of the Safe Assignment report, and students may not be notified in advance of the instructor's intent to use Safe Assignment and therefore may not be able to object to the submission of the paper to the local database.

Ledder pointed out that since the ASUN resolution opposing the Safe Assignment policy was passed in early March the policy has been revised. He noted that the first concern of the students has been dealt with in the revised version. He stated that the latest draft does address the personal sensitivity issue but he wondered whether the language was strong enough. He stated that he would offer an amendment to the policy to make the language stronger because he thinks it is important that the students be protected.

Gifford asked if the section of the policy that stated that students must go through a grade appeal process to appeal having a paper submitted to the local database was still included in the policy. Ledder stated that this has been taken out.

Moeller asked if the students are unable to use the program to check a paper if they do not have faculty permission. Gifford pointed out that the policy does not state that students have the right to see the Safe Assignment report that was made on their paper. Ledder stated that the policy specifically states that it is the instructor's responsibility to decide whether or not to allow students to submit drafts and to allow students to directly view the Safe Assignment report.

Moeller asked if the students want to ensure that they see the report. Gifford pointed out that if students do not get to see the report the program will not be the learning tool that it is designed to be. Bradford asked why the students want to see the report. He noted that if Safe Assignment detects no problems than the student would not be interested in seeing the report. Gifford stated that a student might not have quoted or cited something correctly in the paper because they did not know how. The report would point out the error.

Ledder asked why seeing the Safe Assignment report would be any different than a student seeing their final exam. He noted that students have the right to see their final exam and the Safe Assignment report should not be any different.

Moeller agreed and pointed out that if the faculty wants to say that Safe Assignment is a learning tool, then students should be allowed to see the report to see where they made mistakes. She stated she allows her students to use it when they are writing a draft paper to the program. She noted that the bottom line is that the wording in the policy needs to be changed. She stated that students should be allowed to submit a draft of their paper. Ledder stated that the language in the policy should also state that students should be able to see the report as well.

Bradford asked if a student would need to gain approval of a libraries faculty member in order to be able to submit a paper through Safe Assignment on their own. Gifford stated that he thinks the student will need to go through a faculty member in the library to enter a Blackboard site that has Safe Assignment available. He pointed out that the report would then go back to the faculty member, not the student. He stated that he did not think it was realistic to have students go to the library and go through all of this process.

Bradford questioned whether the Safe Assignment contract only allows use by a faculty member. Moeller stated that she thought the program could only be used if it was tied to a course. Scholz questioned if there is a volume issue. He wondered whether the capacity of the system would allow for a lot of use.

Bradford pointed out that if a student goes to the libraries to use the Safe Assignment

program they will have to go through an educational process on the proper way to reference materials but this may not always happen in a course.

Alloway stated that when he created a Safe Assignment project in a course last fall, it was listed as "Safe Assignment" in the Blackboard grade book list of projects, so he felt there was some notice to students that their projects were likely to be submitted to the program. However, he said that notification would be bypassed if an instructor chose to "quick submit" a student's paper, which can be done for any project. Gifford agreed that it was this "quick submit" process that can cause notification problems."

Gifford stated that one of the other concerns of the students is that a professor might want to submit papers from a previous semester through Safe Assignment and the students would not be able to object because they would not know this was being done. Ledder pointed out that this is factually correct.

Bradford stated that he would like to see the policy written so the instructor would have the freedom to submit a paper through Safe Assignment. Gifford pointed out that it should be in writing that the paper might be put through Safe Assignment. Bradford stated that this should not be included in the policy because instructors will just use a boilerplate statement in their syllabus.

Ledder asked what would happen if an instructor said nothing about using Safe Assignment and put papers through the program without submitting them to the local database. Gifford stated that instructors do the same thing now with using Google. He noted that he does not think ASUN would have any objections to this. He stated that he has no problems with an instructor scanning a paper into the program but he does not want to see papers loaded into the database after the course is completed.

Bradford pointed out that instructors should have the flexibility of being able to check papers if there are suspicions that the student is not writing the paper. Ledder stated that he would like to see the policy written that instructors must notify students in advance if they are going to be using Safe Assignment and putting the paper in the local database. Zimmers asked if there is a way to get papers out of the local database if needed. Gifford stated that he believes there is a way.

Bradford pointed out that there are still concerns with the language of the policy. He suggested that the vote on the resolution by the Senate be put off until September. Ledder stated that the people who drafted the policy should vet the concerns that are being raised.

Alloway suggested that Safe Assignment be contacted to see if the program could be

tweaked to address some of these concerns.

Ledder noted that Professor Flowers and Dean Giesecke should be notified about the concerns raised and the postponement of the vote in the Senate.

4.0 Announcements

4.1 Budget

Bradford stated that Michelle Waite, Assistant to the Chancellor for Community Relations, told him that the Budget Committee is reporting out the 4.1% University budget raise to the legislature. He noted that the question is what will happen on the floor of the legislature.

5.0 Approval of 4/11/07 Minutes

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

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Sending out Executive Committee Minutes by Campus E-News

Griffin reported that she checked with Information Services to see if a continual announcement about the Executive Committees being located on the web can be put into the E-News announcements. She was informed that an announcement would need to be submitted each week. Zimmers stated that he will inform the faculty members of the extension centers that it cannot be easily done.

Bradford suggested that at least twice a year an announcement should be placed in E-News reminding people where the minutes of the Senate Executive Committee meetings can be found on the web.

6.2 Syllabus Policy – How to Deal with Violations

Griffin stated that she received an email message from Associate Vice Chancellor Wilson asking how violations of the syllabus policy will be handled. Bradford stated that the process would be the same as any other formal complaint. The students would speak to the instructor first, then the chair of the department, and on up until the complaint is resolved.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Virginia Tech Resolution

Bradford suggested that a resolution be made at the April 24th Senate meeting regarding the incident that occurred at Virginia Tech. The Committee informally agreed that this should be done. Bradford stated that he would draft a resolution.

Alloway asked if the university is thinking of a rapid information system in case there ever has to be a lock down. He wondered if the venue for doing this would be through text messaging. Bradford pointed out that some peoples' computers would not allow an email message to get through if the notification came through email.

Ledder stated that he has mixed feelings about whether it would be good to get notification out quickly. He pointed out that it would have been difficult for authorities to know what was going to happen at Virginia Tech after the first incident there.

Bradford stated that this would be a good time to get the Campus Police Committee active again to work with the campus police on security issues.

Ledder stated that another issue connected with the incidents is how much faculty members are hamstrung in reporting students that they may have concerns about. Stock noted that with creative writing it can be particularly difficult in knowing whether someone is just being creative or whether there might be real concerns. Bradford stated that legally unless someone poses imminent danger to themselves or others they cannot be reported. Rapkin pointed out that faculty members cannot anticipate every situation that can occur. He noted that the university needs to have the capacity to disseminate information to students, faculty and staff as quickly as possible.

Bradford suggested that one way of doing this might be through text messaging. He noted that the vast majority of students on campus have cell phones and the university could give students the option of providing their cell phone number to the campus police should a message need to be sent out quickly.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, April 25th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Bolin, Bradford, Fech, Flowers, Hachtmann, Ledder, Moeller, Prochaska-Cue, Rapkin, Zimmers

Absent: LaCost, Lindquist

Date: Wednesday, April 25, 2007

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

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

2.0 Interview with Bruce Novak, Candidate for Dean of Arts & Sciences

The Committee interviewed Bruce Novak for Dean of Arts & Sciences.

3.0 Chancellor Perlman/SVCAA Couture/VC Owens

3.1 Security Measures for UNL

Chancellor Perlman reported that UNL has plans in place should an emergency occur. He pointed out that the plans were tested Friday afternoon and they all worked with the bomb threat that was made in the Othmer Building. He noted that the Othmer Building was evacuated in five minutes. He reported that it was suggested that Walter Scott Engineering Building and Nebraska Hall should also be evacuated since some people do not have a clear distinction between the buildings. He stated that UNL is part of an integrated emergency response system. He noted that email messages were sent out quickly about the bomb threat and evacuations and responses were straight forward and clear. He stated that he was proud of the way people on the campus reacted to the situation and he felt that it was handled well.

Chancellor Perlman stated that everybody involved in the bomb threat was being debriefed and every unit that is involved with emergency situations is studying their plans. He noted that the campus is exploring other technologies, especially in communications, to assist in emergency situations. He stated that one question that needs to be considered is to what extent faculty members should be trained to identify students in distress. He pointed out that Congress is looking at legislation that would make it

easier to disclose information about students who were thought to be in trouble.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the campus is also looking at other universities to see what security measures they are using.

Bradford asked if there is a way to identify real threats versus someone calling in a bomb threat just to get out of a class. Chancellor Perlman stated that there are ways to determine this. He noted that UNL is fortunate enough to have one of the leading experts on campus, Professor Scalora of the Psychology department, to help determine whether the threat is genuine. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that each threat needs to be considered seriously.

Ledder asked if there is a contingency plan in place if final exams should be interrupted by a threat. Chancellor Perlman stated he was not sure but thought something would have to be worked out if that arose. It is difficult to plan for all eventualities.

3.2 Budget

Chancellor Perlman reported that there is nothing new yet from the legislature on the budget. He noted that if the university receives a 4.1% budget increase and the Board of Regents fund everything they want to, there would still be a \$7 ½ million system wide deficit. He stated that this would mean a \$3.3 million deficit for UNL.

Ledder asked what this would mean for vertical cuts. Chancellor Perlman stated that he is not sure. He pointed out that UNL had enrollment increases the past two years and this has helped to generate income for the campus.

Bradford asked if the \$3.3 million deficit would be based on a 4.4% salary increase. Chancellor Perlman stated that it would. He stated that if something else needed to be considered he would discuss it with the Senate. He noted that the most likely scenario right now is that we will do a 4.4% salary increase.

3.3 Strategic Plans

Moeller stated that she attended the first session on the strategic plans and noted that it was excellent. She stated that it was exciting to see in concrete forms what the strategic plans look like and where programs intersect. She stated that the new configurations that could come out of these intersections of programs could enrich the university.

