

**UNL FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES**  
**City Campus Union,**  
**September 14, 2010**  
**Presidents John Lindquist, Barbara LaCost, John Fech, Presiding**

**1.0 Call to Order**

President Lindquist called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

**2.0 Announcements**

**2.1 Administrative Searches**

President Lindquist reported that the search committee for the Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs is in place and is working with consultant Paul Chou who is assisting the search by identifying possible candidates. He noted that there is a designated website (<http://svcaasearch.unl.edu/>) for the search which contains the position description and other pertinent information. He stated that people can nominate someone by sending an email to [unl-svcaa@academic-search.com](mailto:unl-svcaa@academic-search.com) and the consultant will try and recruit the person.

President Lindquist reported that the search for the dean of the College of Engineering is underway and the members of the search committee have been announced. He noted that a consultant is also being used for this search.

President Lindquist stated that the search committee members for the dean of the Agricultural Research Division and head of the Nebraska Agricultural Experiment Station have just been announced. He noted that he has been asked to serve on this search committee. He stated that the committee is just getting started and candidates will probably not be brought in until the spring semester.

**2.2 Conflict of Interest Committee**

President Lindquist reported that the UNL Conflict of Interest Committee met several times over the summer. He noted that the Committee was formed as a result of a change made by the Regents in the NU Conflict of Interest Policy. He stated that a rough draft of a policy is being written and that the Committee will be meeting on a regular basis once the draft is completed.

**2.3 Committee on Committees**

President Lindquist stated that there has been some difficulty in getting enough people to serve on the Committee on Committees. He asked Senators to see if they can find anyone who would be interested in serving on this committee. He stated that anyone interested should contact Karen Griffin, Coordinator of the Faculty Senate at [kgriffin2@unl.edu](mailto:kgriffin2@unl.edu).

**2.4 Life Sciences Retreat**

President Lindquist announced that there will be a retreat on September 24 entitled "Challenges and Opportunities for the Life Sciences at UNL in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century." This is an all day symposium. More information and the registration form can be found at <http://go.unl.edu/lifesciences/>. He noted that some high powered people will be coming in to speak about where the life sciences are headed at UNL.

**2.5 Faculty Senate Meetings**

President Lindquist wanted to remind senators that the Faculty Senate represents all faculty members on issues of shared governance. He noted that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is composed of 13 elected senators and that the Executive Committee meets weekly for two hours during the academic year and every two weeks during the summer. He stated that the meetings consist of many discussions but the setting is fairly informal. He pointed out that the Senate meetings are more formal which is necessary, but he would like to have a little more of an informal atmosphere in order to facilitate better discussions. He stated that it is important for Senators to speak up, particularly if there are issues that have been discussed by the Executive Committee but have not been brought up at a Senate meeting.

President Lindquist asked that everyone read the minutes from the Senate and Executive Committee meetings and distribute them to their colleagues as they are only sent out to senators. He asked that people let Executive Committee members know if there are issues that need to be discussed at the Senate meeting. President Lindquist asked that the Senators please read the Senate packet before coming to the meeting. He

noted that it is different not having a hard copy of the Senate packet but encouraged senators to review the information in the packet prior to the meeting.

### **3.0 Approval of 4/26/10 Minutes**

Professor Starace, Physics and Astronomy, moved that the minutes be approved. The motion was seconded by Professor Flowers, Psychology. The motion was approved.

### **4.0 Committee Reports**

#### **4.1 Commencement and Honors Convocation Committee Report (Professor Isernhagen)**

Professor Isernhagen reported that Professor Mandigo was Head Marshal for many years and controlled the commencement ceremonies but he has now stepped down as Head Marshal. She stated that Professor Berger is now Head Marshal and he was in charge for the August commencement which went well. She reported that this year college and university banderoles were included adding to the décor of the ceremonies and she encouraged the faculty to attend the ceremonies.

Professor Isernhagen reported that the greatest number of degrees awarded at UNL in a single term occurred at the May ceremonies. The total number of degrees awarded was 2,536. She noted that the May ceremony was also Professor Mandigo's last ceremony as Head Marshal.

