

Executive Committee Minutes

Present: Anaya, Flowers, Franti, Konecky, LaCost, Lindquist, McCollough, Nickerson, Schubert, Shea, Stock

Absent: Berg, Fech

Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2010

Location: 420 University Terrace

1.0 Call

Lindquist called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

2.0 Academic Planning Committee – Professor Bender and Professor Minter

Lindquist stated that the Executive Committee wanted to discuss the letter, rationale, and motion for increasing the elected faculty members to the APC. He stated that the Executive Committee would like to bring the motion to the Senate at its next meeting. He stated that the Executive Committee made some slight modifications to the proposal made by the APC. He noted that two additional faculty members would be elected to the APC for three year terms and language would be included that would state that the Faculty Senate President designee is typically the past chair of the APC.

Bender stated that he did not have any concerns with the suggested changes. He noted that the APC suggested at one of its meetings to have the Faculty Senate President appoint the past chair of the APC as the designee but it was objected because the APC did not want to bind the Faculty Senate President in choosing a designee. However, since the recommendation is now being made by the Executive Committee, he thinks the APC would find the recommendation acceptable. Lindquist pointed out that the wording is not binding and the President still can choose to appoint someone else.

Lindquist asked that Bender have the APC review the revisions. Once approved by the APC the motion will go to the Faculty Senate. Bender stated that he will have the motion placed on the APC agenda for next week and will get notification back promptly so the Executive Committee can take the motion to the November 2 Faculty Senate meeting.

Lindquist noted that the Executive Committee discussed with the Chancellor how the university is changing in part due to budget cuts and in part due to advances in technology and the changing times. He reported that VC Green stated at the last Faculty Senate meeting that these changes should come from the bottom up. He asked how we might get the faculty together to have campus-wide discussions on how the faculty envisions the campus. He asked if small group discussions would be appropriate. He noted that the Executive Committee's thought is to partner with the APC in conducting these campus-wide discussions.

Bender reported that the APC has been discussing the same topic and has talked with Interim SVCAA Weissinger about having the APC involved, possibly as a resource for gathering faculty ideas, consolidating them, and presenting the recommendations to the Chancellor on how to make the academic process more effective and efficient.

Nickerson asked if the APC's long range planning committee would be involved in generating some of the visions for the campus or would it filter the ideas that are made by faculty members. Bender stated that in discussions last spring it was suggested that there be groups of faculty members generating ideas with the APC or the APC's long range planning committee.

Shea asked when the APC's long range planning committee was formed. Nickerson stated that it was formed in 2004. Shea asked what the committee has done since it was formed. Minter stated that the long range planning committee has made recommendations to the APC and eliminated the academic program review subcommittee. She noted that the long range planning committee has been looking at creating a standing subcommittee that would work on graduate curriculum and other similar issues. She stated that so far the committee has dealt with the business of the APC and has made some suggestions for long term changes.

Shea asked if the intent of the long range planning committee is to do long range planning for the university or just for the APC. Minter stated that it has been mostly involved in the long range planning of the APC but would like it to work on planning for the university. She noted that this has been difficult to do as she is new to the Committee and faculty travel schedules and illness have slowed the transition a bit.

Nickerson pointed out that the APC's subcommittees were started because the APC was not involved in the planning of the campus and was only able to respond to the budget cuts being proposed by the Chancellor. He reported that the intent was to have a subcommittee of the APC that would work on long range planning.

Bender stated that the APC had numerous discussions about how the long range planning committee could go about making long term plans. The APC had to acquire data and identify what type of data would be needed and where to get it. He noted that the budget is public information and Director Nunez of Institutional Research and Planning has provided the Committee with a ratio report and other needed data such as credit hours produced by a department, but decisions cannot be based entirely on this kind of data. He noted that some departments don't generate a lot of credit hours or get a lot of grant incomes but that doesn't mean the university should eliminate these departments. He pointed out that he couldn't imagine a great university without a department like Classics. He stated that more faculty input is needed before long range planning can be done.

McCollough asked if the long range planning committee acts as more of a clearinghouse or a visionary group. Bender reported that it is more of a clearinghouse.

Nickerson asked how the APC would feel about working with the Executive Committee on long range planning. Minter stated that one of the struggles with the APC is the amount of hours that are required of the members to do the needed work and she thinks the APC would be happy to collaborate. However, she and Bender will need to take this back to the APC for confirmation.

Lindquist suggested initially having the APC and the Executive Committee meet to try and put some discussion sessions together for faculty to have a targeted conversation about the vision of the university. This could be used as steps for conducting long range planning. He stated that we could have some cross-campus meetings with very specific target ideas.

Minter stated that the faculty might struggle with attending these meetings unless there is some particular exigency that would require faculty to get together to do this kind of work. She pointed out that we would need to articulate why it is best for the faculty to spend their time participating in these discussions. She noted that she has some ideas on language that could be used to encourage faculty members to participate in these discussions.

