

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: **Anaya, Anderson, LaCost, Lindquist, Nickerson, Purdum, Rinkevich, Schubert, Shea, Varner, Wysocki**

Absent: **Irmak, Struthers**

Date: **Wednesday, April 27, 2011**

Location: **201 Administration Building**

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

LaCost called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

2.0 Chancellor Perlman

2.1 Budget Cuts – how decisions are made

Chancellor Perlman stated that the simplest answer is that he follows the procedures that the campus has agreed to and that have been approved by the Board of Regents. He noted that the best thinking on the budget from the academic side comes from the deans and ultimately the campus administration makes judgment calls about what is best for the university. He pointed out that no formula or spreadsheets are used in determining the cuts, but some very difficult decisions have to be made. Anaya asked if the number of students enrolled in a program is considered when the decision is made to cut a program. Chancellor Perlman stated that all of the data is considered including what the trends are for a program. He noted that academic programs that are eliminated normally have small enrollments and the trajectories reviewed show that there will not be significant enrollment in the program. He stated that his recollection with the organ program in the School of Music is that there was only one student enrolled last year and it is not considered a sustainable program over a long period of time.

2.2 Apportionment Concerns due to Budget Cuts and Retiring Professors and Plans to Cover Courses Vacated by Retiring Professors

SVCAA Weissinger asked what the specific concerns are in regards to apportionment. Lindquist pointed out that there will be 56 course sections open because of the large number of professors retiring from the university on the voluntary separation incentive program and there is concern that some faculty members will have much larger teaching loads to cover these courses.

SVCAA Weissinger stated that the voluntary separation program created a great deal of uncertainty but also a lot of opportunities. She noted that it was a fortunate situation for professors who could retire because they will receive an equivalent of next year's salary when they leave, but this forces us into a process to determine how courses will be covered by the vacating professors. To help deal with this her office has created a form

asking the department what courses the person taught and that must be retained. The next question was how a department was going to solve the problem of open courses for the 2011-12 academic year. The result of the form has been the development of a plan to cover the needed courses. She reported that some temporary instruction money is being provided to meet some of the teaching needs. She pointed out that it is similar to covering people who are going on sabbaticals. She stated that whether some of these temporary solutions become permanent would depend on the department and the deans. She pointed out that it was known from the beginning that not all of the open positions created by the separation program would be refilled.

LaCost stated that some conversations from the faculty concerning apportionment relates back to the suspension of pay policy. She stated that there is concern that people might have their teaching loads reapportioned and this could become an issue for some. Anaya pointed out that the concern is that some faculty members will be told over the summer that they are going to have to pick up an additional teaching load for the fall semester. LaCost noted that some people have already been asked to teach three courses a semester.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he believes the deans all have plans in how they are going to deal with the open courses and he would be somewhat surprised if they have not already communicated these plans to the departments. He pointed out that in the normal course of events there is a reciprocal stated agreement that people fill in for someone who is ill or is on a sabbatical. He stated that this is just a regular part of academic life and he does not want to make this process bureaucratic.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the suspension policy is not an apportionment issue. He stated that the idea of the policy came from a case where a faculty member, who had a 50% teaching appointment, refused to teach and therefore, he suspended the faculty member's salary. He stated that the case was brought to the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee and the special hearing committee stated that the Chancellor had to terminate the faculty member first before suspending his pay. However, the Board of Regents disagreed noting the state law that says that people cannot be paid for work they have not done. He thought, from a faculty perspective, there might be a fear that an administrator might use that power against a faculty member given the authority the Board has now given administrators with the decision that they made on this case. He stated that he brought the issue to the Executive Committee because he believes this is a sensitive issue that the faculty would want input on. He pointed out that the suspension of pay policy would not allow an administrator to just come in and say that a person didn't do a good job and therefore would not be paid. He noted that a case like the one we had here is rare and he hopes that we never have another case like it, but if this should happen again, there would be a policy in place that was created through faculty consultation.

Lindquist stated that he asked the Academic Rights & Responsibilities to review and make a recommendation for a policy. He noted that some of the members of the ARRC drafted a plan, but overall the ARRC felt that the Regents Bylaws are adequate enough to cover this kind of situation. He reported that the Executive Committee is still reviewing

the draft policy and plans to get back to the Chancellor. Chancellor Perlman stated that he does not think this is a significant problem, but one that should eventually be addressed. He noted that it would be much more difficult to draft a policy listing reasons why a person couldn't be paid.

Chancellor Perlman stated that apportionment itself is a controversial issue for some faculty members depending on where they are in their careers. He noted that it is a long standing practice in IANR to have apportionment defined annually because funding sources are distinct. He stated that the future of higher education shows that there are not big bundles of money available in the near future and it is likely that faculty roles will change and be more diversified than they are now. He pointed out that he is not advocating this, but this is what the trends are showing. He stated that if the campus is going to maintain momentum we will need to change things to fit and some faculty members might excel in specific areas and they should be allowed to concentrate their efforts in these areas.

