

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

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

Absent: Anaya, Ruchala, Wysocki

Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2013

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 Announcements

2.1 Upcoming Meeting with Professor Giesecke

Griffin reported that the Executive Committee will be meeting with Professor Giesecke on April 24 to discuss the new criteria for assessment that will be required by the Higher Learning Commission.

2.2 Information Technologies and the Office of Business and Finance Printing Assessment

Woodman noted that an assessment of printing is going to be conducted in the offices of Information Technologies and Business and Finance to see if they can reduce costs by eliminating desktop printers. He pointed out that this is something that faculty members should keep an eye on because this may eventually come down to the departments in an effort to reduce costs. He noted that recommendations will be made but the actual decision will be made at the unit level.

Schubert pointed out that laser printers can be purchased for less than \$80 and a cartridge for these printers can last a long time. Nickerson reported that he purchased his own printers and supplies (lots of paper) through his grant money and personal funds. Guevara noted that faculty members sometimes have to print confidential information that others should not see at a central printer location. Schubert stated that the Executive Committee should ask what the potential savings are for eliminating desktop printers. Zoubek pointed out that this was one of the goals outlined in the 2011 IT Cost Reducing Task Force Report. Purdum pointed out that there is a misassumption that hard dollars are paying for all of the paper and printers and the administration may be surprised in how little state dollars are going into printing. Schubert pointed out that this is something that the Senate should follow up on.

2.3 Salary for Teaching Summer Courses

LaCost reported that she was informed that the formula of paying a faculty member 2.8% per credit hour to teach a summer course will be disappearing and that some colleges will be paying a flat rate for a course. Reisbig stated that this is already occurring in some units. LaCost stated that she is concerned that departments might start using adjuncts to teach summer courses in an effort to control their budget.

3.0 Approval of March 27, 2013 Minutes

Guevara moved for approval of the minutes as revised. Nickerson seconded the motion. The motion was approved with one abstention.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Executive Committee Elections Update

Griffin reported that two Senators will be running for election for President-Elect; one will be running for Secretary; and so far there are two Senators running for the Executive Committee but three positions will be available. The Committee suggested possible candidates.

4.2 ACE Ad Hoc Committee

Schubert noted that Wysocki made a motion at the Senate meeting to create an ad hoc committee to consider possible revisions to the ACE procedures. Guevara reported that he carefully reviewed the Senate bylaws and it states that the Senate has the power to change any of its committees and the charge of the committee. He noted that the ACE subcommittee is a subcommittee of the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) which is a Senate committee. He stated that if the Senate is unhappy with the ACE subcommittee's decision to not make changes to the recertification procedures it can change the charge of the UCC.

Schubert stated that it would be better to have an independent committee to review the ACE Governance and Assessment document and to put forward suggested changes. He stated that the ad hoc committee should have someone from the UCC, the Executive Committee, and a few other faculty members outside of the Senate. He suggested that it would be good to have someone who knows the accreditation criteria and recommended Professor Giesecke as a member of the ad hoc committee. The Senate could then charge the committee. He noted that currently we seem to be at an impasse, but he does not think changing the responsibilities of the UCC would be good for anyone. Guevara pointed out that the ACE subcommittee made a change to the Governance and Assessment document which changed their duties without getting approval from the Senate, even though the UCC syllabus states that Senate approval is needed for any changes.

Reisbig stated that the ad hoc committee's charge should include determining who has governance over making changes to the ACE Governance and Assessment document. Nickerson noted that someone from the General Counsel Office might need to give an opinion on this issue. Guevara pointed out that some people view the suggested changes as major but the Executive Committee sees these as minor changes that make the process

less burdensome for faculty members. Reisbig pointed out that what constitutes substantive changes versus non substantive changes needs to be identified. She noted that the ACE Governance and Assessment document states that substantive changes would need to be approved by the Colleges. She stated that an argument needs to be made as to why the proposed changes to the recertification process are not considered substantive. Schubert pointed out that the proposed changes will have a major change in the workload of those faculty members who teach ACE courses. He noted that the ACE subcommittee will lose some control over the recertification process with the proposed changes and some people might view these as substantive changes. Guevara stated that with the changes, in theory each college would do its own recertification and each department conducts the recertification of their courses. Schubert stated that the best approach is to have an independent ad hoc committee review and make recommendations on how the recertification process can be made better. If the colleges need to vote on this then they should vote on it. Woodman asked how a vote would be put on the colleges' agenda. Schubert stated that it can go directly to the colleges or through Professor Mitchell's office. Reisbig asked if the recommendations of the ad hoc committee would go to the Senate. Schubert stated that the Senate would need to vote on the ad hoc committee's recommendations since it is an ad hoc committee created by the Senate. Nickerson suggested that the ad hoc committee advise on jurisdiction and procedures of the ACE Governance and Assessment process.

Woodman reported that, in talking with his daughter who attends UNL, she was able to transfer in high school courses that satisfy the ACE outcomes. He questioned why high school courses are continually accepted yet the UNL faculty has to prove that their course continues to meet the ACE requirement.

