EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Anaya, LaCost, Reisbig, Rinkevich, Schubert, Woodman, Wysocki, Zoubek

Absent: Bender, Guevara, Purdum, Ruchala

Date: Wednesday, June 13, 2012

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
Schubert called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

2.0 Chancellor Perlman
Schubert stated that he wanted to extend his appreciation for all of the Chancellor’s efforts in getting the Employee Plus One benefit approved by the Board of Regents. Chancellor Perlman thanked him but stated that thanks should be extended to President Milliken who did much of the work.

2.1 Internet Security Breach
Schubert noted that everyone is concerned with the recent internet security breach and asked how serious it is and whether we will have to deal with this more often. Chancellor Perlman stated that it was a pretty sophisticated effort to breach the university security but admitted that some mistakes were made by the university. He reported that outside consultants have been hired to look at our system and they will make suggestions on how to make the system more secure. He pointed out that no system is ever fool proof. He stated that the university has a good idea who the perpetrator is and stated that the breach was confined to a certain extent.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the biggest liability to the breach is the hassle it could create if the data was downloaded and used. He noted that people are not responsible for purchases on credit cards that they didn’t make. He stated that it is hard to see how any of us are at a risk in terms of personal liability or financial loss because of this breach. He reported that some faculty members felt that Varner Hall should have revealed the breach earlier, but there is an ongoing investigation and the police did not want to alert the alleged perpetrator. He noted that so far it is believed, after seizing and examining the computers used, that the perpetrator has not done anything with the data but further investigation will take time.

Chancellor Perlman stated that CIO Askren’s highest priority when he first came here was to improve our internet security. He noted that significant investments have been made to shore things up whenever possible but there are some things that we cannot control that make us vulnerable. He pointed out that at one time there were millions of
social security numbers on computers that we did not have control over and there has been considerable pressure to make sure that those computers are protected behind firewalls. He noted that the university system gets attacks every day from all over the world. Schubert stated that internet security is a difficult issue but this incident does invite the question of how this happened on this scale with all of the security measures we have in place.

2.2 International Housing Issue
Schubert noted that there continues to be problems with housing international visitors for short term visits. He noted that there is now a way to create an NU ID for these visitors so they can have access to housing. However, recently visitors came to campus from Germany and Sweden and when they arrived at the university housing provided for them they had no linens or supplies. He pointed out that visitors who have just spent many hours traveling should not have to deal with this lack of service upon their arrival. He suggested that a group of people be assembled over the campus to come up with an overall plan to deal with international travelers and how we can accommodate them on a decent level. He suggested SVCAA Weissinger and Sue Gildersleeve, Director of Housing be part of the group to work on a plan. Chancellor Perlman suggested that VC Franco be contacted to get a group of people together to work on this issue.

Schubert stated that it would be great to have some short term faculty housing on campus. He noted that he has had discussions with colleagues about this and there is agreement that the needs for this will increase as we do more international research. He suggested that this could be included in the campus master plan. Chancellor Perlman stated that he will be supportive and to let him know if his influence is needed to get this effort started.

2.3 Budget and Faculty Salary Increases
Chancellor Perlman reported that realistic estimates indicate that we will be facing a $2.6 million shortfall in undergraduate and graduate tuition and while differential tuition rates help with the overall deficit, the differential tuition goes to the colleges that assess the higher rates. He noted that for this year we will end up with a $2.1 million deficit.

Chancellor Perlman reported that if you look at next year, two things that have significant impact on the budget are the tuition numbers and salary increases. He noted that there will be a small increase in state appropriations but the end result is that we will have a flat budget. He reported that he has approved a 2% salary increase for this next fiscal year and there should be $3.75 million in tuition revenues but another $1.2 million loss in tuition revenue is projected for next year and another $2.8 million for 2013 fiscal year. He noted that the projected deficit would be greater if a 2.5% salary increase was given. He stated that he is trying to balance providing salary increases with not increasing the deficit any further. He noted that the Board of Regents authorized him to give 2.5% salary increases and he has approved a 2% increase, but has not made a decision on whether to give the remaining .5% increase in January or not. He pointed out that delaying the .5% increase will not cost us as much in cashflow.
Chancellor Perlman stated that what is more troubling is looking into the future. Based on conservative assumptions, with a 3.5% tuition increase in 2014 and a 2.5% salary increase we will have another $2 million shortfall in each year of the next biennium. He stated that one redeeming opportunity is to grow enrollment.

