

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

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

Absent: Purdum

Date: Wednesday, February 20, 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 3:02 p.m.

2.0 SVCAA Weissinger

2.1 Update on MOOC Taskforce

SVCAA Weissinger stated that the Taskforce has not reported yet, but she expects to hear from the Taskforce soon. She reported that she asked the members to look at broad questions regarding MOOC courses: under what conditions should we accept credit from MOOC courses; is there a way to use these courses as an auxiliary to our courses; whether these courses could be considered as part of our curriculum; what are the ways we would attach ourselves to the MOOC courses from other universities; and should we be involved in the creation and/or delivery of MOOC courses. She noted that the Taskforce members have been reading a lot of material about these courses and the committee has met about six times.

SVCAA Weissinger pointed out that MOOC is a very fast changing enterprise. She reported that negative reactions to these courses are just starting to occur and careful review of these courses are just beginning to occur on whether they are useful. She stated that efforts to consider if MOOC courses should be a part of UNL are just starting.

Schubert stated that the Executive Committee is looking forward to hearing from the Taskforce before any policies are put into place. SVCAA Weissinger noted that the Taskforce can give some good starting points that would then need to be explored further. She stated that these courses could have implications for majors, programs, and the campus.

Schubert pointed out that the Electrical Engineering department and the Computer and Electronics Engineering department are considering merging based on the idea that they will deliver courses in a format similar to MOOC. He noted that very specialized courses could be delivered to universities in the CIC. He asked if the Taskforce is only looking at undergraduate courses or whether there are considerations of providing some very pioneering graduate level courses at UNL.

SVCAA Weissinger reported that she tried to put together a group that was representative across the campus but who are also edgy thinkers in terms of higher education. She asked Professor Goddard, Computer Science & Engineering, to chair the Taskforce. She pointed out that there are a lot of technology and platform issues involved with MOOC courses that need to be considered. She noted that the Taskforce is considering whether UNL should provide MOOC courses and some spin-off of virtual learning by-products may occur. She pointed out that the big ticket item with these courses is the learning analytics environment: what can be learned about the students; how they learn from these kinds of course; and the assessment technology that can be built into these courses. She stated that some of these courses have 10,000 students from around the world. She stated that the data and analytics inside these MOOC courses are the exciting components. She noted that most of the companies involved with these courses are involved with data gathering about the students. She pointed out that with students from all over the world the top 10% of them represent an incredible stratum of talent that would be beneficial to prospective employers and others. She reported that she recently attended a CIC meeting of the Provosts from the Big Ten schools and noted that some of the schools are already involved with MOOC courses.

Nickerson asked if anyone on the Taskforce has a legal background. SVCAA Weissinger stated that she did not think at this point someone with a legal background is needed, but if the campus decides to pursue these courses that would change.

Anaya reported that she recently read an article about Stanford's MOOC courses and attrition. She asked if the Taskforce is looking at this aspect. SVCAA Weissinger stated that she has not asked the Taskforce to get into the details of offering these courses. She pointed out that the MOOC situation is totally different now than it was just four months ago when she first formed and charged the Taskforce. She stated that she asked the Taskforce to consider what role, if any, UNL has in this phase of MOOC and she is hoping that the Taskforce will be able to provide some advice on this issue. She stated that some of the more common articles she is seeing regarding MOOC are on critiquing the courses and looking at attrition and the effectiveness of instruction. A question that needs to be considered is what the value is of the students' experience of these courses. She noted that students get a certificate at the end of the course, but what value is there beyond learning the information provided in the course.

Ruchala asked if the CIC is talking about proposals at this stage. SVCAA Weissinger stated that a multi-million dollar platform would need to be built to offer these courses so no requests for proposals have been made. She pointed out that we are closely connected with a number of the institutions that are at the vanguard of this movement and while it might be tempting to ignore the MOOC movement right now due to its rapidly changing landscape, we also don't want to be left out should these courses prove to be very successful. She stated that the question is when and how do we want to have a role with MOOC.

2.2 Update on Student Recourse Center in Love Library

SVCAA Weissinger stated that part of the Campus Master Planning process is to focus on the quality of designs and the contemporariness of designs on campus. She pointed out that this is a critical recruitment issue. She noted that one of the advantages that we have is the natural beauty of our landscaping, but there are things we need to do to make ourselves look like an energized, forward moving, and contemporary university and she believes Sasaki and Associates has accomplished this in their designs. She stated that one of the things that have come out of the Campus Master Plan process is the consideration of using Love Library and CYT Library to help create a fascinating learning environment for the students. She noted that the idea is to make the first floor of Love Library into a common area for students to go to. She stated that this would be a very contemporary space that would include some outdoor spaces. She reported that the second floor of the Library could become an additional space that may be more appropriate for some of our archival holdings, some of which are extraordinary.

