

# EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Date:** Wednesday, January 9, 2013

**Present:** Anaya, Bender, LaCost, Nickerson, Purdum, Reisbig, Rinkevich, Ruchala, Schubert, Woodman, Wysocki, Zoubek

**Absent:** Guevara

**Location:** Faculty Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

---

## 1.0 Call (Schubert)

## 2.0 Announcements

Griffin reported that Professor Hartke, Chair of the Information Technologies and Services Committee will be meeting with the Executive Committee next week to discuss KACE and the structure of the ITSC.

Griffin reported that VC Green and SVCAA Weissinger will not be attending the Executive Committee on January 23 as originally scheduled.

## 3.0 Approval of 12/12/12 Minutes

Ruchala moved for approval of the minutes as revised. Rinkevich seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

## 4.0 Unfinished Business

### 4.1 Update on Charge to University Curriculum Committee to Consider Revisions to ACE Governing Document Four

Schubert noted that hearing concerns from numerous faculty members about problems with the ACE process, Guevara was going to write a charge to the UCC to make recommendations to revise the ACE Governing Document Four, specifically to address the problems associated with recertifying multi-section courses. Unfortunately, Guevara was unable to attend today's meeting.

Woodman pointed out that there was an article in today's Daily Nebraskan stating that the ACE program stifled student learning. Ruchala asked if the article was an op ed piece or based on information obtained from a survey. Woodman stated that it was an op ed piece which was very well written by a student. He suggested that the ACE process should be looked at a little more deeply because of all of the negative comments made at the recent Senate meetings concerning the process. Nickerson stated that it is his understanding that faculty members are calling for the entire recertification process to be revised.

LaCost suggested that Senators send comments from faculty members regarding the ACE process so concrete evidence can be provided to support calls for revisions to the process. Schubert noted that there has been considerable discussion on the ACE process at recent Senate meetings. Woodman stated that the comments made at the Senate meetings should provide enough information. He stated that he is worried that if we don't act quickly the issue will not get resolved. Schubert stated that the recommendations for revisions should address the problems associated with multi-section courses and the recertification process.

Nickerson suggested that the Executive Committee invite Professor DeFusco, chair of the UCC, to a meeting to discuss the concerns that have been raised and to propose revisions to the process that would alleviate these concerns. Schubert asked Woodman to write a brief synopsis of the concerns so we can send this along with an invitation to Professor DeFusco to meet with the Executive Committee as soon as possible. Woodman agreed and stated that we are at the stage where the UCC needs to be involved.

Woodman suggested that faculty members read the op ed piece in the Daily Nebraskan of January 9<sup>th</sup> to see a student's perspective on the ACE program. Purdum pointed out that there is big variability on students' understanding of the ACE program and there is still a lot of confusion about it.

#### **4.2 Update on Survey of Visiting Faculty Housing Needs**

Schubert reported that he and Reisbig worked and finished a draft of the survey over the holiday break. He stated that he sent out a test survey to a few of his colleagues to obtain their feedback on the survey and to date hasn't heard any negative responses.

The Executive Committee reviewed and revised the draft. Reisbig reported that she hopes to get IRB approval very soon so the survey can be distributed.

Schubert stated that he will send an email with a draft pretext to the survey to Reisbig and LaCost for their review.

#### **4.3 Recommendations for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Members**

Woodman reported that in reviewing his department's bylaws he found the definition of faculty members and their voting rights to be very simple and direct and suggested that these be used a starting point for departments/units to use. He noted that the bylaws are very reasonable and provides flexibility to

departments/units. He pointed out that recognized faculty members have voting rights within the unit except in matters of tenure for tenure track faculty members. He stated only tenured faculty members can vote on matters of tenure for tenure track faculty members.

Wysocki noted that the suggested guidelines pertain to professors of practice and not lecturers and senior lecturers who he feels should also be included.

Woodman pointed out that this can cause some difficulties because lecturers may be appointed for only one semester whereas professors of practice are appointed for at least a three year period. Wysocki stated that excluding lecturers and senior lecturers would create another tier or level of faculty members. Schubert stated that lecturers and senior lecturers should be considered faculty members.

Purdum pointed out that if they are teaching courses they should have a vote on issues other than personnel issues and should be allowed to provide input.

Nickerson asked if there would be a difference if a graduate student is a lecturer.

Purdum stated no, if the person is teaching a class, they should be able to provide input. Woodman noted that in the College of Arts & Sciences' bylaws graduate and undergraduate participation in discussions and individual departments can decide whether they could have a vote.

Schubert stated that the intention is to derive suggestions for departments/units that could be disseminated as guidelines for providing non-tenure track faculty members' rights. He pointed out that how the department implements it is up to the unit. He stated that the guidelines should be written to include all non-tenure track faculty members. Woodman noted that this would stay in line with what the Chancellor suggested in his memo when the professors of practice positions were created.

Schubert stated that he would compose an email message to be sent out along with the guidelines and the Executive Committee could review it next week. He noted that he would state in the email that the guidelines were created based on concerns that were identified with the survey conducted last year of non-tenure track faculty members.

Schubert asked if the Executive Committee wants to make a policy on how non-tenure track faculty members should be treated in departments. Purdum pointed out that any policy would require Board of Regents approval and they have already approved a policy. She stated that the Senate will only be providing guidelines. She stated that the Senate would provide clarity on behalf of all faculty members in departments within the guidelines of the Board of Regents.

## **5.0 New Business**

### **5.1 Review of Executive Committee Goals**

The Executive Committee reviewed its goals for this year. Woodman noted that there has been no connection with UNOPA and UAAD other than having a representative from these organizations on the Senate. He suggested inviting them to a meeting to see if there are mutual concerns that can be addressed. Schubert agreed and noted that he received an email message from a staff person asking if he would address increasing staff salaries with the Chancellor. He pointed out that he did raise the issue with the Chancellor but suggested that there could be further discussions with UNOPA and UAAD about this issue and perhaps other issues.

LaCost suggested having someone come and speak to the Senate about diversity issues on campus. She noted that many faculty members may not be aware of the work done by the Jackie Gaughan Cultural Center. Purdum stated that the administration is getting ready to implement the best practices identified by the ADVANCE grant. She pointed out that this will affect all faculty members as they work on search committees and suggested that Professors Holmes and DiRusso be invited to speak to the Senate about these changes and to report on the work of ADVANCE.

Purdum suggested that VC Green and SVCAA Weissinger be invited to speak to the Senate regarding the new faculty positions that are being proposed.

Schubert suggested that instead of the Senate President writing a news article about the work of the Senate that the President provide an update at each Senate meeting about what the Executive Committee is currently working on. The Executive Committee agreed. Schubert stated that he will begin with this report at the January 15 Senate meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:49 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, January 16 at 3:00 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, and David Woodman, Secretary.