SVCAA Couture stated that she believes the strategic plans are getting better every year. She noted that the Deans seem to be hitting their stride in terms of understanding what is required to do effective strategic plans. She stated that there was good focus in the plans

which are helping the Deans to better communicate the goals of their college to each other and the university community. She noted that there is still room for improvements in the plans, but she is very encouraged by what she is seeing.

3.4 Randy Ferlic op-ed article

Bradford stated that some of the faculty members on campus are really concerned with the op-ed article written by Regent Ferlic. He noted that if a director of a business corporation wrote such an article they would be fired. Moeller noted that the timing of the article is really bad given that the university's budget is on the floor of the legislature. Chancellor Perlman agreed that the timing was not good.

3.5 Upcoming Issues

Chancellor Perlman suggested that the Senate pay attention to what the U.S. Education Department is trying to impose on the accrediting agencies. He noted that the proposed regulations would require the accrediting agencies to gather much more accountability information. He stated that he believes that these regulations would be beyond the scope of the power of the Department of Education but the faculty needs to be watchful of this outcome.

SVCAA Couture reported that an agreement has been signed to launch a Confucius Institute at UNL. She stated that a meeting was held earlier today to invite people from across the campus who are doing work associated with China. She stated that there will be periodic meetings of this group and she is finding that a number of people want to get involved with the Confucius Institute. She stated that the campus wants to develop an approach to the Institute that would provide multiple opportunities for our students, faculty, and the community. She suggested that anyone interested in joining the China group contact her.

Fech asked whether the administrators think that there would be enough Senators to support the university should the Governor veto the budget. He noted that 30 votes would be needed in order to over ride the veto.

VC Owens stated that he has heard it discussed a bit and people are hoping that we have enough Senators to support us. He pointed out that there are people right at this moment working with Senators to gain their support. He noted that even the Appropriations Committee proposed budget is going to leave us somewhat in the lurch. He stated that the university is lobbying for budgetary survival, not budgetary nirvana. He stated that faculty members may wish to use their contacts with their legislator to convince them to support the university budget request.

4.0 Announcements

Bradford stated that the Committee and the Senate owed Moeller a vote of thanks for all of her work during the last year. He wanted to formally thank her once again for serving as President of the Senate.

5.0 Approval of 4/18/07 Minutes

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

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Safe Assignment

Moeller reported that she spoke with Dean Giesecke about the Safe Assignment policy and explained that the Senate vote on it was postponed until September because of the concerns of the students. Moeller noted that Flowers will meet with Dean Giesecke to discuss the concerns. Ledder volunteered to attend the meeting as well to convey the students' concerns.

6.2 Meeting with UNL Police Department

Alloway stated that he is meeting with a member from the UNL Police Department to discuss campus emergency procedures in conjunction with the university radio station KRNU. He stated that he will suggest that the Campus Police Committee be reactivated again. Bradford stated that he will designate Alloway as acting chair of this committee to get it functioning again.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Report on Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee Meeting

Bradford stated that the primary thing to come out of the meeting was the proposed changes to promotion increases. He noted that currently promotion increases are a flat sum: for nine month appointments the increase for promotion is \$4,000 from assistant to associate and \$6,000 from associate to full professor. He stated with the new rate nobody would get less than the current plan but an alternative percentage could be used: 7% from assistant to associate and 9% from associate to full. He pointed out that the new rate of increases would help deal with compression in some departments and the cost is not very high. He stated that no one on the committee objected to this change.

Bradford stated that the committee will be meeting again on May 9th to discuss how raises are going to be distributed.

Bradford stated that the committee received various reports on minority and gender differences and the reports were the same as last year. The reports showed no statistical

difference in the last couple of years.

Bradford stated that there was a report on the retirement contributions of other Big 12 schools. His interpretation is that we are not doing as well as our peers but Bill Nunez, Director of Institutional Research and Planning, stated that results are mixed.

7.2 Report on Board of Regents Meeting

Moeller stated that discussions at the meeting included a legislative update, discussion on the issue over the RIAA, need based financial aid, financial assistance for students, and a presentation on the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture at Curtis. She provided a handout summarizing the meeting.

The Committee noted that the university's course of action with students found to have illegally downloaded music includes expulsion from the university. Ledder asked under what authority would this action be made and who would make the decision to expel the student. Moeller stated that President Milliken is very firm in the legal aspect of the issue and that students are conducting illegal activity and using university equipment to do it. She noted that he is serious about catching those students who are engaging in this kind of activity.

Bradford pointed out that the only thing the President knows is that the RIAA has provided the university with a letter stating that illegal activity is occurring but there is no evidence to say that particular students are actually participating in illegal activity.

Moeller stated that two of the student Regents are taking this issue on. She pointed out that Regent Whitehouse did ask if the policing is our job and what responsibility the university has in going after people and where it stops. Bradford noted that there are a lot of things that students could be doing illegally but he does not know if we should be policing every thing they do.

Ledder stated that he does not think the university should be punishing the students. Bradford pointed out that the Student Code of Conduct would cover some to these things and there should be a policy from the Computational Services and Facilities Committee about students being disconnected from the server if there is illegal use.

Alloway pointed out that an IP number could be shared by several people and it doesn't mean that you know who is actually downloading the material. Bradford stated that the RIAA overreaches sometimes and he would not be satisfied with them saying that there have been copyright violations without providing more evidence.

Rapkin asked if the students were given any kind of warning first to stop the activity. He questioned whether a harshly worded warning would suffice. Moeller stated that one of the student regents stated that there should be an effort in new student orientation to inform students about using university equipment illegally.

Fech wondered whether this is an issue that will have to be supervised by Matt Hecker, Director of Student Judicial Affairs. Bradford stated that this is correct and in some ways Judicial Affairs is already dealing with this issue.

Moeller stated that the other item addressed was the need based financial aid. She stated that a presentation was made on the efforts that the UN system is undertaking to find private funding for this aid. She reported that Central Administration is hoping to generate \$300 million to address this issue.

Moeller stated that she spoke at the meeting to voice concerns about UNK and UNO not meeting their research goals yet they are getting salary increases of 4.3 and 4.2 percent. She stated that she informed the Regents that faculty members will start to leave the university to go elsewhere if they feel that they are not being rewarded for their efforts.

Moeller stated that the Senate Presidents met with President Milliken for lunch. She reported that there was discussion on the state appropriations request and the mandatory expenses of the university. She stated that President Milliken discussed voluntary accountability system measures and how this needs to be done or it will be thrust upon us. She suggested that the Committee discuss this sometime during the summer.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, May 2nd at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Bolin, Bradford, Fech, Hachtmann, LaCost, Lindquist, Moeller, Prochaska-Cue, Rapkin

Absent: Flowers, Ledder, Zimmers

Date: Wednesday, May 2, 2007

Location: Faculty 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

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

2.0 Reduction in Force Procedures (RIF) – Associate Dean Rosson and Professor Shea

Rosson noted that he was chair of the Academic Planning Committee (APC) during the time of the budget cuts and operated under the current procedures.

Shea stated that recent Executive Committee minutes were not clear that something was going to be done with the revised procedures drafted by a committee that was appointed by Past President Peterson. He noted that this committee spent several years working on the document. He pointed out that the Senate has never had a chance to look at the revised procedures and this may be something that the Senate wants to discuss in detail. He stated that it may be the will of the Senate to not change the existing procedures but the Senate should at least be given the opportunity to review the proposed procedures.

Bradford noted that Past President Beck had provided the committee with several draft documents. Shea stated that Beck also provided a timeline table which came from the Chancellor's website. This table chronicled what happened and when it happened during the budget cuts although there are some questions about whether the information provided reflects what actually occurred.

Shea reported that Beck is suggesting that the Senate use the Chancellor's guidelines on the budget cuts and make small modifications to it based on the timeline to create a new RIF procedures document. He pointed out that it is important to determine whether the current process is inadequate and whether it needs to be changed.

Rosson stated that some of the reasons for wanting to change the procedures have to do with faculty governance and providing faculty input at an early stage. He noted that there were informed discussions but it was primarily one way with the Chancellor announcing to the APC and the Senate what was going to be cut from the budget. He pointed out that the APC viewed this as having its hands tied.

Moeller reported that she and Beck met with the Chancellor last year to discuss the procedures. She stated that she made it clear to the Chancellor that the one-way delivery on the budget cuts did not fly well with a lot of faculty members. She stated that the Chancellor promised that the APC and the Senate would be the first stop in any budget cutting decisions that may need to be made in the future. Griffin pointed out that this should be put in writing so future Chancellors have something to abide by.

Rosson stated that there were some questions regarding tenure and tenure home, whether it resides in the department or the college.

Rosson stated that the APC was given a list of budget cuts and held hearings about the cuts. He noted that the APC made recommendations based on the hearings and on several occasions the APC recommended to not make some of the cuts. He stated that a few times the APC recommendations were implemented but most of them were not.

Rosson stated that the APC met many times during the budget cutting process and provided plenty of input but he is not sure that the APC had any significant effect. He stated that the intent of revising the procedures is to insert a faculty voice in the process. He noted that the revised procedures would allow the Chancellor to take his recommendations to the Board of Regents but it would also require the Senate to take their recommendations to the Board as well thereby providing another voice for the Board to consider.

Rosson stated that the support staff and managerial/professional staff were hit the hardest during the cuts. He pointed out that they felt that they had no say at all because they had no representation on the APC. He noted that UNOPA and UAAD asked if they could have at least one representative on the APC but this request was not granted by a vote of the APC.

Rosson reported that the APC has Deans and Vice Chancellors on it and they frequently recused themselves from voting on the cuts such that faculty and student members were left to vote.

Rosson stated that recommendations, including some revenue generating and alternate ways to cut the budget were made to the Chancellor but these were never accepted. Moeller asked if these were discussed with the Chancellor. Griffin reported that the Executive Committee discussed some of these recommendations with the Chancellor. Rosson stated that the APC was sometimes told that there were no other ways to do the budget cuts other than what was offered by the Chancellor.

