

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

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

**Absent:** Anaya, Struthers

**Date:** Wednesday, August 24, 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 3:04 p.m.

### 2.0 Chancellor Perlman/SVCAA Weissinger

#### 2.1 What's New since Becoming a Member of the Big Ten

Chancellor Perlman reported that the integration into the Big Ten on July 1 went smoothly and was well received across the country. He noted that the campus is now formally eligible to take advantage of the sponsored projects of the CIC. He stated that this fall for the first time faculty members from UNL are able to attend the leadership development program of the CIC and engagement in the course sharing program will start in the spring. He reported that the critical language area will initially be involved the most in the sharing program. He stated that the deans have all connected formally with their counterparts and the CIC has been very attentive to us. LaCost noted that the Senate Office has been contacted by the CIC and there will be a meeting of Faculty Senate leaders of the Big Ten in October. SVCAA Weissinger pointed out that faculty should participate in existing Big Ten groups, create new groups by inviting Big Ten colleagues to interact, offer to provide service and leadership to these groups and also to invite groups to visit Lincoln and meet on our campus.

Nickerson noted that NETV is prominently featuring a segment on UNL joining the Big Ten and that the Chancellor will broadcast information about the advantages of us joining the conference. Chancellor Perlman noted that he has been interviewed by NETV. He pointed out that he has spent a lot of this summer and last year thinking about what the transition means to us and this will be the theme of his state of the university address. He reported that he will announce some fairly ambitious objectives for the campus which will require fairly significant effort from all of us.

LaCost asked when the faculty leadership development program will take place. SVCAA Weissinger stated that there are actually two segments. The first is a department executive office development program for sitting chairs/heads of departments. The goal is to help these people to become better department leaders. She noted that members of the Big Ten can send up to five chairs to the program and we sent three this year.

SVCAA Weissinger stated that the other program is an academic leadership program which is focused on faculty members who have the potential to be senior administrators. This year, UNL decided to send a cohort of associate deans and we will have the opportunity in the future to send five faculty members per year to this program.

## **2.2 Policy on Teaching Loads for Non-tenure Track Faculty Members**

LaCost asked if there is a clear cut policy about the number of courses a non-tenure track person can teach. SVCAA Weissinger stated that she does not know of any policy and reminded the committee that non-tenure track people, such as professors of practice, are on negotiated contracts which are mutually agreed on. She stated that she will check further to see if a specific policy exists. Wysocki stated that there is concern that having an extremely heavy teaching load on a faculty member could have negative impacts on the students. Weissinger agreed that effective and attentive teaching is a limiting factor that deans should consider when they approve the appropriate teaching load in non-tenure track contracts.

## **2.3 Latest Information on the Health Care Audit**

LaCost reported that she just received an email message from VP Dietze stating that the report will be coming out soon and a presentation will be made to the Board of Regents. She asked if the amount of savings will be published at that time. Chancellor Perlman stated that this is information that he requested when the audit was first initiated and he hopes that it will be included in the report.

## **2.4 Inconsistency across Departments with Apportionment Guidelines**

SVCAA Weissinger asked if there are cases where departments are using the guidelines incorrectly in assigning apportionment of responsibilities for faculty members. LaCost pointed out that there is a policy that the apportionments should be reviewed annually, but she does not think this occurs across all units. SVCAA Weissinger stated that she would be happy to remind the deans about this but that she is unaware of any lack of attention to this process. She noted that apportionment is reported by the deans for every faculty member every year. She stated that the intent is to indicate that a mutual review of the apportionment between the chair and faculty member has occurred.

## **2.5 Clarification on Opportunity Hires**

Chancellor Perlman reported that opportunity hires are not limited to any particular kinds of situations. He noted that the normal process is to have an open search with advertising and a search committee, but any hiring officer is entitled to request permission to not use the normal procedure but to use an opportunity hire instead. He stated that the request must be made to Assistant to the Chancellor Linda Crump and there has to be definite reasons and justification for an opportunity hire. He noted that some opportunity hires have been for a trailing spouse or trying to hire laterally at the full professor rank. He stated that opportunity hires have been used in broad applications.

