FS Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee
Minutes
Tuesday, November 13, 2012
History Conference Room  11:00am – Noon

Present: Chris Exstrom (Chair), Roger Davis (Secretary), Nathan Buckner, Jan Moore, Marta Moorman.
Absent: Allan Jenkins, Janet Trewin
Handouts: Termination of Continuous Contract; Termination of Tenured Faculty;

1. Davis distributed the two handouts which provided basic information from Regents Bylaws and from other campuses in the NU system, the state college system, and other campuses, addressing terminology of adequate cause relative to terminating a continuous contract.

2. The committee began a detailed review of the UNK Post Tenure Review policy. The following observations emerged from the discussion:
   a. It appears clear that the document indicates that a person must have completed three years in tenure to have the document apply to them in their fourth year.
   b. The language of “substantial and continuing deficiency” seems unclear and without specific definition. It was noted that in the UNL Post Tenure Review document it states that: “The standards for substantial and chronic deficiency shall be determined by the faculty in each unit and, when approved by the appropriate unit administrator, dean, and vice chancellor, shall become part of its evaluation process.” The committee discussed the matter of where such language should be defined and whether departments could just reference a campus wide definition. At this point it seemed best to bring the topic to the attention of the Senate and let that body determine the best way to proceed.
   c. The committee discussed the distinct definitions and triggers for the self-selected review and the mandated review due to deficiencies. It appears that the intent of both reviews is meant to be positive, to support a desired program for advancement of a project or to provide a positive avenue to correct deficiencies. A question arose about how the two operated and if they operate distinct from one another. So, could someone choose a self-review, but the next year find themselves in a triggered review. Or, with the expectation of a triggered review, could someone initiate a self-review as a pre-emptive action? Does the limit of once every four years for reviews apply separately for each type?

3. The committee concluded its deliberations at noon and will continue discussion at the next meeting. Next meeting tentatively set for 11:00am on Tuesday, November 27. The chair will send poll members via Doodle, and send an announcement.
Academic Information Technology Committee Mitchell Center Conference Room November 2, 2012 Minutes, 8:00am

Present: Deb Schroeder, Janet Wilke, Jimmy Young, Scott Fredrickson (phone), Brenda Eschenbrenner, Nanette Hogg (chair), Jon Ritterbush, Thomas Freeman (secretary)

Absent: Kenzie Fisher (student representative, conflict with course schedule)

1. Digital Measures for faculty portfolios
   a. Informed that Digital Measures has been adopted with contracts signed, test system loaded and first user meetings scheduled. A goal is to have the system functioning before the accreditation visit.
   b. Some discussion of the process for adoption of the program with concern over apparent lack of faculty input. Seems process was through the administration forming a committee with the Deans providing faculty names for input. The top down approach seemed to not have input from the Faculty Senate (at least no memory of input), and concern was expressed about faculty buy in for the project.
   c. Committee decided to send a list of questions to Kathy Livingston via Nanette Hogg related to the Digital Measures software (purpose, utility to faculty and administration, access to data, data protection, copyrighted materials, etc.).

2. UNK Connections
   a. Discussion related to the discontinuation of UNK Connections as a purchaser of technology for the departments with the implementation of eShop. UNK Connections no longer exists and some roles (personnel) have been merged with the UNK Helpdesk and training and is now named Technology Solutions. Brief discussion occurred on the logic, economics, process and implications of the decision to the University and students. The potential for inappropriate distribution of software from individual campuses to other NU System campuses and the absence of checks to verify hardware and OS compatibility with orders were among the issues discussed.
   b. Currently, the general impression was that all technology purchases must go through eShop; however, due to a lack of a written policy it became apparent that the absolute requirement to use eShop was ambiguous (purchase order vs. purchase card, the apparent absence of a uniform requirement to use eShop across the NU System, purchase price above or below $5000, etc.).
   c. Motion was made by Scott Fredrickson (second Thomas Freeman) to forward a statement to the Faculty Senate as follows:

   Academic Information and Technology Committee strongly disagrees with and does not support the actions of Business Services, which closed UNK Connections to campus departments, thereby substantially increasing costs to the campus and increasing the probability that departments will acquire misconfigured hardware or mislicensed software, in addition to creating delays between ordering and actual deliveries.