

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

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

Absent: Adenwalla, Fech, Leiter, Purcell

Date: Tuesday, March 12, 2019

Location: 201 Canfield Administration 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 2:31 p.m.

2.0 Chancellor Green

2.1 Update on Appropriations Committee Hearing for the University

Chancellor Green noted that the University's hearing with the Appropriations Committee was generally positive. He stated that he believes the Appropriations Committee is solidly supportive of the Governor's recommendation to increase the University's funding by 2.6% in the first year of the biennium and 3.4% in the second year which is a little less than the University requested. He reported that the Governor stated he would fund the salary increase and the rest of the base budget, but would not cover the cost of inflation for operating costs and health care. He stated that the percentage of increase was figured on a 2% increase in salaries which is the amount the bargaining campuses (UNK and UNO) are expected to receive.

Chancellor Green reported that there were a number of people testifying on behalf of the University including representatives from outside the University. Hanrahan asked if any faculty members testified. Chancellor Green reported that there were two faculty members, one from UNMC and one from the Panhandle Research & Extension Center, both were selected by Central Administration. Belli noted that the faculty member from Research & Extension probably raised agricultural issues. He asked if any comments were made that were more unique to UNL. Chancellor Green reported that the conversation was much more general.

Chancellor Green stated that part of the conversation with the Appropriations Committee was explaining the different funding sources for the university and how they are used. He noted that there was discussion about remission and tuition. He stated that the level of tuition, rather than specifics of tuition were discussed.

Hanrahan reported that Senator Vargas raised the issue of accessibility, but the 2025 strategic planning is asking for quality. Hanrahan asked the Chancellor what he believes the people of Nebraska want. Chancellor Green stated that Nebraskans feel that we

should not give up access to education and Senator Vargas was very direct in his questioning about this. He noted Senator Vargas asked about costs and whether the continual pressure on the university's budget would impact student access to education. Chancellor Green stated that we do not want to go down the road to exclusivity, but we should try to increase the academic preparedness of students and the 2025 plan is working on this. He pointed out that data are clear that the higher a university's rate of acceptance is, the lower the graduation success rate. He noted that our graduation rate is 68% and it is improving as we work on improvement of retention and student success. He stated that if we want to have impact, we have to scale the University accordingly.

Hanrahan asked how the Faculty Senate can help the effort to improve quality. Chancellor Green stated that delivering excellence through the work of the faculty is paramount. He noted that currently we are very much in a situation where we need to grow our enrollment. He pointed out that losing 1 or 2 percent in enrollment has substantial impacts on our budget. Hanrahan asked if this refers to undergraduate enrollment. Chancellor Green noted that it is the total enrollment.

Franco Cruz pointed out that the University has a capacity limit on how many students it can handle. He asked where we are in regards to hitting that capacity level. Chancellor Green stated that some colleges are closer to enrollment capacity than others, but if we look at total enrollment we are at 26,000, but we could handle 27,500-28,000 students without too much impact, although classes may have to be scheduled differently.

Belli noted that the N150 report considered removing differential tuition rates for out-of-state students and asked how this was received and if there was any movement to change the tuition rate. Chancellor Green stated that there has been some discussion regarding the surrounding states removing their out-of-state tuition rates. He reported that we want to take a hard look at the differential tuition rates to see if we could do something about them. He pointed out that we have financially benefitted from having the out-of-state tuition rate and it would take some considerable time for us to get to a one-tuition model. He stated that he does not think there has been any political pushback about this to this point, although other states with more students than seats available have experienced it (e.g. California).

