

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Fech, Franti, Hachtmann, Konecky, LaCost, Lindquist, McCollough, Prochaska-Cue, Rapkin, Zimmers

Absent: Bradford, Eccarius, Schubert

Date: Wednesday, April 22, 2009

Location: Faculty Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

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 to Order

Prochaska-Cue called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Interview of Candidates for CBA Dean

Prochaska-Cue reminded the Committee that the third candidate for Dean of CBA will be interviewed by members of the Executive Committee on **Monday, April 27th, from 4:00 – 4:45 in room 208 of the Canfield Administration Building** (this is NOT the Chancellor's conference room but further down the hall). She asked that members attend the interview if possible.

2.2 AAUP Meeting on Campus

Fech reported that he and Franti attended the informational AAUP meeting this past Friday. Franti pointed out that there were only five people in attendance, including Professor Bryant who was coordinating the meeting. LaCost noted that there was a conference going on during this week that many of the faculty members in her college were attending and hectic rush at the end of the semester may have contributed to the low attendance.

Franti stated that it appears that the UNL chapter of the AAUP did not have a transition plan in place that would help keep the organization alive. He pointed out that new officers cannot be elected with so few faculty members participating in the chapter. He stated that the idea is to try to get younger faculty members involved with the organization.

Fech stated that Professor Bryant wondered if the Faculty Senate could help in recruiting new members. Fech pointed out that people would need to be informed why it would be good for them to join. Franti noted that until there is a precipitating event that would cause people to join, they probably would not want to. He stated the current members recognize that they need to establish an active group on campus.

Fech reported that the group discussed the attributes of the AAUP and how they could promote it. He noted that the plan is to see if current members can speak at department meetings about the organization. He stated that Professor Bryant indicated in an email memo that efforts to recruit people will be suspended over the summer due to the lack of people on campus.

3.0 Approval of 4/15/09 Minutes

Zimmers moved, and McCollough, seconded approval of the minutes as amended. Motion approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Senate Motion on Withdrawing Support for Current Budget Reallocation and Reduction Procedures

Prochaska-Cue reported that she and Fech were going to try and meet with Professors Wunder and Peterson to get more clarification on the motion they made at the April 7th meeting but there was a conflict in schedules.

Fech stated that he thinks most people would agree with the first two paragraphs of the motion but he would like to see the last statement modified.

Prochaska-Cue stated that she received an email from Professor Eckhardt stating that the motion should be one of reconsideration. She stated that she referred it to Bradford since he has been acting as parliamentarian, and they debated about the issue.

Prochaska-Cue reported that she received an email message for Emeritus Professor McShane about the motion as well. She stated that he may not be able to attend the April 28th meeting to speak on the motion but she will ask him if she can forward his comments to the Senate.

Lindquist pointed out that changes to the procedures should be done by an ad hoc committee of the APC. Fech pointed out that Professor Eckhardt believes it should be a committee of the Senate. Lindquist noted that it's an APC document, therefore it should be done by the APC. Fech suggested that the faculty members from the APC could be on a committee to rewrite the procedures.

Rapkin pointed out that this is far from the optimal time to push through this motion. He noted that we can express our opinion as a body and put the possible rewriting of the procedures on our goals for next year. He wondered whether a motion from the Executive Committee should be made that states that while the motion raises important issues, the timing of it suggests that we should postpone the motion. The Committee suggested waiting to see what comments are made at the Senate meeting on Tuesday.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Possible Motion on Faculty Salary Increases

Franti moved to table the discussion. No second was made. Discussion followed but no action was taken by the Committee.

5.2 Distance Education

LaCost reported that she recently attended a meeting where she received a working draft of a handout about distance education. She stated that this is an effort to link distance education programs at all of the NU campuses and to create awareness of the programs. She noted that the draft document included a chart of activities and key strategic goals in creating awareness of the program. She stated that, from her understanding, any distance education program will become the property of the university. She pointed out that the current policy allows the faculty member to retain some rights to the distance education course.

Rapkin reported that faculty members could receive \$3,000 for formulating a distance education course. Hachtmann pointed out that the payment you receive for doing this is not in your salary, but it can be used to purchase some things. She noted that it could be used for travel. Prochaska-Cue pointed out that this could have an impact on 12 month employees because they are not eligible to receive additional pay.

Rapkin stated that some distance education courses are being formulated as part of a faculty member's course load and these courses are beginning to supplant normal teaching.

LaCost stated that an explanation was given at the meeting that this program was being created because people have trouble finding the distance education courses for the other campuses.

Rapkin stated that the fundamental issue here is that the program seems to have been created without faculty input. LaCost stated that she was surprised to learn about this because her college is heavily involved in distance education courses.

Prochaska-Cue suggested that the Committee discuss this with SVCAA Couture or invite Associate Vice Chancellor Bateman and Provost Pratt in to talk about this effort.

5.3 Possible Changes in Health Benefits

Fech stated that he learned from an Extension Educator that there may be some new benefits coming out this year. One deals with LB 515 which would extend the age of a dependent from 23 to 30 for health insurance coverage although it would be up to the employer's discretion whether to participate in this program. Prochaska-Cue pointed out that there may be some potential conflict because there are still some professors who have federal blue cross coverage and the cutoff for the dependent is 22. She noted that this might prevent the university from participating.

Griffin noted that Professor Hope, UNL's faculty representative to the University-Wide Benefits Committee is meeting with the Executive Committee next week and she plans on reporting about some of the proposed changes.

5.4 Global Water Institute

Franti reported that he recently received information about creating a poster for a food and water conference occurring on campus. He noted that there is a group trying to form a global water institute here. As he understands it, the goal is to eventually bring in high level scientists to form the nucleus of this group but there has been little faculty input about this institute. He pointed out that faculty might support this if they knew about it. He stated that decisions are being made that would effect the faculty without any consultation of the faculty. Fech stated that there are two outside groups, the University of Nebraska Foundation and the Robert Daugherty Foundation that are backing the global water institute.

Lindquist noted that the university has been invited to submit a proposal to the USAID to aid agricultural development in Afghanistan. He stated that the proposal being developed involves a project that would need to mimic conditions in Afghanistan. This would require a facility being built in western Nebraska that could require maintained support even after the project was completed. He pointed out that the proposal is being drafted by IANR and UNL administrators with faculty input. They are interested in more faculty interest and involvement.

Franti stated that universities around the country have outside investors who are interested in creating specific programs but this is not a common practice for this university. He stated that administrators want these kinds of projects but ultimately it will change the culture of the faculty. He pointed out that Nebaskans will still want us to serve their needs. He noted that there is no reason why we can't serve both the citizens of the state and the outside interests but this will change the lives of the faculty and how we interact and what we do.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:43 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, April 29th at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and David Rapkin, Secretary.