<center>EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES</center>

Present: **Guevara, LaCost, Nickerson, Purdum, Reisbig, Rinkevich, Woodman, Wysocki, Zoubek**

Absent: **Anaya, Bender, Ruchala, Schubert**

Date: **Wednesday, September 26, 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 3:03 p.m.

2.0 Announcements
2.1 ACE Program
Guevara reported that Schubert has received email messages calling for the Executive Committee to discuss the ACE process. He noted that faculty members are finding it burdensome. Nickerson stated that he thinks that everyone would agree with that statement. Guevara noted that the problem is that for every semester that an ACE course is taught evidence has to be submitted for assessment. Rinkevich pointed out that the evidence required is slim and he does not believe it to be burdensome. Reisbig stated that it is more difficult to provide documentation for courses that have multiple instructors.

LaCost wondered if the department designates a staff member to collect the data or whether each instructor has to provide the documentation. Guevara stated that whoever submitted the course for approval as an ACE course has to get the file to the secretary in his department. He noted that if the course is only taught once in a while it is not a big deal, but if it is taught every semester it is a lot of work.

LaCost asked if the Executive Committee should find out from the faculty how they perceive the situation. Guevara pointed out that one of the problems with the ACE program is that it limits the freedom of the instructor to teach a course the way that they would feel is best because they have to follow the same syllabus when the course was first created. He stated that one of the premises of academic freedom is that instructors can teach a course the way they want.

Woodman asked how often the ACE courses have to be re-certified. Reisbig reported every five years. Guevara stated that he does not think the ACE process was well thought out for such a diverse university because of the variety of assignments that can be given in the different courses. Reisbig pointed out that the process for collecting outcome data had to be presented at the time the course was proposed for ACE

<center>1</center>

certification so each professor should have a procedure in place. Guevara stated that this does not make the process easy.

Woodman stated that there is a weakness in setting standards for the ACE program and it was not realized that different people were going to be teaching the course over the years. He noted that IS/ES courses were the precursor and in the end it was difficult to tell the difference in how these courses were taught. Guevara stated that the ACE courses are easier to teach, but the fact that you consistently have to provide documentation on how you teach a class is time consuming for faculty members and without evidence from your department no one outside of the department will understand if a course has merit.

Zoubek asked if it would be sufficient for a faculty member to show that evidence was provided the previous year and would not be needed for the next year. Guevara stated that the faculty is being put in a place for faulting other faculty members if they are not teaching according to the initial syllabus submitted for ACE approval.

Nickerson asked if the Senate could tweak the ACE system or whether others will need to be involved. Guevara stated that the people contacting Schubert are asking the same thing. Griffin stated that the ACE governing documents need to be checked to make sure the Senate has this ability.

Wysocki suggested that more feedback might be needed from the faculty teaching ACE courses. Reisbig suggested that the questions be tacked on to the survey asking about the need for housing visiting faculty members. Guevara stated that it might be better to ask this question when ACE courses are being re-certified. He noted that the ACE subcommittee can collect your syllabus to see if you are adhering to the framework of the course, but they cannot tell you how to teach your class.

LaCost suggested that the Executive Committee meet with Professor Mitchell, Director of General Education Studies, to discuss this issue.

Reisbig noted that when the policy was first implemented it came through administration, but it now resides with the faculty because it affects the curriculum. Griffin noted that the UCC has a subcommittee that deals with the ACE program. Woodman questioned whether the ACE program is making a difference to our students.

Griffin stated that she will contact Professor Mitchell to arrange a meeting.

3.0   Approval of 9/19/12 Minutes
Griffin noted that the Chancellor and SVCAA have not had the opportunity to edit the minutes due to all of the activity that was occurring on campus with the celebration of the anniversary of the Morrill Act. The Executive Committee agreed to postpone approval of the minutes until the administrators had an opportunity to submit their revisions.

4.0   Unfinished Business
4.1   Ballots of APC, ARRC, and ARRP
Guevara reported that the Senate asked the Executive Committee to consider adding personal statements to the ballots so the faculty will be able to see why the person wants to serve on a particular committee. He noted that two Past Presidents felt that it would be asking too much of people who are considering serving.

Woodman stated that his concern is if someone writes a personal statement, but his/her opponent does not, if this will skew the result of the election. LaCost stated that she went to the faculty websites that were provided on the recent ballot and found some information that was helpful in her decision.

Woodman suggested that faculty members willing to run for election to a committee should have the option of writing a personal statement. Guevara noted that faculty members can choose to have a link and a statement.

Purdum moved that candidates for election to committees be given the opportunity to provide a personal statement if they wish. The motion was seconded by Nickerson. The motion was approved.

5.0   New Business
5.1   Agenda Items for CIO Askren
Guevara noted that the Executive Committee will be meeting with CIO Askren next week and asked to identify topics of discussion.
-    Upcoming survey on Information Technology Survey
-    Help desk
-    Issue of using KACE
-    Lack of communications from Information Services regarding classroom computers
-    Who makes decisions on whether to remove classroom computers?
-    Computer help across departments varies. Should be there computer technicians based on building rather than just department?
-    Concern with centralizing technology support
-    Who administers the student technology fee and what does this funding support?
-    Need for technicians to be knowledgeable
-    Difficulties with Common Software
-    Update on plan to get rid of hardwired ports

Purdum pointed out that there needs to be an evaluation of all service groups on campus by the various users. She questioned what the opportunities are for feedback on the service units.

Guevara noted that Dean Manderscheid sent out an evaluation about the Arts & Sciences support people questioning the service. He pointed out that there is no regular campus-wide survey asking how the technology is working for the employees. Woodman pointed

out that the technology service exists at the college and department level but these people may or may not have much connection with Information Services. He noted there needs to be some minimal training for new technicians. Reisbig stated that the question might be who is managing the service people and what they are doing. Zoubek stated that another question is whether they are working for us or are we working for them. He wants to know who makes rules on technology services.

