

UNL FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
East Campus Union, Arbor Suite
December 1, 2015
Presidents Bender, Woodman, and Nickerson, Presiding

1.0 Call to Order

President Bender called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 First Pre-Senate Luncheon on City Campus

President Bender reported that approximately 26 Senators attended the pre-Senate luncheon held on City Campus. He noted that VC Green attended the meeting by video conferencing as he was in Washington D.C. on business for the university. He stated that it was a good meeting and that there will be another one on March 1.

3.0 Chancellor Perlman

Chancellor Perlman reported that the organizers of the Black Lives Matter event that was recently held presented a series of suggestions to improve the campus in regards to diversity issues. He stated that the administration will work and interact with the organizers and will respond to each of the suggestions and hopefully will arrive at some conclusions while working together.

Chancellor Perlman noted that a diversity campaign for the campus actually was started before the Black Lives Matter rally. He stated that there are a number of firms around the country that look at diversity programs and strategies and benchmarks these against other institutions and best practices. He noted that we have reached out to a firm which he had hoped would be able to come in the spring, but they will not be able to do a full review until spring of 2017. In the meantime we are talking with the firm to see if they can help us with intermediate steps that will start in the spring. He pointed out that the campus is trying to be as responsive as we can to improving diversity on campus.

Chancellor Perlman reported that a new policy will soon be announced regarding international travel. He pointed out that there can be serious problems and significant risks with international travel these days due to the threat of terrorism, and the university feels a need to be accountable for not only students that travel, but for the faculty as well. He pointed out that currently we are not able to track faculty members when they travel internationally on university business. While some buy their tickets through Travel & Transport, others go elsewhere to purchase their airline tickets. He noted that we knew that there were some faculty members in Paris at the time of the recent attacks, but we did not know all of the faculty members that were there.

Chancellor Perlman stated that another issue related to international travel has to deal with export control which consists of federal laws that limit the transfer of information, technology, equipment or intellectual property to other nations. He pointed out that a professor from Tennessee is in prison because he did not understand this federal law. Professor Farrell, Agricultural Leadership & Education, noted that if a faculty member is paying for airfare themselves, and they filed a travel authorization form, the university could still face repercussions should the faculty member violate the export control regulations. Chancellor Perlman stated that this is true if faculty members wanted to take that risk, but the university is asking for the faculty's help with export control because violations could have significant impacts. He pointed out that most people do not like regulations, but in this instance the process of filing a travel authorization form and purchasing tickets through Travel & Transport are not difficult to adhere to in order to protect against significant liabilities.

Chancellor Perlman stated that we need to get some control over international travel so we can help faculty members who might need assistance when they are traveling in another country. As a result, beginning January 1, in order to be reimbursed for international travel by the university you must file an electronic travel authorization request and you have to buy tickets through Travel and Transport. He knows that there are arguments against doing this and that people can sometimes get better prices elsewhere, but the problem is that the university cannot track someone's international travel if they don't purchase the tickets from Travel and Transport. If the university cannot track a faculty member it cannot help them if they are in another country should they need assistance. He pointed out that if faculty members have already booked travel that is taking place after January 1 they will be reimbursed, but in the future they will need to comply.

Professor Guevara, Modern Languages & Literature, asked if the rules apply to travel anywhere outside of the U.S. Chancellor Perlman stated they do. He noted that there will probably be a lot of questions, but he thinks the details will be pretty simple and straight forward and a webpage will be created that should address many of the questions.

4.0 Approval of November 3, 2015 Minutes

Professor Wysocki, Electrical and Computing Engineering, moved for approval of the minutes. Motion seconded by Professor Peterson, Agricultural Economics. Motion approved with three abstentions.

5.0 Committee Reports

5.1 Academic Planning Committee (Professor Delserone)

Professor Delserone reported that she is serving as chair and Professor Wagner, School of Biological Sciences is Vice Chair. She stated that the APC spent a significant amount of time discussing the proposed merger of the College of Architecture and the Hixson-Lied College of Fine and Performing Arts. She reported that there was a meeting about the proposed merger which was open to the public. She stated that the APC also recommended to the Chancellor some new programs including a Ph.D. program in complex Biosystems and a Bachelor of Science program in software engineering.

