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

Absent:

Date: **Wednesday, February 6, 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   Professor DeFusco, Chair of University Curriculum Committee (UCC)
2.1   Recommendations for Changes to ACE Procedures
Schubert noted that recommendations from the Executive Committee have been made to address concerns that have been raised by a number of faculty members regarding the ACE recertification and assessment process. DeFusco stated that he thinks the recommendation that the recertification process is unnecessary and that it should be modified could raise some issues because recertification is part of the assessment process as stated in ACE Governing Document Four.

DeFusco pointed out that each department is responsible for conducting an assessment of its ACE courses. He stated that the UCC assumes that the assessment has taken place in the department and only wants to receive a brief report that it has been conducted.

Guevara stated that the angst that people are having is with multi-section courses and all of the evidence that is required for each section. DeFusco stated that this is a misconception and each section is not required to submit evidence. He pointed out that assurance is needed that the ACE outcome is being met and that mutli-section courses are teaching the same information that meets the outcome for the course. He noted that clearly stating in the syllabus for a multi-section course what the ACE outcome is that the class will provide is evidence that the multi-section courses are being taught in a similar format. Woodman stated that Director Mitchell did not say this in a previous meeting with the Executive Committee. Guevara reported that Director Mitchell stated that documentation for each section is required, the number of samples, however, was somewhat flexible. DeFusco stated that it would be fine if the department submitted a document stating that the assessment of the ACE course has taken place. He stated that each department could post a copy of the assessment report.

DeFusco stated that ACE Governing Document Four is driving some of the requirements. He noted that three samples of evidence from an ACE course must be retained by the

department. Schubert stated that it seems as if people are reading more into the document than they need to. Guevara and Woodman pointed out that the Governing Document states that at least three samples of work from a course needs to be submitted. Guevara pointed out that being flexible about the number of samples, such as submitting less, only illustrates that the written rules are not being followed. Woodman pointed out that with some multi-section courses the different sections have their own section and call numbers and some might consider this to be a separate course.

Schubert questioned whether the current language of the document is causing multiple interpretations. He suggested that the language might need to be changed to address the concerns that have been raised by many faculty members. He pointed out that faculty members do not want to submit so many samples of student work for multi-section courses.

Woodman stated that departments should be trusted for conducting the assessments to make sure that a course continues to meet the designated ACE outcome. DeFusco stated that the hosting department has to provide results of an aggregated assessment. He noted that eventually the University-Wide Assessment Committee (UAC) will eventually assess the campus ACE program. When this assessment is conducted the department assessments will be collected and reviewed. He pointed out that this kind of evidence will be required when the campus goes through the North Central Accreditation process. Nickerson asked if the evidence will be for all courses or just for randomly selected departments. DeFusco stated that he does not know because we have not had a university-wide assessment of the ACE program yet. He noted that this will not be conducted until the ACE outcome ten courses have been assessed. He stated that his concern is that if the process is tinkered too much it could create problems down the road for assessing the entire ACE program. He stated that he thinks it is fair that departments have their own plan to assess the ACE courses.

Reisbig suggested providing a sample of how a multiple section course can be assessed within a department. DeFusco noted that the English and Mathematics departments could provide great examples and they have already gone through the process.

Guevara stated that it should be clear that faculty members only need to provide three samples for each course, not for each section, but that it is clear that the document is being interpreted as per section and per instructor. Schubert pointed out that the Governance Document Four states that at least three samples of evidence for each certified course is required.   Nickerson stated that a department could have a small committee that could collect the evidence for the ACE courses and review them for uniformity. Schubert stated that each faculty member should be responsible for providing evidence for their own section of a course. Guevara pointed out that in some departments sections are taught by a part-time instructors who will leave the university before providing the evidence.

Woodman pointed out that the Governing Document was written from a single course perspective, not a multiple section course perspective. He stated that he is bothered by an

assessment process that requires three samples of coursework and believes it is adding work to faculty members for no reason.

Woodman pointed out that the system is flawed if only three samples of work are required for courses with large enrollments. He noted that three samples do not provide enough evidence to accurately reflect whether the outcome is being met. Zoubek pointed out that the Governing Document states that more than three samples can be submitted.