Chancellor Perlman stated that during a faculty member's career interests can change and apportionment is a good way to handle these changing interests. He noted that evaluation and reward follows apportionment. Lindquist stated that the conversations the Executive Committee have had about this issue are in agreement. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that apportionment is first defined for a faculty member in the letter of offer. He stated that he appreciates faculty members not wanting to suddenly have a change in their apportionment before the semester begins and there are procedures in place to address this should it happen.

Purdum pointed out that it is not always easy for a professor to change their apportionment. She noted that in IANR the deans have a formula on how much money departments get for teaching and research. She stated that if someone wants to change their apportionment to do more teaching it would change the formula and administrators sometimes are not willing to do that. Chancellor Perlman stated that this seems like a constraint that the deans have created. He noted that it is not in the Regents policies to distribute funds in this manner.

2.3 Upcoming Issues

Differential Tuition Rates

Chancellor Perlman noted that there was an article in the Omaha World Herald on a proposal to have differential tuition rates for the College of Business Administration and the College of Engineering. He stated that he will make a presentation to the Board of Regents on April 29 asking for approval. He stated that the proposal calls for \$50 a credit hour increase per credit hour for resident undergraduates for these two colleges and corresponding increases for non-resident undergraduates and all graduate students as well. He reported that we are the only institution within the Regents peer group that does not differentiate tuition rates. He noted that the Business College is falling far behind in getting support and for increasing enrollment, but even after tuition rates are differentiated we will still be in the last of the Big Ten for these colleges.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the extra \$50 per credit hour for the College of Engineering is in addition to the \$40 already being assessed for these courses. Even with this increase the Engineering College will still be at or near the bottom of the two peer groups. He pointed out that the Engineering College is essential to Innovation Campus and to the campus as a whole. He noted that Engineering is one of the strengths in the Big Ten institutions. He stated that it is his sense that the biggest restraint in Engineering is that we don't have a critical mass. He noted that our student-faculty ratio is close but is still behind the peers and we are woefully lacking in staff and technical support. He stated that both the Business and Engineering Colleges are expensive colleges with higher faculty salaries compared to other colleges.

Schubert asked where the additional tuition revenue will go. Chancellor Perlman stated that substantial revenues will be generated for these colleges but there will be some series of deductions to address scholarships covered by the College Bound Nebraska program and 10% for administration due to the fact that differential tuition rates are difficult to implement.

Lindquist asked if the increased tuition rate is for all Engineering courses. Chancellor Perlman stated that it would be. He noted that student groups in both Colleges have been engaged recently in discussions about the proposed increases. He stated that CBA student leadership groups seem positive towards the differential rate. He pointed out that Business students usually take courses outside of the college in their first and second year so the increase is about \$3000 more for a four or five year Business college degree.

Shea asked if the additional fees charged to specific courses will remain the same. SVCAA Weissinger stated that they would because lab fees are considered a separate matter. Shea reported that he has heard that some of the fees obtained for specific courses are not being used to support those classes. He asked if it is the unit that has the discretion on how to use these dollars. SVCAA Weissinger stated that the special fees are monitored and go towards what is specified when the fees are requested. She asked people to let her know if this is not the case.

Lindquist asked if Agricultural Economics courses would be affected by the differential tuition increase. Chancellor Perlman stated that these courses are not housed in the Business College and therefore would not be affected. SVCAA Weissinger stated that the courses must be housed in CBA or Engineering to carry the differential tuition rate. Lindquist asked how cross-listed courses would be handled. SVCAA Weissinger stated that it will be determined by the originating home of the course.

Nickerson stated that his department is trying to find out about the introductory requirements for the other Big Ten schools to hopefully eliminate bottlenecks in first year courses. He asked if these data are available or if we need to do it ourselves. Chancellor Perlman stated that it is very difficult to get certain information on the other Big Ten schools. SVCAA Weissinger noted that the CIC does not retain this kind of information. Nickerson asked if there was any specialist on campus that is doing Big Ten

comparisons. Chancellor Perlman stated that no one is working on the kind of information that Nickerson is seeking.

Chancellor Perlman reported that Dean Manderscheid recently attended a CIC deans' meeting and there seems to be interest in collecting data on each of the institutions. He noted that having various meetings with the other institutions might make it easier to collect information of the type that Nickerson is requesting.

Schubert stated that he thought it was a good idea to adjust the tuition rates for Engineering credit hours. He stated that he thinks it would be well received by the students if it is moderated clearly enough so the students understand the reason for the increase and how the funds will be used. Chancellor Perlman stated that he thinks there are plans in place to do this, but the College will be going through a transitory time with getting a new dean.

Dean of Graduate Studies Interview

Shea noted that some of the Executive Committee members met with Professor Dussault, candidate for the Dean of Graduate Studies, and they had a good, positive discussion. He stated that he was surprised that the schedule didn't include time for open discussion for other faculty members to speak to Professor Dussault. SVCAA Weissinger stated that UNL Today announced his interviews and there are three time periods to which department chairs, search committee members, and graduate faculty members can attend. Shea suggested that it would be helpful to let faculty members know this information directly.

