

Hixson-Lied College of Fine and Performing Arts
Fall Faculty Meeting
Lied Commons
Friday, November 13, 2015
11:30 am – 1:00 pm

ATTENDEES:

Charles O'Connor, Dean

Christopher Marks, Associate Dean

Wendy Duerfeldt Schutte, Assistant Dean of Business & Fiscal Affairs

Department of Art & Art History: (DAAH) Stacy Asher, Margaret Bohls, Andrea Bolland, Santiago Cal, Eddie Dominguez, Dana Fritz, Aaron Holz, Karen Kunc, Walker Pickering, Pete Pinnell, Phil Sapirstein, Francisco Souto, Alison Stewart, Colleen Syron, Sandra Williams

Glenn Korff School of Music: (GKSOM) Scott Anderson, John Bailey, Carolyn Barber, Dale Bazan, Alisa Belflower, Anthony Bushard, Mark Clinton, Laura Damuth, Eph Ehly, Peter Eklund, Tony Falcone, Gretchen Foley, Rhonda Fuelberth, Paul Haar, Kevin Hanrahan, Hyewon Hwang, Peter Lefferts, William McMullen, Brian Moore, Susan Levine Ourada, Clark Potter, Jamie Reimer, John Richmond, Hans Sturm, Tyler White, Robert Woody, Brenda Wristen, Doug Bush, Tamara Riker (student)

Johnny Carson School of Theatre & Film: (JCSTF) Laurel Shoemaker, Wesley Broulik, Richard Endacott, Bill Grange, Steve Kolbe, Harris Smith, Paul Steger, Sharon Teo-Gooding, Sandy Veneziano

Dean's Office: Kathe Anderson, David Bagby, Rebecca Bennitt (minutes), Rachel Danay, Sara Fedderson, Joseph Morris, John Ross

Update on the College

Dean Charles O'Connor opened the meeting by welcoming faculty and inviting them to enjoy lunch during the faculty meeting. He discussed the historic announcement of a \$20 million gift to the Carson School from the Carson Foundation to develop the Carson Center for Emerging Media Arts, stating that this transformational gift was the largest gift in the history of the college, also the largest single gift given by the Carson Foundation. He congratulated the Carson school on this great opportunity. He noted that the Carson Center would be housed in the former Nebraska bookstore (\$9 million in renovations) and that the gift would contribute to creating a highly selective program with national distinction. He discussed how the Carson Center would focus on the intersection of traditional filmmaking and emerging media elements. He discussed UNL's contribution of eight new faculty lines, six new staff lines as well as additional resources related to equipment, facilities and it.

O'Connor went further in explaining how the Carson Center would expand the fundamental philosophy of the Carson School: developing narrative content and storytelling. Future Carson students would have exciting opportunities and could explore the boundaries of theatre disciplines, where sciences, arts and humanities intersect. He also noted that the Carson Center would triple the school's enrollment in the next few years.

O'Connor discussed overcoming the expectation of those outside of Nebraska by communicating how exciting our programs are and what we are capable of here. He

shared College had great faculty, staff and balance of traditions. As the College (beginning with the Carson Center) begins to differentiate itself amongst its peers, more students and more donors will come. He expressed his excitement about the new possibilities and asked the group for questions.

Pete Pinnell asked O'Connor to talk about the steps, beginning with how the JCSTF would handle Paul's return to the faculty in the Spring. O'Connor said there would be an interim Director of JCSTF that would serve in the 2016 spring semester with a search for a new director that would begin immediately. He shared that the new Director would provide directions, be in charge of hiring new faculty and staff and help to implement the changes coming with the Carson Center. O'Connor thanked Paul Steger for his ten years of meaningful service to the JCSTF.

Karen Kunc asked what would these new faculty positions do? O'Connor suggested that the Carson proposal didn't want to be too prescriptive and that many of the decisions would be at the discretion of the new director. He suggested that the hires could include computer scientists, designers and artists. He expected that there were many possibilities including areas related to special effects, animation and game design.

Minutes

With no additional questions on the Carson Center, O'Connor moved to discuss the approval of the minutes from the November 14, 2014 meeting (the College did not have faculty meeting Spring 2015) and the minutes from the October 16, 2015 meeting held for discussion on the new Graphic Design degree.