Professor Isernhagen stated that the Committee wanted to express its appreciation to Past President John Fech for his work and assistance in trying to increase faculty attendance. She noted that this is an ongoing issue; however, there was better attendance this year. She encouraged the senators to tell their colleagues to attend the ceremonies.

Professor Isernhagen stated that the Committee's recommended action for the Senate is to award Professor Mandigo a commendation for his many years of service as Head Marshal. Professor Zorn, Finance, seconded the motion.

Professor Stockton, West Central Research & Extension Center, asked what the commendation would be. Professor Isernhagen suggested that it be a letter of appreciation from the Senate.

Professor Lawson, Earth & Atmospheric Sciences, recommended that the Senate give Professor Mandigo an appropriate plaque to show a statement of appreciation for his many, many years of contribution to university service. He pointed out that Professor Mandigo's service is no ordinary thing and some kind of recognition beyond a letter should be given.

President Lindquist pointed out that there is no real motion on the floor. Professor Rinkevich, Classics & Religious Studies, moved that the content of the report be accepted along with its recommendations. Professor Zorn seconded the motion.

Professor King, Agricultural Leadership, Education & Communication, suggested that the Executive Committee make the final decision on what will be given to Professor Mandigo.

Professor Erbe, Mathematics, asked how many years Professor Mandigo served as Head Marshal. Professor Isernhagen stated that she thinks it is 29 years but she will find out if this is correct.

The motion to accept the report and award Professor Mandigo a commendation was approved.

#### **4.2 Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee (Past President Fech)**

Past President Fech stated that the most important charge for the FCAC is to conduct an internal study of salaries within UNL and within our peer group. Based on this information the FCAC advises the Chancellor on how to distribute salary increases. The recommendations to the Chancellor are then communicated to the Senate and the faculty at large. He noted that former Past President Prochaska-Cue did a good job in bringing clarity to the membership and distinguishing which members have voting rights. He pointed out that some people who participate in the FCAC meetings are there only to provide information.

Past President Fech reported that the FCAC made five recommendations to the Chancellor, but some of these turned out to be moot because salary increases were not given to most employees because of economic conditions.

Professor Starace noted that recommendation number five suggested that raises that are already built into

grants be permitted. He asked how this recommendation can override what the university decides to do. Past President Fech stated that this recommendation was discussed with the Chancellor but the Chancellor felt that it would be more equitable to not give raises to those on grants.

Professor Carlson, Veterinary & Biomedical Sciences, asked what the recommended split was for giving salary increases. Past President Fech stated that he was not able to attend the meeting where this discussion took place but he will find out more information about it. Professor Peterson, Agricultural Economics, stated that the split has been conventional for a number of years with some of the money going to the deans and vice chancellors to even out salaries across departments. He pointed out that the Chancellor makes the final decision on the exact amount of the split, but this year it is moot.

Professor Carlson noted that there are a number of people on the FCAC membership list that are not currently in these positions. President Lindquist pointed out that the report covers the committee's work for last year.

Professor Sarroub, Teaching, Learning, & Teacher Education, asked if the recommendations will be changing now that we are going to be in a different conference. She asked if our peer group will be changed. President Lindquist stated that he does not envision a change in our peer group. He noted that the change will not have any effect on this year's recommendations, but it is possible the change could have an impact on future recommendations.

Professor Zorn stated that he raised the issue of the separate retirees' medical insurance pool at the last April meeting but there is no mention about it in the report. He stated that the Executive Committee was supposed to take a look at the retiree pool. He pointed out that many people contributed to the insurance pool for a long time for medical insurance with the understanding that they would still be covered when they retired. He stated that the university separated the retirees from the pool, a practice that is known as adverse selection. He stated that he is generally opposed to business firms reneging on promises that have been made in the past and he is opposed to the government and the university making this change with the insurance. President Lindquist pointed out that this is a separate item on the agenda that will be discussed later in the meeting.

