Executive Committee & Cabinet Minutes

Wednesday, April 5, 2017, 2 p.m., ASH 196

Presentation: UNO Campus Blackboard/Canvas Recommendation (Joyce Crockett, Director, Special Projects, PMO, Information Services; Bret Blackman, CIO, Information Technology Services)

Present: Adams, Eesley, Elder, Grams, Miller, Nash, Ostler

Excused: Woody

I. The meeting was called to order by Vice President Grams at 2:16 p.m.

II. The Minutes of March 1, 2017, were approved as submitted.

III. Officers’ Reports

A. President’s Report: Senator Woody sent the following, by e-mail, to all UNO faculty:

April 1, 2017

Colleagues: As the semester approaches closure, I hope that you are getting “the loose ends” tied and gearing up for a pleasant summer.

There have been questions about why NU President Hank M. Bounds reviews personally all UNO requests for $10,000 or more. Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance Bill Conley has informed the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and Cabinet (EC&C) that the oversight is simply because of the anticipation of a new UNO Chancellor, and this is considered a commonplace administrative practice. That is, there is nothing remarkable about the reviews.

A budget steering committee has been formed by President Bounds as one of several committees for budget planning. It includes faculty and administrative members. Presumably after this month, President Bounds will make the decisions regarding the budget process. On March 31st, I attended an executive meeting with President Hank Bounds, followed by the March meeting of the NU Board of Regents. In a nutshell, no budget decisions have been made, but the following World-Herald site reports the views expressed by President Bounds in the meetings: [http://www.omaha.com/news/education/bounds-says-proposed-budget-cuts-will-hurt-nu-s-ability/article_994b0f66-1633-11e7-93bc-03e631eddc55.html](http://www.omaha.com/news/education/bounds-says-proposed-budget-cuts-will-hurt-nu-s-ability/article_994b0f66-1633-11e7-93bc-03e631eddc55.html)

Discussion of the increasing services provided by the faculty during the summer months continues (i.e., referred to as “committee creep” or “summer creep”). Senior Vice Chancellor B. J. Reed has acknowledged that UNO is now a twelve-month campus, but there are remnants of a nine-month calendar. He has indicated that this issue will be addressed in the foreseeable future. However, without thorough analysis (including input from the Faculty Senate), any conclusions would be premature.

Since institutional accreditation requires detailed documentation of new hires,
Associate Vice Chancellor Deborah Smith-Howell is developing the policies and process for fulfilling this justification. Faculty input is being solicited.

Online informational modules associated with Visas are being developed by Director of Digital Learning Jaci Lindberg and Assistant to the SVC James McCarthy. The Faculty Senate passed a multipart resolution that will unify the information for the Center for Faculty Excellence (e.g., applicable to new international hires and dissemination by Chairs, Directors, and Deans).

Various issues pertaining to intellectual property (e.g., ownership of research/creative activity) are pending. The Committee on Professional Development will continue to explore this topic.

The Faculty Senate passed a resolution endorsing the creation of the UNO Center for Human Rights: “The proposed center will be the appropriate organizational structure to maintain and further UNO’s community-engaged initiatives in the field of human rights.”

Planning for consistency between campuses for blended and fully online courses is underway. However, it is premature to make any predictions or assume that there will be particular changes [see related comment later on herein].

An evaluation of Canvas v. Blackboard by a Task Force is being conducted. In case you have not seen it, the following excerpt from the Director of Digital Learning, Jaci Lindburg, clarifies the situation to date:

“The Task Force broke into two groups. The first group took responsibility for developing the evaluation and the second group took responsibility for analyzing the survey/focus group feedback and writing an executive summary/report. Meghan Salsbury (Faculty, Library) took the lead on developing the evaluation and Michelle Friend (Faculty, COE) took the lead on analyzing the feedback and writing up the report. The entire Task Force will have the opportunity to view and give input into the report before it is finalized and moves forward. Any member of the Task Force was welcomed and encouraged to take part in any piece of this process.

Once we have a recommendation prepared that synthesizes the feedback we received from student and faculty participants in the Spring 2017 pilot, we will present this recommendation to Faculty Senate, the Deans, Chairs/Directors, and Student Government. The purpose of our Task Force recommendation is to create a report based on the feedback we gathered directly from Canvas users. If the recommendation is a positive one, we have daily training and consultation sessions planned the last three weeks in April and the week after commencement in May.”

On the issues of records retention and possible changes in hybrid courses, Jaci Lindburg also reported:

**Records Retention**

Due to law related to Federal financial aid administration,* the UNO LMS will retain course content and student work for a period of three years after the end of the award year for which aid was awarded. UNO’s Information Technology Services (ITS) will retain course content and student work within an LMS. Within the LMS, students will no longer be dropped when they withdraw from a course. Students will be marked in the electronic grade book as unavailable/inactive. Students with this status will not have access to any course content within the LMS. This gives the instructor the required access to verify attendance for financial aid purposes. *(This policy has been put in place due to federal laws related to Student Financial Aid (Return of Title IV Funds (R2T4) –
Anticipated Changes to Hybrid Courses

To align with BOR policy stating that distance education tuition rates may only be charged to online courses, UNO is anticipating a change to how we have historically defined and utilized hybrid courses. Since 2013, UNO has offered hybrid “860 section” courses that were 51-99% online, and DE tuition was applied to these courses. Under the anticipated changes, UNO will only charge DE tuition to courses that are 75% or more online. DE Fee will continue to be applied to courses 51-100% online. These changes are still under review with campus CAO’s and we anticipate the change coming into effect beginning Fall 2018."

As mentioned in my March 1st Report, there has been administrative assurance that the increasing size and complexity of UNO fosters greater committee/service involvement for faculty and staff. Also, being aware of the need for faculty commitments for university-related service (e.g., serving on University committees and the Faculty Senate, including during the summer months) and acquiring new computer skills, administrative consideration is needed to improve incentives and compensation.

