

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Bolin, Fech, Flowers, Franti, LaCost, Lindquist, McCollough, Prochaska-Cue, Schubert, Shea

Absent: Konecky, Rapkin, Stock

Date: September 16, 2009

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

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

2.0 Announcements

2.1 APC Hearings on Proposed Budget Cuts

Fech announced that the second round of hearings on the proposed budget cut is scheduled for Friday, September 18th.

2.2 Recruiting New Senators

Fech reported that he is trying a new strategy for recruiting senators for departments with an open seat. He stated that he is sending each of the faculty members an email message encouraging them to hold an election in their department for a Senator.

3.0 Minutes of 9/9/09

Shea asked for clarification on a statement in the section on Innovation Campus. Fech clarified the statement he made. The correction will be made in the minutes.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Life Sciences Curriculum

Lindquist noted that the Chancellor mentioned the white paper on life sciences in his State of the University Address. Lindquist pointed out that there are some things in that paper that the faculty needs to discuss. He noted that the paper calls for the creation of a Faculty of Life Sciences (FLS), with an executive committee responsible for organizing the activities of the FLS general assembly and be a direct conduit between the general assembly and the administration. While the document notes the importance of faculty involvement and participation, the executive committee of the FLS would be appointed by the Chancellor in consultation with the Vice Chancellors. He questioned whether or not this is sufficient faculty input into who will represent them on this executive committee.

Lindquist stated that the paper also discusses hiring prioritization of the faculty. He noted that ultimately the decision on who gets hired rests with the administration, but he suggests that faculty members are more knowledgeable about where the future of life sciences is going.

McCollough pointed out that the curriculum belongs to the faculty. Lindquist stated that work is already underway to develop a life sciences core curriculum, but is not aware of who Deans Manderscheid and Waller have involved in the process.

Fech stated that he knows of a professor who feels very strongly that students should still be able to get a good agricultural undergraduate degree without any intention of going to graduate school. He stated that the ultimate target of a student doesn't have to be getting a graduate degree. Schubert pointed out that an undergraduate education should be a gateway to graduate school. Fech agreed, but noted that this professor is very concerned that the discipline will be so rigorous and difficult to complete that some students will not want to get an undergraduate degree here.

Shea stated that in the end the question is who should the curriculum come from. He stated that it is alright for administrators to make recommendations but the curriculum should come from the faculty. He stated that it is wrong for the administrators to select who will be on the committee that will define the curriculum. He pointed out that the administration has stated numerous times that the curriculum is the realm of the faculty. He stated that the administration can help coordinate efforts and help with the implementation of a program, but it is the faculty who should develop the curriculum. He agreed that this needs to be discussed more carefully.

4.2 Research Advisory Board

Shea reported that he spoke with Professor Awada, the new chair of the Research Council, about the Research Advisory Board. He noted that Professor Awada just became chair of the Council and has not had any participation with the Board. Professor Awada suggested that the chair of the Board be invited to speak with the Executive Committee. Griffin stated that she will check to see who chairs the Research Advisory Board.

4.4 Meeting with Chief Information Officer Mark Askren

Fech noted that CIO Askren will be meeting with the Executive Committee next week. The Committee discussed what issues they would like to talk about with the CIO: what his goals and visions are, what his priorities are, what he is thinking in terms of global policies, security issues, how information will be stored, at what level do we integrate purchasing, and coordination of computing on campus.

4.5 Preparation for October Senate Meeting

Fech noted that he will introduce the concept of asking senators to provide information on success stories within their department. He pointed out that there are many success stories out there that might not have received big grant money, but are making a

difference in the lives of students and Nebraskans. He reported that he created a form that senators can fill out and place in a suggestion box at the Senate meeting.

4.6 Update on NU Online Worldwide

Fech reported that he received an entire binder full of information about the marketing analysis that was done prior to creating the NU Online Worldwide project. LaCost stated that she will read it and report back to the Committee.

LaCost stated that there is concern in some departments that this program will hurt them because less tuition income will come back to the department. Lindquist pointed out that currently some departments get money back from distance education courses while others do not.

4.7 Update on Parking

Fech reported that he contacted ASUN, UNOPA, and UAAD about parking concerns. He stated that at this point he has only heard back from Helen Fankhauser from UAAD who basically agreed with the Committee's concern but pointed out that the campus master plan calls for parking garages and perimeter parking. Fech stated that he thinks we need to let the administration know that we are concerned with the continual loss of parking along with the rising cost. He noted that parking concerns are always going to be on the mind of the faculty. He stated that the administration needs to keep in mind when faculty/staff parking spaces are lost that they need to be replaced with similar parking.

Shea stated that he knows that the Committee has met a number of times with people from Parking and Business services, but he thinks we should get an update on how the revenue generated is being spent. He understands that Parking and Transit Services is self supporting.

Schubert stated that we should ask specific questions regarding rates for parking. He pointed out that if the decision is to raise the fees to support the building of the garages then people ought to be able to park in those garages. Franti stated that people with A permits are paying to build the parking garages yet cannot use them. He pointed out that this is unfair and not justified. He stated that there is no reason that Parking cannot change so people with A permits can use the garages. Fech noted that when VC Jackson met with the Executive Committee a couple of years ago she stated that the fees were raised to pay off the bonds needed for building the garages.

LaCost wondered how much money is generated on game days. Franti pointed out that faculty members used to be able to use the garage on game days but this is no longer possible.

Shea stated that it is reasonable to ask questions again about parking. He stated that parking is a fundamental thing for people wanting and needing to go to work. He noted that we are having to park further and further away yet we are paying more and more.