Purdum asked if we still have a diversity incentive program. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that hiring decisions cannot be based on race or gender so we don't have a specific diversity program.

SVCAA Weissinger reported that the ADVANCE program is a specific contract with NSF which does allow us to use resources in a grant funded program to advantage women in the STEM fields. She stated that sometimes, in providing these advantages, an opportunity hire is made for the trailing spouse. She noted that the opportunity hire allows us to fulfill our obligations to the NSF grant.

SVCAA Weissinger pointed out that the opportunity hires usually focus on campus or college academic priorities. She noted that the person being considered for an opportunity hire usually brings such talents or skills to the campus that a decision is made to try to hire the individual.

SVCAA Weissinger noted that we are still judged under the Regents framework so we are still obliged to make progress with respect to diversity.

## **2.6 Summer Sessions Discussions**

SVCAA Weissinger reported that after talking with the Senate Executive Committee and speaking with deans and department chairs as well as the functional offices on campus, the decision has been made to dissolve the Summer Sessions office. She noted that Sherryl Wallman, the administrative technician who has helped to maintain the summer sessions office for many years will be transferred to another office where she will continue her value to the university.

SVCAA Weissinger pointed out that over time the summer sessions office adds less unique value to the colleges and that our systems had evolved so that we did not need a centralized summer office. The idea is to dissolve the office and instead allow colleges to manage the summer curriculum in the same ways they manage the fall and spring curricula. The dean and faculty in the college will then decide on how to fund summer courses. She noted that it takes at least a year to make major change to our curriculum procedures and so we anticipate that summer 2012 will not include large policy or structure changes. She stated that the plan is to give colleges a budget for the 2012 summer sessions, give them goals of increasing summer enrollments by 3% and allow them to make decisions about what courses they want to support with their budgets. For summer 2012, the current faculty pay rate policies will remain in effect and no change to the length or timing of the summer terms will happen.

SVCAA Weissinger reported that Associate VC Wilson will lead an initiative this year to see what further changes we want to make for 2013. The ultimate goal is to use summer sessions as a way to expand enrollment capacity, increase student retention and six year graduate rates, and allow faculty to innovate. She stated that discussions on how to proceed with summer plans will involve many layers of the faculty and the intention is to create a fall, spring, and summer curriculum which allow us to think of the year as a total

system that advances our enrollment and retention goals and that faculty can use to advance their curriculum goals.

LaCost noted that in the Executive Committee's previous discussions with the SVCAA and VC Green it was mentioned that some institutions are going to three semesters. She asked if this is still a possibility. SVCAA Weissinger stated that it is something to consider but there are many options that can be explored and she has no preconceived notions of the ultimate approaches that the faculty might generate.

Varner asked if students will be part of the process that considers a new summer sessions system. SVCAA Weissinger stated that input from the students is important. Varner noted that it is easy to look at what works best for the faculty but we need to consider the students' needs as well. He pointed out that there is so much competition to attract students these days that the campus needs to consider what would be most attractive to the students who would take summer classes. SVCAA Weissinger pointed out that changes would have to serve our enrollment and retention goals, allow faculty to design cutting edge curriculum in each major, allow faculty to invent new teaching methods, meet student needs and also fit with the functional needs of Registration and Records, Financial Aid and Business and Finance. She stated that she is excited about the possibilities and it will be a very complex undertaking.

## **2.7 Progress on Meeting with Departments and Colleges**

SVCAA Weissinger stated that has been limited progress with meeting with the departments and colleges because so many people were gone over the summer, but her intention is to be out and about this year.