Purdum asked if there is a review process for the ACE program. Guevara stated that he thinks the recertification process is supposed to do this in some respect. LaCost noted that there is a policy at UNL that states that every few years academic programs need to be reviewed. Purdum wondered whose jurisdiction a review of the ACE program would fall under. She stated that she believes there is a statement in the Bylaws that all academic programs need to be reviewed. Griffin asked if an academic program review would be conducted on the ACE program. Bender pointed out that in serving on the Academic Planning Committee he does not remember an instance when a program was reviewed that was not part of a department. He stated that he did not know if APC would have jurisdiction over ACE or if there is a mechanism that could bring in outside reviewers of the program.

LaCost noted that the ACE program is a campus-wide program and she thinks the review of it comes under the University-wide Assessment Committee (UAC). Woodman asked who is on UAC and whether it is functioning. He asked if they give an annual report on the ACE program and suggested that a copy of the report should be given to the Senate. He reported, after looking at the UNL website, the last time the UAC gave a report was in 2002.

Schubert stated that one way to determine how something works is to turn off a component of the mechanism and then see how it behaves. He suggested that the recertification process be suspended until it can be determined what would be a better way of doing it. He noted that the machine will respond in a way that the situation will be resolved and we can test whether the examples of course work are really important. Guevara pointed out that some faculty members are not in a position to say they will not submit the documentation for recertification because they are being pressured by the department chair to teach the ACE course(s). Schubert stated that the Senate has the power to change the UCC and can state that the ACE subcommittee no longer has to review ACE recertification. Guevara noted that the Senate would need to vote on this change. Reisbig pointed out that the colleges can choose what they want to do. If the recertification process is suspended the needs of the program will be exposed and we can find out what is actually working. Nickerson asked if the Senate would be suggesting to people not to do the recertification while the ad hoc committee is reviewing the procedures. Reisbig suggested that recertification be suspended with the installation of the ad hoc committee. Guevara pointed out that we need to try to make the process work, but we just need a change in the recertification rule. Schubert pointed out that suspending the recertification process would be knocking out the part that is upsetting faculty members the most. LaCost noted that the recertification process was established before it was determined exactly how it would be done.

Guevara stated that the ad hoc committee is a good idea and suggested that Professors Mitchell and DeFusco be invited to an Executive Committee meeting to let them know about the ad hoc committee and proposal to suspend the recertification process. Reisbig stated that she thinks the UCC may be in favor of this since the UCC recently suspended its own procedures on approving and deleting courses.

LaCost pointed out that the Senate still needs to vote on whether to form an ad hoc committee. Guevara asked what the composition of the ad hoc committee should be. He suggested that there should be a member from the UCC ACE subcommittee, a member from the Senate Executive Committee, and two outside faculty members. Bender pointed out that if the main purpose of the committee is to review the certification process faculty members who are involved in recertifying courses should be involved because they are most affected by it. The Executive Committee suggested possible faculty members for the ad hoc committee should it be approved by the Senate.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Review of the Senate Meeting

Schubert pointed out that all faculty members need to read the draft policy on KACE carefully. He noted that for now it would be optional, but the policy should always be in effect and the policy should apply to all similar programs because they can have significant impacts on people's computers.

Purdum pointed out that she is beginning to feel the same about computers as she did with the office telephone policy where it became just easier to get rid of the office phone because of all of the obstacles and hassles of having one. She stated that she is feeling

that she would rather just operate on her own computer with her own software because it is the only safe thing for her to use. Woodman asked if her computer would still be off limits for KACE if she accessed the UNL network. Schubert stated that she would still have the capability of accessing the UNL network. He pointed out that one of the consistent arguments about KACE is about all of the outside attacks that the university system gets daily. He noted that he has been using university computers for a long time and not once has his computer ever been infected. Woodman pointed out that one of IT's arguments would be that there are many people out there who would not update their security programs regularly. He stated that there should not be any unreasonable attacks on people who decide not to have KACE installed on their computer.

Guevara noted that the Chancellor has mentioned a few times whether the Senate can enforce policies and he wondered whether this was partly in regards to KACE. Woodman pointed out that when the Chancellor first discussed this with the Executive Committee he said he may not even be able to enforce the promotion and tenure policy. Schubert noted that the promotion and tenure process is under the purview of the faculty. He pointed out that the Regents Bylaws state that the Faculty Senate is the governing body that acts on academic matters that crosses colleges.

Bender suggested that the Executive Committee hire attorney Mary Kay Hanson, who works on Academic Rights & Responsibilities cases to look at the use of KACE from a privacy standpoint. He pointed out that KACE is almost analogous to having someone rummaging through the papers on your desk. Woodman reported that the Information Technologies and Services Committee has asked for someone from the General Counsel Office to meet with the ITSC to address this question, but twice now the General Counsel Office cancelled out on the meeting.

Nickerson stated that he was impressed with the Chancellor's response to his question about the definition of who is a faculty member and that departments and the Senate can make this definition if they specify or restrict the purposes for which that definition will be used. Woodman pointed out that departments and colleges cannot make decisions that super cede the Board of Regents Bylaws.

Purdum stated that a new topic of discussion for SVCAA Weissinger should be the lack of coordination between UNL's spring break and LPS' spring break. She stated that this lack of coordination creates havoc for faculty, staff, and some students. She noted there is no rationale for why our spring break has to be so late. She pointed out that we are into the 11th week of classes before we have spring break and when we return there are only five weeks of classes left.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, April 10 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.