

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** Alloway, Bradford, Hachtmann, LaCost, Ledder, Lindquist, Moeller, Prochaska Cue, Rapkin, Zimmers

**Absent:** Bolin, Fech, Flowers,

**Date:** Wednesday, October 3, 2007

**Location:** Faculty Senate Office, 420 University Terrace

**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

Bradford called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.

### 2.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

### 3.0 Approval of 9/26/07 Minutes

The minutes were approved as amended.

### 4.0 Unfinished Business

#### 4.1 Parking Fees

Bradford stated that there should always be an assessment done on the cost of the loss of parking spaces whenever a new building is replacing parking spaces. He noted that compensation should be made for parking. Moeller stated that the issue should be addressed with Chancellor Perlman and VC Jackson.

Bradford asked the Committee whether it should pursue the matter of the size of the parking fees, particularly given the comparisons with parking costs for UNO, UNMC, and UNK. Moeller noted that there is quite a discrepancy between the campuses, even with UNO and UNMC who are in a similar situation with lack of space for parking as UNL. She wondered what the rationale is for the discrepancy. Alloway questioned whether UNL's maintenance costs are that much higher than the other campuses.

Ledder pointed out that the issue of the development of the garages is particularly disturbing. He asked why employees should have to pay for the creation of a parking garage. Bradford noted that parking garages are no different from any other building on campus and the cost of constructing these buildings should not be put on the employees. He stated that he can understand needing to cover the cost of maintenance and enforcement but not the construction of a building.

Moeller wondered what state employees pay for parking. LaCost questioned what the rate of parking is for surface lots downtown. Bradford stated that most of those lots are metered.

Alloway stated that the Committee should request how parking funds are being used and how the comparable costs are covered at the other campuses.

Zimmers asked who gets the money when lots are closed for football parking. Bradford stated that he believes Parking and Transportation Services leases the lots to booster groups.

Griffin pointed out that as more surface lots are used for new buildings, it is forcing employees into the garages where parking rates are even higher. Bradford noted that employees used to be able to park in the garages even if they had a surface parking permit. Alloway noted a former colleague who had served on the Parking Advisory Committee had been surprised by that policy change, and that the colleague did not recall the committee having been notified in advance of the change.

Bradford stated that he will draft a letter to Dan Carpenter, Director of Parking and Transit Services, asking about the difference in the fees between the campuses.

Moeller pointed out that the cost of parking is a hardship for a lot of the staff. LaCost noted that it was not as big of an issue several years ago but the current rate of \$492 a year is very high for many staff members.

Bradford stated that he would like to see a difference in fees for faculty/staff and for administrators. He asked if the Committee wants to wait to see what the Parking Advisory Committee will do with looking into a differential fee scale. Alloway recalled Dan Carpenter's comments that the sliding fee had been considered before but not implemented, and wondered why the Parking Advisory Committee decided against it. Griffin stated that the Committee was told that more staff members park on campus than faculty members and there would be too much of a loss of funding if rates were reduced for the staff. She suggested that the Parking Advisory Committee might want to consider fees based on percentage of an employee's income rather than fixed rates. She noted that \$492 a year for a faculty member making \$80,000 a year is a lot less of a percent of pay than a staff member only making \$25,000 a year.

LaCost wondered if there were bonds on the garages and when these bonds were proposed whether they were presented clearly.

#### **4.2 Diversity Plan**

Bradford reported that the ad hoc Diversity Committee has resolved what they are going to do in terms of whether to revise the previous draft plan or to write a new draft plan. He stated that the Committee will first look at recruitment and retention of faculty members and then move on from there. He stated that the Committee will limit the plan to academic issues.

Moeller asked if the Committee has a timeline. Bradford stated that he does not think there is a timeline. He noted that he has had a series of exchanges with Chancellor Perlman, Assistant to the Chancellor Linda Crump, and Professor Moshman about what is going on with the ad hoc committee and he believes it is moving forward.

Alloway asked if the new ad hoc committee on academic dishonesty has met yet to begin its work. Ledder stated that some of the committee members have been tied up with the Safe Assignment policy but work will begin soon on academic dishonesty.

## **5.0 New Business**

### **5.1 Faculty Representatives for Nebraska Union Board**

Bradford reported that he has had two volunteers from east campus who are willing to serve on the board but he does not have any volunteers from city campus. He asked that if anyone is interested in serving on the Board from the city campus contact him.

Moeller stated that the campus unions have become more of a learning environment. She pointed out that the computer rooms are usually filled and there could be more room for computers added in the future. Alloway noted that VC Franco has an office in the city campus union one day a week.

### **5.2 Recap of Senate Meeting**

Alloway stated that he spoke with Professor Mitchell, a member of the GEAC committee, about the concerns the Executive Committee has about all of the courses coming up for recertification at the same time. He noted that she reported that the GEAC committees are already working on alleviating this problem. He stated that Mitchell told him the members of the GEAC committee who attended the Senate meeting were pleased with the support of the Senate and the tone of the comments made at the meeting.

Bradford stated that there is still some concern with the transition into the ACE program. He noted that this was not really addressed by Professor Janovy. Ledder suggested that it is not absolutely necessary to have the initial ACE courses listed in the bulletin of the first year of the program. A supplement could be published during the summer with information received after the normal bulletin information deadline. Bradford stated that students could be notified to check the web about the ACE program.

Griffin asked when the changes to the University Curriculum Committee will take place. She pointed out that the Senate will need to vote on the changes to the syllabus. Bradford stated that a motion should be presented to the Senate that will address the changes to the Curriculum Committee. He noted that the initial ACE committee for approving the courses will not be up and running until about May. Ledder pointed out that it will take departments probably about three months to get their courses submitted for approval to the ACE program.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, October 10 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Rick Alloway, Secretary.