Moeller asked what the context was for the cuts and why there was the one-way delivery of how the cuts were to be made. Rosson stated that the explanation that was given was that the approach would prevent bickering and arguing amongst the faculty.

Rosson noted that academic reviews were seldom, if ever, used in making decisions for the budget cuts. Shea pointed out that the revised procedures would have a process that would include the academic program reviews for making decisions regarding cuts.

Prochaska-Cue stated that she was on the APC during the budget cuts and she remembered the Committee being presented with a list of what was to be cut. Never was it revealed as to what other things could possibly be cut. Shea asked what kind of discussion could there be when the APC is just given a list and not shown any other possibilities. He pointed out that there was no real sharing of information.

Rosson stated that the proposed document would not just deal with budget cuts but would also deal with major changes to the budget. He pointed out that the current procedures are very vague in defining this. He stated that theoretically the campus is not supposed to go down the path of cutting programs and firing faculty members unless financial exigency is declared but this was never done.

Shea stated that the RIF committee went through the existing procedures and discussed where they needed to be changed. He pointed out that in reviewing the existing procedures it quickly becomes apparent that the procedures were not followed during the budget cuts. He noted that in Section II it states that the process shall ensure that administrators, faculty, staff members, and students will be consulted but in actuality they were not consulted with, they were merely informed.

Bradford asked if new procedures are needed or if the real question is whether the existing procedures are not being followed. Shea pointed out that the current procedures do not allow the faculty or the Senate to bring any alternative budget plans to the Board of Regents. Rosson stated that in order for the Senate to present an alternative budget plan they would need to get full access to the budgets. Shea noted that the revised procedures

state that the Senate could provide an alternative plan if there is not an agreement between the Chancellor and the Senate on a budget cutting plan. Rapkin pointed out that this would provide the Senate with some sense of power during the time of budget cuts.

Shea stated that it would not be desirable to have two budget proposals and the procedures would strongly encourage the Chancellor and the Senate to work out some kind of agreement.

Shea noted that the revised procedures are not more complex than the existing procedures. He pointed out that Beck's proposal is a simple, short document that incorporates the timeline found on the Chancellor's website. He stated that it shows participation by the faculty and when this would occur. Moeller suggested that this draft be sent to the Chancellor to see what he thinks of it.

Shea stated that he would like to have the full Senate consider Beck's revised document. He stated that the question is whether the faculty wants to have more participation in the budget cutting process. He noted that there are some people who do not want this. Rosson stated that he thinks most faculty members do want more participation. He pointed out that there was a quorum at every APC meeting that dealt with the budget cuts.

Alloway pointed out that the Chancellor should be bound to follow the procedures but asked what would happen if he does not? Rosson stated that this was discussed. He noted that the APC was not sure that they were going to support the Chancellor's decision on the budget cuts and there was a lot of discussion about whether to even forward the recommendations.

Bradford noted that the revised procedures call for two primary changes: getting information to the APC and other groups about the budget cuts, including alternatives, in a timely fashion and allowing the Senate to provide an alternative plan to the Board of Regents should there not be an agreement on the budget cuts. Shea stated that the revised procedures also tie in the budget cutting process with the academic program reviews. Rosson stated that timing is important but there needs to be a process that allows alternatives to be brought forward. He pointed out that the APC needs to see the whole picture of the budget in order to be able to have true faculty governance in the budget cutting process.

Shea suggested that Beck's redraft document would be a good starting point for further discussion. He suggested that the Executive Committee initially discuss the procedures with the Chancellor. He pointed out that if the Chancellor does not see a need for a

change in the procedures the Executive Committee might want to have discussions with the Senate about it. He pointed out that the revised procedures were not trying to be subversive but would allow a better process for the faculty and the administration to work together. Rosson agreed and stated that the effort is on how to make the process better. He noted that there were a lot of faculty members and staff who were very upset with how the last budget cuts were conducted. He stated that he does not think faculty members would shirk the responsibility of dealing with budget cuts.

Rosson stated that the committee discussed having the Senate President give a full report to the Board of Regents on future proposed budget cuts. Shea stated that this should be put into the procedures.

Bradford stated that the Executive Committee will discuss the draft procedures further at its next meeting.

3.0 Matthew Hansen, Omaha World Herald

The Committee met with Matthew Hansen from the Omaha World Herald to discuss getting stories out about the work of the faculty. Hansen stated that when he worked with the Lincoln Journal Star he used to have good communication with the Senate officers but he has lost touch with them since going to the Omaha World Herald. He stated that he would like to get in touch again with the officers.

Bradford stated that what prompted the Committee to meet with the press is that there is work going on by faculty members that is not getting out to the press and the Committee wants to provide reporters with a list of faculty members to contact. Hansen stated that being in Omaha the connections to UNL are a little more difficult but if faculty members are doing anything that is interesting or if there are some really interesting and cool classes people should contact him. He stated that he can be reached at the Omaha World Herald at (402) 444-1064, cell number 402-984-2725 or by email at Matthew.Hansen@owh.com.

4.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

5.0 Approval of 4/25/07 Minutes

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

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Academic Integrity

Bradford reported that at the strategic planning hearings last week Executive Associate Dean Weissinger reported on some high profile incidents of cheating at the graduate level. He stated that it is a priority of the Graduate Studies office to work on academic integrity. He stated that Executive Associate Dean Weissinger believes that there should be zero tolerance for any graduate student caught violating academic integrity. He noted that he has asked Executive Associate Dean Weissinger to be on the academic dishonesty committee and she has agreed to serve on the committee.

Bradford stated that the academic dishonesty committee will be working during the summer and is looking at academic integrity issues.

Alloway asked who the students are on the committee. Bradford stated that David Solheim, ASUN President, and Greg Gifford, Graduate Student Representative are the students on the committee.

Moeller stated that there are some cultural issues that need to be addressed. She pointed out that some international students do not understand what constitutes plagiarism. Bradford pointed out that academic integrity should be looked at as an educational issue.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Meeting with Professor Poser

Bradford stated that he received a request from Professor Poser who will be assuming the Associate to the Chancellor position asking to meet with the Executive Committee so she can learn more about the Faculty Senate. He stated that he will invite her to a meeting and will probably invite her to meet with the Committee again in the fall.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:36 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, May 16 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Bolin, Bradford, Fech, Flowers, Hachtmann, LaCost, Ledder, Lindquist, Rapkin, Zimmers

Absent: Moeller, Prochaska-Cue

Date: Wednesday, May 16, 2007

Location: Faculty 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

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

2.0 Dean Oliva, University Academy

Dean Oliva reported that nearly two years ago SVCAA Couture asked a subcommittee of the Academic Planning Committee (APC) to review the colleges' strategic plans, looking for similarities and potential crosscutting themes for interdisciplinary possibilities. The subcommittee however had difficulty comparing one strategic plan to another and as a result, went in a slightly different direction. He pointed out that initially the focus was on research, but the subcommittee felt that what was really needed was a greater emphasis on collaboration for teaching. He stated that the committee was interested in learning if there would be an opportunity to create an environment that would support faculty from different units to work collaboratively to explore multifaceted topics with students. The subcommittee therefore arrived at the creation of something called the University Academy. He pointed out that research is important but the campus is already having conversations about doing collaborative research across disciplines.

Dean Oliva stated that there are some things already happening on campus now with collaborative teaching across the colleges. He pointed out as an example that the current visual literacy program is a new collaboration between four colleges. He stated that this is the idea behind the University Academy, to find broad topics that have connections with several disciplines, and to create an environment in which faculty involved in teaching such courses would be able to do so as part of their assignment, rather than as an overload. He also noted that it would be important that each of the faculty members who were teaching in a particular course receive full credit for the work.

Dean Oliva stated that the subcommittee has had discussions with Professor Janovy. He noted that the subcommittee wanted to make sure that the thinking on how these courses work would fit into the new general education program. He also stated that the subcommittee considered the changes that are being proposed with the general education program and felt that the emphasis on student outcomes would also be the focus of the University Academic courses. He pointed out that student outcomes should include the ability to think critically, to collaborate with student peers, to seek out and make connections, to engage in self-learning, embrace broader and have a more informed understanding of the topic, and develop skills of effective communication through a variety of media.

Dean Oliva stated that everyone that the subcommittee has talked with about the academy has had a positive reaction. He noted that the structural challenges are the biggest problems, in particular how the courses are organized. He pointed out that the academy is not an honors initiative although there might be some things occurring in the honors program that could be a model for the academy. He noted that the idea is to have the academy be accessible to a broader group of students.

Dean Oliva stated that there would need to be a paradigm shift in the way these courses are taught. He stated that these courses would be a change of culture in the way that student outcomes are defined and assessed, in the types of classroom experiences students would have, in the way the faculty members are assigned and evaluated with respect to their teaching, in the willingness of faculty members to embrace the new structure, in the ability of faculty members to participate without overload or jeopardy, and in how we think about curricular requirements.

Dean Oliva stated that funding is one of the main challenges that would have to be addressed. He noted that the APC gave unanimous support to continue looking into the Academy and if there is enough interest there might be some experiments with courses.

Dean Oliva reported that the proposal for a University Academy was presented to the Deans at their retreat. He noted that the presentation was aimed at getting the Deans to support the idea and also to think about what the cost would be to release faculty members to teach one of the Academy courses because the plan is not to add additional work on a professor. He stated that the subcommittee wanted to get the Deans' commitment up front before progressing further. He reported that the Deans were fine with the idea.

Dean Oliva stated that there was an open meeting of the APC and the Deans were asked

to talk with their chairs to ascertain whether there would be interest in the Academy. He stated that 30 faculty members and students contacted the subcommittee to express their interest. The subcommittee then met with these faculty members as well as some students to present the concept of the Academy to them. He noted that a prototype of a course was also presented.

Dean Oliva stated that the subcommittee received tremendous positive responses on the concept and this past spring semester a report was given to the APC on the University Academy. He stated that the hope is to have some prototypes of courses launched next spring.