Nickerson stated that the UCC needs to inform departments that real data of assessments may need to be submitted for the university-wide assessment. Woodman stated that someone from the UCC should be on the UAC since it will be responsible for assessing the ACE program. He noted that his department has an assessment tool that graduating seniors must take for graduation. He questioned whether this would be considered sufficient evidence for UAC. DeFusco stated that it should be sufficient at the college level.

Schubert asked if posting samples on line of assessment and recertification reports already submitted to the UCC would be helpful. Guevara noted that departments are to assess their own programs and how the department chooses to do this is up to the department. Schubert stated that putting up some examples of multi-section assessments might solve some of the concerns of the faculty members and could be called "Acceptable Examples" for recertification of multi-section courses.

DeFusco stated that he will go back to the UCC to discuss how the recertification and assessment process for multi-section courses can be streamlined. He pointed out that the UCC is learning that for some courses the process is working well, but for others there are some problems that may need to be changed. He stated that members of the UCC are not in the position to assess the ACE courses. This needs to occur within the department and the department needs to reassure the UCC that it has assessed the course and that the course is still meeting the outcome.

Schubert stated that he will make a formal request to the UCC chair to provide on line samples that will help guide individual instructors in the assessment/recertification process. DeFusco stated that he will show the Executive Committee a sample before it is posted. Woodman asked to include that the goal is to minimize the workload of the instructor. Guevara stated that it should also be included that the UCC trusts the department's expertise in assessing the ACE courses in their departments.

DeFusco stated that he wants to review the Mathematics and English ACE courses that have gone through the process and will select a good example from them. He stated that he can report back to the Executive Committee in March. Schubert stated that he would then present the sample to the Faculty Senate in April.

3.0   Announcements

3.1   Information Technologies and Services Committee (ITSC) Memo

Schubert reported that he received notification from Professor Hartke, chair of the ITSC, stating that the ITSC has formed a subcommittee to review the committee syllabus with the idea of reducing the number of faculty members and non-faculty members on the Committee. He noted that the subcommittee will also consider removing voting privileges for the non-faculty members since it is a Faculty Senate Committee. He reported that the subcommittee will present its suggestions to the ITSC before it comes to the Executive Committee.

Schubert reported that Professor Hartke expressed surprise on hearing Schubert say at the Senate meeting that the KACE issue has been resolved and asked why the ITSC was not notified. Schubert stated that he was under the impression from the Chancellor that KACE was not an issue anymore because it was not being mandated, and he thought the Chancellor was also uncomfortable with KACE. Woodman pointed out that this may have been Schubert's interpretation, but the issue has not been resolved and KACE is up for renewal and is currently being discussed by Information Services. He stated that he wants to ask the ITSC whether KACE is really needed. Nickerson pointed out that the more faculty are becoming aware of KACE the more he is hearing negative comments about it and the sense that people feel like Big Brother is watching.

Zoubek stated that he checked with some of the information technology people in IANR and asked whether KACE was being used. He reported that they said that it is not being used because it is so difficult and cumbersome. Schubert stated that he has heard the same thing in Engineering.

Schubert suggested that the Executive Committee should write an email message to the Chancellor addressing the concerns with KACE and asking whether it is worth renewing. It was suggested that CIO Askren be copied on the email. Reisbig requested that Professor Hartke of the ITSC be involved too.

Nickerson stated that faculty members he has spoken to are concerned that KACE is an intrusive program. Purdum stated that the issue was discussed in her department but faculty members felt that using it was okay since the computers are university property and the faculty and staff members are conducting university business. Woodman pointed out that the program can have root access on computers and is capable of looking at all work that is done on the computer. Nickerson noted that when Professor Hartke met with the Executive Committee he asked if there are multiple levels of KACE that did not have the intrusive features and Hartke thought this was possible. He suggested that perhaps the university could renegotiate for a less intrusive version. Woodman stated that shutting down script writing would be helpful and no records should be kept at Dell. He stated that the question is that KACE is supposed to help us get a better deal in purchasing software and equipment but he questioned whether this has happened.

