

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** Bolin, Fech, Flowers, Franti, Konecky, McCollough, Prochaska-Cue, Rapkin, Schubert, Shea

**Absent:** LaCost, Lindquist, Stock

**Date:** Wednesday, July 22, 2009

**Location:** 201 Canfield Administration Building

**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

Fech called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

### 2.0 Announcements

#### 2.1 Update on AFCON Conference

Fech reported that Professor Laurie Thomas Lee, the Senate's representative to AFCON, informed him that AFCON has decided not to have any co-sponsors for their conference this fall.

#### 2.2 Ad Hoc Committee on Ayers' Disinvitation

Rapkin stated that a draft report has been written but work still needs to be done on the recommendations section. He noted that currently the report does not include recommending UNL host a symposium on academic freedom, but he is arguing in favor of including this in the report.

#### 2.3 AAUP Conference

Fech reported that he will be attending the AAUP conference in St. Paul, Minnesota at the end of July. He stated that he will give a report on the conference at the August 5<sup>th</sup> Executive Committee meeting.

### 3.0 Minutes of 7/8/09

No problems were found with the minutes from the July 8<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### 4.0 Unfinished Business

#### 4.1 Charge to Ad Hoc Committee on RIF Procedures

Fech reported that he met with Professor Bender, incoming chair of APC, to discuss the charge and they were very much in agreement with each other. It was decided that the ad hoc committee would include faculty representatives from the APC and the Senate, one representative each from UNOPA, UAAD, and ASUN. He reported that he and Bender also decided to offer the Chancellor the option of having an administrative representative

on the committee or just have someone available to meet periodically with the committee or the chair of the committee.

Fech reported that he and Bender met with the Chancellor yesterday to discuss the ad hoc committee. They pointed out that some modifications are needed, but the procedures are not as flawed as some say they are. Shea asked if this statement is a consensus of the Executive Committee or the Senate. Fech stated that he and Bender felt this way but they did not make the statement on behalf of the APC or the Senate.

Fech stated that it appeared that the Chancellor agreed somewhat and was open to discussion of possible changes. He noted that the Chancellor thinks his representative would not be a member of the committee but would be available to review and consider any possible changes to the procedures.

Rapkin asked if this meant that the Chancellor's representative would not be attending all of the ad hoc committee's meetings. Fech stated that he took it that way but suggested that the person might want to come occasionally or meet with the chair. He noted that they decided to leave it up to the Chancellor as to whether the administrative representative should meet occasionally with the committee or attend all of the meetings.

Fech stated that the members of the ad hoc committee are: Kathy Prochaska-Cue and Wes Peterson from the Senate; Shelley Fuller and Jeff Keown from the APC; Helen Fankhauser, UAAD; and Peg Johnson, UNOPA. The representative for ASUN has yet to be appointed.

Fech noted that the timeline for the committee is ambitious because he would like to have a draft of the changes by the December break.

Fech noted that one of the guiding principles of the charge to the ad hoc committee is to recognize the need for better and more informed advice to the Chancellor regarding budget cuts. Shea pointed out that the Executive Committee and APC cannot provide informed advice if they are not given adequate information.

Fech stated that he and Bender will attend the first meeting of the ad hoc committee. Shea suggested that the Chancellor's representative be invited to all of the meetings, but it is up to his/her discretion whether they want to attend all of the meetings.

#### **4.2 Update on Research Misconduct Policy Revision**

Shea reported that the faculty members on the research misconduct policy committee is working on the draft policy to respond to the complaints made at the April Senate meeting. He noted that there will be a meeting with the entire committee to review what the faculty members are suggesting for additional changes to the document. He stated that the idea is for the faculty to reach a consensus and bring it to the Executive Committee. Once the Executive Committee feels the document is okay it will go to the full Senate, hopefully in October.

Fech stated that the Executive Committee appreciates all of the work that Lindquist, Shea, LaCost and the administrators have done on this policy. Shea noted that Professor Dana Boden is now on the committee as well since she is the new ARRC chair.