Speaking of size, the aspiration to have 20,000 students by 2020 is being maintained, notwithstanding budgetary challenges. Enrollment and retention have high priority with both the UNO and NU System administrations. In support of UNO’s capacity for positive accomplishment, impressive effort and skill are being demonstrated. Especially noteworthy, graduate education at UNO is advancing steadily. Associate Vice Chancellor/Dean of Students Daniel Shipp provided the following information on enrollment planning:

“20x20 Enrollment Planning Update
Background

In 2014, a campus leadership team was assembled to develop a strategic enrollment plan that would enroll 20,000 students by 2020 (20x20). The campus-wide planning work involved faculty and staff representatives from each of the academic colleges and various non academic units. Student retention and completion goals were established and academic program growth targets and associated additional resource requirements were identified and advanced to Senior Vice Chancellor Reed and Chancellor Christensen.

Updating the 20x20 Plan

Given the current fiscal reality in the State of Nebraska and its impact on the NU System, members of the 20x20 leadership team have begun working with the academic colleges and non-academic units to revise the strategic enrollment plan. This will include reconsidering where there are opportunities and excess capacity for academic program growth and perhaps scaling back initial projections in order to adjust for current and projected fiscal limitations.

It is intended that by early summer, the 20x20 leadership team, academic colleges, and non academic units will be finished with revising the strategic enrollment plan for the campus.

Student Success Hitting Record Levels

It is important to note that presently, Chancellor Christensen’s stretch goal for the campus to enroll 20,000 students by 2020 is still guiding our shared work. The goal is not only about recruiting new students, but also involves improving student retention and completion rates. This work continues to accelerate. Faculty in particular should be proud that they have helped the campus to reach record
levels of student retention and graduation rates in recent years. In the latest IPEDS report, UNO has separated itself from its urban/metropolitan peer comparison groups by nearly 5% when it comes to first to second year retention and six-year graduation rates. And, it should be also noted that UNO has accomplished this work with significantly fewer resources per student FTE than its peers. This is great news for our students and our community.”

On behalf of the UNO Faculty Senate, I hope that your academic year is going smoothly.

B. Secretary/Treasurer Report: Senator Eesley reported

   Senators: Dale Eesley, Laura Grams, Robert Nash, Robert Woody, Ostler
   Administrators: Chancellor Christensen, SVC BJ Reed, VC Dan Shipp, VC
   William Conley, Jaci Lindberg, Omar Correa
   Chancellor Christensen:
   Asked for flat funding but was not supported at this juncture. Continuing to
   meet with admins in Lincoln regarding the budget. Some board members think
   the financial situation may last well beyond two years, perhaps five or more.
   Others are more optimistic.

   President Woody raised several issues:
   Have we abandoned the goal of 20,000? VC Shipp says we are working with
   individual colleges to work towards this goal. We are in “homework stage”
   studying the issue. Omar created a group to study the issue. Colleges are able to
   see their numbers and see how they would approach the goal. Once there is a
   summary of the current status, goals, and new opportunities, will deliver a report
   to individual colleges on what they can do. VC Shipp sees retention as a major
   factor, moving from 69% to 77%, with a goal of 85%. Similar issues remain for
   graduation rates. CC says working to find more money for transfers from Metro
   or other colleges. Without additional resources, SVC Reed thinks it will be very
   challenging to meet the 20 by 20 goal.
   OneIT: SVC Reed: OneIT started 12 months ago as a presidential initiative to
   find savings in computing systems. The impact on UNO is that there will be
   some efficiencies identified at UNO, but not likely to the degree in Lincoln.
   Given how lean UNO operates, he would be surprised if the colleges would be
   impacted. Examples might be software purchases across the campuses or cloud
   computing, security, etc. Bret Blackman will be second in command regarding
   this initiative and will report to Mark in Lincoln and BJ Reed at UNO. In some
   cases, some system costs may be borne by NU system rather than by UNO.
   CANVAS: Vice President Grams raised the issue of support for Canvas. Jaci
   says that several people have been dedicated to providing faculty support. BJ
   Reed has been a strong proponent for allowing faculty the opportunity to study
   and test canvas before adoption. This is unlike what happened at UNK, where it
   was simply decided.
   Jaci asked if we might have a resolution from faculty senate regarding
   Canvas. Student government will be doing this March 16th.
   SVC BJ Reed assured us that there absolutely will be individual
   assistance/personal support for the transfer from Blackboard to Canvas.
   Data retention after if we stop Blackboard: Jaci says that we need storage of
   the past 10 semesters to provide three years of data. You won’t be able to remove
students who drop the class, instead they will be shown as inactive or unavailable. They will develop some option to store the data locally from Blackboard.

Jaci and IT will provide assistance to every faculty to assist them in transferring content from Blackboard to Canvas.

Verification of Attendance: F/FW e-mails. Omar will provide more information regarding why they send the letters and need a response.

**Blended Course Fees**

The proposal is that DE tuition not be charged unless the course is 75% online. This is how it is done in Lincoln. UNO has been out of line with regulations by charging DE for 51%.

**Summer pay for Service**

BJ reiterated that summer pay is not likely to happen, as faculty select a variety of service opportunities. Regarding the three grievance committees, he feels that faculty select this type of service, similar to how faculty choose to serve on thesis committees.

**VISAs:** BJ distributed materials that are used in training hiring committees. Visa issues will likely be handled by UNMC, who already have a system for handling this.