SVCAA Weissinger stated that we are interested in having better places for students, particularly undergraduate students, to use and to have access to academic services. She noted that the Libraries faculty has been incredibly open collaborators about the idea of giving the academic portion of the campus a large footprint. She stated that some academic services such as the Explore Center and the Study Education Abroad Program hope to move to this area in the Libraries. She pointed out that this would put these offices in the middle of the campus making them more easily accessible to students. Nickerson asked if tutoring services would be located there as well. SVCAA Weissinger stated that this is a possibility. She stated that she hopes that renovations on the Libraries to create this area would move quickly. She stated that an RFP is going to be issued and the hope is to have this area in the Libraries open by the fall of 2013, although it would depend on what the architectural firm develops. She thinks it is possible to have all of this done in time provided that we don't hit any snags. She pointed out that if UNL is going to be competitive with other schools we need to prove that we are transforming. Nickerson agreed that having such an area would be a great help in recruiting students and he thinks it would be attractive to student to provide them easy access to tutoring services. SVCAA Weissinger noted that the Explore Center handles a large group of students, many of whom have many interests but haven't been able to determine where to focus their efforts and she thinks the Explore Center can help make this area an exciting environment.

Anaya asked where UCARE would be located. SVCAA Weissinger stated that UCARE is more of a virtual program that does not have an actual office because students work specifically with professors in different departments. However, the idea is to put a Librarian into a location that would help students get the information they need to participate in UCARE. Nickerson pointed out that NSF grants require an educational and outreach component and many faculty members struggle with how to develop this component. He noted that vibrant learning centers located in the libraries could help facilitate this outreach and educational requirement by connecting a wide range of undergraduate and high school students, and their parents, with faculty members and their research. Research oriented educational kiosks have been used successfully at other universities.

SVCAA Weissinger pointed out that parents are very interested in knowing what support services are available to students. She stated that many of our Big Ten colleagues are very good at providing a central location for these kinds of services.

SVCAA Weissinger reported that another conversation is taking place with the faculty of IANR and the CYT Library, although she is not part of this conversation. She pointed out that as more publications become digital it is opening up large amounts of space in the Libraries which can lead to exciting efforts.

2.3 City Campus Efforts to Replace VSIP Faculty Members

Schubert noted that this item was inspired by the announcement from VC Green about the 36 new hires planned for IANR.

SVCAA Weissinger reported that the VSIP money was allocated on City Campus in three ways. She stated that in Academic Affairs \$976,000 was earmarked in 2010 to help offset a possible \$3 million shortfall we thought we would be facing that year. She noted that using the money would help to avoid any program cuts and was strategically allocated across the campus. She stated that half of the remaining funds went back to the colleges that the VSIP money came from. The remaining money had to be competed for by the colleges and hires using this money are starting to happen.

Nickerson asked where IANR is getting money for the startup funds for the 36 new hires. SVCAA Weissinger stated that $\frac{3}{4}$ of the hires are science related and VC Green and VC Paul have more than likely determined where the startup funds will come from. She noted that these hires provide a real opportunity for the campus to reformulate the scientific footprint of the agricultural component of the campus and she hopes that all of the searches are successful.

Schubert stated that he thinks it was a good idea to spread the VSIP money out across city campus. SVCAA Weissinger stated that colleges had to show why there was a need for this funding, but she wishes there was more of it to distribute. She pointed out that the goal is to hire more tenure track faculty and we need to help those departments and colleges that have increased their enrollment to hire more tenured faculty members.

2.4 Numbers of Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty Lines and the Future Development of Faculty Governance

SVCAA Weissinger distributed information on UNL staffing figures for a 10 year trend from 2003 through 2012. She noted that that the information, provided by Institutional Research and Planning Office, shows a 5 year change of -2.1% for tenured faculty members, but the 10 year change is 1.6%. She pointed out that the 5 year change for tenure-track faculty members is 11% and 25.8% for the 10 year change. She noted that she does not know how IRP classified some of the non-tenured faculty positions. Schubert stated that the Executive Committee has asked General Counsel for a legal definition of equivalent faculty members as stated in the Regents Bylaws and is waiting for a reply.