Dean Oliva reported that the plan is to continue working on the project over the summer. He stated that the idea is to roll out an experimental construct this fall and to obtain some support for funding.

Dean Oliva stated that the faculty teaching a University Academy course would also be asked to evaluate the process at the same time, so that the process could evolve as it went along.

Dean Oliva stated that the idea is to get the concept out of the APC and to move it to a group of interested faculty members who will continue to brainstorm on the idea. He pointed out that the future of the Academy will be based on people who want to do this. He noted that in order for it to continue the process cannot over burden faculty members.

Dean Oliva stated that the reason for speaking with the Executive Committee is to let the faculty know what the APC is doing with the University Academy. He noted that the idea is to keep people involved.

Bradford asked how the Academy will be institutionalized. Dean Oliva stated that there has been a lot of discussion on this and how it can be managed. He pointed out that at some point there probably needs to be someone to oversee the Academy, but he did not think someone new needed to be hired to do this. It could probably be done by someone in the office of Academic Affairs. He stated that the creative thinking should come from the faculty.

Alloway asked if the courses in the Academy would count under a particular major or if they would be more like the University Foundations courses. Dean Oliva stated that the general construct is that people will have a choice with the course. He would hope that students taking such a course would be able to have it included as part of their respective degree programs. He pointed out that part of the process of developing the course night

include the chair signing off and stating whether the course will fit into a student's program. He stated that opportunities need to be created to encourage faculty and chairs to become involved with the Academy. He pointed out that the experience of the students needs to be considered and there needs to be discussions on students making connections across disciplines.

Bradford asked if this was exclusively for undergraduate courses. Dean Oliva stated that initially it will be just for undergraduates. He stated that the subcommittee wants to focus on the teaching aspect but there could be opportunities for graduate students to come together. He noted that at some point they want to include graduate students.

Bradford asked if Dean Oliva would be interested in giving the full Senate a presentation on the University Academy. Dean Oliva stated that he would be happy to do this. He stated that anyone with questions can email him (goliva2@unl.edu).

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Dean of Arts & Sciences

Bradford reported that the administration is in negotiations with one of the candidates for the Dean of Arts & Sciences. He stated that he expects that an announcement will be made soon about the position.

4.0 Approval of 5/2/07 Minutes

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

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 RIF Procedures

Bradford reported that he reviewed the existing procedures and the themes that Professor Shea and Professor Rosson discussed with the Committee about what they were trying to accomplish with the proposed revised procedures. He stated that he did not think Beck's revised procedures fully address these themes. He noted that the existing procedures state what is to be taken into account in order for a program to be cut. He pointed out that most of this is eliminated in Beck's document. He stated that many of the procedures are the same in both procedures. He noted that the major difference is that some areas pertaining to confidentiality issues have been eliminated in Beck's document and there are sections where the Senate President has been added.

Rapkin suggested that Beck be contacted to see why she omitted some of these things

from her document.

Bradford stated that one of the themes of the revised procedures was to ensure that the Senate received more information but no process is stated in the proposed procedures for this to occur. He stated that he thought there would be more changes to the procedures but he sees nothing significant. Alloway pointed out that it might be easier to get the revised procedures approved if there aren't wholesale changes to them.

Bradford stated that the one major difference in the procedures is the requirement that substantive enhancements in budgets also should be reviewed. He pointed out that this is a significant change in the approach of the procedures. He noted that if a new program is created there are already procedures that require approval from the APC and the Coordinating Commission for Secondary Education. He stated that he believes that substantive enhancements to a program should go through the APC. Flowers pointed out that the procedures might need to be invoked if the enhancements are a result of reallocation. Bradford noted that the procedures already deal with the issue of reallocation.

Lindquist pointed out that when a faculty line comes open it reverts back to the administration but if that line comes back it could be considered a new position under the proposed procedures. He noted that the administration could see this as the Senate trying to get involved in all financial matters. Bradford questioned what the faculty's interest is in following these procedures if there is new money coming in for a program. He stated that the existing procedures address some of this in the amendments.

Bradford stated that he will make a major list of the changes and try to cross reference them to a section in the existing procedures. He stated that the committee will review the procedures again at its next meeting.

5.2 Publication of Syllabus Policy

Bradford stated that, to his knowledge, no final copy of the syllabus policy has been circulated to the faculty yet. He pointed out that this needs to get distributed. He stated that he will contact SVCAA Couture about getting this out to the faculty. He suggested that a notice of it could be announced in the ENews.

5.3 General Education

Bradford reported that the Committee will be discussing the latest information on the general education program at the next meeting. Flowers reported that people in his department have been reading what was recently distributed and they have concerns with accountability and record keeping issues. He noted that people fear how much time and

effort will be required with the revised program.

5.4 RIAA

Alloway reported that there is a company in Chicago that is developing software for universities that will identify and block peer to peer file sharing. He stated that the company's position is that universities are obligated by terms of the Digital Millenium Copyright Act to provide information requested by entities like the RIAA. Bradford pointed out that the university could block use of certain sites.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Diversity Committee – Replace two members

Bradford stated that Professor Poser needs to be replaced on the Diversity Committee since she has been appointed Associate to the Chancellor. He noted that Professor Haller is retiring in September and he will also need to be replaced on the committee. He pointed out that this creates two openings on the committee although Professor Haller informed him that the APC choose to have Professor Ball, Marketing, replace Haller. Bolin stated that this is correct. She noted that Haller is representing APC and Ball has indicated an interest in working on the committee.

Bradford stated that Poser still needs to be replaced on the committee. He pointed out that there are no minority faculty members on the committee and it would be nice to have one on it. He asked for suggestions for the committee.

6.2 Problems with Computational Services & Facilities Committee

Bradford reported that there has been a problem with the Computational Services & Facilities Committee not meeting regularly. Flowers pointed out that this is an important committee and it was beginning to take up some important work when it stopped meeting. Bradford stated that the committee that needs to become active again. He stated that he would appoint people to the committee that would help make sure that it meets on a regular basis again.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, May 30 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Bolin, Bradford, Flowers, Ledder, Lindquist, Moeller, Prochaska Cue, Zimmers

Absent: Fech, Hachtmann, LaCost, Rapkin

Date: Wednesday, May 30, 2007

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

Bradford called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m.

2.0 Chancellor Perlman

2.1 Budget

Bradford noted that the budget is an issue that everyone is concerned about. He stated that one question that is being asked is how the 4.4% salary increase is going to be financed. Chancellor Perlman stated that the salary increases are covered. He noted that the salary guidelines, based on the recommendations made by the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee, have been submitted to the deans and directors.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the same implementation process used for faculty salaries will be put in place this year for the managerial/professional and support staff employees. He pointed out that the salary pools for these groups will be combined. He noted that deans and directors will receive 4.0 percent. If there is a subunit the dean/director will distribute 3.33 percent to it and the dean/director will retain 0.67 percent of salary increases. This is to address meritorious performance within the dean's or director's unit(s). The other .40 percent will be retained by the Chancellor/Vice Chancellor to address additional performance-related staff salary increases. Chancellor Perlman stated that these changes should allow particularly small units to make some adjustments in regards to merit and gives some flexibility. He noted that deans and directors must have the staff salaries completed by June 15th but all of this is subject to the Board of Regents approval of the budget.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the rest of the budget remains uncertain and it will depend

on what the Board and President Milliken want to do. He noted that there will be some issues that have to be dealt with. He stated that his guess is that the tuition increase will stay at 5% plus the 1% for LB605. He noted that some discussion has been going on about allocations for the utility budget.

Chancellor Perlman stated that until the Board makes a decision on the Programs of Excellence and other programs he will not know what the ultimate consequences of the budget will be. He stated that some reductions will probably have to be made although he is unsure of what the number will be.

Bradford asked about the utilities cost among the campuses. Chancellor Perlman stated that there are some issues among the campuses on the utilities. He stated that UNL participates in a partnership with Lincoln Electric System and our utility payments are made through this partnership. He noted that it makes it difficult to compare utility expenditures between campuses.

Chancellor Perlman pointed out that enrollment figures will make a difference in the budget as well. He stated that if enrollment continues to increase we will get more revenue which will of course help with the budget. He stated that Programs of Excellence money will make a difference as well. He noted that some things with the budget will just have to be worked out once we know more about it.

2.2 Preliminary Enrollment Figures

Chancellor Perlman stated that enrollment for the fall semester looks really strong. He stated that preliminary figures indicate that we will be up about 300-400 students and ACT average scores are holding steady or have increased. He noted that the Admissions Office is doing a great job of recruiting students.

Ledder asked if there will be enough dorm space for the incoming students. Chancellor Perlman stated that a process has been started to explore whether to build more dormitory space. He noted that the administration is trying to arrange this so it can be done in stages. Ledder asked if there will be a problem in housing students for the fall semester. Chancellor Perlman stated probably but adjustments can be made and housing is already working on this.

Alloway asked if the promotional efforts targeting perspective students in key locations outside of Nebraska was having the desired effect. Chancellor Perlman stated recruiting out-of-state students has gone really well and we are building a good relationship with students from high schools in Kansas City, Chicago, and Minneapolis. He stated that there is an increase in international students and our efforts in China may be beginning to

pay off.

Bradford noted that a lot of top tier schools are getting very restrictive with their admissions. He asked if we are seeing more of the top Nebraska students staying here. Chancellor Perlman stated that impressionistically it appears to be the case. He noted that out of the 36 Nebraska high school students honored by the Omaha World Herald, 13 of them are coming to UNL. He pointed out that UNL is now competing with schools presumed to have greater national reputations.

2.3 Reduction in Force Procedures

Bradford stated that he just wanted to let the Chancellor know that the Committee is comparing a document drafted by Beck on the revised reduction in force procedures with the current procedures. He stated that if the Committee believes that some changes should be made to the existing procedures it will be discussed with the Chancellor. He pointed out that he assumes that the existing procedures will be followed if there are any budget cuts.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he does not yet know whether the size and nature of the budget plans will require the procedures to be invoked but he will have discussions with the Committee about any cuts if the existing procedures are not invoked. He pointed out that the campus is not in a crisis mode and most of the budget should be manageable.