Lindquist pointed out that everyone knows that more budget cuts are coming and the Chancellor told the Executive Committee that we need to be more efficient with our teaching resources while at the same time increasing our enrollment. He noted that if we want to compete with the Big Ten universities we need to grow in scholarly achievement. He asked how the university can accomplish both of these goals; how do you increase credit hour production with the same or less funding, plus increase scholarly output. He pointed out that all faculty members should be thinking about this because the changes have the potential to impact everyone.

Nickerson stated that another aspect is how the university is going to absorb Innovation Campus. He pointed out that some faculty members want to move to Innovation Campus while others do not. He noted that there are some things taking place with the life sciences that could make significant changes in the university. He stated that the faculty wants to have a voice in these rearrangements.

Shea noted that it is important to keep in mind that the APC's syllabus includes research and service as well as education and the entire scope of university activities should be included in the planning. He pointed out that academics should be a priority but we need to be careful to not restrict our engagement only to academics. He noted that this point has been an issue of contention with senior administration who in the past has expressed the view that the faculty's only purview is academics. He stated that everyone should be welcome to the table for these discussions but he does not want faculty members to be inhibited when administrators are present.

Minter reported that the APC decided to table the decision to approve the revisions to the "Procedures to be Invoked for Significant Budget Reallocation and Reductions" until the

motion to add two more faculty members to the APC has been approved. She noted that the issue is with having representation on the APC during the budget cutting procedures.

Bender stated that the Faculty Senate approved the revisions to the Procedures which included adding a representative from UNOPA and UAAD to the APC as a voting member during Phases I, II, and III of the budget. He reported that there are some members of the APC that are concerned that the faculty members on the APC could be out voted and the concern is whether faculty governance can be maintained or claimed with a committee that has fewer faculty representatives than administrative, staff and student representatives. He noted that ASUN has approved the changes but APC wants to wait to make sure that two more faculty members will be added to the APC.

Minter stated that this is an appropriate time to think about the composition of the APC. She noted that the faculty members have a limited majority on the committee, although the administrators serving on the committee do have faculty positions. She stated that she did not think UNOPA or UAAD representatives ever had voting privileges before. Griffin pointed out that prior to the Procedures being changed in 1993 UNOPA and UAAD did have a voting member on the budget reduction committees. She noted that with the proposed revisions to the Procedures, UNOPA and UAAD representatives would only participate in the budget cutting process of Phases I, II, and III and would not be involved in other APC work.

Schubert stated that he does not think the argument of voting ratios on the APC should be presented as the justification for expanding the membership. He thinks the right reason for expanding the APC is due to the increased workload for the faculty members on that Committee, not that the faculty wants to have a majority of the voting rights. Shea noted that there are also other reasons to expand the number of faculty members on the APC.

Franti pointed out that the Vice Chancellor for Research is a non-voting member of the APC. He asked if it is the practice to not allow the Vice Chancellor for Research to vote, or are other individuals who are non-voting members voting. Minter and Bender stated that voting rights was an issue that was raised at the APC's last meeting. Bender stated that Michelle Green, Coordinator of the APC, keeps strict tabs on who can vote. Griffin stated that she has heard that administrators on the APC will abstain from voting sometimes and this has happened at times during previous budget cuts.

Bender noted that the administrators on the APC have been very helpful. He reported that last year the APC wanted to meet with each of the deans to discuss how the budget cuts will affect their college. He stated that former Dean Allen was very helpful in facilitating these discussions.

Shea stated that he hopes the proposed changes to the Procedures will not get held up. He asked if the expansion of the APC is delayed whether this will hold up the approval of the Procedures. He pointed out that there are other revisions to the Procedures, besides the addition of the UNOPA and UAAD representatives that are important to the process. He noted that it is likely that we are going to have further budget reductions and he thinks

that it is important to have the new Procedures in place for the next round of cuts. Nickerson stated that he entirely agrees and would like the APC to address the revised Procedures as quickly as possible. He pointed out that when he served on the APC he saw very little controversy with the administrators on the committee.

Lindquist stated that he would like to bring the motion to expand the APC to the Senate at the November 2 meeting and the Senate will vote on it in December. He agreed with Shea that we need to move forward on the Procedures to have them in place as soon as possible.

Bender stated that he does not see any reason for a delay in approving the Procedures if the Executive Committee is planning to bring the motion before the Senate on the expansion. Minter stated that she will remind the APC that there are other changes in the Procedures besides the voting changes. Shea pointed out that he thinks it is likely that the UNOPA and UAAD representatives will vote similarly to the faculty during the budget cutting process.

Griffin raised the point that elections to the APC will take place in March and it would be helpful to have the approval of the expansion of the APC completed by then. Nickerson stated that he would like to have the new people on the APC in place by the summer. Lindquist suggested that the motion to the Senate to expand the APC be an emergency motion. Bender asked if it would be helpful to have members of the APC at the November 2nd meeting.