Schubert asked when the faculty will be able to look at the policy. Shea stated that the draft will probably not be available to the faculty body until October. He pointed out that the administration, Faculty Senate, Board of Regents, and the federal agencies will all need to approve it before the policy becomes effective. He guessed that it will not be effective until the first of the year.

#### **4.3 Request to Change the Curriculum Committee Membership**

Fech reported that he contacted Professor Walklin, chair of the UCC, about adding another administrator to the committee. He noted that Professor Walklin wants to make sure that any changes or requests to the committee must be approved by the Senate. McCollough pointed out that the curriculum belongs to the faculty and must be kept that way.

Fech stated that the proposed changes will be made to the Senate to add the Director of General Education to the Curriculum Committee.

### **5.0 New Business**

#### **5.1 Chancellor Perlman**

##### New Evaluation Process of Administrators

Chancellor Perlman noted that he had mentioned at the Executive Committee's July 8<sup>th</sup> meeting that he is considering altering the performance review process of administrators. He stated that the process would be similar to the one that he just went through for his cumulative five year review. In that process rather than sending out evaluation questionnaires, an external consultant interviewed designated individuals and wrote a report. He stated that he found the report generated by the review of his performance to be extremely helpful and he would like to use this type of process again, probably for the Vice Chancellors and Deans only.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the proposed process meets the UNL bylaw specifications on administrative reviews. He noted that Senior Vice Chancellor Couture's review is coming up and this will give us an opportunity to experiment with this kind of review process. He stated that if it works, he will probably consider doing it for the review of deans.

Chancellor Perlman stated that each administrative review would have a faculty committee that plays a special role in the process. He noted that in the past the Senate Executive Committee served as the faculty committee for Vice Chancellor reviews. He noted that he did not identify specific people to serve on the faculty committee for his evaluation. The colleges elected someone, usually from the college executive committee, or they had the college Senate representative serve on the committee.

Chancellor Perlman reported that in the new evaluation process materials would be provided regarding the job description of the administrator as well as their goals and

accomplishments. Reports for the various interviews that are conducted will also be provided. He noted that the review would be conducted in a confidential manner and reports will go back to him. He pointed out that the thrust of the process is to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the administrator and what can be improved.

Chancellor Perlman stated that with the permission of the Executive Committee he would like to try this evaluation process this year, provided we can get a contract with a consultant for a reasonable price.

Franti asked if the consultant reports back to the faculty committee involved with the review. Chancellor Perlman stated that the report first goes to him and then he would provide the report to the appropriate parties. He noted that during the interview process, follow up questions and examples can be requested.

Franti asked if the report includes any raw data. Chancellor Perlman stated that a list of the people interviewed is provided. The people interviewed by the consultant are first identified by the Chancellor and Senior Vice Chancellor. These people are determined by position relative to the responsibilities of the administrator being evaluated.

Franti asked if the faculty committee would see the raw data. He noted that he is concerned that only two people would be allowed to interpret the data. Chancellor Perlman reported that what he received when he was interviewed is a description of the responses but no specific names were attributed to the comments.

Franti asked if the faculty committee saw the report would the members be able to weed out any bias. Chancellor Perlman stated that he didn't think so. He stated that the report gave him a flavor of what the responses were. He noted that the faculty focus group basically stated that they agreed with his leadership but felt there was a lack of interaction from him and that he did not obtain enough input from the faculty.

Fech asked how soon the Chancellor wanted feedback on the proposed process. Chancellor Perlman stated as soon as reasonably possible.

Franti asked if the process will still solicit feedback from any faculty member. He pointed out that some people might expect to be able to provide feedback. Chancellor Perlman noted that typically only a certain number of people are interviewed and some responses are made in the evaluations, but if the Executive Committee feels that this is important for faculty governance he will incorporate this into the evaluation process. Franti pointed out that some faculty members might feel that they did not have the opportunity to provide feedback if they wish to with this new process. Chancellor Perlman noted that members of the faculty focus group were told to speak to their colleagues to get input on his evaluation.