**Community Engagement Center:** Receiving significant recognition from other universities.

**Travel Policies:** VC Conley asked for quick approval that simply codifies existing practices.

### 2016-2017 Resolution Action Table

**(Action Pending and Current Resolutions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Res. #</th>
<th>Date Senate Passed</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Admin Accept</th>
<th>Sent for Senate Action</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Deferred</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Final Action/Resolved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4283</td>
<td>3/8/17</td>
<td>Endorsement of the Creation of the UNO Center for Human Rights</td>
<td>3/15/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4282</td>
<td>3/8/17</td>
<td>Expenses Associated with Visas for International Hires</td>
<td>3/15/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SVC BJ Reed distributed materials that are used in training hiring committees. Visa issues will likely be handled by UNMC, who already have a system for handling this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TO BE FOLLOWED UP**

| 4200   | 5/13/16            | Development of Task Force to Examine the Role of Part-time Faculty in the University of Nebraska at Omaha’s Strategic Mission | 5/20/15 |                        |        |          |             | Acknowledged           |

**CARRIED FORWARD**

---

*Executive Committee & Cabinet Minutes – 4/5/17*

*EC&C Agenda – 5/3/17- Attachments - Page 5*
2. **Treasurer’s Report:** Senator Eesley submitted the March 2017 Budgets report.

IV. **Standing Committee Reports**

A. **Committee on Educational Resources & Services:** Senator Eesley reported the Committee met virtually by email to address one issue, a resolution regarding faculty senate. By unanimous approval the committee approved this resolution, which the EC&C voted to pass to the full Senate next week.

**RESOLUTION: Canvas Learning Management System**

WHEREAS the UNO Blackboard contract is set to expire on June 30, 2018, and a review of Canvas Learning Management System was suggested by President Bounds and the Nebraska Board of Regents in August 2017, and

WHEREAS a comprehensive testing environment of Canvas LMS was put in place on the UNO campus from September 2016 through May 2017 with a highly favorable assessment by pilot faculty;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends:

1. An adoption of Canvas Learning Management System to be made available to faculty across the institution, and a phasing out of Blackboard at the end of the current contract period;
2. The UNO Information Technology Services department will provide individual assistance to UNO faculty in transferring course content to Canvas, and training and consulting to faculty learning to use Canvas;
3. An adherence to records retention policies throughout the LMS transition, making course content, including grading information and student contributions, available for three years after the end of an award term, in compliance with federal financial aid policy.

**PENDING:**

1. **Request for Blackboard Information to be Retained:** (to ER&S 11/2/16)
   Email Received 11/1/16:
   I suggest we consider asking that “gradebook” information be retained on Blackboard (and Canvas if we switch) for 3 years. It is currently saved for 2 years (6 semesters including summer semesters). Faculty are “strongly encouraged” to save grade information for 3 years. The online gradebook included in Blackboard is a convenient and secure location to have the information stored. Yes, we can download the information and save it, but then we need to worry about keeping it secure to comply with privacy laws and policies, whereas it is already secure on Blackboard.
   - **Regulated Data** (to EC&A agenda 10/2016)
   - **And Retain Data** on Blackboard, etc., for at least 3 years. (EC&A agenda 12/21/16)
   - (dismissed by EC&C 4/5/17)

2. **Disability Designation Process/Testing Center Capabilities** (from Gary Krause) (to ER&S 1/4/17)
Senator Grams will make the first reply to Prof. Krause. This issue was sent to the ER&S Committee to look at, to the extent that these issues overlap with other ER&S Pending items.  
(dismissed by EC&C 4/5/17)

3. OneIT (added to ER&S 3/8/17)  
(dismissed by EC&C 4/5/17)

B. Committee on Faculty Personnel and Welfare: Senator Elder reported the Committee met on April 29 at 2:15pm in DSC 208  
Present: Dale Tiller, Joy Chao, Pauline Brennan, Griff Elder  
Absent: John Noble, Juan Casas, Marshall Prisbell (all were away at conferences)  
Guests: Cecil Hicks (Asst VC for Human Resources), Charlotte Evans (Director, Public Safety), and Shereen Bingham (Ombudsperson)

On our agenda was the pending item: UNO Constituency Safety & Well-being.

1. UNO Constituency Safety & Well-being: (in Faculty Personnel & Welfare, 5/15)  
Senator Scherer reported better education, coordination and communication of information to all constituencies on how to facilitate the health, safety and well-being of ALL of its constituents:
   a. Student Safety Website—very impressive but would like to see a Faculty and Staff Safety website
   b. Confusion on resources for faculty staff (Ombudsmen, EAP person, counseling, Behavioral Review Team, etc.). What information is confidential? What is not? Where to go?
   c. BRT: Student Concerns—Student is the focal person or person of concern and faculty, staff and students can report here? If is the person of concern is a faculty or student, where does a faculty or staff person report? What are the mechanisms for dealing with the issue(s)?

Cecil and Charlotte were with us to present the following website that has been active for approximately 6 months.  
https://www.unomaha.edu/report-a-concern/

They also shared with us a spreadsheet that lists all staff whose job titles are associated with Safety. This was in response to a request made by Bob Woody during a meeting between Cecil, Charlotte, Bob and Griff on Feb 7, 2017.

Shereen had visited with the committee in Spring 2016, and was with us again to participate in our discussion.

After discussion, the committee decided that we were satisfied that the report-a-concern website addresses item c.

Regarding item a. -- the fact that students have a very nice Safety Site and the faculty don't. Student site is  

There was general agreement that there should be a similar website for faculty and staff, and that this is both a reasonable and a realistic request. Our discussions regarding implementation, along with our discussions regarding item b. flagged up what we believe might be the obstacle that is making it difficult for there to be some resolution of these issues.

**Problem:** We perceive a vacuum. There seems to be something missing -- something that is needed.

Whereas, staff have a well-defined process (within Human Resources) and an identified person who is ultimately responsible and has decision making authority, there doesn't seem to be something similar for faculty. Our best guess was that this person is either BJ Reed or James McCarty, but we weren't sure.
To illustrate matters, consider the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. It has an "Office of Academic Personnel" that is a faculty HR unit within their senior vice chancellor's office. See link http://academicpersonnel.unc.edu/faculty-policies-procedures-guidelines/

Compare/contrast with https://www.unomaha.edu/academic-and-student-affairs/academic-affairs/academic-human-resources/

Of course, our committee really isn't in a position to prescribe a solution. Still it seems to us that UNO could have staff working with James McCarty devoted to faculty personnel issues. In this role, they could take on the issue of a Faculty/Staff Safety site, similar to the site for students (above). This staff could develop a flowchart or graph that describes the resources that are currently available at UNO. This is something that faculty senate desires. The decision making authority would reside with BJ Reed, but this unit within his office would organize/implement.

