

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Anaya, Bender, Guevara, LaCost, Nickerson, Purdum, Rinkevich, Ruchala, Schubert, Woodman, Zoubek

Absent: Reisbig, Wysocki

Date: Wednesday, November 28, 2012

Location: 201 Administration

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 3:04 p.m.

2.0 Chancellor Perlman

2.1 Implications for UNL with Maryland and Rutgers Joining the Big Ten

Chancellor Perlman stated that he did not think that there are any real implications for UNL with the expansion of the Big Ten other than altering our athletic schedules. He noted that UNL's east coast alumni will probably be happy to have the Huskers competing in games in New Jersey and Maryland and this could assist our recruiting efforts. He reported that Washington D.C. is a big market for our alumni.

Woodman asked if there are discussions to add an additional two members to the conference. Chancellor Perlman stated that there are no real plans right now for this to happen. He thinks the conference alignment is done for the time being, although there are still some other conferences that may be changing. Woodman recalled that in 2009 some conferences were denied participation in the BCS championship and whether there would be similar issues due to the creation of larger conferences. Chancellor Perlman stated that renegotiations were just completed with the BCS and there will be ten conferences when everything goes into effect.

Nickerson asked if UNL had any restrictions prohibiting discussions when we moved into the Big Ten. He noted that there have been reports that at Maryland there were restrictions. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that all contracts have a non-disclosure agreement and not to have one is not sensible. He noted that we are still bound by our non-disclosure agreement. He stated that he is aware that at Maryland the Board voted in private but he does not believe this would be legally allowed in Nebraska.

2.2 Big Ten Draft Document on Institutional Control

Schubert noted that the CIC Faculty Leadership Conference is being held at the end of this week and Guevara will be attending for UNL. Guevara stated that he understands the Chancellor has made some revisions to the draft document and he has been asked to obtain a copy of the draft for the conference members. Chancellor Perlman stated that

another draft is being considered by the University Presidents and until the Presidents come up with a workable draft, the document will be kept confidential.

Purdum asked what the institutional control refers to. Chancellor Perlman stated that this is an effort to determine who has authority over athletics at each of the schools in the Big Ten and defines the nature of the authority. He stated that this effort will work to protect academic integrity in athletics.

Schubert asked if the draft document is a response to the Penn State situation. Chancellor Perlman stated that in some respects it is, but there are other universities that have had problems besides Penn State. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that there is nothing in the document that is earth shaking and he would be surprised, from a faculty standpoint, whether the faculty would object to anything in the document.

Guevara reported that he is receiving emails from people attending the conference and he has the sense that people feel the Chancellor's version of the document will carry more weight and some people are troubled that the document will be changed. He asked if there will be more control. Chancellor Perlman stated that he thinks the next draft will be more acceptable. He noted that some universities have a governance system for dealing with athletics and he does not believe other universities should be allowed to tell another institution how to allocate responsibility for athletics.

2.3 Athletics Department Budget Information – Increase in Revenue from television Programming and Having a Larger Stadium

Chancellor Perlman stated that Athletics will receive more revenue but he is not prepared to say specifically at this point how that money will be used. He noted that Athletics does pay an academic fee which is based on revenue and there is a provision in the BCS agreement that allocates some funds for use in academics and to provide academic support for student athletes. He stated that 5% of gross revenue from all affiliates comes back to academics. This funding goes to his office for him to delegate to academic priorities. Guevara asked if some of the funding from Athletics goes to the Libraries. Chancellor Perlman stated that there may have been some money raised in the past to help support the Libraries but no money is earmarked each year for the Libraries.

2.4 Update on Health Care Privatization Process

Chancellor Perlman reported that the evaluation committee has recommended continuing pursuing Bryan Health's proposal. He noted that some suggestions to their proposal have been made and there are still a lot of details that still need to be negotiated. He stated that he hopes to get the opportunity to talk to the Board of Regents to see if the proposal meets their approval. He stated that he hopes to know by January whether an agreeable proposal has been written that can then be presented to the Board for approval. He stated that the sooner the proposal can be completed the better because the employees of the Health Center are very anxious about it.