Schubert noted that the rules for voting rights of faculty members vary considerably across all departments, but he understands that the Regents Bylaws super cede all other bylaws. He pointed out that non tenured faculty members add value to a department and should have voting rights. Schubert stated that permanent faculty should make decisions on permanent principles for departments, but non tenure track faculty members should have input into the curriculum. SVCAA Weissinger asked if this means that the curriculum isn't a static reality of the faculty members who were hired for their expertise and given tenure. She noted that Schubert is suggesting that the curriculum should be dynamic and reflect those in the department who are teaching.

Schubert stated that the Executive Committee previously discussed this issue. He noted, that assuming that only tenure track faculty members have the right to vote, if a department has a reduction of tenured faculty members but has a larger contingent faculty group, would this mean that a department would be governed by a minority of the people in the unit. SVCAA Weissinger pointed out that great universities are built around tenure track faculty, and include the additional value of other kinds of faculty. She stated that one of the jobs of tenured faculty members is to improve the world through research and teaching and the core of a public research university is to have a larger research footprint in the world. In order to do this we need a large tenured faculty body. She pointed out that as budget woes have increased our flexibility to remain a comprehensive university and to move towards excellence has required us to utilize all kinds of faculty members. She stated that we need a range of faculty members that are part of the system that helps to deliver our missions. She stated that specialized faculty members have emerged to help us accomplish our tasks and this trend is happening across the country. She stated that it now takes the entire system of faculty types and ranks to deliver the full mission of the campus. She pointed out that she has never heard any administrator state that the goal was to decrease the number of tenured faculty members.

Ruchala stated that in discussing a successful, comprehensive university it makes sense that all of the different roles need to have some full decision-making authority on issues like the curriculum. She pointed out that the current thinking that only tenured faculty members having voting rights is a very western centric concept and noted that in some colleges the faculty come from a very homogenous orientation. Unless this homogenous orientation is opened up, you will lack having the comprehensiveness, particularly in today's world.

SVCAA Weissinger stated that she is very impressed that the Executive Committee wants to have a deep and engaging conversation on this issue. She noted that there are layers of issues that are not just related to voting rights including the protection of academic freedom. Schubert stated that the Executive Committee is just having conversations about the issue and is not pressing anyone to make statements. He noted that there are very divergent views and the Committee is trying to figure out what the language says and to determine what the best practices are.

Woodman pointed out that most non-tenure track faculty members are hired on a national level and there are professors of practice who have been here for 20 years and taught more than 3,000 credit hours a year. He stated that these people should have voting rights on the curriculum. He further pointed out that the promotion process is nearly as rigorous as it is for faculty members who seek tenure.

Guevara pointed out that it is up to the departments to decide who has voting rights. SVCAA Weissinger stated that real conversations in a variety of forums will need to be held across the campus on this issue and she would be happy to help facilitate these forums. Schubert stated that the Executive Committee plans to continue discussion on the issue and will seek SVCAA Weissinger's assistance when the time is appropriate.

Zoubek asked how the figures from IRP compare with the figures that we had with the survey of non-tenure track faculty members. Schubert stated that he would like IRP to break down the categories of faculty members to see where the non-tenure track faculty members are classified. SVCAA Weissinger suggested that the Executive Committee contact Associate to the Chancellor Nunez to get this information.

Nickerson noted that SVCAA Weissinger just complemented the Executive Committee for having a meaningful discussion on tenure versus non-tenure faculty rights and he wondered if this was possible because there is not a strong AAUP presence on campus. He pointed out that 30 years ago when there was an active AAUP chapter on campus this would have been considered a more adversarial conversation.

2.6 Other Issues

SVCAA Weissinger reported that the Chancellor is crafting a response to the Executive Committee's memo regarding the use of KACE.

SVCAA Weissinger stated that her office is busy with tenure and promotion this time of year.

Guevara asked who initiates the process to remove special fees if they are no longer used for the approved purpose or the students paying them are no longer benefitting from such fees. Woodman stated that this goes back to the Special Fees Committee and is initiated by a faculty member teaching the course. SVCAA Weissinger stated that the removal of the fees is usually associated with the deletion of a course.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 March 5 Senate Meeting

Griffin reported that Associate Vice Chancellor Yoder will be speaking to the Senate at the March 5 meeting.

3.2 Review of Vice Chancellor Paul

Schubert noted that the five year review of Vice Chancellor Paul is to take place. He suggested that the Executive Committee discuss this at next week's meeting.