Finally, there was one issue that came up. It came up in reference to the fact that UNO does not have an Intranet. The link for faculty/staff on the University Website is an almost invisible link at the bottom of the page, under "Just for you." If important information is contained in this link, shouldn't it be easier for faculty and staff to find?

**PENDING:**

1. **UNO Constituency Safety & Well-being** (in Faculty Personnel & Welfare, 5/15)
   Senator Scherer reported better education, coordination and communication of information to all constituencies on how to facilitate the health, safety and well-being of ALL of its constituents:
   a. Student Safety Website very impressive but would like to see a Faculty and Staff Safety website
   b. Confusion on resources for faculty staff (Ombudsmen, EAP person, counseling, Behavioral Review Team, etc.). What information is confidential? What is not? Where to go?
   c. BRT: Student Concerns—Student is the focal person or person of concern and faculty, staff and students can report here. If is the person of concern is a faculty or student, where does a faculty or staff person report? What are the mechanisms for dealing with the issue(s)?
   • On 10/12/16 this topic will be postponed until March 2017.
   • (dismissed by EC&C on 4/5/17.)

2. **Wellness Initiative** concerning HPER fees and possible consultant. (Senator Noble continues to report) (8/17/16 goal of FP&W)

3. **Bias Assessment Response Team**
   Sent to the Faculty Personnel & Welfare Committee to decide if a presentation is necessary or if this information can be put in writing and sent to the Senators. (Sent to FP&W 11/2/16).
   (dismissed by EC&C on 4/5/17.)

C. **Committee on Goals and Directions:** Senator Ostler reported the Committee met March 29, 2017.
   Present: Anderson Arbelaez, Bereitschaft, Hawkins, Ostler, Stacy
   Report: The Goals and Directions Committee finalized the following resolution on immigration. Senator Ostler moved and Senator Adams seconded to send it back to
RESOLUTION: Immigration
WHEREAS there is concern on the UNO campus and in the wider community about the Trump administration’s currently enacted and proposed immigration policy, particularly in regard to the status of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program; and
WHEREAS UNO offers a Dreamer’s Pathway Scholarship for students who are DACA recipients, DACA eligible, or Nebraska residents who are seeking an undergraduate degree at UNO; and
WHEREAS a stated goal in the current version of UNO’s strategic plan is to “recruit, develop, retain, and support a diverse student body reflecting a dynamic metropolitan community”; and
WHEREAS the Faculty Senate has reaffirmed the Message from the University of Nebraska Leadership on the Recent Executive Order on Immigration, dated January 30, 2017, which states that, “Our pledge to you is that the University of Nebraska will keep working every day to be the place where all feel welcome, valued, and safe”;
BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate supports the policy of the UNO Department of Public Safety to not allow any federal agency to enter campus without a search warrant from a court or a subpoena; and
FURTHERMORE that the Faculty Senate supports the policy of the UNO Department of Public Safety to not inquire about students’ immigration status, and if this information is disclosed, to not share this information with any federal agency; and
FURTHERMORE that the Faculty Senate supports the continuation of compliance to strict confidentiality regulations under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy (FERPA), by which student records cannot be disclosed to federal agencies; and
FURTHERMORE that the Faculty Senate reiterates that faculty and staff are obliged to serve students equally regardless of their real or perceived immigration status, and that faculty and staff should be protected from any repercussions of doing so; and
FURTHERMORE that the Faculty Senate requests the continuation of financial assistance from UNO to students regardless of immigration status and any and all changes in federal policy; and
FURTHERMORE that the Faculty Senate requests that UNO work with students’ consular representatives to provide reasonable accommodations for online continuation and completion of classes and degree programs in the event of deportation; and
FURTHERMORE that the Faculty Senate requests that UNO commit to finding additional ways to academically and financially support DACA students if the program is terminated.

PENDING:
1. Facilities Planning and Faculty Representation (Sent to G&D 2/10/16) – As important and continuous decisions are made regarding facilities planning on campus, we would like to see more faculty involvement in these plans, and be allowed frequent opportunities to engage in discussion with administration about facilities planning. The one committee the Faculty Senate is aware of is the
University Committee on Facilities Planning, which typically meets once a year. The University Committee on Technology Resources, Services & Planning meets more frequently, but its primary focus is on the technology needs of the campus. In a previous meeting Goals & Directions met with Deb Smith-Howell to address administrative communication and questions about the University’s Strategic Plan and the Faculty Senate’s part in that process. We discussed the possibility of a more regular liaison with Dr. Smith-Howell with a representative from the F.S. Goals and Directions Committee that could increase the level of communication and information in this area.

2. **Unit Based Recruiting:** (Sent to G&D 8/17/16) This item has focused on how individual departments may contribute to the recruitment and retention of students in better pursuit of the University’s enrollment goals. Goals and Directions temporarily tabled this item and it will remain on our Pending list.

3. **How to Encourage Faculty to Serve on the Faculty Senate:** (12/7/16 sent to G&D) Informal data collection by the committee of approximately 40 UNO faculty members has generally revealed that Service of this nature tends to be acknowledged with little payoff compared to the perceived time commitment associated with governance. There is also a great deal of misinformation about the time obligations; nevertheless, most of the faculty we talked to showed little interest in this service even after we answered questions. The Goals and Directions Committee is now discussing ways to help the departments incentivize Faculty Senate and other University service opportunities by increasing by better recognizing the value of this service in ways such as higher Merit rankings on Annual Review, etc.