Chancellor Perlman reported that he had a meeting with the deans and the senior administrative team to see if they were all still enthusiastic about increasing the campus enrollment to 30,000. He noted that they are in agreement that we should still work to attain this goal. He stated that one of the reasons why it is important to increase enrollment is because we have to get the revenue if we are going to make investments in the university. He reported that there are some ideas on how to increase other revenue but these will not have the impact that tuition does.

Wysocki asked how many students are needed to make up the balance in the loss of tuition. Chancellor Perlman responded that it depends on the mix of students. Four hundred out-of-state students would bring in about $2 million in tuition.

Schubert asked if the figures presented by the Chancellor included state appropriations. Chancellor Perlman stated that only state supported budget information was used in determining the figures, funded research was not included.

Woodman noted that some smaller state colleges have gotten rid of separate out-of-state student tuition, making all students eligible for in-state tuition, and asked if this would help or hurt the university. Chancellor Perlman stated that he did not think this would be helpful. He pointed out that the university still has a fairly low tuition rate. He noted that in higher education there seems to sometimes be an inverse correlation between price and demand and our opportunities for growth are with non-resident and international students.

Chancellor Perlman asked the Executive Committee members if they heard anything negative about a 2% salary increase. The Executive Committee members stated that they have not heard any complaints.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he continues to think about ways to provide incentives to the units to be attentive to enrollment rates. He stated that if we are going to increase enrollment, this has to be the first priority on everybody’s mind. He noted that most decisions will have to be based on contributing to enrollment. He pointed out that most people think that getting the right message out about telling people why the university is so good is the way to resolve the enrollment problem, but he doesn’t believe this is correct. He noted that football recruits, who are heavily recruited by other universities, have said that their decision to come here was based on the good relationships they developed with people at the university. He stated that prospective students want to get connected with faculty members. He stated that he does not want to put the administrative burden of recruiting on the faculty, but the deans will be seeking the faculty’s help.
LaCost suggested that the university run Utube spots about the university. Chancellor Perlman stated that Archrival, a youth-oriented advertising firm located in Lincoln and working with the Chamber of Commerce, has been asked to give the university some ideas on advertising.

Woodman asked whether transfer students from community colleges have a significant impact on enrollment figures. Chancellor Perlman stated that transfer students definitely impact our enrollment and we are making great progress in this area. He noted that we used to have a system that wasn’t very effective and efficient. He reported that most departments have now agreed to let Admissions handle standard transfers unless there is a transfer that is questionable. He noted that Admissions handling the transfers has taken a significant burden off of faculty members’ time. Woodman asked if this means that Admissions will decide if courses are equivalent instead of the faculty in a department. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that Admissions will handle the transfer unless concerns are raised. Woodman noted that Southeast Community College offers a nine week course that is not comparable with a similar course here at the university. Chancellor Perlman stated that it is these kinds of transfer concerns that will go back to the department for approval.

2.4 Enrollments and Possible Elimination of Subsidized Student Loans
Chancellor Perlman noted that there are some things happening in Congress that can impact subsidized student loans. He pointed out that this is something that is out of our control.