2.4 Issues on the Horizon

Chancellor Perlman reported that the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Hearing Committee will be holding its hearing on Professor Belot's case next week. He pointed out that the hearing committee will make its recommendation to the Board of Regents and the Board will make the final decision on the case.

Chancellor Perlman reported that he went with President Milliken and five other business leaders to North Carolina State University to look at their Centennial Campus. He stated that the Centennial Campus is a blend of academic buildings and private sector research buildings. He stated that the Campus was very impressive and what started out as 300 acres of undeveloped land has now become a 1300 acre technology park. He noted that the private sector companies on the Campus must have a connection with the university. He reported that the university will probably hire a consultant this summer to envision something similar for the state fair park in Lincoln. Chancellor Perlman noted that if this idea proceeds it will be a change in the culture of the campus. He stated that he sees a blending of private and public sectors on campus.

Moeller asked if there is a stipulation that after so many years the property reverts to North Carolina State University. She pointed out that some of the problems that can arise with this kind of scenario are who owns a professor's intellectual property rights and to whom do you have an allegiance to, the university or the private sector company. Chancellor Perlman stated that this already happens on a daily basis. He stated that there are no easy answers to these questions. He noted that intellectual property rights belong to the Board of Regents but there are contractual and legal questions that need to be addressed. He pointed out that things become tricky when there is interaction and consultation with private companies. He stated that joint research activity, whether it is here within the university or outside create challenges.

Ledder stated that legal issues are after the fact. He noted that the value of a research product is often not fully realized until the research is completed. He pointed out that there are big cultural differences between university research and corporation research and there could be potential problems. Chancellor Perlman agreed and stated that when a faculty member signs on as a consultant to a private company they might be told what they have to research.

Alloway asked if the building being planned for the former Starship 9 lot downtown will be a joint building with university space. Chancellor Perlman stated that there are no plans for this at this time. He noted that the street side of the building will be available for retail space and there is some discussion of having a university related senior retirement center but there have been no serious negotiations about actually university owned facilities in that project.

3.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

4.0 Approval of 5/16/07 Minutes

No objections to the minutes were made. The minutes were approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Nominations Needed for Committee on Committees

Bradford stated that he has one more appointment to make to the Committee on Committees. He asked the Committee to send him recommendations for this appointment.

5.2 General Education – Final Two Proposals

Bradford reported that very rough drafts of the final two proposals are on the web.

Proposal three can be found at http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/documents/ace_proposal_3.pdf

and proposal four can be found at http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/documents/ace_proposal_4.pdf.

Bradford noted that Ledder had previously sent comments on the proposals. He pointed out that the draft proposals have a process for identifying initial courses but there is no process for recertification of courses.

Ledder stated that proposal four addresses approving outside courses. He noted that for the first go around the outside courses will be counted into the student's program and the students will not be asked to justify whether the courses meet the outcomes. He pointed out that the strength of the plan is with feeder schools and working with them so that they know what the university is expecting students to know when they transfer here.

Bradford pointed out that outside courses will be credited to a student's total number of hours but they cannot be counted as an ACE course. Ledder stated that this hard line approach could be taken but the proposal is currently stating that the courses just be accepted. This open approach to outside courses will be evaluated to determine its success.

Ledder stated that items that are critical in the proposals need to be addressed. He noted that he can identify two issues that will more than likely have difficulty being accepted by Arts & Sciences.

Moeller suggested that information on these next two proposals needs to be disseminated to get the faculty informed and engaged. She pointed out that having an open forum is helpful but it would also be helpful to inform the faculty about what the key issues are of the proposals.

Ledder stated that he thinks the Senate is important in getting the information out to the faculty because it is the only organization on campus that has representation from all of the colleges and most of the departments on campus.

Bradford suggested that a summary of proposals three and four be written for the Senate similar to that done for proposals one and two.

Ledder stated that there is a big improvement in how the General Education reform committees are handling the proposals. He noted that this time they have put very rough drafts out on the web and are allowing and encouraging faculty to comment on the drafts. He stated that the committees are more accepting of changes now because they have not invested so much time in the wording of the proposals.

Ledder stated that one concern is that the ideal proposal that would pass the faculty as a whole and what the committee members will pass may be very different. He noted that some of the committee members prefer minimal rules in the proposals but the faculty in Arts & Sciences feels differently.

Lindquist asked what the General Education reform committees are planning with the documents. Ledder stated that everything is on hold right now. He pointed out that proposals three and four have not been approved by the committees and work will not be taken up again until August. He stated that in the fall it is probable that significant changes will be made. The committees will need to approve the proposals and then they will need to go to the colleges for a vote.

Bradford stated that the committee will discuss the draft proposals further in a couple of weeks.

5.3 Reduction in Force Procedures

Bradford reported that he sent Beck an email message with the questions the Committee has on her revised reduction in force procedures. He stated that she will forward her responses to Shea and Rosson to let them respond to the questions as well.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Parking Fees

Prochaske Cue stated that she has received questions about the parking fees. She stated that faculty members have calculated that there is an 8% increase in fees for this coming year. She stated that the concern is that the parking fees have gone up substantially in recent years but salary increases have not, especially for the staff.

The Committee agreed to invite Dan Carpenter, Director of Parking Services, and Milford Hanna, Chair of the Parking Advisory Committee to a meeting.

6.2 Blackboard

Alloway reported some apparent confusion about the use of the Blackboard course management software. He reported some student concern that faculty members were not using the system, particularly to post grades, and asked whether the faculty members are required to use Blackboard or rather urged to use it. The consensus was that use of course management software was not required. A poll of Executive Committee members showed a wide range of Blackboard use by faculty in the various colleges represented, with some colleges indicating nearly 100% use and others around 10%. Alloway wondered whether the issue is really about making grades available during the semester

so students could chart progress. He suggested the Senate might want to check with ASUN about interest in drafting some sort of statement to clarify Blackboard use.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, June 13th at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 420 University Terrace, Room 202. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Bradford, Fech, Flowers, Hachtmann, La Cost, Ledder, Lindquist, Rapkin, Moeller, Prochaska-Cue

Absent: Bolin, Zimmers

Date: Wednesday, June 13, 2007

Location: 213 City Campus Union

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

Bradford called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

3.0 Approval of 5/30/07 Minutes

No objections to the minutes were made and the minutes were approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 General Education Proposals

Bradford noted and thanked Ledder for summarizing the points of proposals three and four.

Bradford stated that it is his understanding that departments will submit a list of courses to their college curriculum committee for approval as an ACE course. If approved, the courses would then go to other colleges' curriculum committees. Bradford asked about the involvement of the University Curriculum Committee (UCC). Ledder stated that there is a certain amount of time when another college can challenge a course on the list. He noted that an example of this could be the Arts & Sciences College objecting to all writing courses that are not being taught in the English department. Bradford asked if there is a limit on how many challenges can be made. He pointed out that the proposals do not explain what the college committees are supposed to do with the list. Ledder stated that there might be some inconsistencies that need to be resolved in the proposals. He pointed out that he does not think the UCC will be very involved in the process. He

noted that the ACE committee will act as a surrogate to the UCC.

Moeller asked how the people will be selected to serve on the ACE subcommittee that will approve the courses. Ledder stated that the proposal calls for one voting member from each college for a total of eight.

Ledder stated that he thinks the proposals could be combined. Bradford stated that he has stylistic concerns about the proposals. He noted that parts of the proposals are rules and parts are justification. He questioned whether the justification is needed in the actual rules.

Moeller asked for clarification of the approval process for the college courses. She noted that the departments submit their proposed courses to their own college curriculum committees, then they go to other colleges' curriculum committees, and then to the ACE subcommittee. Bradford stated that the other college curriculum committees and the ACE subcommittee review the courses simultaneously. Ledder stated that if a course gets challenged by the colleges' curriculum committee then it needs to be discussed. He noted colleges must submit any challenges within a specified period of time. Bradford pointed out that if a course does not get approval from the other colleges representatives on the ACE committee it will not be put on the list of approved ACE courses.

Lindquist noted that proposal four states that "a list of the courses will be made available for review and comments before ACE Committee action." He asked whether people other than those on the college curriculum committees can make challenges to courses. Ledder stated that the ACE Committee will just post a list of courses. Bradford stated that the proposals are not clear on whether the courses can be challenged by others. Ledder stated that more people or groups should be able to formally challenge a course, such as members of the ACE committee. He pointed out that the details of this have probably not been discussed yet and he reminded the committee that these are rough draft proposals.

Alloway asked if it takes a unanimous vote of all eight members to approve a course. Ledder stated that this is his understanding of the proposal. Fech stated that it might be useful to have information within the documents, maybe as a footnote, explaining some of these things. Bradford suggested that there be a clean document with just the rules and another one that is more explanatory. Rapkin stated that justification could be put as an appendix in the document. He noted that a flow chart of the process for approval would be helpful.

Bradford stated that he sees problems of having any course that is established as equivalent through articulation agreements with other schools considered eligible for

credit as an ACE course. Ledder stated that UNL needs to let other colleges know that there are similar courses here and that they have to meet particular outcomes. Bradford stated that UNL should encourage other schools to follow the ACE guidelines. He stated that UNL could give these schools an incentive to do this by saying that courses must meet certain requirements in order to be accepted by UNL.

Ledder stated that he thinks the rules on accepting transfer courses could be problematic but he cannot think of any alternative at this time. He pointed out that one of the reasons for UNL to switch over to the ACE program is to make things easier for transfer students. Bradford noted that accepting all of the transfer courses could give students another incentive for going to community colleges.

Moeller asked how students are going to document their courses through the year. She pointed out that it should be the responsibility of the students to know that they have to meet the outcomes of the course. Ledder stated that the ACE program does not put the responsibility on the students. He argued that students should be responsible for their own portfolio of work demonstrating that they met the outcomes for these courses.

