

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Belli, Buan, Franco Cruz, Dawes, Hanrahan, Kolbe, Peterson, Renaud, Vakilzadian

Absent: Adenwalla, Fech, Leiter, Purcell

Date: Tuesday, February 12, 2019

Location: 203 Alexander Building

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 (*Hanrahan*)

Hanrahan called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

2.0 Dean Tim Carr

2.1 Role of Non-tenure Track Faculty in Graduate Education

Hanrahan noted that he has heard that discussions are occurring in the Graduate Council about changing the status of Graduate Faculty and asked Carr to elaborate on this idea. Carr reported that he asked the Graduate Council to consider ways to better acknowledge the non-tenure track faculty members for engagement in graduate education. He stated that Graduate Faculty status is not automatically granted to non-tenure track faculty lines and must be requested by the department.

Carr stated that with the creation of the Professors of Practice positions some departments began making strategic hires of people who could help teach in professional programs and we want these people teaching in graduate education. He noted that his concern is that many Professors of Practice, because of their skill sets and position, may not meet the criteria for full Graduate Faculty status. Belli asked what are the criteria. Carr stated that the faculty member must have an academic or administrative appointment at the level of Senior Lecturer or Assistant Professor and above. They also must have a terminal degree in their discipline, and have demonstrated a record of scholarly productivity to demonstrate that they have the ability to continue the scholarly activity beyond teaching. He pointed out that for Professors of Practice the last two criteria can be difficult to meet.

Renaud stated that in his college there are Professors of Practice with strong professional experience and they are very valuable to the teaching program, but they are not able to contribute fully into the graduate program because they can't meet the Graduate Faculty status. Carr noted that this is the problem.

Hanrahan asked if having different levels of Graduate Faculty status will require approval of the Graduate College. Carr stated that the governing documents for the Graduate College at the system level identifies two alternative ways for non-tenure track faculty

members to participate. One is to grant permission to a non-tenure track faculty member to have duties in graduate education such as teaching, serving on a committee, or advising masters' students, but they would not have a vote and cannot hold an elected officer position in the Graduate College. He stated that this is considered a Graduate Faculty Associate. He stated that the other is a Graduate Lecturer which allows a faculty member to teach a graduate class. He stated that at UNL this has been expanded to include some other aspects of graduate education such as conducting clinics in various departments.

Hanrahan asked if the only benefit to having Graduate Faculty status is that faculty members can chair a doctoral committee. Carr stated that they could chair committees and would have a vote on graduate issues that are addressed by the Graduate College.

Hanrahan asked why we would want Professors of Practice to advise doctoral students and pointed out that graduate students should be mentored by someone actively involved in research. Carr stated that this is his belief, but the whole issue was important enough to bring it to the Graduate College for consideration. Renaud pointed out that his college does not have a Ph.D. program, but there a lot of faculty members who have significant professional experience that could be helpful with the masters' program. Carr stated that he is a strong supporter of acknowledging these people.

Buan asked if co-advising would satisfy the needs for those without the complete credentials needed for full Graduate Faculty status. Carr stated that the idea was to begin discussion by the Graduate Council on whether there are ways of applying the criteria for granting permission to participate in graduate education. He noted that there could be those with Graduate Faculty status who would only teach, or be a co-advisor, could only advise masters' students, or participate only in the professional programs. He pointed out that those in the professional programs would not be advising Ph.D. students. He stated that the idea is to consider alternatives and we want to recognize the value of these faculty members.

Hanrahan asked how the Graduate Council feels about the idea of redefining the criteria for Graduate Faculty status. Carr stated that there are so many good ideas being discussed by the Graduate Council that there continues to be meetings to discuss the issue.

