

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** Guevara, Purdum, Reisbig, Rinkevich, Ruchala, Schubert, Woodman, Wysocki, Zoubek

**Absent:** Anaya, Bender, LaCost, Nickerson

**Date:** Wednesday, November 14, 2012

**Location:** Faculty 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

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

### 2.0 Professor Potuto, Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA and Big Ten Conference

Potuto stated that previously she would meet with the Faculty Senate President informally to share what she does but did not do so during the years she served on the Faculty Senate or the years in which she made a formal presentation to the Senate. She said that she will do whatever the Executive Committee wants re formal presentations, but, absent any specific requests, will provide information to the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC) on which she serves as a member and have the IAC chair provide information to the Senate.

Potuto reported that every university involved with the NCAA has to have someone with faculty status or administrative status who is not associated with athletics to provide oversight of athletics. She pointed out that she has direct line supervision along with the Athletics Director for academic services for athletes. This includes tutoring, counseling, academic integrity, compliance issues, athletic waivers, violations, and all eligibility issues of athletes. She stated she also has responsibility over NCAA compliance issues. She said that she has to review any issue that involves athletes and academics and although she specifically deals with things relating to athletics, there are some spill overs such as TOEFL scores. She noted that a few years ago the Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs created a committee to look at issues affecting international athletes. She reported that she has suggested that the IAC review issues involving student athletes and concussions.

Potuto reported that every year there is an IAC audit of some function of the academic services to athletes. These have included tutoring, student-athlete entering GPAs/standardized test scores and relation to UNL academic performance. This year the IAC is reviewing student-athlete majors and course selections. She asked to be contacted if there are any problems involving athletes and academics as she wants to follow up on problems as soon as they come up.

Schubert asked if she has been a part of drafting the policy Youth Campus Activities Safety Policy since this policy applies to the athletic camps held during the summer. Potuto stated that she was not part of the team that created the policy but she has seen it. She stated that she believes the Athletics Department does a good job of trying to participate and integrate on campus. She noted that she tries to make sure that Athletics know if there is a policy on campus that has implications and vice versa. She pointed out that the more policies and information are shared, the more we can be sure that we are in compliance, not only with NCAA but with University policies as well.

Potuto noted that we have a new Athletics Director coming in and she thinks he would be willing to meet with the Executive Committee. She noted that he has met with all of the academic deans and he will be serving on the IAC.

Woodman stated that when he receives an email message from the athletics academic counselors that it comes from huskers.com rather than unl.edu. He asked if this is done to make sure that the NCAA can get access to the emails. Potuto stated that this is a campus choice and not a NCAA ruling. She pointed out that the emails from Athletics are no different than other emails and are considered part of the public record.

Woodman asked if, as Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA, she was involved with UNL moving into the Big Ten. Potuto said yes. She stated that she thought moving into the CIC is a huge plus for the university and coordination with the CIC with our academic work is complementary to us. She said that she is not sure that all academic units know about the CIC. She pointed out that being in the Big Ten conference does not change much for the student athletes other than their travel to athletic events may take a little longer.

Woodman asked if academic eligibility issues have changed. Potuto stated that they have not because these are NCAA rules. She stated that there are tighter Big Ten requirements in some areas such as when a team can leave for a competition and she occasionally has to provide a waiver to allow athletes to leave for competition. She pointed out that the IAC occasionally hears complaints on occasions about elite athletes missing class to compete in athletic events other than varsity athletics (Olympic competitions, etc.).

Woodman asked if we have any issues with our student athletes in taking easy, quick, on-line courses. Potuto stated that she has directed the academic advisors in athletics regarding protocols to assure UNL avoids such issues. She said that these protocols sometimes put restrictions on student-athletes that other students do not have to adhere to.

Reisbig asked what kind of efforts there are for supporting gay/lesbian athletes. Potuto stated that she believes there is a group that helps support these students. She noted that Keith Zimmer, Associate Athletic Director for Life Skills, can provide more information. She reported that there is a program called Life Skills for student athletes which brings in guest speakers on various topics such as domestic partner issues and other life issues. She noted that a lot of athletes come from backgrounds where they are not as socialized

as some other students and the Life Skills program provides these students with a very broad experience. She pointed out that student athletes take an online survey and are interviewed when they are graduating about the treatment they received in Athletics and on campus generally.

