

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** Billesbach, Buan, Dam, Dawes, Eklund, Gay, Hanrahan, Kolbe, Krehbiel, Minter, Weissling, Woodman

**Absent:** Franco Cruz

**Date:** Tuesday, February 9, 2021

**Location:** Zoom meeting

**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 (*Buan*)

Buan called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m.

### 2.0 Announcements

#### 2.1 Proposed Bylaws Changes (Associate to the Chancellor Zeleny)

Buan reported that she, along with Chancellor Green, Chief of Staff Bakken, Hanrahan, and Zeleny met with President Carter on Monday and were able to agree on further revisions being made to the proposed Bylaws revisions. She noted that the language mentioning the ombudsperson has been changed because it is against the rules of the national ombudsman association for ombudspersons to become involved with investigations of any case against a faculty member. She pointed out that President Carter has agreed to include the language that was wanted by faculty members belonging to the AAUP.

Woodman asked if the Board of Regents has been sent this latest revision. Buan stated that it is back to the campuses and if there are no other major changes it will be put on the agenda for Friday's Board of Regents meeting. She noted that if there were any issues the previous version would go forward to the Board.

Hanrahan suggested a minor change in one sentence. Buan asked the Executive Committee to accept the amended revisions.

Gay asked if the local AAUP chapter is happy with the new language. Hanrahan stated that he consulted with members of the local chapter and they are happy with the newly proposed changes. Minter noted that the new language is close to what the Faculty Senate approved in November and the changes show a significant amount of goodwill and hard work on the part of all those involved, and she is very appreciative of everyone's hard work. Woodman pointed out that the changed language significantly helps to protect non-tenure track faculty members.

Gay asked what made President Carter and Chancellor Green change their mind to work further on the revisions. Buan stated that the many phone calls and emails had an effect.

She made it really clear last week that the UNL faculty were definitely unhappy that one of the major revisions previously approved by the Faculty Senate was not included. She stated that she also believes both President Carter and Chancellor Green really want to get the AAUP censure removed. She noted that one of her concerns with the way the language the administration had written is that someone could be fired but the University would just let the person work through their contract and not be rehired. She stated that doing it this way would make the person ineligible for unemployment and this could disproportionately affect women and people of color who are the majority of non-tenure track faculty members.

Woodman asked if General Counsel was at the meeting. Buan stated that General Counsel was not at the meeting and President Carter made the assurance that what was being negotiated at the meeting would go forward to the Board unless the other campuses have major concerns.

Billesbach stated that he believed the Regents can have line-item discretion and asked if we have any idea whether the Board will accept all the proposed changes. Buan noted that President Carter and the Board of Regents are very supportive of the language pertaining to Extension Educators and she believes that language will move forward. As she pointed out earlier, if the other campuses have major concerns the previous revisions, which improve protection for faculty as compared to what is currently in the Bylaws, would be put forward and we could work on making improvements in the future. Zeleny stated that if the Board has concerns with the administrative leave section, the Extension revisions would move forward on their own. He pointed out that the Board meeting on Friday is the first reading of the proposed revisions and the Board would not vote until the April meeting.

Woodman stated that he does not think it was only the generosity on the part of administrators that helped to make these last changes but rather the joint effort of faculty members from UNL, UNK, and UNO who were planning to speak at the Board meeting. He pointed out that when the faculty come together, they can have significant influence on the Board of Regents.

Motion to accept the newly proposed revisions was approved by the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee agreed that a letter of thank you should be sent to those on campus who have worked over the past several years to draft the proposed revisions to the UNL Bylaws.

## **2.2 President Carter to Speak to Faculty Senate**

Buan reported that she has asked President Carter to speak to the Faculty Senate and she is waiting to receive a confirmation on an April meeting.

### **3.0 Approval of February 2, 2021 Minutes**

Buan asked if there were any further revisions to the minutes. Hearing none she declared the minutes approved as amended.