Alloway asked how UNL will be able to determine whether the ACE content was met in the transfer courses. Bradford stated that an ACE administrator will need to determine if a course meets the outcome. Moeller stated that the responsibility should be put on the students.

Rapkin stated that he would like to see some figures on how many credit hours are transferred in from other schools. Ledder stated that it would be good to know how many credit hours are transferred in with schools where there is an articulation agreement and those without an agreement. Ledder pointed out that we are tied with giving credit to UNO and UNK courses whether or not they meet the ACE requirements. Ledder stated that there is no system that would be able to handle all of the transfer credits without being overly labor intensive.

Lindquist stated that a possible issue is with the use of the term course work in the document. He pointed out that some students could get credit for internship or independent study courses. He wondered whether course work would stop some people from considering certain projects for acceptance into the ACE program. Ledder stated that he is particularly interested in getting credit for these independent studies and projects. He pointed out that this should not be difficult to do. Bradford noted that this kind of work will need to be evaluated anyway.

Bradford stated that proposal four does not discuss recertification of courses for the

program beyond their initial approval. He stated that courses should need to go through the same process for recertification as when they are originally approved. Ledder pointed out that the original certification procedure does not discuss past practices. He stated that he thinks it would be strange to have the same process for recertification as when a course is first accepted. He stated that when a course is being recertified it should have to show results that it was effective as an ACE course. Alloway pointed out that one of the reasons for revising the general education program is the concern of the faculty about a lack of review and recertification of courses in the current ES/IS program. Ledder stated that he would like to see a formal section on recertification. Bradford agreed.

Ledder stated that he does not like the idea of having an 8-0 vote needed for recertification. He pointed out that one person could veto a course simply because they don't like it. He stated that this should not be allowed to occur if the results show that the course has been successful. Ledder noted that he does not know if the GEAC committees planned to write a recertification section. Bradford stated that he thinks this section is needed.

Rapkin asked why there needs to be a unanimous vote. Ledder stated that this is because of the state law that says that each college can choose their own curriculum. Bradford pointed out that if the proposals are approved the procedures will not violate this state law.

Lindquist noted that if the requirement of having a unanimous vote is kept there needs to be a very clear process on how a vote can be appealed. He pointed out that people would need to know how the course can be corrected in order for it to be accepted.

Bradford stated that there should be discussion about the composition of the committee. He stated that he does not understand why the UCC cannot be the committee that does the work of approving the courses for the ACE program. He stated that the committee could still function with a 7-1 vote of the college representatives. Ledder wondered whether the person appointed to the ACE subcommittee would be a different person than the one on the UCC. He stated that he believed that it would be better to have people on the ACE subcommittee who were genuinely interested in general education and not just the curriculum committee. Bradford suggested that the non-college representatives from the UCC would have a broader overall perspective on the curriculum. Ledder stated that he thinks the composition of the subcommittee will generate a lot of discussion.

Ledder stated that there should be some mechanism that allows students to make a request to have exceptional work they did for a course counted towards meeting an outcome. He noted that generally, the requirements that are set up for course proposals looks good and

it is simple. Bradford stated that the form does not require much work for the faculty member but the department form might be different.

Alloway noted that point number ten in proposal four discusses the need for student products in an ACE course. He questioned whether the guidelines would allow for recordings of creative works like plays or concerts. Bradford stated that he believed they would. Ledder stated that there is a flaw in number ten that could generate objections. He noted that no distinction is made between individual or collective work. He stated that collective work can be allowed but credit needs to be given for individual work.

Ledder stated that he did not think the requirements on the instructor will cause much discussion because they will just need to write a short analysis of what the students did in the course.

Bradford stated that he does not believe that evidence collected in the assessment section will not be used for personnel and budget decisions. Ledder noted that the assessment should not be intended for these uses.

Bradford asked if there will be a representative group of faculty members who will help develop scoring guides. Ledder stated that what is in the proposals sounds similar to what he suggested. Bradford asked what group of faculty members will act as the ACE Assessment Team. Moeller pointed out that it needs to be faculty members who are vested in general education. She suggested that the Academy of Distinguished Professors could be involved. Bradford stated that the selection process for this assessment team needs to be clarified and needs to be specific.

6.0 New Business

6.1 ASUN and Electronic Balloting

Bradford reported that when the Executive Committee officers met with the ASUN officers ASUN discussed having an on-line voting procedure for the election of their officers although there is concern with security issues. He stated that ASUN is interested in sharing the cost of having a program written with the Faculty Senate for email balloting.

Bradford pointed out that the Board of Regents approved email voting by the Senate and/or by the full academic assembly. He stated that an advantage of having a program written is that it would tabulate the responses. He noted that if the balloting is done by email for the Senate it would not be anonymous.

Bradford stated that he will speak with ASUN to see what the costs will be.

6.2 Senate Webpage

Bradford stated that the Faculty Senate webpage will be put on the university templates. He asked the Executive Committee to think about what features should be on the webpage and whether things should be changed or added. He asked that people with ideas email either him (sbradford1@unl.edu) or Karen (kgriffin2@unl.edu) with their ideas.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, June 27 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Bradford, Fech, Hachtmann, La Cost, Ledder, Lindquist, Moeller, Prochaska Cue, Zimmers

Absent: Bolin Flowers, Rapkin

Date: Wednesday, June 27, 2007

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

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

2.0 Vice Chancellor Owens

2.1 Budget & Possible Budget Cuts

Vice Chancellor Owens reported that there have been discussions with the Chancellor about the budget with the senior administrative team but there are still unknowns about it. He pointed out that Varner Hall has not yet informed the campuses of what their budget will be for the 2007-08 year. He stated that he is confident that enrollment is up but according to the NU System formula, UNL will receive half of its tuition increase for this year and should get all of its tuition increase from last year. He stated that Varner Hall is using this formula in determining how the tuition income will be distributed to the four campuses.

VC Owens stated that many units are still carrying minuses on their budget due to low enrollment figures from a couple of years ago. He noted that this is troublesome because it impacts the campus' ability to fill positions and there are more open positions than we want. He stated that it is still unclear how the utilities bill will come out.

VC Owens stated that in the Institute the assigned minuses on the budgets will need to be addressed. He stated that the administration will need to decide how we accomplish budget cuts to deal with the assigned minuses without creating the decreased enrollment situation that occurred in 2003.

VC Owens reported that he is hearing that next year's budget will be more troublesome

because of some things that have been postponed. He noted that zero dollars went into the health care trust fund this past year and it is remarkable that employees did not see an increase in health care.

Bradford stated that he has the sense that the Board of Regents will not be happy with the idea of a tuition increase next year.

VC Owens stated that some states are making investments in higher education during these difficult financial times. He reported that there are three new federally-funded bio-energy centers opening around the country and one state is putting up \$54 million for constructing a facility in conjunction with a new energy center and to support faculty salaries for bio-energy research.

2.2 Whittier Building Construction

See 6.4 below.

2.3 Issues on the Horizon

VC Owens reported that the veterinary program with Iowa State University has received full accreditation. He stated that he is convinced that the university has done the right thing by entering into this contract. He pointed out that UNL will have the lesser of the expense of the program with teaching the first two years of the program here. He reported that all of the faculty members for the veterinary program have been hired except for one. He noted that the position for parasitology has not been filled. He pointed out that the facility associated with this position is old and outdated and has hurt UNL's ability to attract a new faculty member. He stated that UNL has to have someone in this position for the second year of the program.

Bradford asked if there is any concern about the students in the veterinary program not coming back to Nebraska to practice. VC Owens stated that there is concern. He noted that there was some thought to putting a requirement on the program but it decided not to do it because it is not a requirement for other graduate programs. He pointed out that the students entering the veterinary program this year are top notch and have suggested that they want to return to the state. Ledder stated that it would be nice to be able to offer them a financial incentive to come back to the state. VC Owens stated that there have been some discussions about having forgivable loans for students through private donors. He stated that there was a similar program in New Mexico for minority students and it was quite successful.

VC Owens stated that the Virology building is currently under construction on east campus.

3.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

4.0 Approval of 6/13/07 Minutes

The minutes of the 6/13/07 Executive Committee meeting were approved after revisions were made.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Comments on ACE Proposals 3 and 4

The Committee reviewed the written comments that will be sent to Professor Janovy regarding ACE Proposals 3 and 4. Alloway noted that one of the biggest problems is the transfer issue. Ledder argued that this should not be a reason for not approving the proposals. He stated that currently there are problems with transferring credits and it would be difficult and too labor intensive to have a system that could deal with all of the problems associated with transferring credits. Moeller pointed out that 50% of students now go to community colleges because of financial reasons and the community colleges are increasing their standards. Bradford stated that a bigger problem is UNL students taking courses for their majors at community colleges that might not include all the elements necessary to progress when they get here.

Ledder questioned whether there should be stronger comments regarding recertification. He stated that he believes this is necessary for the colleges to vote approval of the proposals.

Bradford stated that he would make the changes recommended by the Committee and send them to Professor Janovy.

6.0 New Business

6.1 ARRC Hearing on Professor Belot

Bradford noted that there was an article in the Lincoln Journal Star on the ARRC hearing on Professor Belot. He pointed out that the news report stated that the committee had decided that Professor Belot should not be terminated. He stated that it is now up to the Board of Regents to make a final decision on the matter. He reported that the Board of Regents has to act on the matter within 30 days.

Moeller asked if the hearing committee's recommendations could be discussed with the media at this time. Bradford stated that no comments should have been made because of the confidentiality rules in the ARRC procedures.

Bradford stated that the Board of Regents will have to accept the factual findings of the hearing committee. If new information has become available since the recommendations were made by the hearing committee, the Board can hold a new hearing to collect the additional information.

Ledder asked if President Milliken fired Professor Belot. Bradford stated that President Milliken is recommending that Professor Belot be fired based on the findings of an outside attorney hired by the university. Ledder asked if President Milliken could reconsider his recommendation based on the ARRC hearing committee's findings. Bradford stated that he thinks President Milliken could reconsider.

