

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Bender, Dawes, Joeckel, Konecky, Lee, Nickerson, Sollars, Vakilzadian, Woodman

Absent: Purcell, Reisbig, Rudy, Steffen

Date: Wednesday, May 27, 2015

Location: Faculty Senate Office

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

Bender called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee Follow-up

Nickerson reported that the FCAC's recommendation was sent to the Chancellor after the announcement that 3% would be put into the merit pool for salaries. He noted that in speaking with the Chancellor he asked specifically about the additional 1% increase that was to be partially restored to salaries back in January if the tuition revenue was sufficient, and the Chancellor indicated that the additional funds were going to be used to cover promotion and tenure salary increases. Griffin asked if the staff's additional increase money was being used for faculty promotion and tenure. Nickerson reported that he did not know this information but he did not think so. Konecky pointed out that using the staff's additional increase would not benefit the staff at all. Woodman noted that the Dean of Arts & Sciences has informed the College that the general merit increase pool will be 2.65%. The Executive Committee agreed to ask the Chancellor for clarification about the additional increase.

Nickerson reported that the FCAC spent at least half of its last meeting discussing benefits. He stated that he was hoping to get some information comparing the benefits of UNL to other Big Ten schools, but Assistant Vice Chancellor Chauche checked with Human Resources at UNL and with Central Administration, but no one has data comparing benefits. He reported that Chauche even checked with his counterparts at other Big Ten schools and the data is not available. He noted that since benefits vary amongst the Big Ten universities it is difficult to make comparisons. He stated that he then contacted Director of Benefits Clayton to ask if he has met with his counterparts through the CIC but they have never had a meeting.

Lee suggested that the FCAC consider just looking at the major benefits such as health care and retirement benefits between the Big Ten schools. Woodman suggested that the FCAC could develop a list of specific benefits like copays and deductibles. Lee pointed out that a downside to making the comparisons is that there could be enormous

differences between the universities in terms of benefits. Nickerson noted that Director Clayton stated that it would be difficult to compare retirement benefits because the University of Illinois and Ohio State do not use social security and instead have another retirement plan in place. Lee reported that Ohio State also does not have TIAA/CREF. Woodman suggested getting just the data, and not the conclusions of the comparisons.

Vakilzadian asked what percentage of the salary increase is used for promotion and tenure. Nickerson stated that this number would vary depending on the number of faculty getting promoted or tenured, but the Chancellor said roughly 0.50% would be used this year and a similar amount for the next year. Lee questioned how 1% of all faculty salaries can go toward promotion and tenure when only 85 faculty members received promotion and tenure this spring.

2.2 Flooding Problems in Buildings on Campus

Joeckel reported that geological samples from the Conservation and Survey Division stored in Nebraska Hall were recently damaged due to the flooding problems. He commended Dave Reinhardt of FM&P Building Systems Maintenance for his assistance in remediating the matter, but he also stated that the recent experience indicates that the campus could use a more explicit set of written procedures or guidelines, made available online, for dealing with such crises. He stated that he would advocate that at some point a set of instructions should be written on how to proceed with these kinds of emergencies. Konecky noted that the procedures might be developed at a department level and reported that the Libraries has a set of procedures to deal with crisis situations. She suggested that Facilities might need to develop a disaster plan. Joeckel pointed out that the university has many kinds of important collections and the long term fate of some of these collections is an issue that needs to be considered.

3.0 Approval of May 13, 2015 Minutes

Nickerson moved for approval of the revised minutes. The motion was seconded by Dawes and approved by the Executive Committee.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Reason for Closure of Southwest Doors of City Campus Rec Center

Bender reported that he received a response from Stan Campbell, Director of Campus Recreation, who explained that the closure was due to budget cuts. An alternative to deal with the budget cuts would be to increase the faculty/staff membership by \$3 per month. By not manning the southwest door Campus Recreation saves \$32,000. He suggested that he could ask if it would be feasible to have the entrance staffed during peak hours.

4.2 Finalization of Recommendations for Chancellor's Search Committee

The Executive Committee discussed and suggested several more people for the Chancellor's search committee. Bender noted that the names will be forwarded to President Bounds. He pointed out that President Bounds will make the final decision on who will serve on the search committee, but the President said that faculty will have a plurality on the committee.

4.3 Reply from Rhett Zeplin on Sustainability Tour

Bender stated that the tour would take about an hour and a half and will visit sites on East, City, and NIC campus. He stated that he will check with Zeplin to see if June 17 at 3:00 would work and only those Executive Committee members who are interested need to attend.

4.4 Revisions to Professional Ethics Statement

Bender noted that he has asked Lee, Reisbig, and Rudy to review and suggest revisions to the Statement. Lee asked what it was about the 1990 Statement that people want to revise. Bender pointed out that the 1990 version is overly long and could be considerably condensed. He stated that in general the ideas of the Statement are sound, but things could be combined, condensed, or eliminated. He stated that of particular concern is section eight dealing with relationships between faculty and students. He pointed out that originally the Chancellor had asked the Executive Committee to consider developing a policy which would prevent faculty members from having a relationship with a student, similar to the policy that Harvard recently created. Nickerson noted that the Executive Committee felt that a new policy was not needed after reviewing the professional Ethics Statement, but it did feel that the policy needed to be updated.

Vakilzadian stated that the Professional Ethics Statement is not a legal document and asked if the Executive Committee wanted to make it stronger. Nickerson pointed out that the idea is not to make the Statement too strong because it should not interfere with academic freedom or the rights of the faculty.

Woodman noted that Joeckel's initial revisions serve the goal of making the document more precise. Joeckel stated that he wanted the revisions to have as much clarity as possible and for it to be as formulaic as it could be.

Lee stated that the subcommittee would work on revising the Statement and would report back to the Executive Committee.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Agenda Items for Chancellor Perlman

The Executive Committee identified the following agenda items for Chancellor Perlman:

- Clarification on the use of the 1% faculty salary increases that was to be returned to faculty and staff if there was sufficient tuition revenue.
- Fall enrollment figures.
- Overall campus budget for 2015-16.
- Possible tuition increase?
- Budget for classroom improvement?
- Committee for determining use of old CBA building.
- Can benefits between the Big Ten universities be coordinated through the CIC?
- 5% Assessment Projections – How much has been recovered and how is it used?
- Tenure and promotion difficulties for faculty members with joint

appointments; demands for additional meetings, work, recognition of publications in other discipline. How can we make improvements for these faculty members?

- Potential collaborations with UNMC regarding iExcel, Inter-professional Experiential Center for Enduring Learning.
- Post tenure review – data on whether it has been invoked, whether people have been terminated because of it, are any in progress, has it been enforced frequently?

5.2 NU ID Numbers Needed

Griffin reported that she will need the identification numbers for the Executive Committee members so they can have access to conference room in the Alexander building. She noted that the Committee will begin meeting there on June 24.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, June 10 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Allison Reisbig, Secretary.