### **4.0 Unfinished Business**

#### **4.1 Board of Regents Statement**

Buan stated that she thinks it would be good to acknowledge the support of the revisions to the Bylaws and to thank the shared governance of the administration, particularly President Carter and Chancellor Green at the Board meeting on Friday. Gay moved that we approve the sentiment suggested by Buan. Billesbach seconded the motion and the Executive Committee approved the motion.

### **5.0 New Business**

#### **5.1 2021-2022 Calendar Proposal**

Buan reported that the calendar proposal is being put forward by administration. She noted that UNK and UNO would like to have a 3-week winter interim session like we did this year, however the proposal for UNL would be to have a 2-week interim session.

Woodman questioned how having an interim winter session would impact summer school enrollment. He pointed out that the calendar presented would not provide any break between the spring semester and summer pre-session and the eight-week session. Kolbe noted that most faculty contract dates state that faculty are to work through the week after finals. He wondered if the adjusted calendar would have faculty working longer.

Krehbiel wondered how many of the interim classes are taught by graduate students. She noted that having the interim session could help graduate teaching assistants by providing them an opportunity to earn more money. She pointed out that this could eliminate faculty members teaching back-to-back.

Buan reported that President Carter wants the campus calendars to be unified in the future. She noted that UNL tried to get UNO and UNK to align more with our calendar but has not yet been successful. Buan stated that the reason why we would only be offering a 2-week winter session had something to do with athlete eligibility. She noted that the calendar proposal does align with the Lincoln Public Schools' spring break, and all of the campuses were in agreement that there needs to be a full week for spring break but pointed out that the proposed calendar does push commencement back.

Woodman asked if we would be gaining much by adding a winter interim session and pointed out that we have more students enrolled in summer session courses and more faculty involved with teaching in the summer. Buan stated that the winter interim session does not replace the full summer classes and noted that the interim courses would more than likely be elective courses of 1-2 credit hours. She reported that EVC Spiller believes the interim session would create curricular innovation and would help with retention, but the courses offered during this time are not meant to be replacement courses. She stated

that any teaching during the winter interim session would be strictly supplemental and there would be no expectation that people would be required to teach during this period.

Hanrahan stated that he likes the idea of aligning with LPS but there needs to be consideration for faculty members who are on contract because they shouldn't be working an extra week without being compensated for it.

Weissling stated that she is concerned with rigor for the interim courses. She stated that she has heard complaints from students who took this winter's interim sessions that the instructors expected too much work for these courses. She pointed out that students should be advised that the courses in the winter interim session will be a more intense version of a course. She stated that she thinks that when we do a compressed semester the rigor of the course may suffer, and she is concerned that the courses are circumventing approval by curriculum committees.

Eklund noted that a former college he was at flipped to a later opening in the spring semester to save money on energy costs. He questioned whether it is strange to start the semester a week or so later. He asked if there would still be the same number of weeks for teaching if we go with the calendar change. Buan reported that AVC Walker assures that the number of weeks for the fall and spring semester would be the same.

Hanrahan wondered if there could be continuous instruction and noted that Professor Kostelnik spoke about this to the Executive Committee when she served as Interim SVCAA. He noted that with continuous instruction faculty members could choose when they wanted to start their academic year.

Billesbach wondered how wise it is to set all four campuses on exactly the same schedule when they each have a specific mission. He noted that there are many things to consider and pointed out that UNL has many more international students to deal with and getting these students to campus can have its challenges.

Hanrahan noted that Regent White sided with former President Bounds in wanting to align the calendar of the campuses which would make it much easier for students to take courses at UNL, UNK, or UNO.

Kolbe asked if there is a committee with faculty input into the calendar. Buan stated that there is the University-wide Calendar Committee of which she, and the other Faculty Senate Presidents, are members of. She stated that she would report the Executive Committee's concerns with the proposed 2021-2022 calendar to the administration.

Billesbach asked if there is any evidence from other university systems that have tried having a unified calendar for each of their campuses and whether this has worked.

## **5.2 Information Technologies and Services Committee Update**

Woodman reported East Campus now has a DLC testing center which has increased DLC testing capacity. He also noted that and as a result the City Campus DLC center is not

being used to full capacity currently even though distance restrictions are in place. He also stated that the Testing Center is assessing new technology soon that will eliminate the need for scantron sheets used for exams.

