

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Fech, Flowers, Franti, LaCost, Lindquist, McCollough, Prochaska-Cue, Rapkin, Stock, Shea,

Absent: Bolin, Konecky, Schubert

Date: Wednesday, September 30, 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

Fech called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 October 6th Senate Meeting

Fech reported that he received an email stating that Associate to the Chancellor Susan Poser will be speaking at the October 6th meeting on behalf of the Chancellor who, along with the other administrators, will be at a deans' retreat in Nebraska City.

2.2 Report on University-Wide Benefits Committee

Fech announced that Professor Hope, UNL's faculty representative to the University-Wide Benefits Committee, will be meeting with the Executive Committee on October 7th to report on the latest meeting of the U-wide Committee.

2.3 Report on the Budget Reduction and Reallocation Review Committee (BRRC)

Prochaska-Cue reported that the BRRRC met in the morning. She stated that she does not think there will be any major changes to the current procedures.

Prochaska-Cue noted that phase one of the procedures is where changes should be made. She pointed out that during this phase the Chancellor holds a meeting with various groups to announce the time frame for the budget cuts, but does not meet again with any of these groups until much later in the process.

Prochaska-Cue stated that the word consultation needs to be clarified in the document. She pointed out that the administration believes that faculty members make recommendations within departments on budget cuts, but this does not always happen. She stated that language should be included in the document that strongly recommends that this process takes place in each department.

Prochaska-Cue stated that the last time the document was reviewed was in 1993. She noted that many people are in agreement that the procedures need to be reviewed.

Fech stated that one of the concerns with the current procedures is that alternative budget cuts are not presented to the Academic Planning Committee.

Shea asked who is on the committee. Prochaska-Cue stated that members are herself, Professor Peterson from Agricultural Economics, Professor Fuller, from Art & Art History, Professor Keown, from Animal Science, Justin Solomon from ASUN, Helen Fankhauser from UAAD, and Peg Johnson from UNOPA.

Shea pointed out that the procedures were reviewed by an ad hoc Senate committee after the 2003 budget cuts. He noted that the ad hoc committee completed a proposal for new recommendations but this was rejected by the Chancellor when it was still in the draft stage. He noted that after the Chancellor rejected the draft proposal, there was little interest to continue with trying to revise the procedures. He stated that the Executive Committee needs to be comfortable with letting the document go with hardly any revisions. He pointed out that this issue is very serious and has implications for future budget cuts. He stated that if it is the will of the Executive Committee to not pursue changes than that is fine, but if the Executive Committee feels that changes should be made then it should not let the issue go.

Prochaska-Cue noted that the document is being looked at, in part due to a request from members of the APC.

Shea stated that if the Executive Committee does not agree with the changes that the BRRRC comes up with, then we should be on record with the disagreement.

Prochaska-Cue stated that she will continue to provide updates on the BRRRC.

3.0 Minutes of 9/23/09

Griffin noted that an email message was sent from Professor Starace, Physics and Astronomy, regarding a statement made during the September 9th Executive Committee meeting. She stated that the email contained forwarded statements made by Professor Kirby”: no parking places were permanently lost as a consequence of construction of the new physics building. Some parking places have been temporarily unavailable during construction. However, the new building construction budget paid for rental parking places to replace every one of these, so there has not even been a temporary decrease in the total number of parking spaces for faculty and staff in the vicinity of the new physics building.” Lindquist questioned where the rental parking spaces are and noted that the response does not address the problem or the question regarding the continual loss of parking spaces on campus.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Report on Interview for Five Year Review of SVC Couture

Fech reported that he, Shea, and Professor Bender of the APC, were interviewed for the review. He stated that the outside consultant was very good and seemed fair. He noted that the point was made several times that those being interviewed did not get any report about SVC Couture's work ahead of time. He stated that there was a lot of agreement on the positive things that SVC Couture has done and also agreement on things that need to be improved.

Shea stated that he thought it was a useful and interesting discussion and overall he was pleased with it. He stated that he thinks the collective comments will be shared. He noted that he did express his concern about not receiving SVC Couture's narrative before the interview but he does not know whether the consultant has any authority on this matter. Lindquist stated that it needs to be made clear that in the future it is critical that the information on the administrators be provided in advance of the interview. Shea pointed out that it should be made available to everyone. Fech stated that this will be brought up with the Chancellor when the Committee meets with him on the 21st.

Prochaska-Cue noted that she has participated in two of these telephone interviews (on Chancellor Perlman and President Milliken) and for neither one was she provided information ahead of time. She wondered whether the idea is to see how much the faculty is aware of the work that the administrator has done.