Ledder asked if there is any potential role for the Executive Committee to play in this matter. Bradford stated that under the new ARRC rules, if the Board of Regents' decision is contrary to the recommendations of the hearing committee, then the Executive Committee will see the report. Ledder asked what kind of action could then be taken. Bradford stated that several things could be done.

6.2 Possible Violation of ARRC Confidentiality Rules

The Committee discussed a possible violation of the ARRC confidentiality rules.

6.3 StarTran Bus Route Changes

Alloway reported that a colleague of his is concerned with the proposed changes to the bus routes, particularly with the elimination of downtown stops. He noted that his colleague has heard that the Q street bus stop is to be eliminated.

Ledder stated that he has looked at the changes and does not think the Q street stop will be closing. He noted that nothing in the plan indicates that any bus stops will be closed but neither is it stated anywhere that all downtown stops will be kept. Alloway stated that the downtown route will no longer be included in all of the bus routes.

Ledder stated that StarTran is doubling up most south routes with a north route. He stated that the only downtown stop that all buses will be required to make is the 11th & O Street bus stop.

Alloway suggested that the University should be aware of all of the changes since a lot of university people use the bus system. Griffin noted that the Committee will be meeting with Dan Carpenter, Director of Parking and Transportation Services, on July 11th and he would probably be aware of all of the changes in the StarTran bus routes.

6.4 Report on Board of Regents Meeting

Bradford stated that the Board approved the budget and a 6% tuition increase for next

year. He noted that he was surprised that the vote on the tuition increase was 7-1 because there were a lot of negative comments made in the morning meetings about it. He stated that he thinks the Board will not be eager to approve another similar increase next year which could create a real problem in the budget. He pointed out that there could be a \$13 million shortfall for the 2008-09 budget.

Alloway asked for clarification on the new Board of Regents policy 3.3.9 regarding endorsement of commercial goods and services by university and university staff. Bradford stated that, with some exceptions the policy states that employees cannot endorse commercial goods, services or business of any person or entity outside of the university without written consent or approval from the President or Chancellor. He stated that the policy does not apply to endorsements of scholarly books or publications or for non-profit organizations.

The Committee suggested that Bradford write a letter to President Milliken expressing concern for the policy.

Alloway asked what "Know How to Go Nebraska" is about. Bradford stated that it is part of a national program of websites. It is a public service commercial directed at first-generation college students that are unsure of what steps they need to take to get into college. He stated that the video gives these students instructions on five steps they need to take to get into the university.

Zimmers asked if the video includes anything about extension educators. He pointed out that they are in every county and they do a lot of recruiting for the University. Bradford stated that he did not know if anything is included.

Ledder asked if UNL does a lot of recruiting in the rural areas. Zimmers reported that extension is heavily involved in recruiting.

Moeller asked when faculty members will know about their salary increases. Bradford stated that faculty in his college already know. Fech stated that official numbers in his extension center were not known. Griffin stated that pay notifications are usually sent out during the summer after July 1.

Bradford reported that the Regents discussed the renovation of the Whittier building. He pointed out that some of the interior space is already in use by Campus Recreation. He stated that the renovation calls for replacement of the heating/air conditioning system as well as renovation for a child care facility on the north side of the building. He stated that most of the renovated space will be used for laboratories and the Nebraska Transportation

Center will be housed in the building.

Bradford reported that the Regents approved the program statement for the Abel Sandoz dorms. He noted that the plan is to remove the dorms and, among other things, make the dorm rooms larger.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:14 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, July 11th at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Alloway, Bolin, Bradford, Flowers, Hachtmann, LaCost, Ledder, Prochaska-Cue, Zimmers

Absent: Fech, Lindquist, Moeller, Rapkin

Date: Wednesday, July 25, 2007

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

Bradford called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m.

2.0 Chancellor Perlman/VC Owens

2.1 State of Nebraska/University Medical Insurance Coverage

Bradford stated that a faculty member raised the issue that the state is changing the rules regarding health care coverage for couples that have one spouse working for the state and the other for the university. He pointed out that the new rules will not allow health care costs to be shared between the two spouses. He noted that this could raise costs for the university health care system. He asked if the Chancellor had any idea how many people would be affected by this change.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he did not know offhand how many employees would be affected by the change. He pointed out that bringing more people into the health care system would not necessarily be a detriment, depending on the status of their health.

Flowers asked when the changes are to take effect. Bradford stated that it will happen at the end of the university's insurance year. Flowers asked if the dental plan can be split or whether this is included under the new ruling. Bradford stated that he thinks the employees will have to carry separate policies or one of the spouses would have to carry both in one plan. He pointed out that the changes will be more costly to the employees than the current cost sharing arrangement.

2.2 Plans for Dealing with Budget Deficits

Bradford stated that the last time the Committee met with the Chancellor he did not know

what the exact allocation of funds will be for UNL. Bradford asked if the Chancellor now knows the amount and how the raises will be covered for this year.

Chancellor Perlman stated that there will not be any required cuts to get through this year but he is not certain about next year. He pointed out that this does not mean that there may not be any cuts this year. It may be prudent to make cuts this year so they could be fully implemented next year when the budget looks precarious. He stated that we are in better shape due to enrollment. He noted that we are looking at another enrollment gain for this fall which will certainly help with the budget. He stated that he is exploring some ideas for next year and is talking with the other administrators about it but it is much too early to know what the bottom line will be for next year.

Bradford asked if there is a possibility of cuts this year to help deal with next year's budget and if so, how they would be accomplished. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that not much can be done with making cuts for this year's budget. He stated that realistically any cuts would not take effect until next year.

Bradford suggested dealing with budget cuts relatively soon if we are going to have to deal with them at some point for next year's budget. Chancellor Perlman stated that this depends on how the possibilities are assessed. He stated that he is not sure at this time how to deal with the budget for next year.

Bradford asked how fall enrollment is looking. Chancellor Perlman reported that there are 400 more students this year than last year. Ledder asked what the total enrollment is for freshmen. Chancellor Perlman stated that last year the freshmen class was about 3600 and this year it is over 4000. He noted that the total increase of new freshmen is 320 or 330 and the rest are transfer students. He stated that he is pleased with what the faculty and campus admissions people have done over the past three years to increase our enrollment. He pointed out that the faculty members have really pitched in on helping with recruiting students.

Bradford asked if the number of available high school students for college in Nebraska is still increasing or whether we are now starting to see the decrease in the high school population. VC Owens stated that he believes we are in the last year of the bulge in the number of students. Chancellor Perlman stated that the number of high school students will trend down in the next few years. He pointed out that the increase being seen in enrollment figures is from non-resident students.

Ledder stated that he is very impressed with the non-resident students that we are getting. Chancellor Perlman stated that he has received letters from people stating how well they

are treated when they come to campus for a visit. He noted that students and their parents say that they feel more welcomed here than any other university they have visited. He noted that we need to sustain this but we also need to focus on retention. He pointed out that we have a responsibility to students when they come here.

Chancellor Perlman reported that most of the new students have been able to get the classes they want and this has been accomplished through the help of the deans and chairs who have helped to expand some of the classes that the new students need.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he has heard that the academic credentials of the incoming students will be high and may even be increasing from previous classes. He pointed out that this represents a challenge for us because it puts more pressure to have a diverse faculty. He stated that we need to make better headway on diversity at UNL.

Chancellor Perlman noted that the diversity plan is on the Senate's plate and he is a bit perplexed about where it is going although he stated that the Senate will manage the process of proposing the plan. He suggested that a question that needs to be addressed is whether the plan should be limited to pertaining to faculty or whether it should include staff and students as well. He pointed out that issues facing the faculty on diversity are somewhat separate from students and staff. He noted that in addition to a diversity action plan, the university has filed a separate affirmative action plan with the federal government.

Alloway stated that the Executive Committee talked about the possibility of having a distinct diversity plan for the faculty. Ledder noted that one of the reasons for disliking the original draft diversity plan is that it was written as an affirmative action plan. Bradford pointed out that the Executive Committee had the concern that there was no distinction between faculty, students, and staff with the original draft plan. He noted that the students fit in with the faculty only on the academic side of things.

Chancellor Perlman noted that there is some ambiguity regarding the plan but he thinks it would be better to cabin the plan into something that is attainable. Ledder pointed out that one source of ambiguity is the different roles that faculty members play at different times. He stated that the rules of the plan should depend on the role that the instructor is functioning in at the time. Chancellor Perlman stated that he thinks this is an issue that should be addressed in the plan.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he did not want our minority faculty members to think efforts for diversity were stalled awaiting a new plan so the Senate should not be surprised if the administration moves forward on some initiatives prior to the plan being in place.

Alloway pointed out that the Executive Committee minutes from the fall semester reflect the Senate's concerns on the original draft plan and whether there should be separate policies for faculty and staff and students.

Bradford noted that the ad hoc committee working on the diversity plan now has a new chair because the previous chair retired from the university. He stated that he will talk with the new chair to express the concerns raised in this meeting.

Ledder asked if there is a significant minority membership on the ad hoc committee. Bradford stated that with the addition of Professor Orey there is minority membership. Ledder stated that it is important to members on the committee that have viewpoints to adequately address the diversity issue.

Bradford stated that he hopes that the committee will get started when everyone gets back on campus for the fall semester.

2.3 Issues on the Horizon

2.1 2015 Announcement

Chancellor Perlman asked if there were any questions regarding the recent announcement on the 2015 plan. Bradford asked what the new building is that was mentioned in the announcement. Chancellor Perlman stated that it is a building for nano technology and possibly life sciences because there is such a demand for space in these disciplines.

Bradford asked if the State Fair Board is still discussing the possibility of moving the State Fair. Chancellor Perlman stated that the Board has had a lot of discussions about this and they are opposed to the move. He noted that there is a legislative committee reviewing the issue and a consultant has been hired to look at the possibility of moving the State Fair. He stated that a report on this should be completed in December.

Bradford noted that the County Commissioners are proposing some building projects at 84th and Havelock. He asked if this is consistent with what the State Fair Board is trying to do. Chancellor Perlman stated that the Agricultural Society projects did not seem inconsistent and in fact they approved moving the state fair to their site and the County Board agrees with this as well.