Woodman stated that Information Technology Services has been asked to conduct a survey of which programs employees use that are supported by ITS and what programs are used that are not supported by ITS. He noted that this will help determine if there are non-supported programs that are commonly used.

Woodman reported that a policy is being developed that will impact research data and security issues for all those who do research, and it will apply to all research data that is generated or acquired, regardless of the funding source, even though granting agencies may have their own requirements. He stated that ITSC had a meeting with Vice Provost Jackson about the policy and he said that the University will need to categorize data as low risk, which is usually made available to the public; moderate risk, which could have a moderate risk for the University; and high risk, which would have a significant adverse effect on the University should it be leaked. He stated that Central Administration wants to put security training and requirements in place for when the policy goes into effect. He stated that responsibility for complying with the policy will lie at all levels: principal investigators, co-principal investigators, and others involved in research.

Woodman pointed out that research policies are typically overseen by the Office of Research and Economic Development, but this policy is being developed by Information Technology Services, Central Administration and with input from Associate Deans of Research. He noted that involving ITS will require new resources for security and new funding needs. He stated that additionally, all data transmission would be done using UNL addresses only and how it is transmitted will be dependent on the level of the security. He noted that each faculty member will have to comply to their risk level and storage of data cannot be kept on a personal computer. He pointed out that a question is how much money the University is going to provide for University laptops for researchers, potentially including students.

Woodman stated that funding agencies typically have their own data management plans. He stated that what UNL wants to do is to make sure that we have a standardized process because it would be more efficient and less expensive as we scale up.

Kolbe asked if the committee developing the policy realizes that some research work needs to take place in the Cloud. He noted that projects that involve multiple teams in different locations often must work through specific programs. Woodman stated that he is not aware of any discussions about this, but the committee is saying that the plan to develop the policy is ongoing.

Billesbach asked if there is any plan to define what constitutes data. Woodman stated that any research information that is gathered and would be reported any way would be data. Buan pointed out that not only does this involve meta-data but it includes all intellectual property including material assets. Billesbach asked if this means that the

data would have to be double stored. Woodman stated that at this stage in the development of the policy it is important to get those heavily involved in research involved to provide input. He noted that we want to make sure that the policy does not cripple researchers and that the policy developed would be phased in and managed. Buan pointed out that those involved in the humanities and arts should also provide input.

Weissling reported that she works with human subjects which needs to be considered with this policy. She asked if the plan is for the University to conduct a systematic review ensuring that data is secured. Buan pointed out that all data, even if someone is scanning images or doing artwork and other creative activity, would fall under the policy.

Billesbach asked if there is a timeline for when the policy will go into effect. Buan stated that the policy is being driven by federal regulations and she believes there is bipartisan support for passing the regulations quickly. She stated that the University wants to get on top of developing a policy so it can be quickly put into place when the federal regulations are approved.

Buan asked if the University Libraries have been involved with the committee working on the policy. Dawes stated that the Libraries has representatives involved with data management but there needs to be consideration of the Archives and with Digital Commons. She stated that she can inquire whether the Libraries has formal representation on the committee.

Buan pointed out that she had concerns because of the size and complexity of multiple kinds of data that UNL has. She had explained to Vice Provost David Jackson that we need to make sure that the policy rules are ones that can be followed by all faculty. She noted that the Chancellor thought UNL should be leading the way because of the different data types we have, and faculty should be playing a role in helping craft the policy.

Woodman also reported that a biennial service survey will be conducted by Information Technologies Services in later spring and it will cover areas such as remote support, customer service, teaching and learning software provided by the University, the state of wireless network, and several other topics.

Woodman stated that anyone wanting to have IT move their data from Box to OneDrive can request this service. He noted that four weeks after the move from Box to One Drive, the data in Box for an individual will be deleted. He stated that the move from Box to OneDrive could impact links provided by faculty members in their course syllabi and other documents or in their Learning Management System (Canvas) pages.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:36 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, February 16, 2021 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be conducted via Zoom. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Lorna Dawes, Secretary.