

UNL FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
November 5, 2019
City Campus Union, Regency Suite
Presidents Nicole Buan, and Sarah Purcell, Presiding

1.0 Call to Order

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

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Approval to Adjourn Early

President Hanrahan asked for unanimous consent to end the meeting at 3:30 so members of the Faculty Senate could attend the listening session of President Priority Candidate Ted Carter. The Senate approved ending the meeting early.

2.2 Professional Code of Conduct Committee

President Hanrahan reported that he has formed and given the charge to the Professional Conduct Committee to develop a Code of Conduct for faculty members. He noted that Professor Deb Minter will be chairing the Committee, and other members are: Professor Christina Falci, Professor Ari Kohen, Professor John Raible, Professor Laurie Thomas Lee, Professor Sydney Everhart, Professor Gwendolyn Combs, Professor Sharon Teo, and Professor Steven Willborn.

2.3 Big Ten Academic Alliance Faculty Governance Conference

President Hanrahan reported that he and President-Elect Buan attended the conference a few weeks ago, and they both felt it was very informative. He pointed out that next year UNL will be hosting the conference. He stated that President-Elect Buan is chairing a committee that will be working on preparations for the conference, and noted that Senators may be asked to volunteer to help.

2.4 Academic Planning Committee Faculty Members and Senate Executive Committee Meeting

President Hanrahan stated that the Executive Committee met with the faculty of the APC to talk about the governance structure of the incentive based budget model. He noted that there was good discussion and he hopes to have a proposed structure that he can introduce to the Senate at the December 3 meeting.

2.5 National Faculty Senate Council

President Hanrahan reported that Past President Purcell, Professor Woodman, and Professor Vakilzadian attended the annual meeting of the Council in October. He noted that members of the Executive Committee have been participating with the Council for the past two years.

2.6 Faculty Members Needed for Academic Planning Committee, Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee, and Academic Rights & Responsibilities Panel

President Hanrahan asked Senators to encourage their colleagues to run for election to the APC, ARRC, and ARRP. He pointed out that participation in committees is contributing to shared governance and people are needed to populate these important committees. He stated that anyone interested should contact Coordinator Griffin (kgriffin2@unl.edu). Professor Woodman asked when non-tenure track faculty members will be allowed to serve on the ARRC and ARRP. President Hanrahan stated that the Board of Regents needs to first approve the changes.

3.0 Election of Executive Committee Member

President Hanrahan noted that an election needs to be held to replace Professor Belli on the Executive Committee. He stated that Professor Ibrayeva, Management, volunteered to run for election. He reported that she is out ill today, but the election can continue. He asked if there were any nominations from the floor. Professor Adenwalla, Physics & Astronomy, nominated Professor

Gay, Physics & Astronomy, who accepted the nomination. President Hanrahan stated that the election should be postponed until the December 3rd meeting to allow both candidates to speak to the Senate.

4.0 Approval of October 1, 2019 Minutes

President Hanrahan asked if there were any corrections to the minutes. Hearing none, he asked for approval of the minutes. The minutes were approved by the Faculty Senate.

5.0 Committee Reports

5.1 Academic Standards Committee (Director Katie Kerr)

Director Kerr reported that she coordinates the Academic Standards Committee which reviews written appeals of students who have been academically dismissed from the university. She stated that groups of three Committee members met for a total of 21 times over the academic year to review and decide whether to accept or reject the appeals. She reported that 124 students appealed to the Committee, and 56 of those students were reinstated, but 68 were denied. She noted that a total of 616 students were dismissed from UNL, but 60 were reinstated. She stated that the Colleges do make recommendations to the Committee on whether to accept or reject an appeal, and noted that 70% of the time the college and the Committee agree on the final decision. She stated that the Academic Standards Committee will be meeting to discuss providing feedback to the students. She noted that the Committee is finding the feedback to be valuable to the students.

