

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Bender, Guevara, Joeckel, Konecky, Nickerson, Purcell, Rinkevich, Rudy, Sollars, Steffen, Woodman, Wysocki

Absent: Anaya

Date: Wednesday, February 18, 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

Nickerson called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

2.0 Associate to the Chancellor Nunez, Executive Director Jackson, and Sustainability Coordinator Shrestha

2.1 Campus Sustainability Initiative

Jackson reported that he is Executive Director of Facilities and oversees all of the grounds maintenance, utility plants, custodial services, and works closely with construction projects on campus. He reports directly to VC Jackson and works with VC Green and SVCAA Weissinger on projects. He stated that he is one of the individuals leading the charge to make the campus more sustainable.

Jackson stated that sustainability initiatives can fall into the feel good initiatives and the fiscal initiatives. He stated some initiatives are just not feasible because of the financial considerations. He reported that he started the first integrated pest management program at UNL. He stated that the goal is for UNL to catch up with current sustainability practices in dealing with pest control. He noted that the culture in Nebraska can make this a little challenging because people here have grown up using pesticides and herbicides and do not see an issue with their use. Nickerson pointed out that pest control can impact faculty research in biology and entomology and in other labs. He stated that he likes that the campus is looking at alternative ways to control pests.

Rudy asked if costs and benefits are weighed with these sustainable initiatives. Jackson reported that some of the things done here at UNL are truly cutting edge. He pointed out that UNL is number one in the Big Ten in the technology of how we operate our buildings. We lead the nation in terms of our green efforts, such as how we manage laboratory hoods and how some facilities have been adapted to be more environmentally green. He stated that Shrestha is working on a study so we can benchmark ourselves to see what we are sustainably good at and where we need improvements. He pointed out that the reason for wanting to speak to the Senate Executive Committee is because all components of the campus, facilities, and the academic side, need to pull together if we are going to succeed at having a sustainable university. He noted that there are some

areas on East Campus that are sustainable and other areas of the campus, but all of the efforts need to be pulled together in order for us to be successful.

Rudy asked if the impetus for the new efforts on sustainability are due from student pressure or from a business perspective. Jackson stated that there are initiatives every day. He reported that he recently received a phone call from the Daily Nebraskan inquiring about the water initiative on campus. This is a \$750,000 water system that will control the flow and measure the water irrigation on campus which will allow us to see the exact amount of water being used. Rain sensors will be put on campus to shut off sprinklers if it is raining outside, and although the project is initially costly, there will be huge savings from it.

Jackson reported that Shrestha will be looking at metrics of key performance indicators on campus to determine what top ten or twelve sustainable initiatives are needed. Once identified these initiatives will need to be prioritized. He pointed out that it will take the entire campus and a change in culture to take these things on. He noted that even feel good initiatives have cost implications.

Shrestha stated that he received his doctoral degree from UNL and has been involved in a lot of different sustainability initiatives on campus and he and some of his friends started some of them. He noted that he cares about the campus and wants to see our sustainability efforts grow. He reported that at conferences on sustainability UNL is not well represented, but he thinks this is the perfect time to improve our sustainability efforts on campus. He stated that we have already achieved some things that are just now being considered at other universities.

Shrestha stated that the question is how the academic side of the campus integrates with the facilities side of campus in these efforts. He reported that there is a faculty member in Arts & Sciences who teaches graphic design and he wants to teach students how to design for sustainability purposes. He noted that another professor is working with the Operations Department in teaching a course about conducting audits of buildings. He pointed out that this is the first course of its kind being offered in the U.S.

Woodman asked what the sustainable criteria is for new buildings. Shrestha stated that we already have standards in place for this, and new buildings must have a silver energy rating. Woodman asked what the difference is between the gold and silver standards. Jackson noted that the gold standard goes back to the feel good side and includes things like having green roofs, how the watershed is set up, and some other things which are not practical given our location. Nunez said that getting locally-sourced sustainable materials is one of the criteria but it is not always possible here.

Nickerson reported that the Executive Committee recently met with the chair of the Academic Planning Committee who stated that the APC would like to see the cost of operating a building included in the program statement for new construction. Jackson pointed out that with the new College of Business Administration Building an operation maintenance fund is being required before it is built. He noted that the building is not

state funded. Nunez stated that operation costs were a controversial issue during the last budget reduction as operation and management costs had to be covered during this process. He pointed out that the last building on campus that received some state funding for construction was the Beadle Center. He stated that 100% of the money for the new CBA building is donated. Jackson stated that buildings constructed 15 years ago cost \$15 per square foot to maintain, but when new technologies are added to the buildings it increases the amount of money needed to maintain them. He noted that it is up to us to figure out how best to support the program and make sure our priorities are in line with maintaining them.

