

UNL FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
City Campus Union, Auditorium
March 5, 2013
Presidents Guevara and LaCost, Presiding

1.0 Call to Order

President Elect Guevara called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Upcoming Executive Committee Elections

President Elect Guevara stated that nominations were still being sought for elections to the Senate Executive Committee. He reported that elections will need to be held for President Elect, Secretary, and three Executive Committee members. He stated that anyone wishing to run for election, or anyone interested in nominating someone for election, should contact any of the current Executive Committee members or Karen Griffin, Coordinator.

2.2 Louise Pound-George Howard Award

President Elect Guevara reported that Professor Helen Moore and Emeritus Professor John Janovy were approved by the Senate to receive the Louise Pound-George Howard Award for Distinguished Career Service. He stated that both recipients will have the award presented to them at the April 14 Honors Convocations Ceremony and at the April 23 Faculty Senate meeting.

2.3 Update on Executive Committee Work

President Elect Guevara reported that the Executive Committee submitted proposed changes to the ACE Governance and Assessment Document to the University Curriculum Committee for its consideration. He stated that the proposed changes calls for the removal of “at least three samples” of coursework and makes departments/units responsible for recertification based on internal assessment of ACE courses.

President Elect Guevara stated that the Executive Committee will be reviewing proposed changes to the Information Technologies and Services Committee membership as suggested by the Executive Committee. He noted that the Executive Committee will also be reviewing the Commencement and Honors Convocations Committee syllabus to add a representative from the Alumni Association as a non-voting member.

President Elect Guevara reported that the Executive Committee submitted a statement to the Chancellor and to the Information Technologies and Services Committee expressing concern about the use of the KACE program on faculty computers.

President Elect Guevara stated that the Executive Committee reviewed data for the past five years on Convocations Committee funding. He noted that the Convocations Committee will be meeting soon to discuss revising their guidelines and increasing funding for guest speakers.

3.0 Associate Vice Chancellor Yoder

Associate VC Yoder thanked the Senate for inviting him to speak. He noted that prior to being Associate VC he served as chair of the Biological Systems Engineering department. He stated that he was asked to speak about the plans to hire 36 new faculty members in IANR. He noted that there has been a great deal of interest recently about this, but the process has been going on for quite some time. He stated that in 2011 VC Green had the leadership of all departments and IANR look at what the future challenges are for Nebraska and the region and what resources IANR has to help the state address these challenges. He noted that over the next year a fairly long process occurred in the units, research and extension centers, and other IANR centers to define IANR’s areas of strength in dealing with these challenges.

Associate VC Yoder reported that in 2012 a retreat was held that refined the areas that IANR wanted to invest in: science literacy, stress biology, computational sciences, healthy humans and healthy systems for agricultural product and natural resources. He stated that it was also recognized at the retreat that in any given departments critical faculty positions were needed. He reported that six areas of core positions were defined. He stated that the administration then went back to the faculty to identify these core positions that are needed for IANR to continue critical programs. He stated that approximately 47 positions were originally identified as needed, but this number was narrowed down to 36 based on available resources. He reported that near the end

of the last calendar year these 36 positions were identified and the Institute is now embarked in the process of filling these positions. He noted that there has been some questions about what portion of these faculty positions will address the instructional mission of the university and it was determined that 8.5 FTE's were needed for teaching, which will fill CASNR's FTE by 10%. He pointed out that this is the largest increase in faculty hires that anyone can recall in recent history.

Associate VC Yoder stated that one of the questions that are being asked is where the funding is coming from for these positions. He reported that IANR stopped filling some positions about a year ago. He pointed out that there was not a hiring freeze but units had to explain why filling a position was a critical need. He stated that over a period of time there has also been some attrition, particularly with the VSIP retirements. He reported that when the campus was going through budget cuts in 2003 the IANR administration became very cautious of spending money for faculty hires and the administration retained this money resulting in a pool of money that could also be used. He reported that after looking at various available funds the administration decided the best investment for this money would be in faculty positions. He stated that faculty members and department heads were engaged in the process of identifying these positions and the process was done in a very calculated and planned manner.

Associate VC Yoder reported that if sequestration occurs it will take funds away from other areas which could have some impacts on the faculty hires but he does not anticipate any serious impacts.