2.2 Sheldon Museum Director Search

Chancellor Perlman noted that the Bylaws are clear about appointing faculty members to academic searches but not clear on who should be on the search committee for director of the Sheldon Museum. He stated that it is a difficult search committee to put together

because of the scope of the people the position has to deal with. He pointed out that the position does not have faculty assigned to him/her as a department chair or dean would. He stated that he wants to establish the search committee soon and noted that suggestions or any concerns would be helpful.

2.3 Board of Regents Policy on Endorsements

Bradford noted that the Board approved a policy regarding endorsements at their June meeting. He stated that some faculty members have raised concerns about the policy. Chancellor Perlman stated that there are some ambiguities with the policy that should be clarified.

VC Owens noted that extension faculty members often recommend products to people in the field and whenever possible they use the generic or chemical names for those products. He stated that the policy should not be that difficult to follow and that a disclaimer could be incorporated clearly stating that the university is not endorsing a particular product.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the intent of the policy is to prohibit using the university to endorse a particular product. He pointed out that employees of the university can endorse something as an individual citizen as long as they do not refer to themselves as an employee of the university.

2.4 City Campus Dairy Store

Vice Chancellor Owens stated that a new dairy store will open in the city campus union. He noted that ice cream from the dairy store will now be sold in the stands at Memorial Stadium as well as at the concession stands.

2.5 East Campus Visitor's Center

Vice Chancellor Owens reported that there is a satellite visitors' center housed in the dairy store on east campus. He stated that information about going to all of UNL, not just the ag campus, can be obtained at the center. He stated that he is hoping that this center will help in the effort to recruit all UNL students.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Professor Waskar Ari

Ledder reported that Professor Waskar Ari will finally be coming to campus for the fall semester. Members of the Committee suggested having an emergency resolution presented at the September Senate meeting to welcome Professor Air. Ledder stated that he will work on a draft of the resolution.

4.0 Approval of 6/27/07 Minutes

The minutes were approved as amended.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 ARRC Confidentiality (Professor Bryant)

Bradford reported that he is sending a letter to Professor Bryant, co-chair of the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee, addressing concern with confidentiality issues pertaining to ARRC investigations and hearings.

Professor Bryant stated that the recent case reported by the press is not the first time that information has been revealed to the public regarding an ARRC case. He pointed out that both he and co-chair Professor Diamond were zealous about telling the members of the hearing committee that confidentiality of the case should not be divulged. He stated that it was pointed out to the committee that only the chair could speak about the case but he noted that it may not have been clear that the chair should not speak to the press.

Professor Bryant suggested that the Faculty Senate and Executive Committee take a more active role in instructing the ARRC on various issues. He stated that he would like to have a conversation about how to enhance the visibility of the ARRC. He pointed out that the ARRC needs to be more important in the minds of the faculty given the business that the ARRC conducts.

Bradford stated that the co-chairs will meet with the Executive Committee sometime in the fall. He noted that it is a good idea to have a little more communication going on between the ARRC and the Executive Committee. He pointed out that the ARRC is one of the most important things that a faculty committee does in terms of protecting tenure rights and academic freedom. He stated that it would be a good idea to get the Senators more involved and more aware of what the ARRC does. Griffin suggested providing more information on the Senate website as well about the committee.

Bradford stated that there is a problem with the ARRC rules regarding the 30 day time limit. He reported that he sent President Milliken an email about this concern. He noted that the ARRC's Academic Freedom and Tenure policies stated that a decision needs to be made by the Board in 30 days after the committee's recommendations are presented to the President and the Board. He noted that the policies state that a statement will be sent to the Faculty Senate President notifying him/her whether the committee recommendations have been accepted.

Bradford stated that this rule has not been followed in the present case and it is not

scheduled to be on the Board of Regents' agenda until the September meeting. When he pointed the inconsistency out to President Milliken, Bradford stated that he received a message from General Counsel Wood stating that the AFT rules are invalid because they are not consistent with the Regents Bylaws.

Bradford stated that the current situation raises some serious questions. He noted that, assuming that the rule is valid, what happens if the timeline is violated. He stated that he believed the argument would be that a tenured faculty member could not be fired if the decision is not made within the 30 days. He asked the Committee what the Senate could do given the position that Central Administration and the Board of Regents is taking on the matter. He noted that the Board of Regents could invalidate the ARRC rules if they are not changed.

Professor Bryant reported that the members of the ARRC are all in agreement that the Senate Executive Committee should bring a resolution to the Senate to propose fixing this problem. He pointed out that 30 days is awkward for getting recommendations to the Board and having the item placed on the Board's agenda. He stated that there is a need to protect faculty members so they are not in limbo for a long time but there also needs to be appropriate time for the Board to act.

Professor Bryant stated that the faculty members who served on the recent hearing committee took their responsibility seriously and if the Regents reject their recommendation there needs to be a very good reason because otherwise it is a pretty serious undermining of faculty governance. He noted that he would be happy to come to a Senate meeting to discuss this issue. Ledder stated that there is a big difference between respecting the recommendation and respecting the process. He pointed out that the administration should be respecting the process.

Bradford suggested that he send a letter to the Board discussing the importance of the tenure process and faculty governance.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Executive Committee Retreat

Bradford noted that the Executive Committee has a retreat every year to work out the priorities for the Senate for the coming year. The Committee tentatively scheduled the retreat for August 29th.

6.2 Committee on Committees Election

Griffin pointed out that there is still an open position on the Committees on Committees that needs to be filled by a member of the Faculty Senate. Bradford suggested that the Committee think of possible candidates and discuss it at the next meeting.

6.3 September Senate Meeting Guest

Prochaska Cue stated that she has been having discussions with Angie Frederick, Assistant Director for Fitness and Wellness at the Campus Recreation Center. Prochaska Cue stated that Frederick would like to come to the Senate to talk about a possible wellness plan at the university.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:11 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, August 8, at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in Faculty Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Bolin, Bradford, Fech, Flowers, Lindquist, Moeller, Prochaska Cue, Rapkin

Absent: Alloway, Hachtmann, Ledder, Zimmers

Date: Wednesday, August 8, 2007

Location: Faculty 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

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

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Academic Rights & Responsibilities Case on Professor Belot

Bradford reported that The Chronicle of Higher Education called him about the case involving Professor Belot. Bradford stated that he informed the Chronicle that the Board of Regents has to make the final decision on the case and they will probably act on it at the September Board meeting.

3.0 Approval of 7/25/07 Minutes

The Committee approved the minutes as amended.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Committee on Committees Election

Bradford reported that he sent an email message out to the Senate indicating that there is an opening on the Committee on Committees that needs to be filled by a member of the Senate. He stated that he has not had any response at all to the message. Moeller volunteered to run for election to the Committee. Bradford stated that he will send another email to the Senators asking for one more person to run for election.

4.2 Executive Committee Retreat

Griffin reported that the Executive Committee Retreat on August 29th will be held at the Embassy Suites beginning at noon. Bradford stated that the Committee will work on establishing the goals for the Senate for the 2007-08 academic year. He stated that a copy

of last year's goals will be sent out to the Committee.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Safe Assignment

Bradford reported that Greg Gifford, ASUN Graduate Student Representative, has some concerns with the Safe Assignment policy. He stated that Gifford thinks students should have access to the program even though a professor may not allow access to it for a particular course. He noted that Gifford did not like the fact that students would have to go through the library to use the program. Flowers pointed out that students only need to go to the library once to initially sign up for use of the program but after that they can use it elsewhere. Bolin stated that the reason for this is so the library can fully explain the program and Blackboard to the students.

Flowers stated that one of the early concerns of the students is that they did not want any of the papers submitted to the local database. Bradford stated that Gifford's concern is that there could be personal information in the paper that would be entered into the local database. Bradford pointed out that an instructor can pull a paper off the system if there is any personal information in it.

Bolin stated that she would like to see the default on the program set so that a paper does not get automatically entered into the database. She pointed out that currently the instructor must indicate not to enter the paper into the local database. Bradford asked if the Safe Assignment committee feels that we should stick with the current default option. Flowers stated that not only does the committee feel this way, but Safe Assignment suggests this default. He pointed out that sending the paper to the local database helps to slow down cases of plagiarism among the students.

Moeller stated that she had great success using the Safe Assignment program this summer with her students. She noted that the students seemed to like the program as well because it gave them the opportunity to revise their papers before finally submitting it.

Griffin asked if a paper can be removed from the local database once it has been entered. Flowers stated that it could be removed but the instructor would have to contact Information Services to do this.

Bradford pointed out that having a paper with some personal information is less of a concern because the paper cannot be accessed from the database by instructors or the students.

5.2 Boycott of Israeli Scholars

Bradford noted that in the New York Times there was a letter signed by several university presidents and chancellors opposing a boycott of Israeli scholars and universities and one of the signatures on the letter was from the Chancellor of the University of Nebraska Medical Center. He stated that he has already received an email asking why UNL has not signed the letter. He pointed out that it is unclear what results opposing the boycott would have. He noted that he wants to discuss the issue with Chancellor Perlman.

Moeller asked how signing such a boycott could affect us. Bradford stated that more than likely it would not affect us unless someone was going to a conference in Israel. Rapkin pointed out that the boycott could raise obstacles for Israeli scholars trying to get visas. He stated that he is not in favor of supporting the boycott.

5.3 Card Entry Locks on Buildings

Bradford noted that to enter the Law College he must swipe his ID card. He questioned how long the information is being kept with these locks. Moeller stated that the use of these locks is to help deal with crimes occurring on campus. Bradford stated that he does think it makes sense to use the locks but he pointed out that there is a privacy issue as well. He noted that the locks would keep track of when people are entering and leaving a building. Lindquist stated that the information could be used to help terminate or penalize a person that is deemed controversial.

Bradford stated that he believes there should be some kind of privacy policy in place so this kind of information cannot be used negatively.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:37 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, August 22 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.