## **2.8 Time Frame for Replacing VSIP Faculty Members**

SVCAA Weissinger reported that no money is available from the VSIP retirements this year because it is all being used to pay the retiring faculty members and in addition, there is special cost this year because we had to cash flow some immediate replacement of teaching capacity. She stated that the deans have been working on a process or approach for using funds that will eventually be available. She stated that she believes that IANR has some reserved funds that can be competitively allocated to high priority hires. In Academic Affairs on city campus, deans received some of the VSIP salary dollars back for next year's priority hires and that she reserved some of the salary funds for future allocation to other kinds of high priority hires. She stated she and the deans have agreed to a pilot program where a couple of cluster hires that create nationally prominent signature programs may be funded this year out of the VSIP money.

## **2.9 Structure for Special Fees and Accountability of the Use of the Fees**

SVCAA Weissinger reported that the Board of Regents has a policy that they have final approval on special fees and what these fees can be used for. She stated that Assistant VC Kenny evaluates the cost center that the special fees go into and reviews the expenditures from this cost center to ensure that the funds are being used correctly. She noted that the deans and department chairs are attentive to the stated purposes of these funds.

Varner stated that the point is that the departments and colleges should try to make sure that it is visible to students how these funds are being used so they can essentially see the fees in action. SVCAA Weissinger stated that the course fees are supposed to be collected to pay for specific, and usually expendable, materials and equipment. She noted that the fees cannot be used for facilities and the fees are typically used to purchase expendables related to the course.

Chancellor Perlman pointed out that it is oftentimes easier, and cheaper, to purchase centrally for a course rather than students buying materials individually. He noted that there are a number of different fees in existence. The library and technology fees are managed by committees that have student and faculty representation and these fees go into separate cost centers. He stated that other fees are college based fees for the colleges of Engineering, Business, and Law and these fees are accounted for in the same ways as the course fees. He noted that the college fees came up under different circumstances. He stated that the Law College fee was attributable to salaries but the Engineering College was more open ended. He noted that all the fees were spent to enhance the college in some way. He pointed out that we are trying to move away from college based fees and instead incorporate them into the tuition. He stated that eventually all of the college based fees will move into a tuition based fee.

Shea asked if CASNR monitors its own special fees or whether it is done through Academic Affairs. SVCAA Weissinger stated that the approval process for special fees on CASNR courses goes through Academic Affairs and they oversee the use of the funds.

Anderson pointed out that the School of Music was able to purchase a significant number of recordings for its library which directly benefitted the students because of the special course fees.

SVCAA Weissinger noted that there are a large number of requests each year for course fees. She stated that a faculty and student committee is formed to evaluate the requests and many are eliminated. She stated that if there are any specific concerns regarding the course fees and use of the fees, both she and VC Green would like to hear about it.

## **2.10 Relocation of Undergraduate Studies Responsibilities**

SVCAA Weissinger reported that none of the responsibilities of the Office of Undergraduate Studies were relocated, but there has been some change in the leadership in regards to reporting responsibilities. She noted that Laura Damuth who oversees the UCARE program is now housed in the Honors Program. She stated that the OASIS office reports to Associate VC Cerveny. She stated that the idea is to fold some of these programs more fully into the larger enterprise and the transition seems to be going well. She reported that Associate VC Goodburn is overseeing that things are going well from the academic perspective and Professor Mitchell, Director of General Education, is overseeing the area of general education, general studies and assessment.

Purdum pointed out that part of the reason for having this agenda item discussed is that it is not clear to the faculty what has happened to these programs because there has been very little communication about them. SVCAA Weissinger stated that all of the former services still exist and that the new structure should be seamless for faculty and students and asked what areas are most relevant to the faculty. Purdum stated that information on general studies and who the key role players are who are still performing the above mentioned tasks would be helpful to the faculty. SVCAA Weissinger noted that the website is still available, that all personnel are still at their same phone numbers and that the same services and information are still available to faculty and students.