Schubert stated that the underlying question is academic freedom of the faculty. He questioned whether a faculty member's academic freedom rights are violated when an

administrator can read what is on your computer which is what KACE is capable of doing.

Ruchala recalled a case of a female faculty member studying pornography and how this woman had to claim academic freedom when the university tried to take action against her. She pointed out that there are some issues relating to KACE that have already been looked at by legal precedent. Guevara noted that some people have work relating to inventions and patents on their computers. Wysocki pointed out that in some cases, if someone else has access to your research you could formally lose the right to disclosure of your work. Schubert noted that KACE has features that allow administrators to look into your work. He stated that even a draft of a memo could be reviewed by an administrator and even though an administrator could say they would never do this, would you really trust that this will never happen. Reisbig pointed out that in her discipline faculty members receive clinical/mental health information that cannot be shared with anyone. Woodman asked about those faculty members who are working with the Defense Department and whether the work on their computers could be accessed.

Purdum stated that the Executive Committee needs to find out more information. Schubert suggested that the Executive Committee should inform the Chancellor that it is seeking information from General Counsel on the issue of academic freedom. Zoubek stated that the Executive Committee should also review the University's Computer Use Policy. He questioned whether social security numbers could be searched by KACE if a faculty member submits reimbursement for travel expenses through the computer. Wysocki stated that KACE is a tool that could allow this to happen.

Ruchala suggested that the Executive Committee should check with AAUP instead of General Counsel about the issue to see what it says on this issue. She stated that she would be willing to check with AAUP.

Schubert stated that he will write an email to the Chancellor to consider against renewing the KACE program.

4.0   Approval of 1/23/13 Minutes
Rinkevich called for approval of the minutes as revised. Anaya seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

5.0   Unfinished Business
5.1   Results of Visiting Faculty Housing Needs Survey
Schubert reported that he sent the results of the survey to the Chancellor and a copy of it to the Executive Committee. He thanked Reisbig for getting the survey done. Purdum asked what the total responses were. Schubert stated that approximately 200 people responded. Woodman noted that most of the responders stated that they would not mind paying the same amount as some of the local hotels so why should the university bother to provide housing for visiting professors. Schubert pointed out that for longer stays the

response was different. He noted that we will need to wait to see how the administration responds.

5.2   Update on Email Message to General Counsel Regarding Clarification of Non-tenured Faculty Members

Schubert stated that the email message to the General Counsel was sent and he is waiting for a response.   He noted that the Committee needs to get more information from the General Counsel before it can continue to address the issue of rights for non-tenured faculty members.

Schubert reported that the departments of Electrical Engineering and Computer and Electronics Engineering have voted to merge and non-tenure track faculty members were involved in this voting. He stated that the policies of the Engineering College, as he understands it, will include non-tenure track faculty members.

LaCost stated that in a report by the Coalition of Academic Workforce shows that 70-75% of all faculty members in higher education are contingent faculty, but this information does include faculty of community colleges. She stated that she will send a copy of the report to the Executive Committee. Nickerson pointed out that this is one of the main concerns of the AAUP and why it is important to keep tenured faculty members.

6.0   New Business
6.1   Report on Board of Regents Meeting
Schubert stated that the State Auditor reported to the Board that the audit of the university is complete.

Schubert reported that the university's appropriation hearing is March 19. He noted that the university continues to receive the smallest part of the state budget and since 2000 the university has cut $76 million through budget reallocation cuts.

Schubert stated that the Board had a lengthy discussion about the proposed increase in housing rates. He noted that the rates increase will depend on the demands for housing but it could be as high as 4.5%. He noted that housing has not reached 100% occupancy yet and an effort is underway to try to get more juniors and seniors to live on campus. He reported that a suggestion has been made to combine existing scholarships that could be used for housing costs. He pointed out that there could also be a 4% increase in the price for food plans and students who have both housing and a food plan could get hit with an 8% increase. He stated that the new Regents were arguing against the increase, but President Milliken pointed out that the compact to freeze tuition rates did not include freezing all of the other fees. He reported that in the end the Regents approved the housing cost increase.

Ruchala asked if there was discussion about the sales tax on the dorms. Schubert stated that the Board set this discussion aside because it is unclear whether the Governor's proposal to eliminate the state income tax would be supported.