Shea stated that the Committee should ask what the cost is for conducting this type of evaluation process. He noted that the Chancellor stated that it was very expensive. Given the budget situation we should know how much it cost. Franti pointed out that you cannot get good information for an evaluation unless you pay an outside consultant to do it, and the marginal cost of it is worth it. Shea noted that we have the right to ask and Rapkin pointed out that the information is a matter of public record and we therefore, should be able to find out what the cost is.

Fech noted that in the initiative provided by SVC Couture, she talked about running something by the Senate and stated that it was passed, adopted, or vetted by the Executive Committee when in fact the Committee and the Senate did not actually adopt it. He pointed out that not speaking on a subject could be viewed as acquiescence and the Committee needs to be careful of this.

Stock stated that this reinforces that we need to be given documents ahead of time so they can be carefully reviewed. Franti stated that it needs to be made clearer what is at stake when we meet with the administrators. He pointed out that just having the Executive Committee look at a document does not mean that it approves the document.

The Committee agreed to review how it has responded to SVC couture's initiatives.

4.2 Possible Senate Resolution

Fech stated that he received a request from the UNMC Faculty Senate asking the UNL Faculty Senate to adopt a resolution calling for the Board of Regents to adopt the current guidelines for stem cell research. The Committee discussed whether to adopt a resolution. McCollough moved that the Executive Committee bring the UNMC Resolution 1 to the UNL Faculty Senate as an emergency resolution as needed, with the changes that all references to UNMC be changed to UNL. The motion was seconded by Flowers. The motion was approved with eight votes in favor and one against.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Life Sciences

Fech reported that he interviewed Dean Manderscheid. He noted that Dean Manderscheid pointed out that he is only one of four deans involved in the life sciences effort, the other deans are: Deans Waller, Kostelnik, and Allen.

Fech reported that Dean Manderscheid sees the core curriculum being developed in a faculty led effort similar to that of the ACE program. There would be a faculty group, a response group, and groups that are being sought for input (various college executive committees, the Senate, etc.).

Fech stated that the executive committee of the life sciences will be a mixture of appointed and elected members. The appointed members would be selected from disciplines that are not covered by the elected members. McCollough pointed out that the white paper states that the executive committee is to be appointed. She stated that it needs to be made clear that not all of these members will be appointed.

Fech stated that Dean Manderscheid feels that the life sciences executive committee would lead the faculty and interact with the administration and will provide the overall structure for the life sciences.

McCollough noted that the white paper states that space will be provided on campus for outside employees who are associated with Innovation Campus. She asked who would receive the money for rental of these office spaces and questioned whether this is a common practice on campus. Lindquist stated that the core facilities could be used but for a fee. McCollough asked who would receive the fee. Lindquist stated that it would probably go back to support the operations of the core facilities.

Fech reported that the hiring plan would include input from a mixture of faculty members in the life sciences and from the life sciences executive committee. He noted that Dean Manderscheid indicated that the deans control the hiring plan and the faculty controls the curriculum. Shea pointed out that he is concerned about this and asked if this is acceptable. Franti noted that deans pretty much control the hiring now. Lindquist pointed out that deans make final decisions on hiring, but the faculty tend to write position descriptions and prioritize which positions are critical.

Fech stated that there was also discussion on having uniform evaluation procedures for promotion and tenure. McCollough noted that there is a proposal for this on page 5 of the white paper. Lindquist pointed out that this refers to the requirement of having external letters. He noted that uniform procedures cannot apply in all cases.

Lindquist asked if a committee has been put together to work on the life sciences core curriculum. Fech reported that he did not directly ask this question and Dean Manderscheid did not mention anything about it. McCollough pointed out that the white paper states that the core curriculum is to go into effect in 2011. She questioned who will be putting this together.

Lindquist pointed out that it still needs to be defined as to what constitutes the life sciences. Shea questioned which majors are going to be life sciences that have to follow this core curriculum.

McCollough stated that the white paper also talks about colloquiums being held. She questioned where the money is coming from for these colloquiums.

5.2 Life Sciences IANR

Fech stated that he will be interviewing Dean Waller on Friday to get his take on the life sciences initiative. He stated that he will give a report to the Committee on this meeting.

5.3 Preparation for Senate Meeting

Rapkin reported that the report on the dis-Invitation of Dr. Ayers' is still undergoing some last minute changes but should be available by next Tuesday.

5.4 Search Committee for VC of IANR

Fech reported that he received an email message from the Chancellor about forming the search committee for the VC of IANR. Fech asked the Committee to think of possible candidates for this search committee. The Committee will discuss this at the next meeting.

5.5 Announce Ayers Visit in Omaha

Fech stated that he received a request from Professor Ball asking for the Senate's help in announcing the visit of Dr. Ayers in Omaha. Lindquist noted that it has already been in the Lincoln Journal Star. Fech stated that he will announce it at the Senate meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:09 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, October 7th at 3:00 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.