#### **4.3 Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report**

President Lindquist stated that the report is about the work the Executive Committee did from the end of April to the beginning of the fall semester. He asked for questions.

Professor Starace stated that some of his colleagues have asked what the motivation was for revisiting the topic of faculty apportionment. He asked how this originated. President Lindquist stated that it came from the Chancellor's office. The Executive Committee was presented with a draft of the faculty apportionment guidelines. He noted that the Executive Committee had the opportunity to suggest changes to the document. This issue will also be a separate item on the agenda to be discussed later.

#### **5.0 Chancellor Perlman**

Chancellor Perlman stated that he wanted to address the retiree medical issue. He noted that Professor Zorn's statement about long term employees, including him, subsidizing retirees in the past is correct. However, he does not think anyone could find that the university promised that the practice would continue or that we would have insurance for any period of time longer than a year. He reported that the university had to move to an assured risk and needed to protect the entire university insurance program. He stated that it was a tough decision. He stated that it is his understanding that most retirees can find medical insurance that is less expensive than the university's. He stated that Varner Hall is looking at some programs, an emeriti insurance program that is designed for retirees. He stated that this program would allow an active employee to contribute to an insurance program that would help pay for insurance when the person retires.

Chancellor Perlman wanted to welcome everyone back to the campus and thank them for their service and stated that he looks forward to interacting with them throughout the year.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the one thing that is constant about our budget is that it is uncertain and as a result we have to act in light of this uncertainty. He stated that indications are that this year's budget is sound and will probably not be looked at again. He noted that there are some signs that revenue is starting to increase for the state but for the next biennium there are some deep concerns. He pointed out that there are predictions of a significant shortfall and the projected shortfall is \$639 million over the next biennium for the state, but it is possible that there could be a projection of a billion dollar shortfall. He noted that the \$639 million prediction is assuming that the tax revenue will increase by 7%, which is a historical average, but this has not happened in several years. He pointed out that there is a cliff affect of the stimulus package and the Governor

has told people who received some of the recent stimulus money not to assume that it will continue. He stated that the expiration of the stimulus funds needs to be considered as a piece of the deficit.

Chancellor Perlman stated that we need to be proactive in terms of the budget and the revenue picture. He noted that he stated in the state of university address that the best strategy for preparing for budget cuts is to explore ways we can do things more efficiently. He pointed out that we need to advance the university in terms of our priorities.

Chancellor Perlman stated that a long term look shows that changes are that higher education in this country will not be the recipient of large tax dollars. He stated that he wants to encourage the faculty and the Senate to think creatively and hard about how we can engage the teaching enterprise in ways that might depart from our historical way of teaching but that doesn't reduce the quality of student experiences. He pointed out that some people might have a higher teaching load which might be in their best interest. He stated that using professors of practice would be a way to maximize faculty contributions in the teaching enterprise and would allow other faculty members to concentrate on research. He stated that he will be encouraging the deans to consider this. He noted that there might be a source of one time funds to assist with this transition. He stated that another way of dealing with the budget problem is to raise revenue. He pointed out that with teaching expertise we might have access to new student markets.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he cannot emphasize enough what an extraordinary effort has gone into bringing the new student information system, PeopleSoft, online. He noted that some people in Student Affairs have been working for the past two years, 12 – 15 hours per day without a break. He pointed out that the system is not perfect yet, and in some respects it is currently less of a system than SIS, but we had to get a new system because the previous one was no longer going to be supported. He reported that PeopleSoft is flexible enough to make improvements to it as we go along and gain more experience. He noted that the system had to be implemented with seven other colleges in Nebraska and everyone is aware that it will not perform perfectly at first. He stated that over 6,000 student records have been transferred from the old system and the program did allow students to register for classes this fall. He noted that the key issues have been taken care of.

Chancellor Perlman stated that MyRed is not like Wham and everyone is aware that it needs improvement. He urged people to be patient and to let Information Services know what things are troublesome about the program.