Belli asked what the difference is between the Graduate Faculty status titles. Carr stated that the Graduate Faculty Associates status is for non-tenure track faculty members and it is a provisional status granted for a limited term not to exceed a period of four years from the start of a faculty member's appointment and it is not renewable after the term expires. He stated that the Associates may teach graduate courses, direct master's theses, serve on or chair a master's committee, and they can serve on doctoral supervisory committees. They cannot chair or co-chair a doctoral supervisory committee, neither do they have a vote in the Graduate College and they cannot hold any elected office in the Graduate College.

Kolbe stated that he is concerned that the changes being proposed could greatly affect the smaller departments. He noted that in the smaller departments Professors of Practice are needed to teach graduate courses. He asked if the idea is to extenuate what the Graduate Faculty Associates can do. Hanrahan stated that a concern with having a Professor of Practice as an advisor is that the Professor of Practice's contract currently cannot be renewed. He suggested that this might be considered in the Graduate Council. He pointed out that what might be more helpful is to perhaps consider putting them on a continuous appointment.

Carr stated that the Graduate Council is not proposing changes, but to better understand the current system. He noted that the current system has been in place for decades and it was very good, but we need to examine it to see if it still serves us well. He pointed out that when the Graduate Faculty status was first created graduate education was largely training people to become part of the academy, but now we have included training people for specific professional positions, rather than just for the academy. He stated that he does not think our policies have kept up with the changes in graduate education.

Buan cautioned that we need to be careful that there is not a lesser expectation of the faculty in the training that is required for graduate education. She stated that we should have the same requirements as the other Big Ten schools. She pointed out that having a Ph.D. does not necessarily mean you will enter into the academy. She stated that there needs to be a demonstrated mastery of theory for those receiving Graduate Faculty status. She noted that professionals might be appropriate to award degrees in professional fields, but there should not be an assumption that these faculty members have a breadth of training that would automatically qualify them to award a Ph.D.

Carr pointed out that the effort to maintain integrity of graduate education will rest with the faculty. He noted that if a discipline decides it will only offer a Ph.D. that decision is made by the faculty in the department, and the same department may say it will offer a Ph.D. and want a mix of theory and actual practice courses so that the graduate students have a variety of options to choose from. He pointed out that the specific training for professional degrees can require licensing and accreditation, and while different from the Ph.D. program, it is still as intense. He stated that it is up to the faculty in the department to make sure that integrity is paid attention to and that a graduate program is an attractive option for students.

Vakilzadian asked if full Graduate Faculty status is automatic. Carr noted that only tenure track faculty lines have automatic nomination for Graduate Faculty status, but they still have to meet the required criteria. He stated that when a tenure track faculty position is offered at the department level the letter will indicate if the individual meets the criteria for Graduate Faculty status. Vakilzadian stated that he thinks it should be automatic for Professors of Practice who have to do research. Carr pointed out that it is actually easier for Research Professors faculty members to receive Graduate Faculty status than Professors of Practice who are hired strictly to teach.

Hanrahan asked what the goal is of graduate education at UNL. Carr stated that there is room for traditional master's and Ph.D. programs as well as professional graduate programs. He pointed out that we already have professional graduate programs and they are thriving. He noted that there is a demand for these programs from the students.

Belli stated that we want to keep a balance of the needs of graduate programs without diluting graduate education. He suggested having some centralized rules that would allow the departments to decide which of the various types of graduate faculty statuses would best apply to their graduate program. Carr stated that this is the thinking of the Graduate Council and he hopes that the Council will wrap up its discussion on the issue sometime soon.

Hanrahan questioned whether any policy that would come out from the Graduate College would need approval by the Faculty Senates from each of the campuses. Carr stated that this is essentially correct. He stated that each of the campuses can implement current policies and interpret them to use now. He pointed out that if there is a decision to have multiple levels of graduate faculty that would require approval throughout the system.

Carr reported that the Graduate Lecturer was first developed in 1982 by the Graduate College. He stated that UNO and UNK began making full use of it allowing a four-year Graduate Faculty Lecturer status with the option to renew. He stated that UNL limits the appointment on a per semester basis, but the Graduate Council changed this at its last meeting to be more consistent with the original intent of the appointment. He pointed out that there should be consistency across the university system with the Graduate Lecturer category.