2.5 Unsuccessful Deans Search Processes
Anaya pointed out that there have been a lot of dean searches recently that have not been successful and an interim person has been appointed. She asked if this is due to the lack of quality applicants. Chancellor Perlman reported that there have been some successful dean searches and he does not think the unsuccessful searches are systematic. He stated that we need to have search committees that surface candidates that the hiring officer accepts and that the faculty will like. He stated that we are taking a strong position across the university in not just hiring someone to fill a position and in some instances the hiring officer went back to the search committee to review the top ten candidates. He noted that the other option is to do a targeted search and these have usually been successful. He stated that the Dean of Architecture search is an example of finding an extraordinary candidate who wanted to come here but had a family situation that could not be resolved and therefore he couldn’t relocate to Lincoln. He stated that the hiring officer did not think that anyone else in the pool would be suitable so the decision was made to wait. He stated that he does not think we have had an unusual number of failed searches.

2.6 Conflict of Interest with Use of Same Consulting firm for Parking System and StarTran
Wysocki stated that the Parking Advisory Committee reported to the Faculty Senate that the same consultants who worked on the parking plan also consulted on the transportation plan and the outside perception is that there is a conflict of interest here. Chancellor Perlman stated that he is not aware of this but will try to get more information on it.
Woodman stated that Director of Parking & Transit Services Dan Carpenter reported that the consultants recommended restricted parking lots for people. He pointed out that this would be problematic for people who work or attend meetings on either campus.

Chancellor Perlman stated that any recommendations come up through the system to him and he would have to review this proposal. He stated that while this might expand the number of available parking spaces, there is always the concern with faculty members coming from east campus and vice versa to do work and we need to manage this situation carefully. He noted that the Board of Regents approved outsourcing our transit service to StarTran which will result in the saving of a significant amount of money.

2.7 Update on Email Migration
Chancellor Perlman reported that approximately 6,000 people have migrated to Outlook which is close to where we want to be at this point. He stated that overall he thinks the migration has been successful.

2.8 Upcoming Issues
Woodman asked if the Chancellor had any comments on the Platte Institute report. Chancellor Perlman stated that there have not been many responses in regards to the report. He noted that the report cites UNL’s removal from the AAU but does not mention the realities of this decision. He pointed out that AAU does not count agricultural research or the Medical Center research funding. He stated that the comments on the dollars spent on administration do not indicate the significant growth in research which resulted in the need to increase the research administration in order to manage the increased research efforts.

Chancellor Perlman reported that he met with the National Planning Group hired to do the campus master plan. He noted that they have worked on many of the Big Ten campuses and have a very good reputation. He stated that he was impressed with their willingness to listen. He noted that this will be an involved, elaborate process that will engage the faculty and students. He reported that information will be collected during the summer and the campus will be engaged in the process in the fall. He said if the Senate does not think they are getting sufficient input into the process to let him know and the membership on committees can be tweaked to accommodate the Senate. He noted that there is not a lot of land to expand on so the scale of the campus will be different and issues will be raised that will ultimately change the campus.

Chancellor Perlman pointed out that retention is a big part of enrollment and good discussions are taking place about what we need to do to retain more students. He stated that the campus will see some major actions with the retention effort. He reported that we are examining what we do for international students, non-residential students, and veterans to see where we can make improvements.

3.0 Announcements
No announcements were made.
4.0 Approval of 5/30/12 Minutes
Wysocki moved for approval of the minutes as revised. LaCost seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

5.0 Changes to University Curriculum Committee – Professor Moore, Professor DeFusco, and Professor Mitchell
Schubert thanked Moore, DeFusco, and Mitchell for meeting with the Executive Committee. He stated that he received knowledge of the UCC’s intention to make changes to the operating procedures and responsibilities but there is a lack of information as to what the changes are and the reasons for making the changes. He stated the UCC needs to layout the reasons why it wants to make the changes, what it hopes to achieve with the changes, and how the changes are to be made.

Moore stated that in the UCC’s report to the Faculty Senate it was mentioned that the UCC wants to change its syllabus and he has been working on how to handle the language. He noted that the UCC is also charged with overseeing the ACE courses and last year he put a motion forward to the Senate to change some of the ACE governing documents but he withdrew this motion. He stated that he is not clear what the process is for making any changes to the ACE process. He reported that at the same time the representative from APC raised the question that a lot of the regular curricular activity seems to be rubber stamping, and the APC is considering whether it needs a representative on the UCC.