Franti stated that he thinks the proposal is good and the evaluation process will be more effective but there should still be the opportunity for all concerned faculty members to provide input.

### Innovation Campus

McCullough asked what the latest information is on Innovation Campus. Chancellor Perlman stated that the consultants were working very hard and the steering committee will be meeting with them soon to see the progress that has been made. He reported that there are some fairly decent ideas on how to manage the flood plain and reviews are beginning on best practices on how to manage the property and how to finance the project.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he is pleased with where the efforts are going. He noted that it was hoped that some of the original stimulus funds could be used for an agricultural research building but the money is to be used for reconstruction purposes, not construction of a new site. He reported that the university has asked for an extension to come up with a better site. He stated that the campus has now been told by the USDA that the master plan needs to be completed. The master plan consultants have come up with the proper site. He noted that Senator Nelson is working on obtaining \$3.5 million for the project. He reported that the business consultant has done a lot of work exploring our research strengths and whether there is a market for those strengths.

Griffin asked when the latest plans will be shown to the campus. Chancellor Perlman stated that he will ask when it will be rolled out to the campus. He thought it would probably not be until the end of September.

### Distance Education

Chancellor Perlman reported that there is a major initiative at the systems level to bring distance education from all campuses together. He noted that there has been a Regents policy which stated that distance education tuition for Nebraska residents could be no higher than in-state tuition rates, but the Regents removed this policy at its last meeting. He pointed out that this allows us to be a market player in the distance education field. He stated that there will be efforts to collaborate in terms of infrastructure. He noted that the initiative hopes to provide some economic efficiencies. He stated that distance education will not be controlled by Varner Hall, but the marketing and web design will be handled by Central Administration. He noted that the initiative should help coordinate distance education. He reported that several consultants reviewed our distance education programs and all said that there were some moderate economic advantages to be gained. Fech noted that the Committee has met with Interim Distance Education Director Paul Savory and Kristin Grosskopf, Distance Education Specialist to learn about the initiative.

### New Student Information System (SIS)

Griffin asked what the status is of the new student information system. Chancellor Perlman stated that it has to go live on the admissions' part by September 1<sup>st</sup>. He noted that the system will be implemented in waves as students go through the university. He reported that it has to be set for those students being admitted for the 2010 session. Next will come the financial aid package, and after that the registration package. He stated that there are critical deadlines that must be met.

Chancellor Perlman pointed out that everyone involved with setting up the new system believes that at the outset people will feel that the new SIS is not as good as the current system, but it will eventually have more flexibility to allow for improvements. He noted that the current system will no longer be supported so it is mandatory that we move to a different system. He stated that he knows there will be some transition issues but he is hoping that there won't be anything major.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the Vice Chancellor Franco and his staff in Student Affairs are working extremely hard on getting the new system up and running. He pointed out that the university was provided funding for the new system, but the funding did not provide for these people to get relief from their job responsibilities so these people are essentially doing two jobs.

### **5.2 Discussion Topics for President Milliken**

Fech reported that the luncheon with President Milliken has been postponed. He stated that the luncheon has not been rescheduled at this time.

### **5.3 Research Council Recommendations**

The Committee discussed possible members for the Council.

Shea noted that there have been some issues in the past with the Research Council. He stated that he has heard that the policy and procedures work is being done by the Research Advisory Board. He pointed out that the Faculty Senate President does not make appointments to this Board, Vice Chancellor Paul makes the appointments. The Committee discussed suggesting to Vice Chancellor Paul that appointments made to the Research Advisory Council be changed.

### **5.4 IT Survey Results**

Flowers stated that the themes that came out in the survey are not terribly surprising. He noted that the themes are similar to those identified by private consultants. He stated that one of the main themes that came from the survey is that faculty members are confused about what services the university offers and where to go to get these services.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:36 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, August 5<sup>th</sup>, at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and David Rapkin, Secretary.