### **2.11 Update on the Search for Dean of the College of Fine & Performing Arts**

SVCAA Weissinger reported that the search committee has been formed and will be meeting with Paul Cho, the outside consultant next week. She stated that advertisements for the position have gone out and the timeline is to try to have the search concluded by the end of the term.

### **2.12 Continuing Problems with MyRed**

Chancellor Perlman acknowledged that there are still problems with MyRed and that we are having a very difficult time finding people that have experience with PeopleSoft. He stated that part of the problem is that we share a student information system with seven other campuses and what we deem as an important component of the system may not be so for the other campuses. He noted that an elaborate organizational structure was put into place when the legislature approved this joint information system and getting the system tweaked to our needs will take some time. He stated that MyRed is an important portal and we knew that there would be some work that needs to be done in order to get it where we need it to be, but it will take some time. SVCAA Weissinger reported that the deans were invited this summer to provide their priorities for PeopleSoft and MyRed and they had people in their colleges who work closely with these systems to provide feedback on what is needed.

Varner stated that a family member recently had experiences with several other different universities and all of the other universities had very nice portals. He stated that a problem that was encountered here is that it was extremely difficult to get to actually talk to someone when you need to. He noted that it took several days to get to talk to someone or to even get an email response making for a very frustrating experience. SVCAA Weissinger stated that this is very important to know and something that needs to be addressed. Schubert stated that to counter balance this it should be noted that UNL is listed second among the top eleven universities that have the best designed websites.

### **2.13 Problems with Department Names Changes Being Entered into the System**

LaCost asked what happens once a department name change has been approved by the Board of Regents. She asked if an automatic change is made to the system. SVCAA Weissinger stated that Associate VC Perez queried Registration & Records about this and he was informed that name changes are not made during the middle of a term. In almost all cases the change should be accomplished at the beginning of the following term but there are some caveats. She stated that while we have done 2-3 this year, department

name changes are relatively rare and she would be happy to address any specific problems that may have occurred in this regard.

## **2.14 Upcoming Issues**

Chancellor Perlman reported that the capital campaign is well underway and we still have three years to go with it. He stated that the initiative now is to raise money to complete projects that were identified as priorities. He noted that we still have some ways to go with this and some priorities have not attracted a lot of donations, but the Foundation is working on this. He reported that the colleges have been doing well with the capital campaign and some colleges have unilaterally raised their goals.

Chancellor Perlman reported that there are now three more chapters in the Big Red footprint as a result of the Alumni Association's tour of the Big Ten cities over the summer. He noted that there will be an alumni function at Big Ten away games this year and that there is a lot of enthusiasm and interest for these events. He reported that Diane Mendenhall is doing a great job with the Alumni Association and he suggested that the Senate might want to have her come and speak at a meeting. He noted that she is working hard to engage students and is attracting significant student groups to be engaged in alumni activities.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the university did receive \$25 million from the state for Innovation Campus. He stated that \$10 million will be used for the renovation of the 4-H building. He noted that the renovation will include an auditorium that can seat 500 and another one that will seat 200 which will help the campus to deal with large classes. He reported that the infrastructure is being put in by a developer with no cost to the university unless we become tenants of the building. He noted that most of the 4-H building will be laboratory space. He stated that the other \$15 million is being allocated to a life sciences facility that the university will occupy. He pointed out that the university has agreed to match the \$15 million with donated funds. He stated that he has had a faculty group do the initial work of programming for this building and the faculty group came to the same conclusion as the builders in that it should be an open and flexible building with no one owning the space. He pointed out that the plan is to go to the Board in September for approval.

Chancellor Perlman stated that another agenda item for the Board will be to transfer the Industrial Arts building to the NIDIC Board. He reported that the NIDIC Board will look at possible renovation plans. He pointed out that it could be an interesting site for greenhouses. The next step will be to find a tenant for the property once it is renovated.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the Innovation Campus faculty advisory committee was urged last year to survey faculty members for ideas on how to have faculty driven initiatives that could get private sector partnerships. He reported that seven or eight initiatives were proposed and nine teams were put together with people from the private sector. He stated that hopefully three or four of these joint initiatives will start happening this fall.