Griffin pointed out that any changes to the UCC’s responsibilities or syllabus needs to be approved by the Faculty Senate since the UCC is a Faculty Senate committee. Moore stated that he was under the assumption that the APC was working with the Faculty Senate regarding the proposed changes.

Moore noted that the ACE subcommittee of the UCC meets monthly and it was the subcommittee who approved, in notion, to suspend a portion of the UCC’s responsibilities for a period of a year to test out the new process for approving changes to courses. He stated that the ACE portion of the responsibilities would not change, but the work of the UCC relating to a change in a course would be handled differently. Currently a course has to get approval from the department and the college and then be reviewed by the UCC. He pointed out that the UCC gets involved late in the process.

Moore reported that UCC has been using CREQ, an electronic course approval system, to review and approve course changes and this has been working well. He stated that with the proposed changes non-ACE curriculum requests would be tagged as official and entered into the undergraduate bulletin once it has been approved by the college curriculum committee. He stated that the CREQ system would be programmed to identify if there are any duplications or impacts on other courses. He stated that a subcommittee consisting of the UCC chair, the Director of Undergraduate Education, and the APC representative will be able to view course requests at their initial submission at the department level. He pointed out that the UCC wants to test this for a year before submitting a formal request to the Faculty Senate to change the UCC syllabus.
Schubert stated that he is taken aback that a Faculty Senate committee that is almost completely changing the way it operates has not contacted anyone on the Senate about the proposed changes. He pointed out that the proposal basically changes the operation of the UCC resulting in the committee being run by a subcommittee. He stated that these changes are substantial and need to be vetted by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and possibly voted on by the full Senate.

Moore pointed out that in the nine years he has served on the UCC only two courses have been tabled and the proposed changes in procedures would help to alleviate the workload of UCC committee members. Mitchell agreed and pointed out that what tends to come in front of the UCC is whether a course should be an ACE course. She stated that a structure in CREQ can be created that can help catch course duplications and can flag a course change, such as a change in the number of hours a course is taught, if the change impacts other programs. She stated that her office is working hard to figure out how duplication of courses can be identified electronically and there are people in her office that will review any course changes.

Woodman asked if there is a central, non-departmental office that works with the UCC and oversees course changes. Mitchell stated that the Office of Undergraduate Studies used to deal with the UCC, but now Brooke Glenn in Undergraduate Education does much of the work and Keith Dawson in Records & Registration handles getting the information into the undergraduate bulletin. Woodman asked who the last person would be to look for duplications. Mitchell stated that Glenn would be the person but a program is being developed that would catch the duplications electronically. She stated that a process needs to be determined to notify the different colleges of course changes.

Schubert pointed out that if the intention is to capture duplications, why would you have less people looking at the course changes. DeFusco noted that no courses have ever been stopped for duplication since he has been on the UCC. Mitchell stated that the UCC would still review course requests that are interdisciplinary or would have impacts on other programs. Moore pointed out that the proposed system will allow the subcommittee to be auditors of the course requests and can see them when they are first submitted so any problems can be dealt with before the request leaves the college.

Woodman noted that the college’s representative on the UCC protects the interest of their college and this person should be knowledgeable about the college’s curriculum so they can identify any problems that might arise if there are changes with courses that impact college programs. He pointed out that this is a reason why the UCC should be meeting.

Moore stated that the initial request for course amendments is being changed. Department and colleges will be responsible for checking to see if the course will be a duplicate of an existing course, if the request has any university-wide impact, and what impacts the changes have on other department/units. Woodman asked how other departments and colleges will be notified if a course is changed. Mitchell noted that a
department owns the course but the college representatives on the UCC could see any changes that are made and could notify their college.

Reisbig stated that the process has been well thought out but she has two concerns. One is that the request for the change did not come to the Senate even though the UCC is a Faculty Senate Committee. The other is the lack of oversight. She believes that most colleges will act in good faith, but if the UCC’s responsibilities are changed as being requested, the oversight portion of the UCC’s work will be dissolved. She pointed out that it would not be good to lose communication between the colleges in reviewing course requests. Moore stated that the UCC has oversight on courses but not programs.