D. **Committee on Professional Development:** Senator Adams reported the Committee met on March 29, 2017. Present: Senators Adams, Woolf, Feng, Boron  Excused: Senator Nordman

We continued our work on the policies and documentation regarding Intellectual Property and Faculty Development Fellowship. After discussion, we agreed to begin drafting a resolution on the IP issue in which we will be asking UNO administration—likely BJ Reed—to 1) gather all relevant policies and have them made available in one place on the UNO website and 2) review the IP policies to make sure they reflect changes to the range of IP faculty now produce. Senator Adams will begin drafting the resolution based on language the committee generated during the meeting; we hope to have our resolution ready to go at least by the May senate meeting.

On the FDF issue, we looked at the FDF policy that is included in the AAUP contract (page 21) and then discussed moving toward drafting a resolution. We decided to first contact James McCarthy to request a copy of the “rules” that are referred to in the Board of Regents FDF policy. Senator Adams agreed to request the rules. Once we have those rules—or clarification if any such rules exist—we will likely move forward with a resolution asking for the FDF policies to be gathered in one space and for clarification on the criteria used to make decisions on FDF (at this point we have not seen any clear criteria that is by deans or advisory groups to make such decisions).

At the end of our meeting we talked briefly about our April meeting and agreed that in April we will discuss our committee Chair/Vice chair positions for next year.
1. **10/2016:** Concerns have been raised about the **ownership of research/creative activity/intellectual property**, particularly with regard to software, but we are exploring this issue broadly, with the following questions:
   a. What policies/practices describe intellectual property?
   b. How does ownership of intellectual property work with “new” technologies, like the Digital Commons?
   c. How or to what extent are royalties/fees received from books, research, or creative activities impacted?
      [Because Victor Winter raised this issue but was not at our meeting, we are asking him to speak more about this at our next meeting. Depending on where this goes, we may need to talk with administrators from a range of offices as well as the Dean of the Library]

2. **10/2016:** Given a growing number of questions and concerns about **Faculty Professional Development Leave policies/procedures**, our committee will be gathering information (policies/procedures) at all levels (regents, university, colleges, departments) and comparing those documents in order to explore questions, including:
   a. Can faculty get a full year of leave if waiting until 12 years of service instead of at 6 years?
   b. What are the earning restrictions while on leave (sabbatical)?
   c. What documents govern how leave is prioritized/awarded?
   d. What are the criteria for leave across colleges/departments? How consistent are these?
   e. Who all reviews and/or weighs in on these decisions?
   f. What language does the AAUP contract have regarding leave/sabbatical?

**E. Committee on Rules:** Senator Nash reported the Committee met on March 29, 2017. **Present:** Sue Bishop, Jeremy Johnson, Paul Landow, Olivier Maisondieu Laforge, Bob Nash. **Absent:** Samantha Clinkinbeard (excused), Kathy Peterson (excused).

Sue Bishop attended the meeting to distribute copies of the 120 “Committee Service Preference” forms that were received. Sue also provided spreadsheets tabulating the survey responses, and assisted the Rules Committee in its work of filling university committee vacancies.

Candidates for 47 vacancies on 25 committees need to be identified, and the Rules Committee is in the process of contacting candidates to confirm their willingness to serve.

Candice Batton, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs, has asked if the Senate would be interested in appointing a second Faculty Senate representative to the Academic Assessment Committee (AAC). She indicated that the size of the AAC is expanding for the next 2-3 years to: 1) make the committee workload more manageable for members, 2) to increase knowledge of assessment processes on campus, and 3) to facilitate peer mentoring for assessment.

University Committees needing Faculty Senator representatives or liaisons for 2017-2018:
- AAUP Executive Committee (AAUP member)
- Academic Freedom Coalition of Nebraska (AFCON)
- Academic Assessment Committee #1
- Academic Assessment Committee #2

(The Faculty Senate had assumed that Faculty Senators were appointed to...
AAC as representatives, not worker-bees.)

- Faculty Grievance Committee – Candidate #1 (FP&W Committee at August retreat)
- Faculty Grievance Committee – Candidate #2 (FP&W Committee at August retreat)
- Graduate Council (Graduate Council member)
- Academic Planning Council #1 (AC&A Committee at August retreat)
- Academic Planning Council #2 (G&D Committee at August retreat)
- Strategic Planning Steering Committee (G&D Committee at August retreat)

**PENDING**

1. Clarification of faculty representation on the University Committee on Excellence in Teaching.

**F. Committee on Academic & Curricular Affairs:** Senator Miller reported the Committee met at the Criss Library (CL 307) on 3/29/17 at 2:30 p.m.

**Members Present:** Laura Grams, Jodi Kreiling, Stu Bernstein, Burch Kealey, Ken Dick and Holly Miller

**Guests Present:** Phil Covington

Attendees were welcomed. Two agenda items were announced – the Academic Integrity Policy and the proposal to create a M.S. in Biomechanics. We started with the Academic Integrity Policy and Phil was invited to speak about record keeping regulations as set forth by the Board of Regents and application of those regulations at UNO. The 2014 sexual misconduct procedures were briefly discussed as a record keeping comparison. Committee members spoke about wanting to identify repeat offenders, but wanting faculty members to be able to use discretion in this process. Concerns were voiced about records of misconduct following students and impacting their future professional careers. A lengthy discussion followed. Attendees agreed that the University needs to have processes in place to guide faculty actions. The current draft of these policies were shared with 8 faculty members from across campus earlier in March. Their comments and suggestions were discussed by committee members. The Academic Integrity Policy and Policies and flow chart below reflect the current status of these process.

---

**UNO Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures [DRAFT]**

Adopted by the UNO Faculty Senate on (date).

The UNO academic integrity policy and procedures apply to both undergraduate and graduate students. However, for graduate students, the role of the Department Chair refers to the Graduate Program Chair, and the role of the college and dean refer to the University of Nebraska Graduate College and the UNO Graduate Dean. In the procedures below, “school days” are defined as those days on which the University is in session.