Shea stated that something that he finds disturbing is how the fees are fixed. He noted that it doesn't matter what type of position you have, the lowest paid staff member has to pay the same amount for parking. He recalled custodians on east campus who used to work at night received a discount for parking in the evening, but when put on a day shift they had to pay the additional cost which was very difficult for them given their low salaries. He stated that he believes it is immoral to expect people with low salaries to pay such a high fee.

Schubert pointed out that the faculty and staff members are paying for the infrastructure of the university. He asked if people are expected to pay for the lighting in the offices or the buildings they work in. He noted that he doesn't think parking should be for free, but it should not have gone up as much as it has. Prochaska-Cue pointed out that if you look at the cost of parking in 1999 through 2009 the cost has risen by 18.5% a year. She asked who at the university has received this kind of increase in their salary.

Franti stated that there is no budgeted money for parking from the legislature. Schubert wondered why the university can't allocate some of the increase in salary to offset the cost of parking. He pointed out that this could be seen as a benefit.

Prochaska-Cue recalled discussions when the change was made that prevents holders of A permits from using the parking garages: when concerns were raised about it the administration dismissed them.

4.8 Update on Research Misconduct Policy

Lindquist stated that the Committee working on the policy recently met and decided to rearrange much of the document in order to simplify it. He noted that the Committee had used a template from the U.S. Public Health Service. Some improvements were made to the template but there is a lot of redundancy in it. He reported that the Committee will discuss the newly revised document on October 2nd. He reported that once the Committee has reviewed and made any necessary changes to the policy, the Executive Committee will get to review it. He stated that the hope is to have it ready for the Senate to review at the November meeting.

Shea stated that Associate Vice Chancellor Espy stated that she would come to the Senate meeting to address any questions about the policy.

4.9 Budget Reallocation/Reductions Revision Committee (BRRRC)

Prochaska-Cue reported that the BRRRC met again. She noted that the goal is to revise the current procedures, not throw them out and start with something new. She stated that major concerns with the current procedures include the process; the administration thinks that faculty members have input at the department level when in fact, this is not always the case. She stated that this part of the process needs to be standardized.

Prochaska-Cue stated a question is who should make the decisions. She noted that the majority of faculty members do not want to be the decision maker, but they do want to be

aware of the process and have the opportunity to make comments as the process is occurring.

Prochaska-Cue stated that transparency is another issue that needs to be addressed. She stated that it needs to be clear where we are in the process. She pointed out that this latest round of cuts began in February but oftentimes it was unclear just what phase the campus was in.

Prochaska-Cue noted that the present procedures are very redundant and not well written. She stated that they should be more concise.

Prochaska-Cue stated that the UNOPA and UAAD groups are now totally left out of the process, but previously they were included. She stated that the suggestion would be to bring a representative from UNOPA and UAAD into the APC when dealing with budget cutting issues.

Prochaska-Cue reported that the next meeting is on September 30th and the BRRRC is planning on meeting every week through October. She stated that she hopes that they will have specific revisions ready in November.

Prochaska-Cue stated that she has asked Associate to the Chancellor Poser to ask the Chancellor if he has any specific concerns with the procedures that he would like addressed. She asked if anyone on the Executive Committee has other concerns to please let her know.

Flowers noted that there was far more representation of faculty and staff members in the previous process. He pointed out that one concern with having a larger group of members is the issue of confidentiality. Prochaska-Cue reported that this was discussed. She noted that ASUN has two student representatives on the APC but UNOPA and UAAD have none.

4.10 Five Year Review of SVC Couture – Issues

Fech reported that he and Shea will be interviewed next week for SVC Couture's five year review. Shea stated that he believes he and Fech will be meeting together along with Professor Bender, chair of the APC.

Shea reported that he has asked for a list of SVC Couture's accomplishments and activities so he can provide better feedback for the review. He noted that there are five or six questions that will be asked. He stated that all administrators should provide a list of their accomplishments every year just like the faculty members have to. McCollough stated that the document should be made public. She questioned how the faculty is to work better with the administration if we do not know what is being reported and what their projections are.

Shea suggested that the Senate be solicited for input on SVC Couture's performance. He stated that if information is provided, this can be presented as well as his own view.

Fech agreed to send out the list of questions to the Senators.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Benefit Issues for UNL Faculty Representative to University-Wide Benefits Committee

Fech reported that he has been talking to Professor Hope and Professor Skipton, UNL's representatives to the U-wide Committee about a possible ROTH IRA, disability, and medical reimbursement. He noted that the health care reimbursement account can be for a 12, 15, or 18 month period but the university opts for the 12. Prochaska-Cue pointed out that there is the issue of having a health savings plan or a health flexible plan. She stated that it is up to the employer to choose which one. With a health savings account the money could rollover until a person is 65 and then it would be put into the retirement package if a person retires. She noted that a person would only be allowed to contribute a certain amount each year.

Fech stated that the UNL representatives will raise these issues at the U-wide Benefits Committee meeting.

5.2 Storage Space Charges for Needed Equipment

Shea reported that he was told that some departments are implementing a charge for storage of equipment as a way to garner more funds. McCollough stated that this is occurring in Arts & Sciences and that it is a major issue for archeologists who need a lot of equipment to conduct field studies. Lindquist stated that there is a proposal to start charging \$5 per square foot of storage space in Agronomy & Horticulture, including shelf space.

Shea stated that things are heading in the wrong direction at the university. Faculty members should have enough support to do their job of conducting research and teaching, not penalized for it by being charged for storage of the equipment that they need.

Franti pointed out that 40% of grant money received is being diverted from the faculty member.

The Committee agreed to put the issue on the agenda for the meeting with the Chancellor on October 7th.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, September 23rd at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in Faculty Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and David Rapkin, Secretary.