Wysocki stated that the fact that no courses have been turned back in the last nine years doesn’t matter because it doesn’t mean that it couldn’t happen in the future. Schubert asked why the Committee would want to change the syllabus and take away its oversight. Moore stated that the oversight would take place in the beginning of the process rather than at the end of the process. Schubert pointed out that the oversight would only be done by a small group of people. He stated that colleges are not going to allow an outside subcommittee to review its courses when they are initially submitted. He noted that fifteen people might start developing courses, but ten of these will probably never be completed. He stated that having a small subcommittee review all of these courses is an enormous amount of work. Griffin suggested that the subcommittee that would review requests when initially submitted be expanded to include the Faculty Senate representative and the ASUN representative. This would still make it a small subcommittee but would spread the work out so it does not have to be done by only three people. Moore stated that the plan is to allow the UCC subcommittee to have the ability to see if a course request is going to be a duplicate so the department can be alerted to the problem in the beginning of the process.

Woodman asked if the UCC has the ability to give up its oversight. He pointed out that doing this would basically make the UCC toothless. Wysocki suggested that the UCC be allowed to provide input into the initial request without giving up its oversight ability.

Moore stated that he is not trying to bypass the process and asked how to move forward. Schubert stated that the Executive Committee will need to discuss the proposal as the changes clearly affect the faculty. He asked that Moore compile a document to the Executive Committee outlining the changes that are being proposed. He pointed out that the entire UCC, not just a subcommittee, needs to vote on the proposed changes. The Executive Committee will then review this and make recommendations. He stated that personally he thinks these changes should go to the full Senate.

DeFusco proposed that the changes in procedures pertain to perfunctory course requests. He pointed out that the amount of course proposals submitted each year is overwhelming and if the perfunctory changes could be taken care of automatically it would help reduce the workload of the UCC. He stated that any course request that has university-wide impact should have broad UCC overview.
Schubert stated that the request to the Executive Committee needs to clearly explain what changes are to be made and why, and if it is due to an increase in the number of course change requests. He noted that the change is connected to a software tool but this is not clearly explained. Griffin stated that the letter should also state that the proposed changes are to be done on a trial basis for a year. Mitchell suggested including a draft of changes to the UCC syllabus that the Senate would vote on after the trial year is completed and the document needs to clearly identify the reasons the UCC wants to make these changes.

Woodman pointed out that these changes are going to require curriculum committees at all levels to change. He noted that department curriculum committees have totally different processes even within the same college. Mitchell stated that various people on campus have discussed the proposed changes.

Anaya pointed out that it is challenging for the UCC to request changes to its responsibilities because most faculty members are not aware of the work that the UCC does. She stated that the faculty needs to be educated about the work so they can see the issue more clearly.

Moore stated that he will write up a formal request to the Executive Committee asking that the UCC’s responsibilities be suspended for a year and will include an explanation of what the UCC wants to do and the reasons for it. He stated that he will include the letter sent by the APC and a draft of the proposed changes to the syllabus.

6.0 Unfinished Business
6.1 Update on Memo to SVCAA Weissinger about Survey
Item postponed until the next meeting.

6.2 Update on IRB Protocol Changes
LaCost reported that Reisbig approved the proposed changes but the request has not been submitted to the IRB. She noted that Anaya will be secondary investigator on the survey.

6.3 Update on Memo to ASUN about Student Bereavement Policy
Item postponed until the next meeting.

7.0 New Business
7.1 Request for Guidance I Changing Student Code of Conduct
Item postponed until the next meeting.

7.2 Proposed Policy on Youth Camps at UNL
Item postponed until the next meeting.

7.3 CPR Presentation and Training at Faculty Senate meeting
Item postponed until the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:14 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, June 27 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office.
minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and David Woodman, Secretary.