

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Anaya, Guevara, LaCost, Lindquist, Nickerson, Purdum, Rinkevich, Shea, Varner, Wysocki

Absent: Irmak, Schubert, Struthers

Date: Wednesday, December 6, 2011

Location: 201 Administration

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 p.m.

2.0 Chancellor Perlman

2.1 The Role of APC and the Faculty Senate in the Planning and Decision Process for University Programs, Initiatives, Restructuring, and Policies

LaCost reported that Professor Byrant, Chair of the APC, came to speak with the Executive Committee regarding the responsibilities and charge of the APC and whether these should be changed to more accurately reflect current practices. She asked if the Chancellor could provide a brief overview on how he works with the APC on initiatives and restructuring. Shea noted that one of the areas of concern is that the APC is a planning committee yet the APC is questioning how much engagement and planning the Committee is actually involved in because most of what they do is reactionary. He pointed out that it appears that the APC is not involved in the initial stages of planning. He acknowledged that this could be due in part to the sheer volume and timing of the work that the APC is expected to do.

Nickerson stated that related is agenda item 2.3 APC Involvement in Revising the Master Plan. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that the Bylaws explicitly state that the APC has a direct advisory role in the master plan of the campus so the APC will be involved in helping to form a master plan. He stated that the question may be when to get the APC involved. Nickerson stated that the APC should be involved as early as possible in the planning stage. Chancellor Perlman noted that creating the master plan is such a structured process that there won't be any question in getting the APC involved early in the process. He stated that an outside consultant will be brought to campus to assist with the creation of the master plan and with Associate to the Chancellor Nunez being Director of Institutional Research and Planning we won't suffer from lack of attention to the master plan.

Chancellor Perlman stated that involving APC on the academic side of things is different because most of the academic planning is done within the colleges and he does not think faculty members want the APC involved at this level.

Nickerson stated that he sees the connection with the APC and the forming of the master plan. He stated that APC should be involved in the academic structure of how the buildings will be used on campus. Chancellor Perlman stated that the master plan will not say that we need a particular building. It deals more with what sites are available for buildings and how high these buildings can be. He pointed out that there is not a lot of planning in designating what specific buildings should be constructed because there is no capital construction money available. He noted that most of the buildings on campus are built through philanthropic funding. He stated that there were state initiatives on deferred maintenance but he does not know how involved the APC was in determining which buildings are included in the deferred maintenance plan.

Chancellor Perlman stated that from the programmatic side, the APC and the Faculty Senate were closely engaged from the outset with the creation and acceptance of the ACE program.

Shea noted that the issue regarding the 120 credit hour requirement was mentioned by the APC as an example of something that they would have liked to have been engaged with. Chancellor Perlman reminded the Executive Committee that this requirement was imposed on us by the Board of Regents. He noted that LaCost did speak to the Board about the faculty not being engaged in this decision.

Chancellor Perlman pointed out that he is not trying to avoid the APC and he is certainly open to consulting with them more. Nickerson stated that Professor Bryant was asked at the Faculty Senate meeting how much the APC would be involved in developing the campus master plan. It was pointed out that Professor Bryant was unsure how much the APC would be involved but it is clearly stated in the Bylaws that the APC is involved in developing the campus master plan.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the current master plan was supposed to be in place until 2015. He stated that at a recent Board meeting UNMC gave a presentation on its master plan and the Chancellor was then asked to give a presentation of UNL's master plan. In reviewing the current plan, it was determined that the campus accomplished most of its goals already and that a new plan needed to be created. He pointed out that there is no doubt in his mind that the APC will be deeply involved with the forming of the master plan.

Chancellor Perlman stated that there might be some odd circumstances where the APC have not been engaged much. He noted that Innovation Campus is one of these odd situations because it is really being built by private companies and he is not sure how much involvement the campus will have in the planning of the buildings these private companies will construct. Purdum asked if Innovation Campus would be considered part of the master plan. Chancellor Perlman reported that Innovation Campus has its own master plan. He stated that he is more than willing to think how we can engage the APC with Innovation Campus but the reality is that the university really doesn't have anything to do with the property because it is managed by a separate Board. Chancellor Perlman

stated that the APC might be involved in conversations about the standards that would be used for buildings on Innovation Campus. Nickerson pointed out that Innovation Campus will have impacts on UNL. He noted that it will impact the entire Life Sciences program because there will be groups of faculty members who will move onto Innovation Campus thereby freeing up space within departments on east and city campus.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the master plan is to develop a comprehensive plan and the plan will see where spaces are available, including green spaces, for possible construction of buildings. He stated that there will need to be discussion about Innovation Campus and what role it will play in the master plan. He reported that he will be speaking to Associate Chancellor Nunez when he returns about the comprehensive planning process.