Woodman noted that the chronic head injury issue, which can cause problems years after the injury, is of great concern and asked if there are efforts to address the problem. Potuto pointed out that researchers are focusing on football even though the incidence of head injuries per capita may also be high. She mentioned women's soccer in particular. She said that a major reason for this is that it is difficult to get head injury data on soccer players because they do not wear a helmet where a computer chip can be installed to gather information. She reported that UNL has protocols in place, such as getting a baseline EEG before a student athlete plays is important. She stated that there are measures on timing that are fairly reliable in indicating a concussion. She reported that current available data shows that there is no correlation between where the impact occurs and the time of the injury which makes it harder to deal with problems associated with head injuries. She stated that she has suggested to the IAC that UNL consider having a concussion policy to cover class absences on medical advice. She stated that a new helmet design might be helpful for football players and colleges are looking at it very closely. She noted that there is a Big Ten cooperative effort to look into head injuries. Guevara pointed out that there could be issues involved if a student cannot take an exam following a head injury.

Schubert asked if there is anything the Senate can do to help support Potuto's work. Potuto stated that she would like to hear about any faculty concerns with student-athletes or the Athletic Department, particularly so that she can assure that the Athletic Department is complying with NCAA rules.

### **3.0 Announcements**

Griffin announced that there would be no meeting during the week of Thanksgiving.

#### **3.1 CIC Faculty Leadership Conference**

Schubert reported that Guevara will be attending the CIC Faculty Leadership Conference at the end of November. He stated that two topics that will be discussed are the role of non-tenure track faculty members, particularly with voting rights in the Senate and a proposed policy about issues of institutional control which was drafted by Chancellor Perlman.

### **4.0 Approval of 11/7/12 Minutes**

Wysocki moved for approval of the minutes as revised. Reisbig seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

### **5.0 Unfinished Business**

#### **5.1 Follow up on Discussion of ACE Assessment and Recertification Process**

Woodman reported that he checked to see if some of the Big Ten schools had something equivalent to the ACE assessment, but while they had a general

education program, they have no follow up assessment requirement. He noted that Senator Katz questioned how we are going to assess whether the recertification and assessment process is making a better student or is just a time sink. Schubert pointed out that the Senate needs to make a recommendation in order to fix the problem. Guevara noted that the recommendations suggested by Director Mitchell are not any different from what is already in the ACE governing document. He stated that what needs to be changed is what happens in the department and any changes will need to go to the Senate for a vote. He suggested that streamlining the process of recertification would be a good start. Schubert stated that changes to the way the ACE courses are assessed and who evaluates the courses changes the entire procedures. Guevara pointed out that this should all be done at the department level but he is not sure that each department is doing it. He noted that the assessment process has been imposed from the top down.

Reisbig suggested that the program assessment part of the ACE governing document could be altered to improve the process. Guevara agreed and stated that the Executive Committee could approve the changes and send it to the Senate for approval. Schubert questioned whether people will want the ACE committee to be reformed to look at any recommended changes. Griffin pointed out that a number of the people on the ACE committee have retired. Woodman noted that the colleges own the curriculum of the ACE courses but not the processes which is why the Senate should vote on any changes. Schubert stated that if substantive changes which change the value of the program are made the ramifications could be huge. Guevara pointed out that the evaluation of the courses is the right of the departments and not anyone else and this is the major problem with the process. Schubert stated that the implications are that someone in the department should be doing the oversight of the courses instead of the University Curriculum Committee (UCC). Guevara stated that this is already being done in some departments. He stated that the UCC should get a report from the department and review it for recertification but should not be involved in assessment of courses.

Schubert asked how the workload for assessment is going to be reduced, particularly if there are multiple sections. Guevara stated that the faculty members in charge of the course need to assess the courses and write a report. Schubert asked if the suggestion is that these faculty members write the report without having to keep any evidence from the course. Guevara stated that the suggestion does not include eliminating evidence. Schubert stated that the complaints received are about the time it takes to provide the evidence. Guevara noted that people are not complaining about one course. The complaints are about courses with multiple sections, particularly if they are large sections. Woodman suggested that the ideal circumstance is to have the department certify on a regular basis that they are meeting the ACE certification but the process has to be meaningful and honest.