Purdum asked if there were any specific student concerns about Bryan Health's proposal. Chancellor Perlman reported that a few students expressed concerns, particularly for the

employees of the Health Center. He noted that students who have had a good experience with the Health Center do not want anything to change. He pointed out that there was very little student turnout at the public presentations of the proposals. He stated that the current proposal looks pretty good. Bryan Health plans on building the facility and will not only maintain the current services, but will add some additional services. Furthermore fee increases will be limited to inflation. He stated that the framework component of the proposal looks good but details still need to be ironed out.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Merger of Computer and Electronics Engineering and Electrical Engineering Departments

Schubert reported that there was an article in the Omaha World Herald about the merger of the Computer and Electronics Engineering (CEEN) department in Omaha and the Electrical Engineering (EE) Department in Lincoln. He stated that the two departments had an interesting meeting before the Thanksgiving break and talked about identifying courses that could be conducted through a shared classroom. He stated that there would need to be a pilot phase to see if this idea could work. Nickerson asked if the merger has already been approved even though there are some people that object to it. Schubert stated that it is his understanding that the merger has not been completed yet. He pointed out that there are technical issues that need to be resolved and it needs to be determined whether the courses would work well. He noted that, as far as he knows, no two engineering departments have been joined together through distance education. He stated that if it is possible to teach the course on two different campuses it could have implications beyond the merger because it means that students from one university could sit in a classroom on one campus and take a course from another university. He stated that CEEN serves a specific community and EE conducts a lot of research. He stated that both departments have their own identity and reputation for doing different work and neither department wants to lose their reputations.

3.2 Inquiries on Salary Compensation Issues

LaCost reported that she received two inquiries about salary compensation issues and she is working on arranging an appointment with Professor Simpson, chair of the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women, to discuss the issue. She noted that she has also received a request for a comparison of salaries by departments. She reported that a member of the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee wants to make a statement that the merit pay policy presents a hardship to faculty members and that a cost of living increase should be considered.

3.3 Email on Parking Concerns

Schubert noted that the Executive Committee received an email message from Professor Shea and Professor Willis once again raising concerns over the high cost of parking at UNL and asking that the Executive Committee revisit the issue and have an open discussion at an upcoming Senate meeting. He suggested that the parking issue be put on an upcoming Senate agenda. Griffin suggested trying to get VC Jackson in to speak to the Senate about it.

LaCost pointed out that UNL's parking permit rates are higher than nearly all of the other Big Ten schools yet the salaries are among the lowest.

Schubert stated that he believes the Parking Advisory Committee faculty members agreed to a model of increasing the price of tickets, but faculty members did not realize how large the increase in parking would be. He stated that the high fees are to help pay back the bonds that were needed to build the garages. He stated that he thinks it may be illegal to take any state funds to build the garages. Nickerson suggested that the way the bonds are written should be reviewed to see if they can be more flexible. Schubert reported that the final decision on building the garages and approval of the bonds is made by the Board. He stated that the faculty should tell the administration what it wants in terms of parking and then let the administration find the solution of how to fund the garages. Woodman stated that he believes the bonds could only be obtained by the University showing a constant source of funding and the parking permits are the only funding that is consistent.

The Executive Committee agreed to invite VC Jackson to speak to the Senate about the parking concerns.

4.0 Approval of 11/14/12 Minutes

Approval of the minutes was postponed until next week due to the Thanksgiving break.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Survey on Visiting Professor Housing Needs

Item postponed until next week.

5.2 Recommended Changes on ACE Assessment and Recertification Process

Item postponed until next week.

5.3 ASUN Student Bereavement Policy Request

Schubert noted that this past spring ASUN tried to get a separate student bereavement policy but the Senate tabled the motion indefinitely. Several Senators suggested that a bereavement policy should be included in the existing Class Attendance Policy. This information was sent back to ASUN for them to work on and they are now proposing a paragraph in the existing Class Attendance Policy. He noted that ASUN tried to follow the suggestions provided to them by the Senate. He reported that ASUN is meeting this evening and will vote on whether to formally present the bereavement policy to the Senate Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will review the proposed revisions and will present it to the Senate for a vote if the changes are deemed acceptable.