Hanrahan asked if a one-tuition rate model would be successful. Chancellor Green stated that a tuition model would need to be figured on a base number with the tuition being affordable for the students, yet not negatively impacting the University's budget. He pointed out that there is a lot of serious movement occurring in higher education because as public financial support is pulled from the universities the dollars get transferred to the student loan industry, and higher education is being criticized because of it. He stated that higher education is being asked what the real costs are in offering courses. He noted that some universities are starting to reevaluate approaches to student debt. Peterson asked how these universities are able to do this. Chancellor Green reported that Purdue University is offering students a contract which states that the university will cover part of the cost of a student's education, but the student must pay the university back over time. In essence Purdue is becoming the bank. Hanrahan questioned how Purdue is able

to cash flow this arrangement. Chancellor Green stated that in conversations about the University and economic development the question has been raised about why there couldn't be different tuition models. An example would be a student getting their education here and agreeing to stay in Nebraska after they graduate thereby helping us grow our workforce and contributing to the State's economy. He noted that UNMC has the Rural Health Occupation program which is a commitment to work in Nebraska for a portion of an alumni's career in order to repay the academy.

Belli asked if there is a contingency plan in place to deal with the utilities costs that will not be funded in the Governor's proposed budget. Chancellor Green stated that at a recent President's meeting there was very early discussion about a slight tuition increase, that would put the University into a net positive territory assuming enrollment rates are stable.

Hanrahan asked if UNL's allocation of the state funding will change. Chancellor Green stated that there are no plans to change UNL's allocation of funds. Hanrahan pointed out that based on student credit hour production UNL produces over 50% of the university's credit hour production and we should therefore receive 50% of the budget. Chancellor Green noted that the non-instructional base budget has to be removed when factoring the percent of the budget that each campus receives. Hanrahan noted that Executive Vice President Fritz produces a credit hour production each semester for the campuses and based on those numbers UNL produces over 50%. Chancellor Green pointed out that the credit hour productions are weighted by different factors. He noted that some courses are more costly to deliver. He stated that what impacts our budget from year-to-year is enrollment. If enrollment goes up, the campus gets its appropriate share of the tuition that is generated.

2.2 Issues on the Horizon

Chancellor Green noted that the 2025 group is now busy working. He stated that the RCM effort is moving forward with forming a steering committee that will start working on developing a hybrid budget model. He stated that he is well aware that there is significant concern across the campus about the idea of a new budget model.

Chancellor Green reported that there are two interim leadership positions, the Interim Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and the Interim Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance, and he is determining how he wants to move forward with these positions. He noted that the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs has been an interim for two years now and the Interim Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance has been an interim for 14 months.

Hanrahan asked what the plan is to replace VP and CIO Mark Askren since he is stepping down at the end of June. Chancellor Green stated that Central Administration is going to conduct an internal search across the university to fill the Vice President of Information and Technology position that VP Askren has held. He stated that it will depend on who is selected to fill that position. He noted that if the internal person is not from UNL, we will do a search to fill our CIO position. Buan pointed out that whoever our IT contact

person is it will be important that they understand the computing needs of UNL. Chancellor Green stated that he feels confident about the level of IT people that we have both here and at Central Administration.

3.0 Academic Integrity Committee (Professor Dussault; Erica Musgrave, GSA; Jake Johnson, Assistant VC Student Affairs)

Dussault noted that previously the Faculty Senate had an ad hoc committee working on academic integrity and there was a recommendation from that committee to create a permanent Academic Integrity Committee (AIC). He reported that the AIC has been busy reviewing the ad hoc committee's recommendations and then discussed a number of these individually.

Dussault noted that a major recommendation from the ad hoc committee was ~~which include~~ conducting surveys to assess student knowledge of academic honesty and faculty knowledge of academic activities relating to academic honesty. He reported that the AIC met with a representative from the Executive Vice Chancellor's Office to discuss the possibility of conducting surveys of students. He noted that, in particular, there are the McCabe surveys which are survey instruments that have been widely applied and analyzed in relation to assessment of campus academic honesty issues.

Dussault stated that after discussing the possibility of conducting a student survey about academic honesty with the Dean of Undergraduate Education the AIC determined that there were challenges associated with administering even a short survey, never mind a more detailed survey. As a result, the IAC decided to focus initially on conducting a faculty survey to assess faculty knowledge about academic honesty and the practices related to academic integrity.