Professor Nickerson, School of Biological Sciences, stated that he applauds IANR's courage to hire 36 new faculty members. He noted that he estimates that the start-up package for these positions could come to roughly \$9 million and asked where this money would come from. Associate VC Yoder stated that this is a good question and department heads were asked to identify important faculty needs and what would be required for start-up funds. He pointed out that not every one of the hires is for a bench scientist so the start-up needs are not as great. He stated that after looking at all of the positions it was estimated that \$5 million would be needed to cover start-up funding.

Secretary Woodman pointed out that there seems to be an overlap in the areas of stress biology and the life science initiatives and asked how these new positions would work in these areas. He asked if some of the faculty positions will be shared by some units. Associate VC Yoder stated that there have been conversations with people working in these areas and the bottom line is that the units are willing to share any of these positions if it is possible. He noted that the Computational Science areas are working closely with Dean Manderscheid to see if some of the new positions could be shared. He pointed out that Statistics is half IANR faculty and half Arts & Sciences faculty. He stated that there have been discussions taking place across the university because it is important that these new faculty members be very integrated.

Professor Zlotnik, Earth & Atmospheric Sciences, asked if anyone considered creating a new unit with some of these new hires, a unit where people were related by discipline. Associate VC Yoder stated that focus was not on the units per se because it was expected that all of the conversations about these positions would be cross disciplinary. He pointed out that all of the units that have any interest in stress biology were involved in the discussions and he knows that there were five areas where a joint conversation of department heads was held. He noted that two departments had disciplinary interest and Professor Brewer, chair of Entomology lead a cross campus effort to get all areas of biology interested in these discussions. He stated that everyone who was interested came to the table for discussion and at times there were as many as ten unit heads at the table in discussions. He noted that every one of these positions needs a tenure home, but the goal was to develop multi-disciplinary teams to work together.

4.0 Approval of February 5, 2013 Minutes

Professor Joeckel, School of Natural Resources, moved for approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded by Professor Wysocki, Computer & Electronics Engineering. The motion was approved.

5.0 Committee Reports

5.1 Parking Advisory Committee (PAC) Report (Professor McCoy)

Professor McCoy reported that the PAC has been a very full and active committee that had numerous, serious and in depth discussions with student leaders about the increase in student fees for transit services which will have direct impacts on transportation and parking budgets. He stated that the fee increase represents a fundamental change in the transit system funding and attempts to create a more balanced and representative approach.

Professor McCoy reported that over the past year the PAC completed transition of the intercampus bus service

to StarTran which became effective on January 1. He stated that the Committee for Fee Allocation approved a 62.3% budget increase for UNL Transit Services which raised student transit fees from \$15.46 to \$25.10 in the 2013-2014 academic year. As a result Transit Services will see a budget increase of more than \$441,000. He reported that with this increase the PAC was able to recommend that there be no increases for parking permits for the next fiscal year.

Professor McCoy reported that the wrap around garage and apartment complex slated for 18th and R streets has yet to be approved by the Board of Regents and the City Council but it is expected to be approved. He noted that if all goes as planned groundbreaking should occur at the end of the month.

Professor McCoy reported that PAC recommended an increase in the university parking meter fees in heavily used areas to \$1.25 an hour. He noted that other meters would increase to \$1 per hour. He pointed out that these are the first increases in meter rates since 2000.

Professor McCoy stated that PAC had conversations about parking permit fees being based on salary but decided to table this until next year. He noted that the PAC does not recommend action at this point.

Professor McCoy stated that PAC has been discussing acquiring new radio access frequency for garages which would let people know what the parking flow is like on campus. He stated that this identification system would be available to people using smartphones and would tell them what lots have available parking. He noted that acquisition of this system would be used with supplemental funds and would not require an increase in fees.

Professor McCoy reported that PAC surveyed other universities to do a comparison on parking fees and found out that UNL is doing pretty well in the cost of transit fees compared to many of the other schools. He noted that even with the fee increase this fall we still rank in the bottom third of the institutions surveyed. Secretary Woodman asked where we stand in regards with parking fees. Director Carpenter, Parking & Transit Services, noted that parking is funded differently at some of the other institutions, but when you separate the funding out we are in the middle in terms of costs for parking permits.

Professor Carlson, Veterinary & Biomedical Sciences, asked what the cost of a transit permit is for someone who does not purchase a parking permit. Director Carpenter stated that the cost is \$10 a month if no permit is purchased which is still half of what StarTran charges. Professor McCoy pointed out that faculty/staff members who purchase a parking permit can receive a transit pass for free.