Wysocki stated that he agrees with Schubert that not keeping evidence would water down the sense of ACE. He pointed out that leaving the majority of the process up to the departments is akin to the department being judge and jury. He noted that the ACE courses are taken by students from the broader university community and it makes sense to have some oversight of these courses. Guevara stated that the oversight can be done by the UCC reviewing the department reports on the ACE courses. Reisbig suggested that an audit process could be implemented to make sure that departments adhere to the oversight of the courses. Wysocki asked if this is already occurring with the current recertification process. Reisbig stated that samples of student work from individual courses are held at the department level and only aggregate assessment information along with a smaller collection of samples is reported to the hosting college level.

Woodman wondered whether other schools in the Big Ten have to prove themselves academically like we do with having such a process. He asked if other schools have more academic integrity than we do. Schubert noted that it was the students that wanted a better general education program.

Schubert stated that he does not understand why some departments are not willing to share information on how the outcomes of their ACE courses have been met. Woodman pointed out that every document that is produced in a course is already a public document. Reisbig noted that the oversight is at the program level. She stated that the college makes an overall assessment based on the reports they receive from the department. She pointed out that the UCC is providing oversight of the process, not assessing the courses. Ruchala stated that the department's assessment report will talk about the outcome of the ACE courses and will tell whether students have made improvements. She noted that this can be done without knowing the content of the course and at some level a report is needed verifying that the outcomes have been met. Schubert stated that this is clearly a faculty issue. He noted that some faculty members are wishing that an administrative person would step in between the ACE process so that other faculty members cannot look at your work.

Guevara stated that it is the right of every faculty member to decide on whether they want a course to be an ACE course, but faculty members are finding the process to be unnecessarily complicated. He stated that the language of the ACE Governing document needs to be changed so it more realistically follows what is being done in the departments. Schubert stated that he liked Reisbig's suggestion to make changes regarding limited documentation for multiple section courses. He suggested that changes to the governing document be made one step at a time. Woodman stated that the numbers sampled should reflect the size of the class.

Ruchala asked if the governing document is revised will it need to go through the UCC or directly to the Faculty Senate. Guevara stated that he will look into this but he thinks not taking the suggestions to the UCC would be undermining a Senate committee. He stated that he and Reisbig will bring suggestions back to

the Executive Committee for review and then send them to the UCC for review before being presented to the Senate.

## **5.2 Faculty Survey on Visiting Housing Demand**

Schubert reported that he sent the Chancellor a draft of the proposed survey and the Chancellor suggested some minor revisions. He noted that the survey seeks to gauge the number of days housing is needed on campus for visiting professors. He stated that the survey will be sent to all faculty members.

Woodman stated that he has some concerns about over counting due to chairs and faculties both reporting numbers representing the same guests. Wysocki pointed out that some visitors are just a guest and the department does not pay for their visit. Schubert noted that some people come in on grants from their own institution.

Schubert stated that another question is the duration of the visit. He asked if the majority are coming in just for a few days or longer. Guevara asked if job candidates would be included. Schubert stated that any work related visitor should be counted. He stated that the survey also seeks to determine what departments are willing to pay and what they want in the rooms that would make it more attractive than the hotels. Purdum suggested offering some amenities such as providing the visitor with a pass to the Recreation Center and transportation services. Schubert stated that other questions that need to be addressed are whether daily room service is needed and who would provide the housekeeping. He asked that anyone with other suggestions should email him.

Reisbig agreed to be the PI on the survey and she will get IRB approval.

## **6.0 New Business**

### **6.1 Common Use Teaching Facilities**

Woodman reported that Associate Vice Chancellor Perez will be presenting a report on information technology plans for classrooms to the Information Technologies and Services Committee. He noted that there should be direct faculty involvement in formalizing these plans and that it should not be a purely top down effort.

The Executive Committee agreed to invite Associate Vice Chancellor Perez to a meeting to discuss this issue.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, November 28 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and David Woodman, Secretary.