Academic Integrity Policy

The maintenance of academic honesty and integrity is a vital concern of the University community. Any student found responsible for violating the policy on
Academic Integrity may be subject to both academic and disciplinary sanctions. Violations of the policy on Academic Integrity include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Cheating

Copying or attempting to copy from an academic test or examination of another student; using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, notes, study aids or other devices for an academic test, examination or exercise; engaging or attempting to engage the assistance of another individual in misrepresenting the academic performance of a student; or communicating information in an unauthorized manner to another person for an academic test, examination or exercise.

2. Fabrication and Falsification

Falsifying or fabricating any information or citation in any academic exercise, work, speech, test or examination. Falsification is the alteration of information, while fabrication is the invention or counterfeiting of information.

3. Plagiarism

Presenting the work of another as one's own (i.e., without proper acknowledgment of the source) and submitting examinations, theses, reports, speeches, drawings, laboratory notes or other academic work in whole or in part as one's own when such work has been prepared by another person or copied from another person. Materials covered by this prohibition include, but are not limited to, text, video, audio, images, photographs, websites, electronic and online materials, and other intellectual property.

4. Abuse of Academic Materials and/or Equipment

Destroying, defacing, stealing, or making inaccessible library or other academic resource material.

5. Complicity in Academic Dishonesty

Helping or attempting to help another student to commit an act of academic dishonesty.

6. Falsifying Grade Reports

Changing or destroying grades, scores or markings on an examination or in an instructor's records.

7. Misrepresentation to Avoid Academic Work

Misrepresentation by fabricating an otherwise justifiable excuse such as illness, injury, accident, etc., in order to avoid timely submission of academic work or to avoid or delay the taking of a test or examination.
8. Other

Academic units and members of the faculty may prescribe and give students prior notice of additional standards of conduct for academic honesty in a particular course, and violation of any such standard of conduct shall constitute violation of this policy.

Academic Integrity Procedures

Under the Bylaws of the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska [Sections 2.9 and 4.1(i)], the respective colleges of the University have jurisdiction over procedural matters concerning academic dishonesty. Just as the task of inculcating values of academic honesty resides with the faculty, the faculty is entrusted with the discretionary authority to decide how incidents of academic dishonesty are to be resolved.

In cases where a faculty member finds that a student has committed any form of academic dishonesty, the faculty member may, in the exercise of his or her professional judgment, impose an academic sanction as severe as giving the student a failing grade in the course. In cases involving an academic sanction, the faculty member shall initiate the following procedures, starting at Step 1 and continuing only as necessary to Steps 2 or 3.

Step 1: Determination and Reporting of Offense and Sanctions

The faculty member shall discuss the matter with the student either in person or through e-mail, and shall:

1. Explain to the student the basis for the suspicion of academic dishonesty; and

2. Give the student a reasonable opportunity to explain the matter.

If the student offers an unsatisfactory explanation, does not respond within seven school days after first being notified (in person or through e-mail) of the suspected academic dishonesty, or if the faculty member otherwise concludes that the student has violated the academic integrity policy, the faculty member shall notify the student of any sanction for the offense through a letter or e-mail. The faculty member shall explain to the student his or her rights to mediation, as described in step 2, and appeal, as described in step 3.

Any sanction imposed by the faculty member, such as retaking a test or rewriting a paper, or failure in the entire course, shall be limited to the course. If the student does not respond or make a request for mediation or appeal within ten school days after the date of first being notified in writing of any sanction for academic dishonesty, then the student is considered to have accepted the sanction, and the faculty member shall make a written report of the facts of the case, including any pertinent materials related to the academic dishonesty. This report shall be retained by the faculty member for one year following the last day of the semester of the course in which the sanction for academic dishonesty was imposed, in
Keeping with the records policy of the NU Board of Regents referenced below.

Whenever an academic sanction is imposed that directly results in a grade of ‘F’ in the entire course, the faculty member’s report shall be conveyed to the department chair and dean of the college in which the course is offered, and to the UNO Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards, and the faculty member shall inform the student in writing that a report has been made. Student conduct proceedings shall be initiated, and students may be subject to disciplinary action up to and including expulsion under the UNO Student Code of Conduct. Students shall be informed of their right to appeal, in accordance with the procedures established by the UNO Student Code of Conduct. In keeping with Board of Regents policy, records of cases resulting in expulsion or suspension shall be retained indefinitely, and records of other cases shall be retained for six years. Upon graduation or after two years of separation from the university, students may request that records of any cases not resulting in expulsion or suspension be expunged.

Cases involving lesser sanctions that do not result in a grade of ‘F’ in the entire course, such as retaking a quiz or rewriting a paper, may be reported at the discretion of the faculty member. However, if a faculty member reports any sanction imposed for academic dishonesty to the department chair or dean of the college in which the course is offered, or to the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards, then the faculty member shall inform the student in writing that a report has been made.

The Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards shall maintain a record of students who are reported to have violated the policy on Academic Integrity. Student conduct proceedings shall be initiated whenever a student is reported for violating the policy on Academic Integrity in more than one course. If a student is found not responsible for violating the academic integrity policy after mediation (Step 2) or appeal (Step 3), any records related to the incident shall be destroyed.

When academic dishonesty occurs in courses that are taught for a learning community, such as the Honors Program or a scholarship-based learning community, the faculty member may convey the report of any sanction to that learning community’s director or academic adviser, and if so, the faculty member shall inform the student in writing that a report has been made.