Professor Delserone stated that the APC is looking at the involvement of administrators in the academic review process (APR). She noted that the APR guideline document is reviewed every ten years and it is due for a revision soon. President Bender asked if the APC made a recommendation regarding the involvement of administrators in the meeting of the external review team with the faculty of the department/unit undergoing the APR. Professor Delserone stated that the APC has had reports from APR monitors that the external review team members questioned why administrators and deans attended the meeting of the faculty. She stated that these incidences occur primarily in IANR where administrators attended the entire meeting and there was concern that their presence inhibited discussion. She reported that the APC had a frank discussion with VC Green who has guaranteed that this will not happen again and this is being put into writing. President Bender asked if the APR guidelines will be revised this year. Professor Delserone stated that an APC subcommittee has not been appointed yet to work on the guidelines but she thinks it would be a good idea to have the revisions made during the spring semester to help prevent any further incidents.

Professor Fech, Southeast Research & Extension Center, asked if there was a model or template in place for who could attend the external review team's meeting with the faculty of a unit. Professor Delserone stated that the APR guidelines are fairly clear and schedules of when APRs will occur are distributed ahead of time. She noted that the charge of the APC monitor is to look at who is in attendance at the meeting to see if any administrators are present. She noted that the problem seems to be specific to IANR. Professor Joeckel, School of Natural Resources, noted that VC Green stated that hereafter no deans or directors will be allowed to attend the meeting, but he wondered if it was possible for the recently conducted meetings to be done again without the administrators present. Professor Delserone stated that this was unlikely.

5.2 University Conduct Board (formerly University Appeals and University Judicial Boards) (Dean Hecker)

Dean Hecker reported that the UCB had eight cases this year, and one appeal. He stated that most of the cases were on academic misconduct. He stated that this is a troubling trend, not just here, but nationwide and his office is trying to get an idea of how the problems associated with academic misconduct can be solved. He noted that many of the problems have to do with technology. He noted that the difference in international cultures and what is considered accepted behavior here is part of the problem.

Dean Hecker reported that the campus is seeing a growing number of Title IX cases, one of which was heard by the UCB. He pointed out that these cases are coming quickly to the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance resulting in the need for the Office to expand its staff. He pointed out that these are very difficult cases to deal with and his office is going to use the Student Code of Conduct to create subordinate boards to hear the sexual misconduct cases which is a federal requirement. He noted that the boards will need to be trained to hear these kinds of cases. He stated that he is unsure whether there is an increase in these cases or whether there is more sensitivity and awareness. He reported that problems with mental health issues and the need for threat assessment is growing exponentially nationwide. He stated that he appreciates the faculty help in solving these issues. He noted that the key is making these situations known to his office and to help identify the problems.

Dean Hecker stated that he did not know if this is the right time for the faculty to look at the issue of academic

dishonesty. He pointed out that years ago there was a suggestion to have a grade of XF which means that the student failed due to academic dishonesty, but the campus decided not to adopt this grade. He noted that another option would be to look at the honor code. He stated that his office is trying to find as many different tools as possible to help deal with the problem, but the decision would ultimately need to be made by the Senate.

President Elect Woodman asked how Dean Hecker's office works with the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance and the police. Dean Hecker stated that when there is a report of sexual misconduct two different tracks can be taken, one is criminal which involves the police, and the other is a violation of the Student Code of Conduct which involves the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance. He noted that the police would look at a different level of evidence and proof. He reported that if there is a possible violation of the Code of Conduct the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance will conduct an investigation and make a recommendation which could result in his office being involved for adjudication. President Elect Woodman asked if Dean Hecker's office can look at the recommendation from the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance and decide that the recommendation is too much. Dean Hecker stated that the university can weigh in on the decision but noted that the respondent and the accused can also weigh in on the matter.