Professor McCoy stated that for clarification the conversation with students about increasing the transit fees was based on fair cost sharing. He noted that the students were willing to help subsidize the transit services to a certain extent, but when it was pointed out that the number of students who use the transit services is significantly higher than faculty and staff they were willing to accept the increase in fees. He reported that for a number of years the university delayed acquisition of new buses which would have been costly, particularly with the new pollution standards that buses are required to have. He stated that one of the rationales for going to StarTran is the ability to apply for federal government support of the transit system.

Professor Shea, School of Natural Resources, asked who the peer group is for the permit cost comparisons. Director Carpenter stated that the group surveyed was a mix of Big Ten schools and members of UNL's peer group. Professor Shea reported that he conducted a survey this past fall on parking permits and found UNL's rates to be towards the higher level, even though he surveyed many of the same schools. Director Carpenter pointed out that the transit fees associated with UNL's permits needs to be removed when comparing with the other schools for parking.

Professor Shea stated that when VC Jackson spoke to the Senate about parking she stated that she believes there might be some consideration to move some of the Parking & Transit Services' budget to the university's operating budget. Director Carpenter stated that this question was posed to her, but she said that doing this would add cost to the university budget resulting in the need to make budget cuts elsewhere. Professor Shea stated that he hopes that this kind of discussion can be continued. He stated that he thought the Chancellor had said that the university cannot pay for parking. Director Carpenter pointed out that the university cannot allocate money to construct a building for parking.

Professor Shea noted that Professor McCoy earlier had stated that PAC discussed a salary based permit fee structure but tabled this discussion, yet the PAC report says that the Committee recommended against this structure. He asked for clarification. Professor McCoy stated that PAC recommended against the salary based

permit fee structure at this time but agreed that it was a worthy conversation to discuss in the future. He pointed out that PAC does not want to ignore the fact that there are some people who are very supportive of the concept if there is a way to make up the lost revenue. Professor Shea noted that the University of Illinois has a salary based permit fee structure and suggested that PAC look into its structure.

Professor McCoy stated that another issue in regards to parking is that when the state legislature or the university allocates money to construct another building the funds do not go towards parking. He noted that many parking lots have been lost due to construction projects and PAC has tried to balance where to create new parking. He stated that PAC studies the parking issue on campus and has to take into account the goal of increasing student enrollment but PAC hopes to be able to find some answers to the parking concerns.

Professor Carlson noted that when the Kauffman Center was built two large parking lots that had been recently improved were lost. He pointed out that there was no recompense for covering the cost of losing these improved lots. He thought the administration had made some promise that this would not happen again and that any new construction would have to cover the loss of parking. Director Carpenter reported that the new housing units being built and the Jackie Gaughan Multi Cultural Center covered the cost of loss parking, but he does not know if the same thing would happen if academic buildings are put on existing lots. He stated that building projects are to include these figures and there has been support from the academic side on it but he is not sure if it will happen in all cases.

Professor Carlson stated that he is confused with some of the cost comparisons in the survey of other schools. He noted that some revenue goes to subsidize transit services and students will accept the heavy burden to cover these costs. He asked what percentage of our parking fees actually goes towards parking in comparison to the other schools. Director Carpenter stated that if an institution has separate funds to cover transit fees than 100% of the parking permit fee is used to cover debts and maintenance. He pointed out that at Texas A & M none of the parking fees subsidize transit services, but each institution is different. He stated that this was the first time in three years that there has been an increase in parking rates. Past President LaCost asked if the parking permit fee can be broken down. Director Carpenter stated that 40 cents of every dollar from parking permits is used to cover debt services. Professor Weissling stated that it would be helpful to see all of the data from our peer institutions because parking is a hot topic in the departments.

Professor Joeckel, School of Natural Resources, stated that he is curious to learn that ultimately there is a formulaic approach as to how much parking is available on campus. Professor McCoy stated that parking needs are based on enrollment figures at the university. Director Carpenter stated that it is a 48% rate for the campus population to available parking spaces. Professor Joeckel asked if this includes the faculty and staff. Director Carpenter stated that this is for the entire campus population. He pointed out that some of PAC's goals to have larger UNL surface lots in four-five years does not jive with the goal to have a greener campus. He suggested that this could be addressed by resetting the formula that is used for parking. Professor McCoy stated that when he first started serving on PAC he was skeptical but his personal experience on the Committee has changed his views. He noted that Parking & Transit Services recently hired consultants to review the parking situation on campus to see how we could provide better parking. He stated that one of the suggestions was to improve the use of mass transportation which would fit in with the "greener campus" idea. However, this is a cultural problem because many people do not want to use mass transportation. He noted that with a new campus master plan being developed it would be more efficient to have a fixed rail system that could be used between the campuses but the cost associated with this would be high.