LaCost asked if Associate to the Chancellor Nunez serves as a liaison between the Chancellor and the APC. Chancellor Perlman stated that he does. He noted that Associate Nunez does not have voting rights on the APC and serves as a provider of information to that committee.

Shea stated that aside from the APC some people feel that the Senate should be engaged or given the opportunity to be more engaged. He noted that the Executive Committee is certainly appreciative when it is more engaged. He realizes that timing can be an issue on some matters. He pointed out that there are tremendous resources in the people that make up the university and they would be helpful in discussing matters that arise on campus. He stated that one of the frustrations that the Executive Committee and some others have experienced is that sometimes there is a very short window of opportunity to provide feedback on various issues.

Chancellor Perlman noted that the jurisdiction of the Senate is relatively clear in the Bylaws in that the Senate is to address academic policies that translate across the colleges. He stated that he believes the administration reaches out to get faculty advice quite a bit but the advice might not necessarily come through the Senate because there are other faculty groups that might be more closely aligned with a particular issue, the Research Council being an example. He stated that there is strong faculty engagement on many things from other formal and informal groups and in part this is because the Senate only meets once a month. He pointed out that the Senate played a significant role in the creation and adoption of the ACE program. He stated that he would be open to the kinds of examples of issues that would be important to the Senate. He stated that the more participation the better, but sometimes the windows for providing input are very short. LaCost noted that the Chancellor has made invitations numerous times for people to provide input to him.

2.2 Importance of Following the Bylaws

Shea noted that oftentimes how things are being done on campus do not always coincide with the way the Bylaws say they should be done. He questioned whether we should be vigilant with adhering to the Bylaws. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that the UNL Bylaws mostly repeat what is in the Regents Bylaws and most of the UNL Bylaws deals

with the structure of the campus which is subject to change over time. He noted that while we need some kind of authority such as the Bylaws, we need a process where changes to the Bylaws are not so difficult to make. He stated that we need Bylaws that everyone is comfortable with and that are transparent. He stated that we need clear Bylaws that include important information because right now the UNL Bylaws are cumbersome and tedious to go through.

Shea stated that the campus should really look at the Bylaws more frequently and should make changes to them if they are not appropriate. He noted that there seems to be hesitancy to change the Bylaws and he agrees that there are elements in the Bylaws that are not needed. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that the Regents Bylaws state that they have to approve all Bylaws for the campuses and making changes to the Bylaws is a lot of work. He noted that the Bylaws have to be broad enough in scope and they need to be followed.

Shea stated that one specific issue of concern regarding the Bylaws is the frequency of the administrators meeting with the Executive Committee. He pointed out that the Committee understands that the schedules of the senior administrators do not always allow them to meet with the Committee, but we need to figure out how meetings can be managed better. Chancellor Perlman stated that the administrators do not want to give the impression that they don't want to meet with the Executive Committee. He noted that the Bylaw requiring the administrators to meet on a regular basis with the Senate is unenforceable and this is the kind of thing that needs to be removed from the Bylaws.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he will try to go through and make an initial draft of revising the UNL Bylaws. The draft will then be distributed to the appropriate bodies so they can review and make additional changes to the Bylaws.

2.3 APC Involvement in Revising the Master Plan

See section 2.1 above.

2.4 Possibility of Reinstating a Teaching and Learning Center

Nickerson reported that this issue relates to concerns of some faculty members and students in the Biological Sciences department. He stated that there was discussion on how we could better help non tenured faculty members with teaching large classes. He noted that there was mention that the Teaching and Learning Center used to provide this kind of assistance. He pointed out that the university would be more efficient as a whole if there were specialized groups on campus that could provide assistance in teaching. He stated that reconstituting the Teaching and Learning Center the way it used to be is not what he is suggesting. He noted that the Century Teaching Club was a helpful component of the Teaching and Learning Center that could be useful. He asked if there is any discussion about centralizing assistance to help the teaching faculty.

Chancellor Perlman stated that this is not something that has recently been discussed. He pointed out that when the Teaching and Learning Center was eliminated it was because there was no evidence to document that it was having a positive impact. He stated that he

believes that teaching has some disciplinary aspects that are critical, but teaching in the different disciplines can vary greatly. He stated that he is skeptical that having a centralized service to assist with teaching is helpful, but there is probably room to encourage or fund departments to focus on the teaching enterprise. He noted that senior faculty members should be mentoring younger faculty members. He stated that he will speak to SVCAA Weissinger and VC Green about this.