Peterson asked if the Graduate Council will come up with a proposal. Carr stated that if the Council feels there is a need they will definitely come up with a proposal. He pointed out that we need to make full use of what is already in place which might allow us to address all of the nuances that currently exist amongst the departments. He noted that he spoke with Provost Fritz about changing the Graduate Faculty Associate policy to allow for it to be a renewable appointment, but she did not seem favorable to this idea.

Hanrahan asked if Carr could speak with the Executive Committee to provide an update on any changes that the Graduate Council might make. Carr stated that he would although he expects the conversation within the Graduate Council to continue for this semester.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Clarification on Testifying Before the Legislature

Hanrahan reported that he was contacted about his comments in the President's newsletter regarding notifying Assistant to the Chancellor Michelle Waite if a University employee is asked to testify before the State Legislature. He wanted to clarify that employees are not required to let anyone know they are speaking, it is simply a courtesy request. He noted that Waite can provide assistance, if needed, and making her aware that someone is going to speak is helpful should any of the administrators be questioned

by Legislators when they are visiting the state capital. He pointed out that employees are free to testify on anything they want and there is no mandatory requirement that employees need to notify any university administrator.

3.2 Clarification on University Police Jurisdiction

Hanrahan noted that Chief Yardley contacted him to clarify statements that Hanrahan made during the January 29th Executive Committee meeting regarding a legislative proposal to specifically identify University Police in state statute. In Chief Yardley's email he pointed out that there are several definitions of law enforcement agencies in Nebraska statutes, but NU police departments are not specifically identified nor included in every statute that defines law enforcement agency. The legislative proposal would clear up this discrepancy. Furthermore, Chief Yardley pointed out that the University Police is a department within the University and receives law enforcement officer commissions from the Nebraska State Patrol, but the Patrol exercises no other authority over University Police departments. Chief Yardley wrote that the UNL Police Department hires off duty officers from the Lancaster County Sheriff, Lincoln Police Department, and the Nebraska State Patrol to assist with large events. Officers from the other campuses are not allowed to work on other campuses due to statutory restrictions. In regards to concerns that the NU Police would not have to follow the strict rules outlined for State Police Chief Yardley stated that University of Nebraska police officers meet all state law training requirements for law enforcement officers and the UNL Police is an accredited police department.

3.3 Emails on Health Insurance Issues

Hanrahan reported that he continues to receive complaints regarding problems with the handling of the health insurance by UMR. He stated that he continues to forward these emails to Assistant Vice Chancellor Currin and has suggested that Assistant Vice Chancellor Currin speak at a Senate meeting.

4.0 Approval of February 5, 2019 Minutes

Hanrahan asked if there were any corrections to the minutes. Hearing none he asked for unanimous approval and the Executive Committee agreed.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 IANR-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee

Hanrahan reported that he is meeting with Associate Vice Chancellor Richard Bischoff to discuss the proposed IANR-wide P & T Committee and the need for the Faculty Senate to approve it since it is a matter that affects more than one college. Franco Cruz reported that there was also a forum on East Campus about the proposed committee. Buan noted that her department has concerns about the committee and how it might affect contributions to the approval process. Peterson pointed out that one of the problems with the current process is that the lead dean actually gets to vote twice on a promotion and tenure file. Buan reported that this would not occur with the IANR-wide committee.

5.2 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Forum and Survey

Belli reported that the non-tenure track faculty forum has been set for April 5, 3:00-5:00 p.m. in Love Library. He noted that Chancellor Green, Vice Chancellor Boehm, and Associate Vice Chancellor Walker have responded to a scheduling invitation and that this date and time fits into their schedules. He noted that Executive Vice Chancellor Plowman responded to the scheduling invitation by stating that Associate Vice Chancellor Walker would be her representative. Peterson asked if the deans and chairs have been invited to attend the forum. Belli stated that the deans have been invited but not the chairs. He stated that he will suggest this to the committee working on the forum.