Dussault reported that UNL is now a member of the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI) which is a grouping of institutions which was "founded to combat cheating, plagiarism, and academic dishonesty in higher education." He noted that several universities in the Big Ten are also members. The committee is now corresponding with the ICAI about taking part in updating the McCabe surveys.

Dussault stated that the AIC carefully looked at faculty and staff orientation to determine whether faculty members and staff know what to do in cases of academic dishonesty, what appropriate measures should be taken in cases of academic dishonesty, and what the appropriate measures are and how severe penalties should be. He noted that a Tip Sheet was issued last year by the EVCs office in this area.

Dussault noted that there has been an effort to revise the Student Code of Conduct and in the process of revising the Code it was brought to the attention of the AIC by Professor Lenich, Law, that the descriptions of faculty policies and practices related to academic integrity were housed, perhaps inappropriately, as an administrative section within the current Student Code of Conduct. Dussault noted that the AIC had acted as an informal resource during the revision of the Student Code.

There was a brief discussion at this point about the status of the revised Student Code. Johnson stated that a proposed revision of the Student Code of Conduct has been endorsed by the students and by the Faculty Senate. The revision is now before Central Administration which is putting together a working group of representatives from each of the campuses to look at the draft with the hope that all of the campuses will adopt some portion of the Code. Hanrahan pointed out that the Board of Regents Bylaws gives the campuses the right to set their own policies. Johnson noted that currently the idea is to set aside the academic integrity portion of the Code to allow each campus to create its own process. Hanrahan asked if Johnson is the only representative from UNL on the working group. Johnson stated that each campus has one representative and there are three representatives from Central Administration. He reported that the working group hopes to have the Student Code of Conduct ready for the spring 2020. Hanrahan recommended that the working group get early involvement from the student groups and faculty if they want the Student Code of Conduct to be accepted on the campuses.

Buan asked for clarification. She noted that if a violation of the Student Code of Conduct occurs the Code is applied, but the academic integrity process will be up to each campus. Dussault stated that when Professor Lenich and Johnson were working on the Code it was determined that the action of the faculty are delineated in the Code rather than in faculty governance and it was felt that there should be a separate policy addressing faculty processes in regards to academic integrity. He noted that the AIC is drafting a motion “Proposed Senate Policy on Sanctions Related to Academic Integrity” to present to the Faculty Senate.

Dussault stated that another goal of the AIC is to have students better understand what is academic integrity. He pointed out that there is currently no orientation about it, although there is some website information. He stated that the AIC developed a one-page tip sheet providing basic principles; this tip sheet is being used by Student Conduct and has been shared for comments with advisors in one college. He stated that the goal is to take the tip sheet information and develop it into training or orientation models which could be delivered through Canvas. Buan asked if the Committee has thought about delivering the survey to the students through a module attached to the tip sheet. Dussault pointed out that the McCabe survey gathers a fair amount of information and he did not think it would work well with the tip sheet. Musgrave reported that there has been consideration of providing a short quiz at the end of the tip sheet module to see if students have an understanding of what constitutes academic honesty. Buan stated that she would rather see an improvement on the education side of academic honesty rather than the punitive side. Dussault stated that the effort with the students is more educational. For the faculty it is about adjudication of what faculty members should do in cases of academic dishonesty.

Discussion then returned to a draft motion from the AIC related to faculty policies and practices related to academic honesty, and, in particular, the sections requiring reporting of any instances in which a faculty member believes there has been a violation of academic integrity principles.

Vakilzadian asked if there are tools that faculty members can use to see if a person is cheating. Franco Cruz stated that there are programs: I Authenticate and Turnitin that are available to faculty. He pointed out that the faculty member has to inform the students that she/he will be using these tools to check for academic honesty. Hanrahan noted that the programs can be set up in Canvas so students can review their paper before they submit it to the instructor. Belli stated that it would be helpful if faculty members were made aware of these tools. Kolbe noted that the Senate should recommend that there be a university policy informing students that their papers would be checked for plagiarism. Buan pointed out that there is an issue of copyright because a lot of these programs will archive papers. Peterson stated that he is concerned with a blanket policy. He noted that he purchased his own tool for checking for plagiarism, but he notifies his students that he will be using it. Dussault stated that this is an issue that the AIC has not yet considered.