Chancellor Perlman reported that there have been many questions from the faculty about the Big Ten and the CIC. He noted that the CIC is located in Champaign, IL and more information can be found on its website (<http://www.cic.net/Home.aspx>). He stated that Interim SVCNA Weissinger has taken two teams to the CIC and a team from the CIC will be coming here this fall to educate us on the opportunities will be available to use as a member of the CIC. He pointed out that the administration is exploring every opportunity to maximize the academic opportunities that can arise when we join the CIC in July 2011.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the non-profit corporation (Nebraska Innovation Campus Development Corporation, NIDCD) for Innovation Campus has been formed. He stated that five members from the private sector and four university people will be managing the corporation. He reported that the Board of Regents recently approved the master lease between the Board of Regents and the NICDC. He pointed out that the land of Innovation Campus will belong to the university, but it will be leased to the NICDC. He stated that challenges remain in putting the infrastructure in place. He stated that he believes the private sector will assist with this and university resources will not be used. He stated that he is pleased with how much progress has been made and as soon as development agreements are in place, the ground will start being leveled. He noted that we ought to see a lot of progress this year on the land and he hopes that we will be able to sit down and talk with private sector firms. He noted that an advisory board will be formed soon and there will be faculty members on it. He pointed out that there will be other ways the faculty can contribute with the campus as well.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the voluntary separation incentive program (VSIP) is part of the effort to be creative in capturing some funds and will allow some flexibility with UNL's budget, but he noted that there will be some tradeoffs with the program. He acknowledged that the university benefits from the experience and talent of older faculty members and he does not want the program to be interpreted as a way to get rid of older faculty members and pointed out that he is one of them. He stated that the program might allow people to retire who were interested in retiring, but couldn't. He stated that he would be happy to respond to questions.

Professor Starace noted that public universities in this country have faced and will face increased reduction in state support. He reported that some places like the University of Colorado have negotiated for independence from the state for its total budget. He asked if the Chancellor foresees this as an issue for Nebraska. He asked if we would operate differently by being more competitive. Chancellor Perlman stated that this would not serve as a model for us because we are essentially free from state control. He pointed out that in the 1970's the state legislature dealt with this issue. He noted that most state universities that have privatized have suffered with legislative control over their tuition. He stated that he does not see any advantage to this. He pointed out that if you track tuition and state support over time you will see they are correlated, tuition goes up when state dollars to the university goes down. He stated that he really doesn't think there are any real alternatives. He noted that even the Commissioner of Higher Education reported that every new job created in Nebraska requires education beyond high school. He pointed out that everyone acknowledges that the U.S. used to be number one in the world in terms of the percentage of its population that attended college but we have now dropped to number twelve.

Chancellor Perlman pondered what Nebraska's policy should be. He stated that there is no question that higher education should be one of the top priorities for the state, yet a recent review showed the university as receiving the least amount of increases in state funds of all of the state agencies. He stated that he is hopeful that the legislature will recognize the importance of the university.

Professor Nickerson, School of Biological Sciences, asked if the Chancellor intends to replace faculty members who take advantage of the VSIP with tenure track faculty members. Chancellor Perlman stated that there is no assumption in the program with respect to this. He pointed out that decisions would be unit specific and units would have leeway with this decision. He noted that under the current system any money from a line that is above the starting salary will be captured by the administration. He stated that we might want to relook at the current system to see if it is serving the needs of the university.

Professor Nickerson pointed out that the driving force behind most new hires is the large start-up packages, particularly in the physical sciences. He noted that some of these packages can be more costly than the outgoing faculty member's salary. Chancellor Perlman acknowledged that this is quite possible. He stated that start-up packages are one time funds but salaries can be continual.

