

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Baesu, Bearnese, Billesbach, Gay, Herstein, Kolbe, Krehbiel, Minter, Weissling, Woodman, Zuckerman

Absent: Buan, Eklund, Zuckerman

Date: Tuesday, March 1, 2022

Location: Zoom

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 (*Kolbe*)

Minter called the meeting to order at 4:16 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Consultant Fees

Griffin reported that Associate to the Chancellor Zeleny would be meeting with the Executive Committee on March 29th to provide a report on the consultant fees that UNL has paid over recent years. She noted that the Committee would be meeting with EVC Ankersen and AVC Walker and AVC Hope on March 22nd.

2.2 No Meeting Over Spring Break

Griffin reported that the Executive Committee would not be meeting during the week of spring break.

3.0 Approval of February 22, 2022 Minutes

Minter asked if there was a motion to approve the revised minutes. Gay moved to approve the minutes and the motion was seconded by Weissling. Motion approved by the Executive Committee.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Code of Professional Conduct (Minter)

Minter reported that she will share the draft Code, along with the comments made by the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee (ARRC), with the Executive Committee in a OneDrive folder. She stated that she would like a vote from the Executive Committee on the status of the draft and afterwards share it with AVC Walker to see if there is anything that would be problematic before it is presented to the full Senate.

Woodman asked if the Code was a process document or an aspirational statement. Minter pointed out that the ARRC comments should help clarify this issue, noting that Professor Peterson addresses this in his comments. She stated that Peterson argued that the Code should be seen as partly aspirational, but largely as setting standards as to what

the burden of proof is that administrators must provide if they want to impose sanctions on a faculty member who is accused of misconduct. She noted that it is stated in the document that misconduct would be defined as a violation of the ethical principles of the Code and that it is injurious to the mission of the institution. Woodman asked if misconduct would be the only conduct that could be used to impose sanctions on a faculty member. He pointed out that sometimes faculty members receive sanctions in the form of punitive measures. Minter stated that the bottom line is that there need to be due process and the Code stipulates that faculty members have to be notified of their due process.

Billesbach questioned how much of the Code is covered in the Regents Bylaws. He pointed out that we need to be cognizant that we are not duplicating things because it could cause confusion. Minter stated that the ad hoc committee that worked on the Code was very careful not to replicate language that already exists but instead provides a consolidated source for the language. She pointed out that the Code is much easier for faculty to navigate rather than the Regents Bylaws or the Regents Policies documents. She noted that the ARRC really wants a Professional Code of Conduct.

Minter stated that she would provide the draft Code for the Executive Committee members and they would discuss it again at the March 22nd meeting.

4.2 Academic Calendar Changes Meeting

Minter reported that the University-wide Calendar Committee voted on the start and end dates of the fall and spring semesters and for the January interim session, but a vote did not take place on moving the fall break to the week of Thanksgiving. Kolbe pointed out that the new calendar would be conducted on a trial basis for the first year. He noted that each of the campuses agreed with the calendar, and they are interested in moving the fall break, but this change would still need to be voted on.

Woodman asked if the Faculty Senate could voice a collective opinion regarding the proposed change. Kolbe stated that the Senate might be able to but pointed out that the Calendar Committee is a university-wide committee and approval of the calendar would be made by Central Administration.

Kolbe stated that he is glad that the campuses will still maintain a 15-week semester. Weissling asked if shortening the semester by a week would require longer class times. Kolbe noted that we have one of the highest numbers of contact hours for students compared to other universities in the Big Ten and shortening the semester by a week would not require longer class times. He stated that he was working hard to ensure that the gap week between the end of spring and the beginning of summer classes would remain. Woodman asked if having the January interim session would reduce the number of summer credit hours. Kolbe pointed out that summer enrollment has been down for a number of years now. Herstein noted that her students look for a winter interim session because they want to work full-time during the summer rather than take classes.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Agenda Items for Meeting with Chancellor Green/VC Boehm

Kolbe asked that the Executive Committee members forward agenda items for the upcoming meeting with the Chancellor and VCIANR. Billesbach suggested asking for more information regarding the suspension of the Delta Upsilon fraternity.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, March 8, 2022, at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Kelli Herstein, Secretary.