Schubert stated that Associate VC Goodburn made a presentation to the Board which showed that UNL's 4 year graduate rate has increased. The presentation showed that 86% of first year students at UNL are either still enrolled or have graduated from another school. He reported that UNL's student success rate is higher than at our sister campuses.

6.2   Review of Senate Meeting
Schubert stated that he thought about the comments made by Senator Shea at the end of the meeting about having stronger faculty governance than we currently have. He noted that most faculty members do not want to become an administrator and overall he thinks we are doing fairly well with faculty governance. He questioned how we could evaluate how well our faculty governance is working compared with our peers. Purdum pointed out that we have live dialogue with the Chancellor on a regular basis and the Senate President can always request to meet with the Chancellor if any issues arise in between regularly scheduled meetings.

Anaya stated that she thinks Senator Shea was talking about faculty engagement. She pointed out that many faculty members on campus are disengaged and many are not participating in faculty governance even though there are plenty of ways to participate. Guevara stated that there is even frustration with the lack of involvement of some of the Senators during the meetings. Anaya noted that many of the Big Ten schools had several representatives at the CIC Faculty Leadership Conference. LaCost stated that some of the Big Ten schools, such as Purdue, have three or four satellite campuses that work closely together and they had multiple representatives and greater participation at the CIC Faculty Leadership Conference.

Anaya stated that an example of the lack of engagement can be seen in the elections to the Senate Executive Committee. She pointed out that rarely is there a full ballot and the number of faculty members who are willing to share and have the desire to be involved in campus committees and governance seems to be dwindling. She noted that new faculty members are not really being made aware of the Senate and the value in participating on it.

Wysocki asked what can be done to rectify this situation. He stated that the desire is to have faculty members become involved in the public life of the university and in public governance. He pointed out that everyone on the Senate volunteers to serve.

Schubert noted that most faculty members have a 10% service apportionment to their duties and being involved in faculty governance, through the Senate or on committees, is one way to fulfill service. He stated that part of the problem is that faculty members do not connect the Senate with their daily work.

Woodman stated that many faculty members have the perception that the Senate does not have any power but this is not true. Griffin noted that the Senate, specifically the Executive Committee, worked hard to make sure faculty members were protected when the Board wanted to change Bylaw 4.3 regarding chairs being able to change the

apportionment of a faculty member's duties. The Executive Committee also voiced the faculty's concern on the Chancellor appointing someone to the Senior Vice Chancellor position instead of going through the required search process and the Senate has created and/or revised policies relating to the curriculum. Wysocki noted that the recent surveys conducted by the Executive Committee is trying to get the faculty engaged in discussions and these appear to have been successful considering the number of people who have responded.

Nickerson stated that two things were mentioned that required further work at the meeting. The first is the request from Senator Peterson on creating an ad hoc committee to review the Class Attendance Policy to see if it can be written more succinctly. Schubert stated that if a Senator thinks there is a problem with the document they should make specific recommendations on how to fix it. He stated that he does not see a problem with the policy. Reisbig suggested asking the Senators if there are volunteers who would want to work on the policy. Nickerson noted that the Executive Committee does not think there is a problem with the policy. Schubert stated that he will email Senator Peterson and suggest that if he wants changes made to the policy he should indicate specifically what the changes should be.

Schubert asked if the chair of the Convocations Committee should be invited to meet with the Executive Committee because the Committee appears to not be functioning properly. Griffin pointed out that the Convocations Committee is a functioning committee. She noted that she informs the chair of the committee in the fall semester how much money is available for funding. These amounts include the $4006 from the Special Events Fund sponsored by the Chancellor's Office, and interest accumulated on the Palladian Avery Lectureship Fund in the foundation. She stated that the Convocations Committee decides who should get funding and how much funding should be provided. She stated that this fall there were only 10 applications, but the previous fall there were nearly 20. She noted that the number of applications can influence the decision on how much money is awarded. She stated that she was a bit surprised to see that this fall the Committee only funded six of the applications. The Executive Committee suggested that the Senate be informed of how much money is available for funding guest speakers from the Convocations Fund.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, February 13 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.