Professor McCollough, Anthropology, stated that some colleagues asked how much faculty involvement there was in the creation of the VSIP. Chancellor Perlman reported that there was no faculty involvement. He stated that the administration looked at several universities that are similar to us to see what plans they offered. He noted that many of these universities are two years ahead of us in dealing with severe budget cuts and many of them have adopted similar plans. He stated that after reviewing the plans and speaking with administrators at these other institutions, the administration adopted what it thought was a reasonable plan for the short term, but also long term, benefits. He pointed out that he doesn't think the VSIP is the kind of thing that you have faculty involved in creating. He noted that the Board of Regents policy states that faculty members can try to negotiate early retirement on their own, but the VSIP is a package that the administration is willing to allow under these circumstances.

Professor Zorn stated that several colleagues have wondered why the payout couldn't be given in January of the following year of the retirement date so it would lessen the impact of taxes. Chancellor Perlman stated that he believes there is strong interest in getting the retirement resolved quickly on both sides. He stated that there might be some tax functions that would allow retiring faculty members to deal with the taxes but he is not certain of this.

Professor Lawson pointed out that it is a voluntary program but the university does not have to accept the request. He asked what process would go into turning someone down. Chancellor Perlman stated that this was a good question and he struggled how to frame the decision making. He noted that there will be an honest effort to accept every applicant, but there may be small departments where a number of faculty members would qualify and retiring a significant amount of the professors would severely hamper the department's ability to deliver its academic and research programs. He pointed out that the decision is not going to be based on quality or performance basis. He stated that in some cases a staged system of retirement might be needed. He stated that a denial would be nothing more than a start of a conversation to try to preserve the quality of the university. He reported that requests will go directly to him noting that this way common criterion will be used in deciding whether to grant the request for early retirement.

Professor Fuller, Art & Art History, stated that she has talked to people who are not quite eligible to participate in the program. She asked if there is a way these people can individually negotiate the same plan at a later date. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that this is a window program and any window program will produce some anomalies. He stated that there is no way to insure that the program will be offered again, but faculty members can attempt to negotiate an early retirement package because the Board's policy states that this can be done. He pointed out that faculty members might not get the same terms as the package being currently offered.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he invites people to submit ideas to him about what we can do to increase revenue and cut costs. He noted that he is open to any creative thoughts.

## **6.0 Unfinished Business**

### **6.1 Update on Retiree's Health Insurance**

President Lindquist noted that several questions were raised at the April meeting about the retiree's health insurance pool. He reported that the Executive Committee first met with Professor Hope, one of UNL's faculty representatives to the University-wide Benefits Committee. He stated that there was some discussion with Professor Hope on the retiree's insurance plan but the Executive Committee still had questions so VP Dietze and Greg Clayton, Director, Benefits & Risk Management, were invited to come to a meeting. He pointed out that the best way to fully understand their explanation for why two insurance pools exist is to read the minutes of the June 30 Executive Committee meeting (<http://www.unl.edu/asenate/exec/10jun30mins.pdf>).

President Lindquist reported that in 2000-01 new federal regulations were put into place stating that institutions would have to carry forward their monetary obligations which would have resulted in another \$17 million added annually to the university budget. This would have had an impact on the university's bond rating making it more difficult for the university to get money for projects. He reported that several university committees all recommended separating the insurance pools because this would then release the university from including future insurance obligations into the budget. He pointed out that while this move substantially improved our bond rating, it means there is no hope that the insurance pools will be combined again.

President Lindquist stated that the other request raised at the April meeting was to get comparisons of health insurance plans with our peer institutions. He noted that we did receive some general comparisons from VP Dietze.

Professor Starace suggested that either Director Clayton or VP Dietze be invited to speak to the Senate to report on the impacts of the new health care reform.

The Executive Committee has invited Director Clayton to speak to the Senate at the October 5 meeting.

## **7.0 New Business**

### **7.1 Executive Committee Goals for 2010-2011**

President Lindquist reported that the Executive Committee had a half day retreat to discuss what the goals should be for the Senate this year. He noted that many of the goals roll over from year to year because of the responsibilities of the Senate. He stated that anyone with additional items for the goals should contact the Executive Committee.