Chancellor Perlman reported that NIDIC will likely hire an Executive Director of Innovation Campus sometime within the next three or four weeks. He stated that the person will probably be someone from UNL who works with the faculty and knows the NIDIC. He noted that the person would be the representative for the university as we try to get the private sector involved with Innovations Campus. He stated that things are moving smoothly although no one has signed up for the property yet.

Nickerson asked the Chancellor for his thoughts on the recent comments made by John Bruining referring to poor people as raccoons while wearing a university shirt. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that we cannot keep people from wearing our logo. He noted that there have been some politicians in the past that have crossed the line and the university has interacted with them, but he is not sure if the Bruning incident is an issue for us at this point.

Chancellor Perlman reported that he recently attended the NCAA presidential retreat. He noted that there was support for the general direction of the NCAA president's direction on eligibility for entering or transferring athletes and the ability for athletes to play in post season games. He reported that he suspects by the end of this year there will be an elaborate set of reforms which will probably put a lot of pressure on the head coaches. He noted that our football team has the highest GPA that we have ever had and he thinks Nebraska will do well under the new regulations.

LaCost reported that she has several graduate students who work in the Athletic Advising Center and they are quite impressed with the process of the Center. She noted that the people who work there are very dedicated. Nickerson stated that he is very impressed with our athletes' academic abilities.

Anderson wondered whether the way professors of practice are used is the same across the campus. He noted that he knows of people who have terminal degrees in their fields who cannot get a professor of practice decision, yet some people with just a bachelor's degree in other departments can get a professor of practice appointment. Shea stated that the committee that originally created these positions developed general guidelines for the position. He thinks the administration was reluctant to dictate to the colleges what the criteria would be for these. He thinks there should be a consistent policy across the campus although there are many people who disagree with this. Purdum stated that every unit within IANR was required to come up with their own guidelines and promotion criteria for the professor of practice positions.

Irmak asked why these positions were created. Rinkevich noted that Harvard originally created the positions. Purdum stated that the positions were created to recognize professionals and to provide a means of promoting these people who are not on tenure track lines. She pointed out that there was no room for promotion with the lecturer positions. Irmak asked if lecturers could pursue a doctorate degree which would then allow them to apply for tenure track positions. Lindquist stated that the professor of practice position is oftentimes used to hire people who have many years of professional experience but may not have a terminal degree in their field.

Irmak stated that he does not think that people without terminal degrees in their field should have equal ranks to tenure track faculty members who choose to go through academia to obtain a terminal degree. Anderson pointed out that non-tenure track faculty members only have one to three year appointments. Nickerson noted that lecturers and professors of practice, who typically teach courses, relieve tenure track faculty members from teaching responsibilities, thereby enabling them to spend more time on research. Shea pointed out that having some non-tenure track professors generally seems to be working and is a wide acceptable practice, but it is possible to have some abuse or downside to having these ranks.

LaCost wondered if there is any consistency across the colleges in regards to the criteria required for these non-tenure track ranks. Shea recalled that the committee that worked on creating these ranks favored uniformity across the campus, but the committee was just an advisory committee and did not have the power to implement a policy. He noted that it is important to have guidelines and certain caveats for departments, but the campus is fairly decentralized and the administration typically allows colleges and departments to make their own requirements. He noted that it is good to revisit this issue periodically. Schubert stated that the recommendation should be to discuss the issue in the departments.

Irmak stated that he understands that non-tenure track faculty members have a mutually agreed contract so he was surprised to see this issue being raised. Wysocki pointed out that some faculty members will only be hired if they agree to teach a specific number of classes and in some cases the number of classes is excessive. Lindquist noted that faculty members in a unit should begin having discussions about this issue and take it to the next level, only if it cannot be resolved within the unit.