Step 2: Mediation

If the faculty member and student cannot reach agreement as to the matter of an alleged incident of academic dishonesty, then either party may request the departmental chair or UNO Ombudsperson to serve as a confidential mediator, exploring the student's intentions, the gravity of the suspected offense, and the appropriateness of the sanction. This request must be made within ten school days after the date of the first notification, either in person or via e-mail, of any form of sanction imposed for academic dishonesty. If the matter is satisfactorily resolved among these three parties, then a written record of the resolution shall be prepared by the mediator, communicated to both the faculty member and student, and retained by the faculty member for one year following the end of the course, in keeping with the records policy of the NU Board of Regents referenced below.
keeping with the Board of Regents policy on records retention. Any form of sanction agreed to in mediation that directly results in a grade of ‘F’ in the entire course shall be reported to the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards as described in Step 1, and the mediator shall inform the student in writing that a report has been made. Lesser sanctions shall not be reported further.

Step 3: Appeal within the College

If the matter of an alleged incident of academic dishonesty cannot be resolved satisfactorily through mediation (Step 2), or if either the faculty member or the student do not wish the departmental chair to mediate, then either party may request the dean of the college to convene an appropriate college standing committee with student representation or impanel a committee with student representation to consider the matter of the alleged academic dishonesty. The request for appeal shall be made within ten school days after the date of the first notification of any form of sanction for academic dishonesty or, if Step 2 is pursued, within ten school days after the date of any unsuccessful attempt to resolve the issue through mediation. The membership of the college committee shall be drawn from the college in which the course is taught. The college committee shall function in accordance with the procedural guarantees provided in Section 5.4 of the Bylaws of the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska.

If the committee finds the student did not violate the UNO academic integrity policy, the faculty member shall award a grade for the student's work and course without prejudice, and all records related to the incident, apart from those normally retained for grading purposes, shall be destroyed. This includes any report of the incident which had been conveyed (see Step 1) to the department chair, dean of the college in which the course is offered, Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards, or learning community for which the course is offered.

If the committee finds that the student has violated the policy, it shall uphold the faculty member's sanction. The dean shall convey a report of the incident, including the sanction and the committee’s decision that the student has violated the policy, to the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards, the student, and the faculty member. The dean shall retain the evidence and records of the committee’s proceedings in accordance with the policies of the Board of Regents and UNO on the retention of disciplinary records.

Withdrawals

The procedures described above still apply if a student who is suspected of violating the UNO academic integrity policy withdraws from the course at any point.

Repeat Offenses

The Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards shall maintain a record of students who have violated the UNO academic integrity policy. Students who
are reported for violating the policy on Academic Integrity in more than one course are subject to disciplinary action up to and including expulsion under the UNO Student Code of Conduct. Students shall be informed of their right to appeal such disciplinary action, in accordance with the procedures established by the UNO Student Code of Conduct. The disposition of such cases shall be communicated to any faculty members who communicated a report to the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards concerning that student’s violation of the academic integrity policy, and to the dean of the student’s College. When students graduate or are separated from the University, any record of sanctions for academic integrity violations retained by the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards shall be destroyed.

Annual Report

Each year near the beginning of the Fall semester, the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards shall convey an anonymized report to the UNO Faculty Senate including the total number of academic integrity cases reported during the preceding academic year, the number that involved failure in the entire course, as well as the number and final disposition of any academic integrity cases adjudicated under the UNO Student Code of Conduct.

Records Retention and Communication

Records shall be retained when the student is found in violation of this policy in accordance with applicable Board of Regents policy. Records may be communicated outside the immediately concerned parties (Department, Dean’s Office, Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards, Learning Community, etc.) only if the student has been found to violate the academic integrity policy and no further mediation or appeal may be made under the procedures described above.

Syllabus Language

The Faculty Senate recommends that faculty include as part of the syllabus language: “UNO has an academic integrity policy and procedures available at [web address]”, in addition to any other comments on academic integrity that may be included in the syllabus.

(Faculty Senate policy as of 3/28/2016) – proposed for revision 12/2016, updated 3/2017

---

**UNO Academic Integrity Flow Chart for Faculty**

This is intended only as an illustration of the procedures for handling potential violations of the academic integrity policy. It does not supersede the language of the UNO Academic Integrity Procedures and Policy. Students have the right to appeal as described in those Procedures.

What happens if an instructor discovers or is told about a potential violation of the
academic integrity policy. First, does the instructor judge that a violation occurred?

NO: no further action is required.

YES: The instructor communicates to the student, in person or in writing, the basis for the suspicion of academic dishonesty, and gives the student a reasonable opportunity to explain.

Is the explanation unsatisfactory, or does the student fail to respond?

NO: No further action is required. The instructor need not retain any record of the incident.

YES: The instructor determines an appropriate sanction for the violation, communicates it in writing to the student, and informs the student that UNO’s academic integrity policy includes provisions for mediation and appeal, which must be requested within ten school days.

Does the student respond or request mediation or an appeal within ten school days?

NO: The instructor prepares a report of the incident and preserves it for one year.

YES: The instructor follows appropriate procedures for Mediation (Step 2) or Appeal (Step 3).

Does the instructor agree to participate in Mediation?

NO: Either the instructor or student may request that an Appeal (Step 3) be pursued instead.

YES: The Department Chair or UNO Ombudsperson may be asked to mediate.

Who needs to make a report to whom, and when?

Whenever an instructor communicates to a student a sanction for a violation of academic integrity, a record of the incident should be made and preserved for at least one year. This record MUST be reported further, as described below, if the sanction directly results in a grade of ‘F’ in the entire course. Lesser sanctions MAY be reported at the instructor’s discretion, only if no mediation or appeal occurs. If mediation occurs, then the mediator reports the results. If an appeal occurs, then the College Dean reports the results. Students must be informed whenever a further report of their case is made.

Is the student given a sanction – either by the instructor or at the end of a process of mediation or appeal – that directly results in a grade of ‘F’ in the entire course?

NO: It is up to the instructor’s discretion whether to report the incident to the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards, or to other parties (e.g.
Department Chair, College Dean, Learning Community). However, ANY time a report is made, the student must be informed in writing that a report has been made.