Shea asked if other candidates are expected or if only one is being interviewed and then evaluated. He asked where the process goes from here. SVCAA Weissinger noted that the search has been conducted according to policies. She reported that an email was sent to every tenured faculty member announcing the opening and the application period. She stated that the search committee reviewed applicants and sent two finalists forward. She stated that both were invited for on campus interviews but one decided not to go further with the search process. She informed the search committee of this candidate's decision and the search committee recommended interviewing the remaining finalist. She stated that the search will be reopened if there is not enough support. If it should be reopened a decision would need to be made whether to do an internal or national search. She pointed out that she needs to get feedback from all of those who attended the interviews. She stated that the evaluation form can be found on the search website but she would be happy to receive feedback in any way.

Temporary Suspension of Moving the Faculty Senate Office

SVCAA Weissinger apologized to LaCost and Griffin for any confusion that might have occurred with the moving of the Senate Office. She stated that there is now a temporary suspension on the move as the administration develops an alternative plan.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Complimentary NY Times

LaCost reported that any faculty member who requires or recommends the New York Times for their class, and includes this on a syllabus will receive a complimentary Sunday home delivery subscription for the semester the class is being taught. Digital access will also be available. Faculty members interested should contact Paul.Wilson@huskers.unl.edu.

3.2 Review Procedures

LaCost welcomed the new Executive Committee members and stated that the Senate rules and bylaws can be found on the Senate website (<http://www.unl.edu.asenate/welcome.htm>). She noted that the Executive Committee usually meets once or twice a month with the Chancellor and sometimes meets with SVCNA Weissinger and VC Green. Shea pointed out that meetings with the administrators can be irregular because of their schedule which has caused some concern in the past. Nickerson noted that in interviewing the recent candidates for administrative positions on campus they have uniformly said that our level of interaction with the Chancellor is so much better than at other institutions. He stated that he believes we have a good dialogue with the administration. Wysocki noted that he has been at other institutions and thinks UNL is the best in terms of faculty governance.

LaCost stated that the role of the Executive Committee is to advise and assist faculty members and articulate the pros and cons of issues that affect the faculty. Lindquist pointed out that if there is something that comes up that members feel is important to them or their department, they should feel free to put this on the Executive Committee agenda for discussion. He stated that he understands that faculty members are busy, but it is important for members to come prepared to the meetings. He noted that all of the members are equally responsible for making sure work gets completed.

Shea noted that the minutes are the official record of the Executive Committee and record what transpires at meetings. He stated that it is important for members to take the time to review the minutes to make sure they reflect what they said. He noted that administrators also read the minutes. Lindquist pointed out that a remarkable number of faculty members read the minutes as well. LaCost stated that distribution of the minutes by Senators makes for a more dynamic response from the faculty and provides a better opportunity for the Committee to grapple with faculty issues. Schubert stated that Senators should forward the minutes to their constituents. He pointed out that constituents are more likely to read the minutes after a Senator forwards them rather than by receiving them through a generic email. He noted that his provides for good feedback from other faculty members.

3.3 Draft Suspension of Pay Policy Update

Lindquist reported that he sent the draft policy to the Senate's attorney, Mary Kay Hansen for her to review and provide input on to see if it would comply with the state law and the Regents' Bylaws. He stated that he will forward the new Executive Committee members a copy of the proposed policy.

4.0 Minutes of 4/20/11

Lindquist noted that Professor Franti, former member of the Executive Committee, sent an email stating that he was against including the entire discussion about the April 6 Executive Committee minutes in the April 20 minutes. Lindquist reported that he has made significant changes to the discussion. Schubert stated that the issue is that technically we should transport all conversations that we have but lately it seems that people do not want all of the information recorded. He stated that this is a critical issue that he feels needs to be addressed. Lindquist noted that Executive Committee members have the right to edit the minutes regarding what they said during the meeting. Shea stated that ultimately it is the Executive Committee's call on the minutes and the Committee is not the Chancellor's committee, it is the faculty's committee. Griffin suggested that she will resend the minutes to the Executive Committee with all of the revisions that she has received since the minutes were first sent out for review. She stated that the members of the Committee can communicate back whether they approve of the minutes as revised. The Committee agreed.

5.0 Unfinished Business

No unfinished business was discussed.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Nebraska Union Advisory Board – City Campus Faculty Representative Needed

Griffin reported that a faculty member representing the city campus is needed for the Nebraska Union Advisory Board. She noted that Professor Deb Pearson, University Libraries, is interested in serving again. The Executive Committee approved Professor Pearson's reappointment.

6.2 Agenda Items for SVCAA Weissinger and VC Green

The Executive Committee identified the following topics for discussion with the upcoming meeting with the Vice Chancellors: distribution of funds in IANR; apportionment changes in IANR; mentoring of new administrators; update on Dean of Graduate Studies search.

6.3 Textbook Adoption Form – Request from ASUN

LaCost reported that ASUN is requesting that faculty members submit their textbook order forms quickly to help students receive the greatest amount for selling their books back to the store. Anderson noted that the Bookstore is working on creating an online system for doing this but there are some difficulties with the system.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, May 4, 2011 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.