

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Belli, Buan, Franco Cruz, Hanrahan, Kolbe, Minter, Peterson, Purcell, Vakilzadian, Woodman

Absent: Adenwalla, Fech

Date: Tuesday, May 7, 2019

Location: City Campus Union, Heritage Room

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 Conversation with Computer Science & Engineering Faculty

The Executive Committee met with members of the Computer Science & Engineering faculty to discuss the faculty's concern with the future direction and plans for the department.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Executive Committee Summer Schedule

Griffin noted that the Executive Committee would begin its summer schedule and would be meeting every other week during the summer.

3.2 Meeting of the Faculty Senate Presidents

Hanrahan reported that the Faculty Senate Presidents were meeting on Friday to discuss mutual concerns. He noted that he will be meeting with Chancellor Green tomorrow.

3.3 IT Symposium

Woodman reported that he attended the recent IT symposium. He reported that many of the featured presentations emphasized online education, expanding the "classroom" for international students, use of Artificial Intelligence in education, use of technology to teach and broadening the definition of teaching to involve AI based feedback systems which will replace faculty in the direct delivery of the course. He pointed out that many of these methodologies will require faculty to monitor issues like the use of faculty, the reduction in faculty, intellectual property issues, collaborations with companies that package a text and also deliver content (packed lectures for instance), royalties, etc. to ensure that they are not being abused. Hanrahan stated that he would like the Executive Committee to look into who owns a course syllabus.

4.0 Approval of April 30, 2019 Minutes

Griffin noted that she has not received revisions yet from Chancellor Green. Purcell moved that the approval of the minutes be tabled until the next meeting. Motion approved by the Executive Committee.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 President's Search Email Message

The Executive Committee reviewed the draft email message that the Committee will send to the Board of Regents regarding the qualifications that should be considered for the next President of the University. Latta Konecky moved that the revisions be accepted and the email sent. Motion seconded by Peterson and approved by the Executive Committee. Hanrahan asked if the email should be sent to the faculty encouraging them to send their own email about what they feel are important qualifications for the next President. Peterson moved to send the email to the faculty. Motion seconded by Belli and approved by the Committee.

5.2 Student Email Policy

Hanrahan noted that Central Administration has developed a policy that requires all students to use husker@unl.edu email. Buan pointed out that this policy was proposed in fall 2018 with the intent of providing greater security and improved service. She stated that Central IT is claiming that the husker email easily links into Canvas and Admissions thinks it will be beneficial because it could help them retain information which could assist them with helping students. She pointed out that in the interest of helping people there is potential for erosion of privacy. Woodman reported that all faculty are supposed to send course information to their students husker email account.

Woodman noted that information on faculty members and their email addresses are being obtained through department directories. Buan pointed out that the faculty information is very public and Nebraska has a state open record law. She stated that if a FOIA request on a faculty member is made to the University information must be provided.

Hanrahan stated that one of the real concerns is whether the Registrar's Office plans on sending tuition bills to the students via the huskers email address. He questioned how secure this would be. Belli asked if the policy is coming from Central Administration.

Hanrahan stated that the policy is coming from Central Administration since all IT (One IT) is now run out of Central Administration. Kolbe asked what the problems are with the proposal. Hanrahan stated that security, particularly financial security, is a real concern and there is no way to enforce that students will not forward emails they receive on their husker email account to a different personal email account would could affect security. He pointed out that using Canvas for applied courses is really difficult for the instructor. Woodman noted that students can initially use huskers email, have that email forwarded to their preferred email account.

Hanrahan noted that the last paragraph of the policy discusses selling the following information: email addresses as well as name, dates of university attendance, major field of study, enrollment status, participation in sports or activities (including physical

attributes such as weight and height), degrees awarded, honors or awards, and hometown are freely accessible to the public as amended and approved by the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska on March 29, 2019. Buan stated that the laws have been checked about releasing this kind of information and found that the information falls under the public records laws. She pointed out that there is no policy that says that our directories should not be searchable.

Buan stated that there are concerns that need to be addressed with the policy. She questioned whether the students are aware of the policy and what they think of it. She wondered whether vetting procedures could be put into place to make sure that requests for information are not phishing scams.

Belli asked if the policy originated because the Board of Regents wants to make the email addresses public information. Buan noted that university email addresses used to be private, but no longer are. Belli asked if a Board of Regents policy could keep the emails private. Buan stated that it could. She noted that FERPA protects a certain amount of information from being made public.

Belli stated that he has heard that the Chancellor claimed that the student email addresses were being made public so that the Alumni Association and the armed services could contact the students for recruiting purposes.