YES: The instructor MUST send a report of the incident to the Department Chair, College Dean, and Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards. Student Conduct proceedings will be initiated and students may be subject to additional disciplinary sanctions up to and including suspension or expulsion.

Is the student a repeat offender who has been reported to violate the academic integrity policy in more than one course?

NO: Student conduct proceedings are initiated if the sanction directly results in a grade of ‘F’, but not in the case of lesser sanctions.

YES: Student conduct proceedings are initiated if a student is found to be a repeat offender. Students may be subject to additional disciplinary sanctions up to and including suspension or expulsion.

What happens to the records?

This policy follows the Board of Regents policy on records retention, in coordination with the UNO Student Conduct procedures. Records are retained indefinitely when student disciplinary proceedings related to violations of the academic integrity policy result in suspension or expulsion. These records cannot be expunged. Upon graduation or separation from the university for two years, students can request to expunge other records related to violation of the academic integrity policy. In the absence of such a request, these records are kept for six years like other conduct records.

What if the faculty member chooses not to report a sanction of less than ‘F’ in the entire course?

This is up to each faculty member’s discretion, but choosing not to report means that if a student commits an academic integrity violation again in another course, UNO and other faculty members will have no way of knowing about the previous violation.

What syllabus language is recommended?

The UNO Faculty Senate recommends that faculty include a link to this policy in the syllabus, along with any additional academic integrity information that may be important for the course.

- - - - - - - - - - - -

Next the committee discussed the proposed MS in Biomechanics and had the following questions. These questions were sent to Keristiena Shenouda, Project Specialist from the Office of Academic Affairs.

1. Can the current faculty meet the mentoring and teaching work load that will be created with the addition of the students in this program?
2. What teaching assignments will these graduate students be capable of fulfilling or required to do? Is the expectation that students in this program will pay tuition and not teach?

3. On page 5, the process for thesis hours is explained. Are there faculty members identified who will serve as committee members?

4. On page 11, mention is made of the current "strong enrollments" in existing classes. Will the students in the proposed MS in Biomechanics be taking classes with PhD students?
   
   Committee members will revisit the discussion of this proposal in their April meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

**PENDING:**

1. **Request for Faculty Working Committee** for Definition/Discussion of Student Academic Integrity (from Candice Batton) *(to AC&A 1/6/16) (see above 4/5/17)*

2. **MS in Biomechanics** (assigned 3/17)

### V. Old Business

**PENDING**

**A. Grading Policy Change for “F” “FW” Grades** *(Policy draft 11/02/15 by Financial Support and Scholarships Office, updated 11/15/15.)*  
(Another issue to note is verification of attendance.) *(Fall 2016 w/ Senator Grams and Executive Committee)*  
*(On 3/1/17, the EC&C had these questions and asked that they be put on the EC&A agenda:)*

1. What is the policy for data storage?
2. Are Faculty, both full time and adjunct, responsible for records retention?
3. Why are E-mails sent as reminders going out too often - - every day or so?)

**B. Participation in UNO Faculty Senate** *(Fall 2016 to EC&C Pending)*

1. Need to encourage and strengthen participation on UNO Faculty Senate.
2. One possibility might be to change the FS Constitution
3. Discussions with Colleges
4. Go to Chairperson mentor(s)?
5. Go to Board of Chairs

### VI. New Business

**A. Request for Presentations at Meetings**

1. **Dan Shipp, VC, SA & EM and Omar Correa, AVC, EM**
   
The EC&C decided to invite Dan Shipp and Omar Correa to speak at next week’s (4/12/17) full Senate meeting about significant enrollment and retention goals already achieved at UNO, and future goals set.

2. **Jonathan Benjamin-Alvarado, AVC, SA**
   
   Received: 3/28/17
   
   *Sue:*
   
   *In my capacity as the Assistant Vice Chancellor, I have been working on a comprehensive analysis of inclusion and equity here at UNO. Part of the process was a contracting external consultants to assess faculty, staff and*
student responses to focus groups on diversity, inclusion and equity. I have the results and was wondering if I couldn’t get on the schedule for the May meeting. The presentation is 15 minutes in length and I can field questions for a few minutes as well. Let me know what my next step is.

Sincerely,
Jonathan Benjamin-Alvarado, Ph.D.
Professor of Political Science
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, and Interim Director, Office of Latino/Latin American Studies.

The EC&C decided that this would be a good presentation for the August 16, 2017, Faculty Senate Retreat. Sue Bishop will contact him and invite him to speak then.

B. Chancellor’s Farewell

Chancellor’s Farewell Open House
Tuesday, April 18, 2017 - 3 P.M. to 5 P.M.
Thompson Alumni Center
RSVP by April 10.

C. Invitation to Faculty/Staff Banquet for Beth Brown-Gershovich

Received from Donna Hathaway 3/27/17:

The Chancellor said it was fine for Beth Brown-Gershovich to come. Who will invite her? Does Faculty Senate want to invite her as a guest of someone already attending and let her know the purpose of the invitation?

The EC&C agreed and Sue Bishop will invite her.

VII. The meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m. with announcements.

VIII. Announcements

A. Faculty Senate Mtg: Wednesday, April 12, 2017, 2 p.m., CEC 230/231.

B. Chancellor’s Farewell Open House: Tuesday, April 18, 2017, 3 P.M. to 5 P.M., Thompson Alumni Center, RSVP by April 10.

C. EC&A Mtg: Wednesday, April 19, 2017, 2 p.m., EAB 200

D. Faculty/Staff Awards Banquet: Wednesday, April 26, 2017, (MBSC Ballroom, 6:30 p.m. Social, 7:15 p.m. Dinner.) Invitations will be sent, RSVP required.

E. EC&C Mtg: Wednesday, May 13, 2017, 2 p.m., ASH 196

F. Faculty Senate Change Over Mtg: Wednesday, May 10, 2017, 2 p.m., CEC 230/231 Mammel Hall 117.