Professor Carlson asked what the ratio to population is to parking, east campus versus city campus. He stated that in the big picture there appears to be plenty of parking spaces, but if you go to particular areas of campus parking can be very limited. He questioned how this situation would be remedied. Director Carpenter noted that this is difficult to do because there are a lot of unused spaces on east campus but not on city campus.

5.2 Graduate Council Report (Associate VC Perez)

Associate VC Perez was unable to make the meeting. The report was included in the Senate package. Anyone with questions should contact either Associate VC Perez or Assistant Dean Bellows.

5.3 Committee on Committees (CoC) (Professor Cassner)

Professor Cassner reported that one of the main responsibilities of the CoC is to provide nominations and recommendations to the Faculty Senate President to make appointments to various campus and Senate committees. She stated that she wanted to acknowledge the work of the other Committee members and Karen Griffin, Coordinator of the Faculty Senate. She asked that Senators encourage colleagues to serve on campus committees and noted that they can indicate their interest by filling out the committee service preference form

located on the Senate webpage <http://www.unl.edu/facultysenate/> or they can respond to the email messages sent out by Karen asking for volunteers to serve on various committees.

Professor Carlson asked if all of the committees are fully staffed and functional. He stated that it would be more valuable to know which committees are critically short compared to what committees are popular. He wondered what happens to the work of the committees when they are chronically understaffed. Coordinator Griffin stated that she did not think any of the committees were chronically understaffed, but some committees are definitely more popular with the faculty: the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, the Information Technologies and Services Committee, the Teaching Council. Other committees are not as popular and the CoC typically has to seek people to serve on them. Professor Cassner pointed out that the email messages that are sent to all faculty members asking for volunteers to serve on committees indicates the number of people who are needed on each committee. She stated that the CoC has had fairly good luck in getting people to serve on committees once they have been personally asked by members of the CoC.

Professor Eskridge, Statistics, asked if there are any committees that are not active. Coordinator Griffin noted that some committees do not have to meet often during the year, such as the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee or the Convocations Committee, while others, such as the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee meets monthly. She noted that several years ago a review of committees was conducted by the Senate Executive Committee and several committees were combined to reduce the number of committees.

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Motion to Approve the Ballot for Elections to the Academic Planning Committee, the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee, and the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Panel

President Elect Guevara noted that the Senate was presented with the ballot at the February meeting and is seeking approval so it can be sent to the faculty. Professor Peterson, Agricultural Economics, motioned to approve the ballot. Professor Carlson seconded the motion. Professor Wysocki stated that he had concerns with one of the faculty members on the ballot. He asked what would happen if this person should win because he typically does not show up for meetings. Professor Peterson and Professor Shea, both former chairs of the Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee, stated that the professor would be removed from the panel if he failed to serve. Professor Joeckel pointed out that this is a moot point because there is an election and the faculty member may not even win the election. The motion was approved.

7.0 New Business

7.1 UNL Committee on Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Concerns (CGLBTC) (Dr. Tetreault, Director of the LGBTQA Resource Center and Gregory Nosan, CGLBTC President) Optional Identity Questions on Surveys, Preferred Names and Pronouns, and Online Bias Reports and Response Team

Mr. Nosan stated that the CGLBTC has been active since 1989 and was started by Dr. Tetreault. He reported that committee members are a mix of faculty and staff, some who are GLBT and some not, who try to make the university a better place and ally for students, faculty and staff. He stated that the Committee meets once a month, particularly the faculty members, and they are always trying to get more faculty members involved.

Mr. Nosan reported that the CGLBTC works on a range of projects including supporting student political action and the LGBTQA Resource Center and is working with the University Foundation to help endow a scholarship. He stated that the Committee has worked for the past ten years on trying to get employee plus benefits at the university. He noted that the Committee has started a queer reading group that meets regularly and attracts faculty, staff, and students. He stated that there is a list serve that people can subscribe to that will keep you posted on the current activities of the Committee. He reported that the Committee is interested in demographics and how to identify students that may need or want assistance. Dr. Tetreault pointed out that there is a very high volume of people subscribed to the list serve which provides information on all programming events of the CGLBTC and provides action alerts.