Nickerson asked who faculty members with sustainability ideas should contact. Nunez noted that about six years ago there was a Chancellor's Commission on Environmental Sustainability and it accomplished some things, but the work was strictly voluntary and there was no office dedicated to sustainable efforts. He reported that the Chancellor is looking at reconstituting the Commission in a much more focused way with the goal to make the campus sustainable. Through some savings and reallocation in VC Jackson's office a Sustainability Office has been formulated with Shrestha operating it. He stated that faculty participation is definitely wanted and the faculty contribution can be many fold. He noted that the sustainability initiative is still in the initial phase, but early participation by faculty members is needed.

Joeckel asked how often will the entire Commission meet. Shrestha stated that this will depend on the amount of work that the Commission wants to take on. Joeckel noted that Nunez indicated that there were already 14 people identified for the Commission. He asked how many more members they think is needed in order for it to be fully functional. Nunez stated that the goal of the Commission is to be a functioning group, but not necessarily meet every month. He suggested that there could be a subgroup of the Commission comprised of faculty members. Jackson stated that the right group of people need to come together to develop the sustainable priorities for the campus. Initially we need to determine what the campus does well now and then focus on where we need to make improvements in order for the Commission to move forward on initiatives. Joeckel suggested that if dedicated faculty involvement is wanted it might be beneficial in the spring to have interested faculty members go on a tour of the campus to see the physical accomplishments with sustainability that have already been made. Nickerson stated that this information could also be provided in the President's newsletter. Jackson stated that there are plenty of accomplishments that are directly related to academics, particularly on the research side, such as researchers having the ability to control the temperatures to their own laboratory space.

Joeckel asked what efforts they have already been involved in on campus. Shrestha stated that he was involved in establishing the recycling program on campus. Steffen asked if consideration has been given to having water bottle fillers to eliminate the amount of plastic bottles being used. Nunez stated that this is being worked on with the students. He stated that new buildings are getting these. They are a one-time investment and they are unfortunately expensive. Jackson noted that there is a maintenance issue with them too because they have filters that need to be replaced periodically.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Monitoring Courses Taken by Student Athletes

Nickerson reported that he sent an email to Professor Swenseth, Interim Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, asking the IAC to monitor courses and majors taken by student-athletes to ensure that no problems arise similar to what recently occurred at North Carolina University where there was an academic course that had no required standards and a lack of oversight. He noted that Professor Potuto, UNL's Faculty Athletics Representative, asked the Executive Committee to consider conducting an examination because the problem essentially begins on the academic side and later morphs into a problem for athletics. He stated that the IAC and University Curriculum Committee should be aware if anything that looks suspicious in terms of no or limited standards for a course. He noted that the IAC will continue to monitor on a yearly basis the student athletes. He reported that the Daily Nebraskan has made an inquiry about why there are so many student-athletes who have not declared a major. He pointed out that there are very significant reasons for the delay in declaring a major by student-athletes because once they declare, it puts them on a different time program because of NCAA regulations.

3.2 Guidelines for Extension Educators

Nickerson reported that he sent Dean Hibberd an email message asking what the status is over the document, but he has not received a response yet.

3.3 Emeritus Box Account

Woodman reported that emeriti professors will be allowed to keep their Box account with the university. Purcell asked if there is anything they need to do to retain the electronic storage file. Woodman stated that he assumes that nothing needs to be done, but if anyone has any questions they should contact Neil Wineman, Director – Client Services at UNL.

3.4 Enrollment Management Council

Sollars reported that the EMC went over the responses of the faculty in regards to scheduling of classes. She pointed out that the EMC was very interested, and took the comments of the faculty seriously and recognized the clarity that is needed for the scheduling of classes on East, City, and Innovation campuses.

4.0 Approval of February 11, 2015 Minutes

Joeckel moved for approval of the minutes as revised. Rinkevich seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Possible UNL Ban on Faculty/Student Relationships

Wysocki stated that he thinks having a ban to prohibit relationships is a violation of human rights. Joeckel wondered if anyone considered that the university could be opening itself up for a lawsuit if such a policy existed. He noted that he is not in favor of a huge gap of power in a relationship, but he is thinking that a ban could create more

problems. Guevara noted that he stated this before and said a ban is just too broad. He stated that a young faculty member could meet an undergraduate student outside of the university and begin a relationship. He said he is troubled at the fact that we want to imitate an elite university. Sollars pointed out that the policy might make sense for Harvard because it does not have non-traditional undergraduate students.