Bill Grange provided the motion to approve the minutes from November 14, with Carolyn Barber having the second. With no discussion, the minutes from November 14th, were approved.

Harris Smith provided the motion to approve the minutes from October 16, 2015 with Clark Potter having the second. With no discussion, the minutes from October 16th were approved.

Proposed Amendments to Bylaws – Christopher Marks

O'Connor handed the discussion over to Associate Dean Christopher Marks to seek approval on the proposed amendments to Bylaws. Marks stated that the proposed amendments were developed in order to clarify the current HLCFPA Bylaws and bring them into compliance with the UNL guidelines. He shared that the College Executive Committee had looked over and approved the amendments, so these come to the faculty today with a motion to approve and a second. Marks asked that the faculty vote on the amendments one-by-one. He also noted that the amendments would be passed with a two-thirds majority vote. With no questions, he began discussing the amendments:

Amendment 1: Minor Fixes and Clarifications

1. Replace "School of Music" with "Glenn Korff School of Music" in all instances (2.0, 6.6.1.5, 9.1.1.4, 9.3.1.3, 9.4.1.3, 9.5.1.3, 9.6.1.4, 9.7.1.1.3, 9.8.1.4, 9.9.1.2, 9.10.1.2)
2. 16.4.3.2.1: Replace "his" with "This" at opening of sentence.

3. 16.6.2: Replace reference to section “2.5.8” of UNL Bylaws with correct section “2.9.8”.
4. 16.6.16: Replace reference to section “2.5.4” of UNL Bylaws with correct section “2.9.4”.
5. 22.4: change internal reference to “20.5” with correct reference “22.5”.

Marks remarked that this amendment was largely housekeeping. He asked the faculty if there was any discussion? With no discussion, Marks asked for the vote. The amendment was passed unanimously.

Amendment 2: Addition of material to promotion and tenure files

Proposed language:

- 16.6 Rights of Access **and Contribution** To Materials Used In Personnel Evaluations
- 16.6.1 ~~Access to promotion and/or tenure files~~
~~Other faculty members in the candidate's department may contribute comments and other material to the candidate's file and material may be solicited from a variety of sources. For that reason, the Bylaws of the Board of Regents guarantee the individual being considered for tenure "access to all material submitted for his or her evaluation and the opportunity to respond in writing." The exception is material from external peer reviewers for which the faculty member has waived review rights.~~
Anyone (including the candidate) with relevant information for inclusion into the file may proffer that information at any level of consideration to the person responsible for conducting the review. That person shall determine, after consultation with the candidate, whether to include the material.
- 16.6.2 The rights of access and written response ~~is~~ **are** guaranteed by Sections 2.9.8 of the UNL Bylaws and 4.6 of the Bylaws of the University of Nebraska Board of Regents, **which states that “faculty members shall have access to all material submitted for their evaluation and the opportunity to respond in writing.” The exception is material from external peer reviewers for which the faculty member has waived review rights.**

Marks said that Amendment 2 addressed adding new information to the candidate’s review file and the right of the faculty member to waive access to those peer review documents. Marks asked for questions or any discussion? With no discussion, Marks

raised the question of the vote. Amendment 2 was passed unanimously.

Amendment 3: Introduction of new material at review meetings

Proposed language:

16.6.8.2 ~~no derogatory material sufficiently substantive to affect the decision is introduced for the first time at the meeting.~~ **New material of such a substantive nature as to adversely affect the decision shall not be introduced at any meeting unless the candidate is to be given an opportunity to respond.**

Marks discussed Amendment 3 and the introduction new material at meetings (departmental meetings). The proposed Bylaws suggested that candidates for Promotion and Tenure could have new materials added during a meeting, even if those materials could adversely affect the vote. This also gives the candidate the right to respond following said introduction. Marks said this was taken straight from the UNL Bylaws and asked for questions.

Peter Lefferts asked if the candidate needed to be alerted prior to the meeting of said new materials or would the issue need to be tabled until the candidate can respond. Marks responded affirmatively. He said it is responsibility of chair of meeting to determine if the material is substantive enough to be introduced.

Aaron Holz asked if the converse was true – could positive material be introduced? Marks replied that yes, if materials were introduced that resulted in a positive vote, the proceedings could continue without the necessary response. With no further discussion, Marks asked the faculty for the vote. Amendment 3 was passed unanimously.