### **7.2 Faculty Apportionment Guidelines**

President Lindquist reported that the guidelines were presented to the Executive Committee in the beginning of summer. He noted that there were discussions with the Chancellor about why the guidelines were being created and the justification was that there is a lot of variability across the campus on how faculty evaluations are conducted and having apportionment guidelines will hopefully help define a professor's responsibilities. He pointed out that the faculty members of IANR have clear cut apportionments but this is not the case for many other faculty members. He noted that the apportionments should clearly define the work of a faculty member.

President Lindquist stated that the guiding principles for the apportionment guidelines have been distributed across the campus and now colleges will need to put together clear policies that spell out the issues of apportionment.

Professor Peterson stated that these guidelines relate to the Regents Bylaw 4.3 which was modified in 2000. The Bylaw specifies how disputes between a faculty member and a chair/head are to be resolved. He noted that under Bylaw 4.3 colleges are supposed to have an elected faculty committee that will make a judgment

about a faculty member's apportionment and the college has to adopt proceedings for dealing with these kinds of disputes. He noted that the goal is to mutually resolve apportionment complaints. He stated that the guidelines do not provide information about resolving disputes between a faculty member and the chair of a department. He asked if Bylaw 4.3 could be included in the apportionment guidelines. He pointed out that the Regents' Bylaws supercede campus and college bylaws or policies. (*See below for Bylaw 4.3*)

President Lindquist thanked Professor Peterson for the suggestion and noted that Bylaw 4.3 is an important bylaw for faculty members and he will recommend that the Bylaw be included or referenced in the guidelines. He noted that it is up to the faculty to make sure that colleges develop good policies on apportionment and he encouraged the senators to get involved with providing input to their college on this issue.

President Lindquist pointed out that Bylaw 4.3 states the apportionment of a faculty member's duties should not change instantaneously and should be included in all of the college policies. He stated that any disputes that arise over a faculty member's apportionment should be handled by the elected college committee. He stated that he does not think many faculty members are aware that they can dispute a change in the apportionment. Professor Peterson suggested that the minutes for this meeting include the text of Bylaw 4.3 so Senators can pass this information to their colleagues.

Professor Lawson noted that when faculty members are hired at the university they are given a letter of offer which states the apportionment of duties. He asked what this document has to do with that letter of offer. President Lindquist stated that the letter of offer is a faculty member's initial apportionment but a faculty member, or a chair, might want to change this later. Professor Peterson pointed out that there is some ambiguity with this. He noted that at the time of hiring, faculty are supposed to get in writing a description of their apportionment but by definition this is an impossibility because people do not receive a specific statement exactly defining a person's responsibilities. He stated that for many colleges and departments there is a default apportionment of duties. President Lindquist stated that this may be one of the reasons for the guidelines.

Professor Kranz, Northeast Research & Extension Center asked why we want to have different policies for evaluating faculty in the different colleges. President Lindquist stated that departments across the campus vary in how they evaluate faculty members. For instance a faculty member in art history would not be evaluated on the same things as a faculty member in agronomy.

Professor Zorn pointed out that what Professor Lawson referred to is what he brought up in terms of medical insurance in that the initial letter of offer that a faculty member signs is a contract and this contract gives a faculty member certain legal rights. He stated that post tenure review also needs to be considered in this discussion because it is a policy that the Senate agreed to that states that faculty members who are not living up to their contract can have their position renegotiated by the administration.

Secretary Shea pointed out that within IANR a position description states all the responsibilities associated with a job and when first hired the faculty member and relevant administrators sign this document. He stated that he thinks it is highly desirable to have a position description, but he continues to be surprised that the practice of using a position description is not universal across the campus. He noted that the apportionment guidelines may be an attempt to move more in this direction. He pointed out that faculty members can periodically ask for a review of their position description if they feel that it needs to be revised. He stated that administrators can begin this process as well. He stated that when a position description is revised, all relevant people should be involved and should sign the document.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:09 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, October 5, 2:30 p.m. in the City Campus Union, Auditorium. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, and Patrick Shea, Secretary.