### **3.0 Approval of 7/27/11 Minutes**

Wysocki moved approved of the minutes. Rinkevich second the motion. The motion was approved.

### **4.0 Unfinished Business**

#### **4.1 Draft Suspension of Pay Policy**

LaCost reported that the rationale from the ARRC for not developing a new policy is that there is already a policy in place for suspending a faculty member in the classroom, but the Chancellor wants a similar policy for suspending a faculty member's salary. She noted that the ARRC procedures state that the Chancellor must contact the chair of the ARRC who will arrange a meeting with three members of the ARRC Special Resource Group. This must be done within 48 hours of the suspension.

LaCost asked where procedures for suspension of a faculty member's salary will be stated. Will it be in the ARRC procedures or in the UNL Bylaws? She noted that the person whose pay is suspended should go to the ARRC to take action. Purdum suggested that the Executive Committee consult with the Chancellor on where this procedure should be stated.

Shea pointed out that there should be an advisory committee that the Chancellor must consult. Wysocki stated that he does not think the chair of the ARRC should be on this advisory committee because there is the potential for a conflict of interest since the faculty member will be filing a request for a repeal to the ARRC. Shea pointed out that the chair of the ARRC is not a member of the special hearing committee that will actually investigate and decide on a complaint. The chair meets with other ARRC members to see if a complaint is legitimate and requires an investigation by a special hearing committee.

LaCost suggested that the advisory committee to the Chancellor have four members from the Senate Executive Committee. Lindquist disagreed and felt that the chair of ARRC should be on the advisory committee because that person is aware of the existing regulations. Purdum suggested that the ARRC could be represented by a previous chair of the ARRC.

Shea noted that there is a real difference between suspending an individual's responsibilities and suspending their pay. Schubert pointed out that the Chancellor is seeking to have some restrictions in place so the Chancellor cannot just arbitrarily suspend a faculty member's pay. He noted that the Chancellor wants to have some group in place that he can discuss the matter with should there be an incident of a faculty member refusing to perform their duties. Schubert suggested that the Executive Committee should formulate a policy that the Chancellor has to consult with a specific group before taking any action. Wysocki asked if the result of the decision made by the Chancellor is made clear to the faculty member. Griffin suggested that language stipulating that the faculty member needs to be notified could be included in the policy.

Lindquist stated that he thinks the procedure ought to belong to the ARRC and should be included in the ARRC procedures. He stated that he does not understand why the Executive Committee should build a separate policy. Shea stated that it makes sense to include it in the ARRC procedures. He wondered if the Executive Committee should again ask the ARRC to consider adding language to the procedures or should we simply respect the recommendation made by the ARRC.

Schubert pointed out that the Chancellor wants input from the faculty about his decision. Shea stated that he thinks it is more logical that the issue should go to the ARRC. He wondered if the Executive Committee could instruct the ARRC to include language dealing with suspension of pay in its procedures. Purdum pointed out that there is still a conflict of interest with the ARRC hearing the case and suggested that it would be better to have a separate advisory committee consult with the Chancellor.

Schubert stated that he does not believe the issue should go back to the ARRC because the ARRC made it clear that they could not do anything about the policy because they felt that language is already in place to deal with issues of suspension. Lindquist suggested that the ARRC procedures could distinguish between suspension of duties and suspension of pay. Griffin pointed out that the Senate will be considering revisions to the ARRC procedures this fall and the Executive Committee could make an amendment to include

language referring to the procedures that should be followed if the Chancellor seeks to suspend a faculty member's salary.

The Executive Committee agreed to discuss the issue further at the next meeting.

**5.0 New Business**

**5.1 Faculty Senate Goals**

LaCost asked the Executive Committee to review the draft of the Faculty Senate goals and prepare to suggest any changes at next week's meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:22 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, August 31, 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.