

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Buan, Franco Cruz, Hanrahan, Latta Konecky, Minter, Peterson, Woodman

Absent: Adenwalla, Fech, Kolbe, Purcell, Vakilzadian

Date: Tuesday, November 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 2:34 p.m.

2.0 Syllabus Database (ASUN President Emily Johnson and External Vice President Ibraheem Hamzat)

Hamzat reported that the idea to create a syllabus database came from a survey of the students which indicated that they would like to see a course syllabus prior to registering to see if the instructor's teaching style would best fit the student's learning style. Buan asked how the syllabi would be stored and how students would access them. Hamzat stated that ASUN will maintain the database, and only syllabi that have been permitted by the instructor will be in the database. He stated that the database will be housed in UNL Box.

Woodman asked what the students hope to get out of having the database. Hamzat noted that students don't know the structure of a course until they attend class. He stated that the database is an effort to provide students with as much information about a course prior to registering. Woodman pointed out that there is a Faculty Senate policy on course syllabi, and asked if the requirements of the policy provide the needed information that students are seeking. Hamzat reported that the policy does not require all of the information that students are seeking.

Latta Konecky pointed out that some faculty update their syllabus every year. She questioned how anyone would know how accurate the syllabus is. She also stated that the course syllabi for some faculty members is segmented because they use Canvas which separates some of the course information. She suggested that Hamzat speak with Minter who oversees a large course with multiple sections because Minter had pointed out that while there is a basic structure for the course syllabus, each instructor teaching a section could tweak the syllabus to how they want to teach the course. Woodman pointed out that some instructors are hired very shortly before the class begins so the syllabus is written at the last moment and wouldn't necessarily be available for students to review prior to registering. Hanrahan noted that Minter had suggested having a written description of the course available, rather than the syllabus.

Johnson stated that instructors would have the option of whether or not to submit their course syllabus. She stated that a one-page description would be helpful, but the syllabus could be more valuable. She pointed out that the different teaching styles could make a big difference for some students, particularly those who may have some disabilities.

Woodman asked what minimum information would be needed. He noted that the syllabus structure can vary significantly from instructor to instructor. Buan pointed out that advisors might find a syllabus database helpful.

Latta Konecky suggested having an executive summary on the courses, and the syllabus could also be included. She stated that faculty might be more willing to fill out the summary form, and the information that is provided could be more easily identified by the students. Buan agreed and stated that this approach would be more compatible with faculty-led assessment. Latta Konecky stated that there would need to be an introduction about the reason why the information is being requested, and the message could ask the instructor if they would be willing to include their syllabus.

Peterson pointed out that his department has been posting syllabi on its website for many years. He suggested ASUN contact Ag Econ students to see if they even look at the online syllabi and whether they found them useful.

Latta Konecky noted that the Executive Committee is supportive of what ASUN is trying to achieve, and the Committee is trying to provide some suggestions which might make the effort successful. Hazmat stated that he would like to have the full Senate support a resolution. Buan suggested that it might be more successful if a letter was sent.

Franco Cruz suggested that the student senators should approach their colleges to see if they would be willing to cooperate with creating a syllabi database. Hanrahan stated that the student senators could have a letter from the Senate asking the colleges to support the students' effort.

3.0 Assistant to the Chancellor Tami Strickman

3.1 Title IX Issues

The Executive Committee went into closed discussion to discuss Title IX issues.

Hanrahan asked if a new training model would be adopted. Strickman reported that it is in the process. Hanrahan asked what the Senate could do to help get faculty to interface with the new training model. Strickman reported that she is willing to speak to the college deans to say how helpful it would be to the campus and to each person to take the training because it would help guide them in their interactions with students, staff, and colleagues. She noted that there is an employee and a student version of the training model.

Woodman asked if consideration is being given to make everyone a responsible employee, which means they must report any incidents of Title IX that they hear about. Strickman stated that at one time this was being considered, but that idea has been put on

hold. Woodman pointed out that some students just want to talk to someone, and do not want an incident reported. He stated that making everyone a responsible employee could deter many students from speaking to anyone about an incident.

Hanrahan asked if the Senate could do anything to help the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance. Strickman stated that she believes the Senate and the Office are good partners, and she appreciates Executive Committee members viewing the new training video to assess it. She noted that the open communication between her Office and the Senate Executive Committee is helpful. She stated that having the Senate encourage people to take the new training video, when it becomes available, would be helpful.

4.0 Announcements

4.1 Priority Candidate Response

Hanrahan reported that he has been contacted about an effort to coordinate the campuses' responses to Priority Candidate Carter. Hanrahan stated that he has reached out to UNO and UNMC to see what they plan on doing.

4.2 Professional Conduct Committee

Hanrahan announced that the Professional Conduct Committee has been formed. He noted that Minter will chair the Committee, and other members are: Professor Gwen Combs, Professor Ari Kohen, Professor Christina Falci, Professor John Raible, Professor Sydney Everhart, Professor Laurie Thomas Lee, Professor Sharon Teo, and Professor Steve Willborn. Woodman asked if there were any non-tenure track faculty members on the Committee. Hanrahan stated that there weren't but asked for recommendations. Griffin suggested a Professor of Practice from Engineering.

Franco Cruz asked what the charge is to the Committee. Hanrahan stated that the Chancellor and others have felt that we need to have a Professional Code of Conduct. He stated that previous attempts were written by administrators in the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor, but NU Bylaws and academic freedom gives the faculty the right to set conduct guidelines. Franco Cruz stated that Vice Chancellor Yoder said at the IANR Senators' luncheon that this was done previously. Buan pointed out that any previous documents were four or five pages long, but at other institutions such as the University of Illinois, the document is 127 pages long. She noted that too short a document can easily lead to misinterpretations. Latta Konecky suggested that an Executive Summary be included when the document is presented. Hanrahan noted that the Committee needs to be careful when writing the Code so that the faculty are protected.

5.0 Approval of October 29, 2019 Minutes

Hanrahan asked if there were any further revisions to the minutes. Hearing none he asked for approval of the minutes. The minutes were approved.

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Academic Freedom Training Videos

Agenda item postponed.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Agenda Items for Chancellor Green

The following agenda items were identified for the Chancellor for next week's meeting:

- Appointments
- Incentive Based Budget Model
- VSIP
- Legislative Updates

7.2 Response to Priority Candidate for System President

The Executive Committee worked on revising a draft letter of response regarding Priority Candidate Carter. Hanrahan noted that the letter will be sent to the Senate for approval before it is sent to the Board of Regents.

7.3 Incentive Based Budget Model University Oversight

Agenda item postponed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, November 19, 2019 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Joan Latta Konecky, Secretary.