Amendment 4: Rights of promotion/tenure candidate to request reconsideration of negative recommendation

Proposed language:

16.1.5 At every step in the process, the faculty member must be given copies of all recommendations and has the right to read and respond to any recommendation forwarded to the next level. **The candidate may request reasons for adverse recommendations or request reconsideration of the decision by the group or individual not recommending promotion or tenure. Results of such requests should be provided to the candidate in writing. No negative recommendation shall be forwarded until the reconsideration is complete. The department or college shall establish timelines for the candidate to request either a statement of reasons or reconsideration of a decision. If the candidate requests a statement**

of reasons or requests reconsideration of a decision within these time lines, such request shall be granted as expeditiously as possible. Departments and colleges must schedule the review process so that any reconsideration shall be completed in time to meet established submission deadlines to the next level of consideration. The purpose of the statement of reasons is to give an unsuccessful candidate an opportunity to prepare a rebuttal argument.

Marks stated that Amendment 4 addresses timing and opportunity for reconsideration, adding that if the department faculty makes a negative recommendation, the candidate should have the reconsideration responded to before it goes to next level. Marks asked if there were any questions. With no questions raised, he asked the faculty for the vote. Amendment 4 passed unanimously.

Amendment 5: Introduction of new material at college level

Proposed language:

22.6.1 the chairperson or director is to be given an opportunity to present additional materials that might help clarify the position taken by his/her department or school, prior to the final vote of the College Executive Committee. **New material of such a substantive nature as to adversely affect the decision shall not be introduced unless the candidate is to be given an opportunity to respond. It is the responsibility of the individual conducting the meeting to make the necessary judgments concerning the substantive nature of any new material, to convey new information to the person being evaluated and, if necessary, to delay the vote or decisions until the person has had the opportunity to respond.**

Marks said that Amendment 5 (introduction of new material at College level) essentially states the same as Amendment 3 (introduction of new materials at Department level) only changes in the meeting level. Marks asked for any questions. With no questions, Marks asked the faculty for the vote. Amendment 5 passed unanimously.

Amendment 6: Candidate's right to request reconsideration of College Executive Committee's recommendation

Proposed language:

22.6.3 If the College Executive Committee disagreement with the department or school remains after any subsequent review or appeal, the reasons for disagreement must be provided in writing to the chairperson/director and to the individual concerned, ~~and the negative recommendation with all supporting information is forwarded to the Dean for transmittal to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.~~

22.6.4 **If the College Executive Committee recommends against promotion or tenure, the candidate must be informed of the ability to obtain reasons and request reconsideration as described in 16.1.5. No negative recommendation shall be forwarded until the reconsideration is complete.**

Marks said this offers the candidate the opportunity to respond to the College Executive Committee and asked for questions. John Richmond asked if this was suggesting that the majority of the votes were negative? Marks responded that if the recommendation is in favor, then this does not become an issue. But, if the majority is negative, then the candidate must be provided the time to respond. With no further discussion, Marks raised the question of the vote. Amendment 6 was passed unanimously.

Amendment 7: Candidate's right to request reconsideration of Dean's recommendation

Proposed language:

22.6.5 After receiving the recommendations of the voting faculty, the chairperson/director, and the College Executive Committee, the Dean of the College will conduct an independent review of the file and any additional materials that might have been compiled in any review or appeal and will make an independent evaluation of the application. The Dean will forward his/her recommendation and all requested file materials to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. ~~The Dean also will send copies of his/her recommendation and that of the College Executive Committee to the faculty member,~~ **the candidate**, the College Executive Committee, and the chairperson/director. **If the Dean recommends against promotion or tenure, the candidate must be informed of the ability to obtain reasons and request reconsideration as described in 16.1.5.**

Marks said that Amendment 7 offers the candidate reconsideration from the Dean if

the recommendation is negative. Marks asked if there were any questions. With no questions, Marks raised the question of the vote to the faculty. Amendment 7 was passed unanimously. With no further discussion, Marks thanked the faculty and said that the amended Bylaws would be posted soon.

Closing Remarks

O'Connor thanked the faculty for their service and adjourned the meeting at 12:15 pm. The Spring HLCFPA Faculty Meeting is scheduled to be held on April 1, 2016 from 3:30-5:00 pm. The location has not yet been determined.

RB