Professor Adenwalla asked why nearly half of those students who write appeals get reinstated. Director Kerr pointed out that many of the students had extenuating circumstances, such as health issues, family emergencies, or a change in majors. She noted after investigating the situation it has been found that the reasons are usually not cut and dry as to the cause of the dismissal.

Professor Lindquist, Agronomy and Horticulture, inquired whether the 616 dismissed students were distributed uniformly across the colleges. Director Kerr stated that the number of students dismissed were fairly uniform across the colleges in accordance with the number of students in each college. Professor Stentz, Durham School of Architectural Engineering and Construction, asked what triggers a dismissal. Director Kerr stated that a cumulative low GPA is cause for academic dismissal. She stated that in the written appeal the students will state why they were struggling.

Professor Larsen, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, asked if the Academic Standards Committee looks at the demographics of those dismissed. Director Kerr stated that the Committee just looks at the appeals, but it can look at gender, race, and how many times the student met with an advisor. Professor Larsen asked if this information is reported and Professor Brantner, Modern Languages & Literature, asked if the information can be made available. Director Kerr stated that she will look into it. Professor Larsen noted that a large number of people in the state are economically challenged and suggested that this should also be examined.

Professor Woodman, School of Biological Sciences, asked for clarification on Probation I and Probation II. Director Kerr stated that students are placed on Probation I when their term or cumulative GPA falls below 2.00. She stated that students are notified of their status from the University Registrar, and once on probation a hold is placed on their account for future registrations. Students must then complete a semester of coursework with both a semester and cumulative GPA above 2.00. She stated that Probation II is when their term or cumulative GPA falls below 2.00 for two consecutive semesters. To remove this probation status, students must complete a semester of coursework with both a semester and cumulative GPA above 2.00. She stated that students on Probation II have to go through the academic recovery process. She reported that students are dismissed if they have three consecutive semesters below 2.00 GPA. Professor Woodman suggested also keeping track of ACT scores when the demographics are run on students who are academically dismissed. Secretary Latta Konecky suggested reporting the suggested demographics on all of the students who are dismissed, not just the ones that write an appeal. Director Kerr stated that this information could be provided.

Professor Lindquist asked if there was information on how successful the recovery program is. Director Kerr stated that she could ask Associate VC Goodburn if there is campus wide data available. Professor Weissling, Special Education and Communication Disorders, recommended that a report be given to the Executive Committee on the questions that have been raised.

5.2 Academic Integrity Committee (Professor Dussault, Graduate Student Erica Musgrave)

Professor Dussault, Chemistry, reported that the AIC met bimonthly, including over the summer. He noted that the major charge to the Committee was to provide an assessment of the campus climate regarding academic honesty. He stated that the Committee contacted the International Center for Academic Integrity, which administers assessment surveys. He reported that the Committee found that the current policies and guidelines governing faculty handling issues of academic dishonesty are inadequate and are housed within a section of the Student Code of Conduct. As a result, the AIC will present a motion to the Senate for a “Policy on Sanctions Related to Academic Integrity.”

Erica Musgrave stated that the third charge to the AIC was to look at student orientation on the issue and to being more proactive of making students aware of academic honesty. She noted that the Committee developed a student tip sheet on academic honesty which is being used by the Office of Student Conduct. She stated that currently it is just a written document, but the hope is to turn it into a more interactive format for the students with five minute modules on different types of academic dishonesty. She pointed out that these modules are in the early development stage. Professor Kolbe, Johnny Carson School of Theatre & Film, suggested that the videos on academic honesty not only address integrity here, but also explain it in the context of outside the university.

Professor Dussault reported that President Hanrahan asked the AIC to look at online services that buy, sell, or trade course instructor-generated materials, often without the instructor’s permission. He noted that the question is what is the law regarding these transactions and what can and cannot be done about it. He stated that some professors actually choose to copyright their material, and some institutions have put into their policies that students may not release course notes without permission of the instructor. President Hanrahan noted that a faculty member from Michigan reported at the Big Ten Academic Alliance conference that the content of your course is not copyrighted, but the delivery method is copyrighted. Professor Woodman asked if the number of these kinds of sites is known. Professor Dussault reported that conversations with the Center for Academic Integrity indicated that controlling these sites would be difficult, and a professor or university would have to fight for each document if they wanted it removed from the site. Professor Harbison suggested loading false information onto some of the sites. Professor Dussault pointed out that this is a major issue nationwide, and the solution to the problem is probably not unique.