Steffen reported that the Senate's 1990 Professional Ethics Statement already bans inappropriate relationships and he does not think it is in the faculty's interest to adopt a ban. He noted that the Chancellor's email sent to Nickerson about a possible ban did not include our Professional Ethics Statement. Joeckel asked if we need a compromise between a ban and the Ethics Statement. Steffen suggested sending the Ethics Statement to the Chancellor pointing out that it addresses the concerns of relationships between undergraduate students and faculty members. He pointed out that it could be revised if needed.

Joeckel noted that the Ethics Statement discusses professional and supervisory powers and asked what exactly this means. Rudy stated that it would mean any faculty member who supervises a student in anyway. Konecky noted that anyone having a direct teaching relationship would have professional and supervisory powers.

Bender stated that there are faculty members who are married and are in the same department on campus. Rudy pointed out that the Ethics Statement does not include staff. He noted that there have been instances, at other universities, where athletic coaches were dating students on the team they coached. He stated that the Ethics Statement should probably include staff as well.

Woodman asked if there should be a Regents policy on this issue. He stated that if the Chancellor wants a more detailed policy the Title IX officer should draft one and it should be based on whether there is a high potential for an exploitative relationship.

Nickerson asked if the Ethics Statement should be tweaked to make them more current and to address the Chancellor's concerns. Joeckel suggested that the Executive Committee draw the Chancellor's attention to the Ethics Statement. Konecky stated that it should be done within the context that we are all opposed to an outright ban.

The Executive Committee agreed to review the Professional Ethics Statement more closely next week.

5.2 Report on Non-tenure Track Faculty Survey

Woodman gave a report on the Professors of Practice responses to the survey. He noted that of 316 responses, 73 of them were from Professors of Practice and of these 40% have been here less than one year. He noted that the responses indicated that teaching roles are clear for them, but the service/research responsibilities were less clear. He noted that while the research portion of their work is supposed to be only 10%, some respondents said that research is considered a major criteria for being considered for promotion. He

noted that the survey showed a difference in department expectations of duties for these positions.

Woodman reported that one of the issues for Professors of Practice at the end of their contract is that during the summer months they lose email services, access to MyRed, and MyPlan until the following fall semester when their official reappointment would begin. He noted that this may be an automatic default of an administrative computer program and that it led to a lot of difficulty getting ready for the following semester.

Rudy stated that Professors of Practice on a temporary line are paid a certain amount per course, but this does not include any kind of salary increase from year-to-year. He suggested that the deans should be asked to consider giving these faculty members merit increases. Steffen suggested that if a unit has enough Professor of Practices it could have a separate pool to compare these faculty members amongst themselves so they would not be in the same pool with tenure track research faculty. He pointed out that when all of the salary increase funds go into one pool, those that bring in research funding typically get the bulk of the increase.

Nickerson stated that the questionnaire is very useful. Rudy stated that some of the comments indicate that the Professors of Practice recognize themselves as faculty members but did not think other faculty members thought the same way. Woodman noted that validation of non-tenure track work is a topic for a future discussion,. Steffen stated that he has concerns with any research requirements for non-tenure track faculty members. Joeckel pointed out that there seems to be an endemic problem with how tenured and non-tenured faculty members are evaluated. Steffen suggested that the tenure track faculty members be surveyed at some point to see if they face similar problems.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Agenda Items for Chancellor Perlman

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

- Professional Ethics Statement and Policy on Faculty/Student Relationships
- Position on APC for non-tenure track faculty members
- What is the university doing to protect ourselves from the MARC Situation?
- Title IX Language Being Put on Blackboard
- Elimination of Housing for Graduate Students on East Campus – Plans to Relocate the Families?
- Depth of the pool of candidates for the SVCAA position
- Strategic rationale for presenting the University's budget to the legislature
- Are there venues on campus where the availability of alcohol on campus might be available given the legislator's proposal?

6.2 Proposed Bus Service to Nebraska Innovation Campus

Agenda item postponed due to lack of time.

6.3 Canceling March 3 and April 8 Executive Committee Meetings

Nickerson noted that it is a time constraint for the President and other members of the Executive Committee to meet the Wednesday after a Senate meeting. Rudy suggested having the Executive Committee members convene for 30 minutes after a Senate meeting to take care of any necessary business in place of the Wednesday meeting. The Executive Committee agreed to do this on a trial basis.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, February 28, 2015 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Tad Wysocki, Secretary.