Professor Adams, Plant Pathology, stated that he would like to see some early discussions with students regarding cultural changes that have taken place that have not been addressed such as women are equal and are not someone's property. He pointed out that neighborhood groups naturally form but some male members of the group may see the women as belonging to them. He stated that students need to be educated that members of a group may be part of the group, but they are not property of the group. He stated that sociological behaviors come to the campus from the fraternities, sororities, and the dorms. He said that students might not even understand that they are equating a member of their group as property.

Dean Hecker stated that we are required to conduct a campus climate survey to assess the level of climate issues on campus and part of the requirement is that we also provide education for our community. He stated that the campus is struggling with determining what would be the best way to provide the education because the Federal Department of Education that requires the survey is not providing any guidelines. He stated that there needs to be education on the expectations of the community.

Professor Schleck, English, noted that additional hires have been made for the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance and asked if the same investment in staffing is being provided to CAPS so we can be proactive in developing our mental health network. Dean Hecker noted that the issue is on everyone's mind, but there needs to be acknowledgement that there are limited resources. He stated that the campus needs to make the right kind of assessment about what is needed.

Professor Lee, Communication Studies, asked if Safe Assignment is not working for academic integrity issues or do we need a more vigorous program to check student papers. Dean Hecker stated that Safe Assignment is being used and it does work. He noted that it provides a percentage of matched wording, but it is then up to a faculty member to check to see if plagiarism has occurred. He pointed out that there is a level of sophistication now with academic dishonesty. People will gladly accept money to write an original paper for someone. He noted that his office received a case of a student at UNL who wrote a paper for a student at another campus but complained on social media when she did not get paid. He stated that the Computer Science and Engineering department has had problems with students getting someone else to write code for them.

5.3 Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee (Professor Albrecht)

Professor Albrecht reported that the issues handled by the ARRC are confidential. She noted that two special hearing committees have been formed to investigate cases. She reported that the ARRC was asked by the Senate Executive Committee to consider guidelines about Extension Educators serving on external boards.

Professor Albrecht noted that a number of people contact the chair of the ARRC about concerns, usually dealing with promotion and tenure issues. She stated that an upcoming issue is VSIP and whether retiring faculty members are still allowed to do some work with the university. She pointed out that some retired faculty members continue working with graduate students, grants, and research, but others are told they cannot have any involvement. She stated that there are no rules or guidelines and suggested that this is an issue that the Senate might want to look into.

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Proposed Professional Ethics Statement

Professor Lee proposed that the motion to approve the revised Professional Ethics Statement be postponed

until the next meeting. He noted that some suggestions were made at the last Senate meeting but the English department has looked over the document more closely and some faculty members have some further suggestions. He reported that the subcommittee working on the revised Statement will work with faculty members in the English department to address concerns. Rudy seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

6.2 Motion Concerning Guns on Campus

President Bender noted that a newly revised resolution was sent on Monday. He stated that the Executive Committee is presenting the newly revised resolution to replace the two resolutions presented at the November meeting. He asked if there was any discussion on the substitution. Professor Joeckel asked that the new resolution be read for the minutes. President Bender read:

“Whereas the university is a place for reflection, discussion, study and learning, and

Whereas faculty, administration, campus police, staff and students share a priority of keeping a safe and welcoming campus and are able to evaluate campus culture and threats and

Whereas, the presence of unrestricted weapons or concealed carry are unlikely to enhance the University mission, campus safety or perceptions of a welcoming environment.