4.0 Approval of 2/13/13 Minutes

Anaya moved for approval of the minutes as revised. The motion was seconded by Wysocki. The motion was approved with one abstention.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Update on Draft Statement Regarding the Use of KACE

Schubert noted that he received suggestions and amended the draft statement that will be sent to the Chancellor. He reported that he sent the statement to Professor Hartke and asked him to review and share the statement with the members of the Information Technologies and Services Committee. He stated that the issue will be discussed with the Chancellor when the Executive Committee meets with him next week.

Ruchala reported that she followed up with AAUP and could not find that they addressed this specific issue. She stated that most of what she found pertained to privacy issues of emails although the AAUP suggested that all universities should have a policy outlining computer privacy and privileges versus non privileges.

Woodman stated that the ITSC discussed whether an opt-out option would be sufficient for faculty members. Guevara pointed out that when the Executive Committee discussed this with CIO Askren he stated that not having KACE on computers would make it more difficult for people to have their machines serviced. Wysocki stated that everyone should be able to opt out of having KACE on their computer if they want to. Woodman pointed out that people should not be punished if they decide not to have the program installed on their computer.

5.2 Convocations Committee Report on Funding and Applications

Griffin distributed information she compiled on the number of applications received and awarded over the past five years. She noted that the number of requests each year ranged from 12 – 25; that only in the past two years have applications been rejected; the last three years the median amount requested was \$750 each year; and the average amount awarded ranged from \$339.29 to \$604.17 over the five year period.

Nickerson asked why applications were rejected. Griffin reported that typically applications were rejected due to an incomplete budget proposal or that the speaker would be speaking to a relatively small group of students and faculty members outside of an individual's department. Anaya suggested that public funding might require an event where the speaker gives a presentation that is open to the public.

Schubert suggested that the Convocations Committee might want to review their syllabus to see if it needs updating. He stated that members of the Committee should be invited to meet with the Executive Committee.

5.3 Update on Proposed Changes to ACE Governing Documents

Woodman noted that he sent out a suggestion on how ACE Governing Document Four can be modified to address the concerns raised by the Executive Committee to Professor DeFusco. Guevara stated that he thinks the proposal should be finalized by the Executive

Committee. Ruchala pointed out that just because some faculty members make a complaint does not mean that the Executive Committee has to take action. She stated that the Executive Committee needs to let the University Curriculum Committee work on the proposed changes and if the Executive Committee decides that it does not like the changes suggested by the UCC, than it can take action.

Guevara stated that his perspective when the Executive Committee met with Professor DeFusco was that Professor DeFusco's opinion was that the changes suggested by the Executive Committee would be acceptable, but language needs to be put into the Governing Document since Professor DeFusco will not always be on the UCC. Woodman agreed that language needs to be put into the document.

Woodman stated that his suggested changes attempt to mollify the concerns that the assessment remains in the department. Basically the ACE subcommittee will reserve the right to ask for an audit of a small sample of ACE classes that have been assessed and recertified.

Schubert suggested that Woodman's proposed language be indicated in the existing document. Griffin stated that she would get the Executive Committee a copy of Governing Document Four with the proposed changes.

The Executive Committee will discuss the proposed changes next week.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Student Bereavement Policy

Schubert reported that he had an exchange of email messages from Chancellor Perlman regarding the student bereavement policy. He noted that the Chancellor is not concerned with the policy, but the process of it and that he felt that administrative approval was needed. He questioned why changes to a Senate policy would need to have administrative approval. He pointed out that the policy came from ASUN and the students told the Executive Committee that they worked with the VC of Student Affairs to develop the policy. He noted that the Regents Bylaws state that the faculty governing body acts on academic matters across the colleges.

Guevara stated that the administration maybe concerned that it would have to enforce the policy. Bender asked what there is to enforce. He stated that the policy is not binding on anyone. Guevara pointed out that the policy states that a student can go to Student Affairs to find a resolution. Bender noted that the policy simply states that a student can go to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs to try and find a resolution. The Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs does not have the ability to enforce anything on the instructor. Woodman pointed out that the policy gives the student a process.

Schubert pointed out that if the Chancellor thinks that every change or policy requires administrative approval this would mean that an administrator would have to sign off on all of the Senate's policies.

The Executive Committee agreed to discuss the issue further with the Chancellor next week.

6.2 Representatives from CGLBTC to Speak to the Senate

Reisbig asked if the Executive Committee would consider inviting two representatives from the UNL Committee on GLBT Concerns to a Senate meeting to announce an online bias reporting form that has been created and share information for faculty regarding student preferred names and pronouns. Woodman reported that this is an increasing issue that is very appropriate. The Executive Committee agreed. Reisbig stated that she will contact the representatives to have them speak at the March 5 Senate meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, February 27 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.