Dr. Tetreault reported that she is the only professional member employed at the LGBTQA Resource Center but she does have graduate student help. She stated that there are a lot of collaborative programming and opportunities for student to get involved and there are library resources that are cataloged into the university library system.

Dr. Tetreault noted that she has discovered that people do not always understand the distinction between all of the different terms used to identify LGBTQA people. She pointed out that that her office is trying to track these students and to raise awareness to the campus about the distinctions of them. She noted that national data indicates that approximately 6% of students are willing to identify themselves as LGBTQA but students

are not asked to identify their sexual preference when they are admitted. She reported that 118 students this past fall asked for information on the topic. She stated that the CGLBTC would like to see campus surveys include an optional identity question which could help provide better demographics. She noted that the word gender can be defined in a lot of different ways.

Dr. Tetreault stated that using preferred names and pronouns of students goes beyond the classroom and benefits international students who adopt English names because they can be more easily used. She wanted to encourage instructors to ask students if they have a preferred name and what pronoun they prefer to use. She noted that this could be done in the classroom or in a private space. She stated that some students will let an instructor know especially if they are transgender students.

Dr. Tetreault reported that over the years an assessment on the climate for LGBTQA students has been conducted and the findings are that the climate on campus has improved. She noted that when first assessed 100% of LGBTQA students stated they felt bias, but this figure has dropped to 79%. She pointed out her own experience is that there are other prejudices that also exist on campus. She stated that some LGBTQA students have a tendency not to tell anyone when they experience bias. She noted that having an online form where students can report these incidents would be helpful and might encourage students to report these incidents. She stated that there is a website for the CGLBTC (<http://www.ul.edu/cglbtc/>) and for the LGBTQA Resource Center (<http://involved.unl.edu/lgbtqa/resources/center.php>). She stated that the goal is to raise awareness, not punish anyone. She pointed out that if a crime occurs students should contact the Campus Police, but if there is a bias concern a member of the Bias Response Team can be contacted. She stated that the members of the team can evaluate the situation and determine what can be done. She noted that handouts about the LGBTQA Resource Center are available through Student Involvement.

Professor Carlson asked how an incident of bias can be assessed. He stated that he is concerned with third party observations when someone overhears or witnesses bias. He asked how the Bias Response Team assesses whether an incident is bona fide or is just a misunderstanding or misinterpretation. Dr. Tetreault stated that those people involved in the Bias Response Team, Jan Deeds of the Women's Center, Sylvia Hall of the Jackie Gaughan Multi-Cultural Center, Tim Alvarez of the Office of Student Affairs, and herself are all very aware that some things can be misperceived and they have all received training on this issue. She pointed out that the intent is not to punish anyone involved but to contact them and to talk about the dos and don'ts if someone is experiencing harassment. She noted that they do not want to jump to conclusions but want to listen with an open mind. She stated that sometimes people may be overly sensitized and the team wants to assess if there is really a problem and if there is, how can it be made better. She noted that this is one of the reasons why people are being encouraged to report instances to the Campus Police if they think it is a crime. She pointed out that if a Bias Response Team member feels that a crime has been committed they will contact Campus Police. However, if an incident is reported anonymously there is very little that can be done about it. As a result, the reality is that some students may not tell anyone about the incident making the student feel isolated and not seeking help when they really need it. She stated that the efforts are to provide a resource for LGBTQA students. She stated that if the Bias Response Team knows about situations they provide resources that can help and create a more welcome and respectful climate for everyone on campus.

Secretary Woodman noted that this is a small state in terms of population and some students experience a transition when they come to campus. He asked if any input has been provided on having non-gender specific restrooms. He stated that he has heard of some students going across campus to the union to use restroom facilities. Dr. Tetreault stated that it is her understanding that the campus is considering having non-gender specific restroom/family rooms and changing areas in new buildings that are planned for construction. She reported that there is one restroom on city campus that can be reserved, but this is out of the way or not available at times. She stated that there is a list of public gender neutral bathrooms in the downtown area and hopefully this will help. She stated that the Robert Knoll Residence Center on 17th and R streets has gender neutral restrooms. She pointed out that it is expensive to remodel the older buildings on campus but the campus is making efforts to make these restrooms more available in new buildings.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, April 2, 2:30 p.m. in the East Campus Union, Arbor Suite. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, and David Woodman, Secretary.