Peterson asked where students are taught about plagiarism. Dussault stated that they should be taught about it in the introductory courses. Peterson pointed out that he teaches junior and seniors and many of them still do not know what constitutes plagiarism. Dussault noted that a faculty survey would make the individual concerns of the faculty visible. Peterson noted that getting faculty members to report when academic dishonesty occurs would provide a sense of how widespread the issue is on campus. Belli pointed out that faculty discretion is needed, and the faculty member should have a key role in what should be done in cases of academic dishonesty. Dussault stated that the faculty member will have the role in deciding what would happen academically. He stated that the idea is if faculty encounter academic dishonesty they need to report it, but the faculty member decides what they want to do about it. He reported that the AIC would like to see the faculty educated about the range of actions that could be used in cases of academic dishonesty. He noted that anyone interested in obtaining more information should contact Johnson. Buan stated that if there is a strong academic penalty there should be some policy and she cautioned about having a behavioral norm that faculty are supposed to follow.

Dawes pointed out that from a student's perspective it is difficult to understand plagiarism when it is handled differently by various faculty members. She stated that faculty reporting incidents is important, but what levels and how faculty address levels of plagiarism needs to be considered. She stated that it needs to be explained to students that plagiarism is contextual and you have to have an ethical understanding about it.

Belli stated that what isn't clear is whether a report of plagiarism is submitted to administration. He pointed out that students should know about this if this occurs. Dussault stated that students are given a copy of a report so they are aware that an act of academic dishonesty will be reported. He stated that Johnson informed the AIC that, at present, students can hurriedly withdraw from a class if they are caught cheating. He noted that the Registrar's Office is notified of a reported act of academic honesty so a student cannot withdraw from a class until the issue of academic dishonesty is resolved. Belli stated that it should be clarified that faculty members would not be sanctioned for their actions if they report incidents of academic dishonesty.

Dussault reported that the recording of reports of academic dishonesty would go to Johnson's office for data collection only. Johnson pointed out that it is not his office's job to question what sanctions a faculty member wants to take. Belli stated that students need to know their standing is at risk if multiple reports are made, and faculty need to know that they will not be sanctioned for giving a report. He suggested that a report of academic dishonesty should stay within the AIC. Johnson stated that this cannot be done because the university has to keep records of cases of misconduct and academic dishonesty is considered a misconduct. He noted that there is just one database on student misconduct that is kept. He pointed out that his office has no authority to take any action against a faculty member. He stated that if a student feels that the punishment for academic dishonesty is too strong they can appeal it to the college appeals committee and if not resolved, it can go to the Student Conduct Board. Dussault asked if Johnson could share some sense of what fraction of academic dishonesty cases leads to substantial disciplinary action. Johnson reported that it is a very small proportion and very few would result in suspension.

Buan stated that there should be a benchmark in place that guarantees that reported incidents of academic dishonesty are for informational purposes only unless a student raises an issue about a case. Kolbe stated that reporting academic dishonesty is similar to Title IX reporting in that it is a faculty member's academic responsibility to report these cases. Johnson stated that we want to follow the students across the curriculum to see if there is a problem with an individual student. He pointed out that the records are only kept for seven years and are then discarded. Hanrahan noted that mandatory reporting puts extra bite into telling students not to cheat. He stated that hopefully the mandatory reporting would not identify too many multiple offenders.

Belli stated that he has problems with the discretion of reporting being removed from the faculty member. Dussault suggested that the motion for the Senate could clearly state that the faculty member has the right to set the grades and follow their judgement without the risk of retribution when a case of academic dishonesty is reported. Johnson once again pointed out that his office would not substitute a faculty member's judgement and the Student Conduct Board recognizes that it does not have the ability to change the faculty member's penalty for a student. Dussault stated that he would appreciate input from the Executive Committee so the AIC could do further work on the motion so it can eventually be presented to the Senate.