Shea noted that it sounds like very little long range planning has been done by the APC. He pointed out that once there is a committee in place with a syllabus people are going to be watching to see what the committee is doing. He wouldn't want the administration to say that a long range planning committee was formed but the faculty never did any planning.

Lindquist stated that the Senate's liaison to the APC should meet periodically with the Executive Committee to give reports on the work of the APC.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Reception for Professor Mandigo

Griffin asked the Executive Committee if they want to have a reception for Professor Mandigo when the Senate presents his gift of appreciation for his many years of work on the Marshal Corps. The Executive Committee agreed to have a reception.

4.0 Approval of 10/6/10 Minutes

Revisions to the minutes were received. The Executive Committee approved the minutes.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 +1 Draft Resolution

Lindquist reported that he sent the resolution to Greg Clayton, Director of Risk & Benefits, to get feedback but Clayton has not yet responded.

LaCost asked if a parent lives with someone and files an independent tax form would be covered under the +1 revision. Lindquist stated that they would not be covered under the requirements listed. He pointed out that the person would have to be a dependent.

Lindquist stated that he plans on sending the resolution to President Milliken to see what his ideas are on the resolution when he meets with the Executive Committee next week.

Lindquist reported that he received emails from the three other Faculty Senate Presidents who all reported that their campus is going forward with a similar resolution. He noted that the motion will be presented to the Senates in November and voted on in December.

Nickerson asked if the campuses were doing the resolution in unison or will the resolutions be sent over to the Board of Regents at the same time. Lindquist stated that his intent is that once it is approved by the Senate, he will send a letter to each Board member, along with the resolution, notifying the Regent that it was approved. He stated that he will encourage the other Senate Presidents to do the same.

5.2 Concerns About Increased Administrative/Bureaucratic Work for Faculty

Lindquist noted that the Executive Committee had discussed at an earlier meeting about having Vice Chancellor Jackson speak to the Senate or the Executive Committee to discuss concerns about increased administrative/bureaucratic work for faculty members. In response, we sent an email to Senators asking for specific examples of such work. He noted that some examples have been sent to the Senate office. Franti suggested that the examples be sent to the Executive Committee for review to see if there are common issues that are being raised.

Nickerson stated that he is not sure if the Chancellor and other administrators have spoken forcefully enough and tried to educate the Legislature and State Auditor on how the state requirements are making the university less efficient. Lindquist stated that VP Withem stated that the university has put a document together about efficiencies but he does not know to what extent the administrators have worked to educate the Legislature about the inefficiencies some regulations are causing.

Schubert stated that the Executive Committee needs to identify the problems that faculty members are having and suggest solutions to these problems. He pointed

out that the university cannot change rules that are imposed by the State Auditor but perhaps some of the process could be changed.

Nickerson stated that he suspects that some of the additional administravia that has occurred is a result of staff members being eliminated. Schubert stated that faculty members in his college have been informed that they have more staff people working on administrative paperwork now than they had before. LaCost stated that it takes five weeks for her to get a reimbursement for travel.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Board of Regents Agenda

Lindquist stated that the Board will be meeting in Omaha this month and will discuss the expansion of the UNL stadium. The Board will also learn from VP Lechner about health care cost issues in the future. There will also be a vote on the construction of housing and an activity building on the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture (NCTA). Shea noted that there was talk in the past about eliminating NCTA. Lindquist stated that he believes that some of the improvements being made at Curtis are the result of a foundation gift.

Lindquist stated that UNO has developed an nformatics program and the Board will be hearing a presentation on this.

Lindquist stated that there will be a presentation on enrollment at the university.

Lindquist reported that other agenda items include the acceptance of the audit of the university, voting to establish the Water for Food Institute, a community engagement center at UNO, an addition to the Lied Center, building an indoor practice facility at Haymarket Park for baseball, the Big 12 settlement agreement, and at the end of the agenda are the set of strategic plans for the university.

The Board of Regents agenda can be found at <http://www.nebraska.edu/board.html>

6.2 Agenda Items for President Milliken

The Executive Committee discussed possible agenda items for the meeting with President Milliken next week.

6.3 Senate Meeting

Shea stated that he was concerned with Professor Harbison's comments regarding how the Chemistry department was forced required to include all graduate supervisory committee members (including those who are not Department of Chemistry faculty) as part of the department's faculty. He stated that this is disturbing because it influences the National Research Council's rankings which can affect how we are perceived. It will also influence who is asked to serve on supervisory committees. He stated that the Executive Committee should follow up on this issue.

Nickerson suggested that Professor Harbison be contacted to see if he has any further details about this issue.

Flowers noted that there are some long range concerns on just how meaningful the NRC's rankings are. Shea pointed out the process for obtaining information for the rankings needs to be done fairly for all units.

6.4 Article on Eliminating the Humanities from Universities

The Executive Committee agreed to place this item on the agenda for next week's meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be held on Wednesday, October 20, 2010 at 3:00 p.m. in the Faculty Senate Office, 420 University Terrace. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, Faculty Senate and Professor Patrick Shea, Secretary of the Faculty Senate.