The Executive Committee reviewed the proposed changes and made some suggestions. Overall the Executive Committee felt that the policy was much improved. Woodman stated that he does have some concern with students being told to contact the department chair or the VC of Student Affairs if they are not satisfied with how the instructor is dealing with the student's grievance. He asked what action the VC of Student Affairs could really take on such a matter. Nickerson pointed out that students already can

follow these procedures, the policy just informs them of the process. He noted that the policy will hopefully encourage faculty members to be accommodating to students during times of grief. Schubert stated that he understands why the students are pushing for the policy after hearing of cases where instructors have not been accommodating.

Schubert stated that he would contact Reanna Nichol森 of ASUN to let her know the Executive Committee's suggestions.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Report on Information Technologies and Services Committee Meeting (Woodman)

Woodman reported that the Information Technologies and Services Committee (ITSC) will eventually be voting on the KACE policy. He noted that KACE is a software program that would be loaded onto people's computers which can detect all software that is on the computer, but it can also inspect other things such as browser history and has the potential of scanning everything on a computer. He pointed out that if someone wanted to download a software program they could be provided codes for the download rather than having to install KACE. He stated that KACE would work well on computers in labs, but he questions the use of it on individual faculty computers. Schubert pointed out that faculty will end up having two separate computers, one that is their official work computer and another computer that they will do work on but that is not subject to the examination of KACE.

Woodman stated that the current proposed KACE policy would allow colleges to opt out of using it, but he stated that faculty members should be able to opt out of it too. He pointed out that many faculty members have sensitive information relating to their work on their computers and KACE could provide access to this information.

Woodman stated that IT's stance on KACE is that using it will allow audits of computers to see what programs are being heavily used across the campus. This would allow the university to negotiate contracts to purchase these software programs at a cheaper rate. LaCost pointed out that there are always good reasons for why these kinds of things should be done, but the bottom line is that the issue of academic freedom needs to be considered.

Schubert stated that he thinks the idea of KACE is a bad thing and only IT really wants it. He asked what the status of this idea is. Woodman reported that it is a precursor to a policy being created. LaCost asked who created it. Woodman stated that Pam Wilcox-Holley, Director, IT Support, wrote it. LaCost stated that the Senate needs to insist on individuals having a choice on whether they want this installed on their computers. Schubert stated that the Senate needs to alert all faculty members that this is coming up. Woodman asked if someone should address the Senate on this issue. The Executive Committee agreed that this should be presented to the Senate.

Anaya asked who makes the decision on the policy. Woodman stated that implementation of a policy would be carried out by IT, but the ITSC needs to approve it.

Anaya asked if the ITSC is asking for feedback on the proposed policy. Woodman stated that in some sense feedback was gathered from the ITSC, however, there are many IT people serving on the Committee. He noted that some of the IT people wondered why faculty members could be upset with allowing someone else to see what is on their computer.

Schubert stated that we need to stop this effort. He suggested that Woodman tell the ITSC that the Executive Committee is against the policy and that it will be brought to the attention of the full Senate.

Ruchala reported that the use of KACE has already been implemented in the Business College. Anaya stated that the Libraries have it too. Ruchala stated that the faculty did not receive any notification that KACE was going to be installed on their computers. Anaya stated that faculty and staff in the Libraries have no control at all of their computers. Ruchala stated that in the Business College people are allowed to download some programs.

Schubert stated that he does not see a strong rationale for using KACE and no data has been given to support the use of it. He noted that the Senate should suggest alternative ways to determine what kind of software is being used by employees. Ruchala suggested that a survey for each college could be sent out. Anaya wondered what the rate of return on such a survey would be and suggested that this might be a factor in why a survey has not been conducted. Ruchala pointed out that the IT staff of each college can check on the software on the college computers. Schubert noted that SAP should be able to identify software purchases.

Woodman stated that if the situation is not resolved to the satisfaction of the faculty, IT should have to defend the use of KACE to the full Senate. Schubert stated that he wanted Woodman to notify the ITSC of the Executive Committee's concerns.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:36 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, December 5 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and David Woodman, Secretary.