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln opposes any legislation that would curtail the ability of University authorities to appropriately restrict the presence of weapons on campus and further we affirm support for the current published weapons policy which can be found at [http://police.unl.edu/property-registration-weapons-storage.](http://police.unl.edu/property-registration-weapons-storage)”

President Bender noted that the proposed motion basically states that we want the policy to remain as is. Professor Wysocki, Electrical and Computing Engineering, asked what would happen if the policy on the website changes. President Bender stated that if the current policy listed were to change the Senate may not support the policy. Professor Wysocki proposed that there be an amendment to include the date of the policy that is referred to in the motion. Professor Leiter, Law, stated that the date of December 1, 2015 would need to be included in the policy. Professor LaDunga, Statistics, pointed out that the current website might disappear and suggested that there be an attachment of the current weapons policy to the motion. Professor Stoltenberg, Psychology, pointed out that the URL for the policy has already changed since it was first listed in the resolution. Professor LaDunga made the motion for a friendly amendment to include the actual language of the weapons policy in the motion. Professor Wysocki seconded the motion. Professor Shea asked that the policy be read:

WEAPONS POLICY

(Conduct, Corrective Action and Dismissal)

Possession of dangerous weapons - concealed or unconcealed - on University property, on the worksite, in University vehicles, or in personal vehicles when on University property shall be a violation of UNL policy. A dangerous weapon shall include guns, knives, explosives, or any other device defined by statute or as determined by the University, which in the manner used or intended is capable of producing death, harm to person or property, or bodily injury. Violation of this policy shall make the offender subject to appropriate disciplinary or legal action.

Exceptions: This policy shall not apply to: a) students, faculty and staff when in direct transport of dangerous weapons between off-campus and weapons storage at University Police; and b) members of athletic teams who train and use firearms as a part of their competition in the University's rifle range, or in direct transport between firearms training facilities and authorized weapons storage facilities; c) authorized UNL Police personnel; d) law enforcement officers and security personnel working directly with UNL Police and acting in their official capacity for purposes of carrying out work responsibilities; e) persons authorized by the facility administrator for IANR units to use and store dangerous weapons consistent with the Weapons/Hunting Policy of IANR as it applies to IANR

research sites located outside the city limits of Lincoln, Nebraska.

In order to maintain and protect the health and safety of UNL property or persons on UNL property, persons who are neither UNL employees nor students who are found to be in possession of a dangerous weapon on UNL property may be subject to immediate seizure of the weapon by the University of Nebraska Police Department and removal from campus. Seized property not held as evidence in an investigation will be returned to the person upon exiting UNL property.

Students, faculties, and staffs have access to weapon storage located in the University Police Department while on-campus. For more information, please visit this page <http://police.unl.edu/property-registration-weapons-storage>.”

The friendly amendment was approved. Professor Vakilzadian, Electrical and Computing Engineering, suggested that the URL be removed since the entire policy is already in the motion. President Bender agreed.

Professor Farrell asked what the motivating factor is for creating the resolution. President Elect Bender stated that one of the State Senators intends to introduce a bill that would allow the Board of Regents to change its policy regarding guns on campus. He noted that even if legislation passed it does not mean that there would be an immediate change in the current gun policy, but the proposed legislation could put political pressure on the Board. He stated that the motion would make it clear to the Legislature that the faculty prefer that the university’s policy remains the same as now. Professor Joeckel pointed out that he thinks it is an appropriate time to reaffirm any policy that would help to make the campus a safe place.

Professor Rudy, Nutrition & Health Sciences, asked what a response would be to a naysayer who feels that the resolution is just a symbolic gesture and there is nothing to keep people from bringing guns to campus. President Bender pointed out that there is no guarantee as to where you are going to be safe, but the evidence is that schools and college campuses are among the safest places in the country, and while there have been incidents, by and large you are safer on a campus than in other places. He noted that the motion is a symbolic gesture, but the fact that weapons are tightly controlled on campus do make it safer.

Past President Nickerson pointed out that if this bill is introduced he anticipates that President Bender will testify in front of the Legislature and he would be able to make a more powerful statement if the Senate passed the motion. Since the Senate only meets once a month it is important to have the Senate’s position on the issue established because there may not be much notice for when President Bender needs to testify to the Legislature.

The motion was approved by all except for two that were opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:31 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, January 12, 2016, at 2:30 p.m. in the City Campus Union, Auditorium. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, and Allison Reisbig, Secretary.