#### **REGENTS BYLAW 4.3**

**NU Board of Regents Bylaws (available at <http://www.nebraska.edu/docs/board/bylaws.pdf>)**

**4.3 Appointments: Apportionment of Faculty Responsibilities; Stated in Writing.** [a] Every

appointment by the University to a position as defined in Section 3.1.1.1 of these Bylaws shall be in writing and signed by the Board or its authorized agent. The writing shall contain the following, and may contain additional mutually agreed upon terms:

- (1) Identification of the type of appointment, either a "Special Appointment," an "Appointment for a Specific Term," "Continuous Appointment," or a "Health Professions Faculty Appointment," as defined in Sections 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3, and 4.4.7 of these Bylaws.
  - (2) A statement that the rights and responsibilities specified in Sections 4.1 through 4.2 of these Bylaws are a part of the appointment.
  - (3) Identification of the appointee's rank, compensation, fringe benefits, and, where applicable, the termination date of the appointment.
- (b) In addition to the written appointment required by this Section, every faculty member appointed to a position as defined in Section 3.1.1.1 of these *Bylaws* shall, when initially appointed, be given a written statement specifically stating and apportioning the faculty member's initial teaching, extension, service, research, and administrative responsibilities.
- (1) This written statement shall be provided by the unit administrator or other appropriate official.
  - (2) The specific apportionment of a faculty member's responsibilities shall be reviewed periodically. Either the faculty member or the responsible unit administrator may initiate discussions of changes in apportionment of teaching, extension, service, research, and administrative responsibilities. In the process of any such discussions, both the faculty member and the unit administrator shall act in good faith to reach a mutual agreement.
    - (i) If the faculty member and the unit administrator are unable to reach mutual agreement with respect to changes in apportionment of the faculty member's responsibilities, the unresolved issues between them shall be expeditiously reviewed and decided by an elected faculty committee of the faculty member's tenure home college or equivalent administrative unit established pursuant to Section 2.9 of these Bylaws. The rules and regulations for each such committee may provide for a representative of the faculty member's tenure home department or equivalent administrative unit to serve as member of the committee.
    - (ii) Each college shall develop rules and regulations pertaining to the membership of this committee. These rules may allow an elected faculty representative of any department(s) or equivalent administrative units) in which the faculty member holds a full or partial appointment to serve on the committee, as either full or nonvoting members.
    - (iii) The committee shall consider the positions of each party in relation to the departmental and college missions, as well as the faculty member's overall areas of professional competence and expertise. The committee shall decide whether the apportionment of the faculty member's responsibilities shall be changed and, if so, in what manner. The decision of the committee shall be reasonably within the faculty member's overall areas of professional competence and expertise; it shall be in writing and it shall not violate the rights and responsibilities of the faculty member provided in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of these Bylaws. It shall be final, subject only to review by the committees established by Sections 4.13, 4.14 and 4.15 of these Bylaws.
- (c) Within the terms of a faculty member's general apportionment of responsibilities, the details of a faculty member's specific assigned duties shall, after consultation with the faculty member, be determined by the department chair or head, unit administrator, or director concerned, consistent with

the requirements of Section 3.4.4 of these Bylaws. Duties may vary from semester to semester, but must be reasonably within the faculty member's overall areas of professional competence and expertise, and shall not violate the rights and responsibilities of the faculty member provided in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of these Bylaws. These decisions are subject to review by the committees established by Sections 4.13, 4.14, and 4.15 of these Bylaws.

(d) Definitions.

- (1) The word "apportionment" as used in this Section 4.3 means and refers to the specified division among teaching, research, service, extension, and administrative responsibilities making up a faculty member's University appointment. It is generally expected that a faculty member's apportionment of responsibilities shall be relatively stable from year to year, unless there is reasonable justification for change.
- (2) The term "assigned duties" as used in this Section 4.3 means and refers to the specific professional activities a faculty member is responsible for carrying out in a given year within each apportioned area of his or her University appointment.

**History:** Amended, 63 BRUN 60 (15 July 2000)  
Amended, 53 BRUN 149 (6 May 1988)