Woodman reported that the policy is supposed to be implemented on May 20. Belli stated that he believes the fundamental problem with the policy is making the email addresses public. Buan pointed out that preventing the selling of information and making email addresses public are much bigger issues and work needs to be done to protect the security and privacy of University users.

Hanrahan stated that he will meet with Professor Krcmarik, chair of the Information Technologies and Services Committee, to discuss the concerns the Executive Committee has with the policy.

5.3 Lecturer Resolution

Hanrahan noted that the Executive Committee has been working on developing a resolution regarding notice of termination for Lecturers which would be similar to the Regents Bylaw providing greater protection to Faculty Practice and Faculty Research appointments. He pointed out that there is nothing in the current Bylaws to address the issue of non-reappointment as punishment. Hanrahan reported that the Committee on the AAUP Censure will be completing its proposed revisions to the Regents Bylaws and the Senate should have this resolution presented and voted on so the proposed changes can be given to the Board of Regents at the same time.

Purcell reported that at the recent Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee (FCAC) meeting that EVC Plowman indicated that she would put forth a proposal for Lecturers and the FCAC voted to support her in developing a plan, although no definitive details

were provided. She stated that EVC Plowman discussed providing a one-time solution for Lecturers.

Belli stated that he is proposing a more detailed plan for the Chancellor to consider and this plan would include elevating the Lecturer status. Woodman asked if Lecturers would be part of the permanent budget. Purcell stated that EVC Plowman's proposal would be to move Lecturers who have served consecutively for a period of time to a Senior Lecturer or Professor of Practice position. Minter noted that previously the idea was to move people away from Senior Lecturer positions to give them more stability. Belli pointed out that some members of the FCAC were a little more reluctant about this idea and stated that departments might want a national search conducted for Professor of Practice positions. Woodman stated that he believes a national search has to be conducted for Professor of Practice positions. Hanrahan reported that he will discuss this issue with the Chancellor when they meet.

Belli stated that he believes the compensation issue for Lecturers is easier to deal with rather than the promotion issue. Hanrahan suggested paying Lecturers \$6,000 per course they teach, although he noted that there needs to be a tiered level of compensation for Lecturers because Lecturers should not be getting paid more than a full-time Assistant Professor. Woodman pointed out that Lecturers are being paid for their effort by the course. Minter stated that the Lecturer salary should not be held at the cap of an Assistant Professor. Belli suggested that the salary of the Assistant Professor should be raised to the minimum level of a full-time Lecturer.

Hanrahan questioned whether there should be a university-wide minimum salary for Lecturers, and pointed out that there is a minimum salary for GTAs. Minter noted that some Lecturers do not have a Ph.D. and asked if this would be taken into consideration. Belli stated that he did not think there should be a difference if comparable work is being done. Belli cautioned that the salary should not be set too high because departments might have to reduce the number of Lecturers in order to pay the higher salary. Hanrahan stated that he will propose to the Chancellor a salary of \$5,000 per course for Lecturers, and a 1.00 FTE would pay \$40,000. Belli moved to accept this idea. Motion seconded by Kolbe. Woodman moved to amend the salary to \$45,000. Purcell seconded the motion. Belli and Kolbe accepted the amendment. The motion was then approved.

Belli moved that a minimum salary of \$45,000 should apply to any other faculty member and any faculty member below that salary should receive a raise. Vakilzadian seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

Hanrahan asked if the Executive Committee approves the proposal in the resolution to offer any Lecturer who has served consecutively for five years be appointed either a specific-term appointment or a Faculty Practice appointment if they are being reappointed beyond the fifth year. Woodman moved to accept the proposed language. Kolbe seconded the motion. Belli suggested that there ought to be a set minimum FTE for the consecutive service. Woodman stated that rank is not connected to FTE and moving a Lecturer to a specific-term appointment of Faculty Practice appointment should

just be considered a promotion. Minter pointed out that voting rights for non-tenure track faculty members is also a consideration. Buan asked what is considered consecutive service. She noted that there are Lecturers who are appointed each academic year, but are not employed by the university during the summer. Kolbe moved that there be a requirement of a minimum .50 FTE. Motion seconded by Vakilzadian and approved by the Committee.

6.0 New Business

6.1 RCM Committee Update (Peterson)

Peterson reported that the RCM Committee met and discussed tuition and how it would be assigned, but nothing was decided. He noted that the Committee will meet again on May 15th and will continue to meet over the summer. He pointed out that the RCM budget would not go into effect until July 2020.

6.2 Agenda Items for VC Boehm

Hanrahan asked the Executive Committee members to submit agenda items for VC Boehm.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, May 21, 2019 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 203 Alexander Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Joan Latta Konecky, Secretary.