Purdum noted that these are good issues to address to VC Jackson too. She pointed out that in her unit faculty members now have to show the program for the conferences they are planning on going to. She stated that it is becoming too complicated to get reimbursed to go to some conferences and pointed out that international travel is extremely difficult. As a result she and other faculty members are starting to choose whether they want to do this kind of travel or presentation.

Nickerson stated that another issue is the inability to purchase computers with NIH grant money. He pointed out that he has paid out of pocket for some computers and also for paper. He noted that many department budgets have been cut to the bone and funding is not available to purchase some of the items that are used daily in professors' work lives. He stated that if we really want to be a Big Ten university we should buy new computers every three years. Wysocki stated that he has purchased his own computers as well. Nickerson wondered how widespread an issue this is. He stated that if a typical faculty member has to provide these things for his or her self in order to do their job, this could be a hardship. Reisbig stated that this is not an issue in her college where computers are replaced every five years. Griffin pointed out that some of these issues are a result of how departments and colleges want to spend their budget.

5.2   November 6 Senate Meeting – Topics of Discussion for Todd Jensen and Michael Ruhrdanz of Information Services
Guevara noted that Jensen and Ruhrdanz will be speaking with the Senate about Information Services on November 6 and asked for topics of discussion. The following topics were identified:
- Temporary administrative rights for faculty members on classroom computers
- Addressing faculty needs in terms of renovations
- Plans for upgrading classroom computers – getting faculty input on what is needed on the classroom computers

5.3   Scheduling Dean Cerveny and Director Hunter, Enrollment Management Council to Speak to the Faculty Senate
Griffin asked if the Executive Committee wanted to have Dean Cerveny and Director Hunter of Admissions speak to the Senate as suggested by SVCAA Weissinger. The Executive Committee agreed that they should speak to the full Senate. Purdum noted they had a poor performance this past year of recruiting students. Nickerson pointed out that their message to the faculty in how they can help has totally changed from what was said last year. Woodman stated that he was disturbed to hear that Admissions is no longer conducting high school visits. Purdum reported that CASNR is still making visits to the high schools.   Woodman noted that Arts & Sciences just hired a recruiter.

Purdum stated that recruiters working in major cities like Chicago and Kansas City do not have the level of background information needed to provide information to perspective students. She stated that the faculty needs to continue discussing how the faculty can be engaged in the different recruiting processes. Reisbig pointed out that good webpages are needed to attract students.

Woodman stated that it seems like a significant amount of student help areas seem to have been eliminated. He noted that previously students could attend study tip sessions but this is no longer offered. Nickerson stated that the faculty members are not only being told to recruit new students but to help retain students. Woodman pointed out that we offer courses for students to complete math deficiencies but he does not think there are support services available to help students who need assistance with these courses. LaCost noted that if the students do not have the needed support it contributes to their lack of self-confidence which could be a factor in their decision to stay at the university.

Guevara wondered if the university is accepting students who are not qualified and suggested that TOEFL scores might need to be raised. Zoubek asked how well do ACT scores relate to success in school. Woodman stated that it is a good predictor in successful performance.

Nickerson reported that Associate VC Goodburn is starting a program to identify at risk students. Guevera stated that a list of at risk students is identified in their first eight weeks of classes.

Purdum pointed out that time management skills are also essential to a student's success. She noted that if students are connected with good mentors, good advisors, and have peer models it will help them to be a successful student. She reported that there are very well researched guidelines to help these at risk students. Woodman stated that there are a number of distractions for young students. Guevara stated that some of this is covered in the student orientation. LaCost noted that Dennis Leblanc of Athletics has built an example of a center that assists students to succeed.

Woodman stated that we need to have good advisors to students and they need to know what the appropriate classes are for them. Guevara pointed out that we need to provide professional advisors and not put this responsibility on the backs of professors who are already overloaded with work. He stated that the question is what the administration is willing to invest to help address these needs.

Griffin asked if the learning communities still exist on campus. Guevara stated that they do but they don't have any weight to them. He noted that they would not help someone who is ready to quit. He stated that there is supposed to be peer support for students that are organized by students.

Purdum stated that she has found that most of the at-risk students are from small high schools that have not developed good networking skills. She pointed out that department

chairs and college administers need to give credit to faculty members who take the time to help these students. Reisbig stated that it might be helpful to know why students came to UNL in the first place.

5.4　Employee Plus One Benefit – Questions on Inclusion Criteria

Reisbig stated that she was contacted by faculty and staff members that have concerns regarding the 12 month waiting period for non-married couples living together to receive this benefit. She pointed out that the same requirement is not made for married people and this potentially runs in conflict with the university's non-discrimination policy which identifies that the University does not discriminate based on marital status. Guevara pointed out that the state of Nebraska only recognizes marriage between a man and a woman. He stated that the 12 month period may be a way to justify that the policy does not get abused and three of the four criteria must be met in order to receive the coverage.

Reisbig provided a handout compiled by a member of the University Committee on GLBT Concerns that compared Big Ten schools and their waiting periods required in their benefits policies that are inclusive of unmarried partners. It was noted that five of the schools have no waiting period. Wysocki stated that a time scale is needed to determine a long term relationship.

Guevara stated that he thinks this is out of the Senate's control. Purdum stated that she is concerned that if this issue is raised by the Senate it could jeopardize the policy that was just recently approved by a narrow margin.

Reisbig asked if the waiting period is equitable though. Woodman pointed out that this issue might evolve in the future. LaCost stated that she believed the 12 month waiting period was a compromise in order to get the employee plus one benefits approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, October 3 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.