Professor Dussault stated that the AIC has met with Associate VC Goodburn to let her and others know what the Committee is working on and to hopefully get support from the EVC’s office for the efforts being made.

5.4 Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee (Past President Purcell)

Past President Purcell reported that the number of times the FCAC meets has been increased to four times a year which allows the Committee to stay on task and keep momentum going. She stated that the FCAC focused on three items: gender pay equity, compression of salaries at the associate professor level, and the low salaries of lecturers. She noted that the Committee’s letter of recommendation were included in the Senate packet, but she wanted to provide an update. She stated that before former EVC Plowman left the university, she directed the deans to look at gender equity pay issues. She reported that the Deans found that 33 faculty members should receive an increase in salary because of gender equity issues. She noted that Interim EVC Moberly asked for further information from the Deans to ensure that information is accurate and that the increases are warranted. She stated that the Deans were to report back by October 1, but she has not received any

further updates. She pointed out that the total amount of funds needed to increase the salaries of the 33 faculty members is \$280,000. She stated that Interim EVC Moberly also asked the Deans to look at strong performers, but whose salaries are low to see if these people could get an additional increase in salaries.

Past President Purcell reported that former EVC Plowman was trying to address the lecturer salaries before she left, but this was more problematic than originally thought. She stated that Interim EVC Moberly and Dean Button, CAS, have decided to form a committee to examine the problem more carefully. She noted that Professor Woodman; Professor Minter, English; and Professor Stevenson, English are all on the committee which has until March 1 to deliver its report.

Past President Purcell stated that within IANR there has been some movement with Extension Educator salaries. She noted that 84 Extension Educators received increases which amounted to a total of \$329,000 in permanent funds which was given in installments for equity increases. She reported that the IANR leadership team has been working on pay equity within the tenured/tenure track faculty lines, but noted that adjustments need to be made now, rather than in the foreseeable future.

Past President Purcell stated that the FCAC will continue to monitor the three issues listed above over the next year. She stated that the Committee will also see if the University of Nebraska system mileage rate can be improved from the 25 cents per mile.

Past President Purcell stated that the FCAC is working on the tuition remission policy. She pointed out that the employee's spouse or children can receive tuition remission, but tuition will be charged to the campus that your dependent is attending. As a result, UNL is being overly charged for remission from faculty members who work at the other campuses, but whose spouse and children attend UNL.

6.0 Honorary Degree Nomination

President Hanrahan noted that there was only one nomination for the Honorary Degree award and asked for approval by acclamation. The Senate voted to approve the nomination, there was one abstention.

7.0 Unfinished Business

No unfinished business was discussed.

8.0 New Business

8.1 Resolution to Approve a Policy on Sanctions Related to Academic Integrity

Professor Dussault reported that the resolution is from the Academic Integrity Committee. He noted that the existing code of how faculty handle incidents of academic dishonesty are currently housed in the Student Code of Conduct, but this section has been removed in the proposed revisions to the Code. As a result, the AIC has redrafted the section to be a faculty policy. He stated that the major change with the redrafting is that faculty members must report academic dishonesty if they take an academic sanction, such as lowering a grade. He stated that another change is for faculty members to be informed by the Office of Student Conduct what the outcomes are on cases of academic dishonesty. He stated that another change is that faculty members would be advised not to allow the student to drop a course until the issue of academic dishonesty has been resolved.

President Hanrahan noted that discussion and a vote on the changes will take place at the December 3, Senate meeting.