4.0 Announcements

4.1 RCM Committee

Hanrahan reported that he suggested the name of five more faculty members for the RCM Committee. He noted that the Chancellor is appointing three of these members to the Committee which will bring the total number of faculty members to four.

Peterson noted that he has been appointed to the Committee and stated that Executive Committee members could channel thoughts to him about the RCM. Hanrahan noted that student production credit hours has to be carefully thought out. He pointed out that the

Arts have small, but very intensive classes, and there needs to be a formula that accounts for one-on-one instruction. Renaud stated that he has heard that courses will be cancelled if they do not meet the required number of students in a class. He stated that the overall production of a department needs to be considered rather than just looking at individual classes. Buan stated that time and quality of interaction with students should be considered and it should be acknowledged that some smaller classes are needed.

4.2 Search Committee for Vice President of Information Technology

Hanrahan reported that he has been asked to serve on the search committee for the Vice President of Information Technology. He noted that we have had a lot of in-house hires and pointed out that VP Askren was from outside the University and has done an excellent job.

4.3 2025 Committee Meeting

Hanrahan reported that the 2025 Committee met for the first time and the major discussion was what is not being done well for students to succeed. He noted that there are a lot of innovative ideas being proposed, but no clear objectives have emerged yet.

4.4 Faculty Senate Presidents' Meeting

Hanrahan reported that the Presidents of the four Faculty Senates met today and once again discussed health insurance concerns which are a real problem for those in Omaha and Lincoln. He stated that they plan on discussing this further and hope to have a meeting with President Bounds to talk about the concerns.

Hanrahan stated that the Presidents discussed Executive Memorandum #32 and both Professor Mims of UNK and Professor Hansen of UNMC recalled seeing a draft of the memo and were asked to provide feedback, but there is no record of the UNL Executive Committee receiving a copy of the draft. He reported that the Presidents agreed to try to discuss the Memorandum with President Bounds when they meet with him, and they will ask under what circumstances the Memorandum applies.

5.0 Approval of March 5, 2019 Minutes

Hanrahan asked if there were any additional revisions to the minutes. Hearing none he asked for approval by unanimous consent. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee.

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Faculty Rights Document

Hanrahan reported that Professor Woodman incorporated the suggestions made by Senators into the document. He noted that the document should now be put on the Senate website.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Proposed Amendments to Procedures to be invoked for Significant Budget Reallocation and Reductions

Hanrahan noted that the proposed revisions to the Procedures was presented to the Senate at the March 5th meeting, but Belli has some concerns and is proposing some amendments to the document. He reported that there was an email exchange between Belli and Professors Bloom, Bender, and Clarke of the APC to refine the proposed amendments. He stated that the APC will vote on the proposed amendments tomorrow. He stated that the amendments would then be presented to the Senate at the April 2 meeting.

7.2 Agenda Items for EVC Plowman and VC Boehm

The Executive Committee identified the following agenda items for the upcoming meeting with EVC Plowman and VC Boehm:

- Update about Business Centers and the recommendations of the Huron Group Consultants
- Why can't the statements on academic freedom being developed by the AAUP Censure Committee be considered policies?
- Are there any issues that the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor can identify that the Faculty Senate could assist with?
- What are the plans since the IANR promotion and tenure committee was voted down?
- What is the policy for when search consultants are used for a hire?
- Possible Senate Executive Committee and Administrators retreat
- What are ways the faculty and Academic Affairs can collaborate to improve enrollment.

7.3 Resolution on Workload Calculations

Agenda item postponed due to lack of time.

7.4 Resolution on Lecturers 90 Day Notification

Agenda item postponed due to lack of time.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, March 26, 2019 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Lorna Dawes, Secretary.