Belli stated that revisions to the questions on the planned non-tenure track faculty survey have been completed.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Statements on Academic Freedom (Professor Julia Schleck)

Hanrahan stated that he asked Schleck to come to the meeting to provide information on the proposed UNL Statement on Academic Freedom and the Statement on Academic Freedom in Teaching and Learning which the Executive Committee is being given for review and feedback.

Schleck reported that the statements are a result from meetings she had with EVC Plowman regarding the violation of a faculty members' academic freedom in teaching and the need to have a statement on academic freedom. She noted that she was asked by the EVC to work with her office to develop a statement. As a result, a committee, which she co-chaired with Associate VC Walker, was formed. She stated that Interim VC Bellows and various faculty members, including some associated with the Faculty Senate, served on the committee.

Schleck reported that the committee produced two statements: one an overarching document on academic freedom and the other on academic freedom in teaching and learning. She noted that AAUP documents were referenced in both statements and EVC Plowman eventually approved the document for consideration by the Deans' Council and the Faculty Senate. She pointed out that EVC Plowman was insistent that the documents be considered statements and not policy. She stated that at this time the committee is seeking feedback and suggestions.

Belli asked why the insistence that the documents be a statement rather than a policy. Schleck stated that she did not know. Hanrahan noted that at the December Board of Regents meeting President Bounds said that the Board voted that they did not want individual campus policies concerning behavior or values, and any policy would have to be for all four campuses. Dawes pointed out that a policy has consequences if it is not followed. She asked if there will be any consequences if the statements are violated. Schleck stated that if a faculty member's academic freedom is violated they could hire a lawyer, although she believes this rarely happens. She noted that the statements would apply in cases of employment termination which would have to be considered by the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee. Peterson pointed out that the statements

could be cited in Academic Rights & Responsibilities special hearing cases on academic freedom.

Hanrahan suggested that the documents could start as statements, but eventually be folded into a Professional Code of Conduct policy which the Chancellor would like to have developed by the faculty. Buan asked what the statement is intended to do and whether it would achieve the goal that the committee has for the document. Schleck pointed out that the Dean's Council may recommend that it be a policy because a policy would provide them with protection. She stated that if UNL decides to sponsor a policy it could be put forward to Central Administration for consideration. If it should fail at the Central Administration level the documents could remain as a statement for UNL.

Schleck noted that the statements are meant to be an outward facing educational document. Hanrahan stated that it could be used to educate faculty, students, and administrators. Peterson pointed out that the statements could still have an influence on the behavior of the campus even if they are not made into a policy and they could become the norm for the campus. He stated that whether the documents are a policy or a statement they could be helpful as a resource to faculty, students, and administrators.

Belli asked where the statements would be located for accessibility. Schleck stated that they could be on the Executive Vice Chancellor's Office website. Griffin noted that a link to the documents could also be provided on the Senate website.

Schleck stated that all of the members on the committee that worked on developing the statements approved the documents. She noted that she will be speaking to the Graduate Student Assembly to discuss the issue of academic freedom as this is an important issue, especially for those graduate students that are teaching.

Hanrahan thanked Schleck for coming and stated that the Executive Committee would consider and review the statements in greater detail at the Committee's next meeting.

Belli asked what the status is of the Faculty Rights Document discussed at the February 5th Faculty Senate meeting. Hanrahan stated that it is his understanding the Professor Woodman and Professor Leiter were working on the proposed revisions. Belli stated that he thinks the Senate needs to vote on the document. Hanrahan pointed out that it is a resource document that is coming from a committee and suggested that it be accepted as the committee report.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:32 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, February 19, 2019 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 203 Alexander Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Lorna Dawes, Secretary.