8.2 Resolution in Support of Shared governance of Financial Oversight at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

President Hanrahan stated that the resolution was from the Executive Committee and calls for the colleges to establish a governing committee to look at the incentive based budget model decisions

made within a college. He noted that with the new budget model, once the funding has been given to the Dean, the Dean then has all of the power in distributing the funds. He pointed out that this is where the faculty will be most impacted and the Executive Committee felt each college should have some kind of committee with faculty members on it to oversee financial data quality, budget allocations, expenditures, and to participate with Administration in making decisions relating to the budget adjustments and reallocations in their colleges and administrative units. He noted that discussion and a vote on the changes will take place at the December 3 Senate meeting.

8.3 Motion to Revise the Commencement and Honors Convocations Committee Syllabus

President Hanrahan reported that the CHCC has proposed changes to its syllabus. The major changes include changing the name of the Committee to more accurately reflect its work, and to include non-voting members. He noted that discussion and a vote on the changes will take place at the December 3 Senate meeting.

8.4 Open Mic Discussion Topic: Priority Candidate for NU System President

Professor Harbison stated that he had concerns that the Board of Regents believed that UNL having one faculty member on the President's search committee was fair representation of the faculty. He reported that he felt that the Priority Candidate, Ted Carter, waffled on the issue of academic freedom, and there was serious concern with how the firing of Professor Fleming from the Naval Academy was handled while Priority Candidate Carter was President. He noted that he finds Priority Candidate Carter's statement that there may be circumstances where a faculty member is not allowed to bring some materials to class, worrisome.

Professor Billesbach, Biological Systems Engineering, reported that he sent an email to the faculty in his department asking for their input on the Priority Candidate. He noted that he received two responses, both very positive and supportive of instating Priority Candidate Carter. President Hanrahan asked the Senators to contact the faculty in their department to get their response, pointing out that this would be helpful for the Senate's response.

Professor Billesbach encouraged faculty members to make their individual comments on the Priority Candidate to the President's search committee. He pointed out that the search process was flawed. He noted that Priority Candidate Carter has been a wonderful military man, however, he does not know how that experience translates into the ability to manage a land grant university. He stated that the University has a three headed mission: teaching, research, and extension, and Priority Candidate Carter lacks experience in research and extension. He stated that it is important that the next President of the University be more than a fundraiser.

Professor Adenwalla stated that she did not think the Priority Candidate should be President. Professor Guo, Civil Engineering, stated that he agrees with the comments that have been made.

Professor Weissling stated that the Priority Candidate could withdraw from his nomination as the Priority Candidate within 30 days. She pointed out that Priority Candidate Carter may choose not to come here, particularly if he feels that many people do not trust him.

Professor Billesbach moved that the Executive Committee issue a statement distilling the feelings of the Senate regarding Priority Candidate Carter. Professor Brantner, Modern Languages & Literature, seconded the motion. President Hanrahan asked if the body wants the Executive Committee to draft a letter, or whether there should be a resolution from the whole Senate. Professor Dussault questioned whether the Senate wants to make a formal objection without knowing what the consequences would be if the Priority Candidate is rejected. Professor Stentz asked if the Senate knows what attributes the President should have. President Hanrahan pointed out that the Executive Committee did send a letter to the Board of Regents in June expressing what traits the Priority Candidate should have for serving as President. The motion was approved.

Professor Harbison made the motion that the Senate find out the process that was set for selecting

the candidates for NU President, because it was done secretly. He stated that he would like to know why the Board of Regents felt that Priority Candidate Carter was the best candidate. He stated that he would like to see a lot more transparency as to why the selected Priority Candidate was considered the best fit.

Professor Gay stated that he agrees with Professor Harbison that the process was flawed. He stated that it is a serious problem with only having one faculty member on the search committee and he made this comment pointedly to the Regents.

Professor Stentz noted that he has a military background and stated that he would be very surprised that a Navy Admiral would not want to talk to the faculty before making a decision whether to accept the job.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:32 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, December 3, 2019, at 2:30 p.m. in the City Campus Union, Regency Suite. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, and Lorna Dawes, Secretary.