Shea suggested having some kind of forum, whether it is by college or campus wide, where faculty members who are involved in these kinds of teaching situations can come and explore common needs. Nickerson pointed out that this is what the Century Teaching Club did. He reported that there are some faculty members in his department, even some that are retired, who come in monthly to assist younger faculty members.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he is inclined not to create something that is centralized but he does see how providing assistance to the teaching faculty could be helpful. Nickerson suggested that providing more staff to help these instructors could help.

LaCost noted that getting faculty members to participate with the Teaching and Learning Center was sometimes difficult. Guevara noted that he participated in one of their sessions and found that it was not very helpful.

2.5 Administrator to speak at the January, February, and March Faculty Senate Meetings

Chancellor Perlman suggested the Senate could have VC Paul, VC Jackson, Innovation Campus Executive Director Duncan, or Associate VC David Conrad, Office of Technology Development to speak to the Senate during the time he will be out of town.

2.6 Update on Search Committee for Dean of Architecture

Chancellor Perlman reported that he and SVCAA Weissinger met with the search consultant to discuss the qualifications they are seeking for the Dean of Architecture. He stated that the search committee will be formed in January.

Shea reported that the Executive Committee had only a few days to provide a list of possible faculty members for the search committee. He understands that sometimes the list needs to be provided quickly, but it would be beneficial if the Executive Committee could be allowed to discuss it at its meeting. Chancellor Perlman stated that he understands and pointed out that he cannot proceed with the search until he gets a list from the Executive Committee.

Nickerson stated that he is pleased to have a faculty dominated search committee but thought it would be good to have a local architect on the search committee as well. Chancellor Perlman noted that the Senate Executive Committee just reviews and provides names of faculty members for the search committee. There are other members on search committees and these people are appointed by the administration.

Shea stated that he appreciates the requirement that there be a list of possible faculty members to choose from but some on the Senate might feel better if the Senate could appoint at least one person to serve on a search committee. He pointed out that all search committees are advisory anyway. He noted that the faculty might be more favorable to the search process if they feel that they have an opportunity to assign or appoint someone independently from the administration to a search committee. Chancellor Perlman stated that he would think about this idea. He noted that it would depend on the tier of the vacancy. He stated that the Senate President is automatically a member of a search committee for the position of Chancellor. He stated that there could be some negotiation between the Senate and the appointing authority with respect as to who will be on a search committee. He pointed out that the current process of determining search committee members is set up the way it is to maintain balance on the committee.

LaCost asked if the members of search committees are selected by a committee. Chancellor Perlman stated that he usually selects the members of a search committee. Varner asked if the process is in the Bylaws. Chancellor Perlman stated that it is in the Bylaws and the Bylaws state that there has to be a search committee for administrative officers for deans and above. He noted that the Bylaws require that the Senate provide a list of faculty members twice as long as the number of faculty members that will be on the committee. He pointed out that faculty members will have the plurality on an academic search committee.

2.7 Upcoming Issues

Chancellor Perlman reported that he will not be forwarding the names put forward by the Honorary Degrees Committee this year for an honorary degree. He pointed out it is not because any of the nominees put forward for the award were not exceptional individuals rather there seems to be a lack of agreement on what criteria should be applied for the honorary degree and other awards.

Shea stated that he has some concerns with how the Senate deals with prospective honorary degrees. He pointed out that the ballots are distributed at a Senate meeting and there is very little time to carefully read the biographical statement on the nominee. He stated that he would like to do some research on the nominees to see how they are connected to the university. He stated that he does not feel qualified to reject someone based on the limited information that is provided on the nominees. Chancellor Perlman stated that he understands this perspective. He pointed out that the nominees are noteworthy people, but he questions the argument for giving people an honorary degree, particularly if they have not been associated with the university in the past. He stated that the honorary degree is not about recognizing someone for being philanthropic. There are other awards that can address outstanding philanthropy.

Chancellor Perlman pointed out that the timing of the honorary degrees is not the best either. He stated that a set of rules adopted by the Board requires the Board to vote on the honorary degrees at the December meeting yet the campus administrators do not know the results of the Board's decision until March. He suggested that the Senate might want to think through the criteria used for selecting nominees for an honorary degree.

Chancellor Perlman stated that we do have the Builders Award and the criteria for this award include language that the recipient of the award has made contributions to Nebraska but not necessarily to the university. He noted that this award could possibly be given to someone who has made contributions to the state. Nickerson pointed out that the Honorary Degrees Committee does not have anything to do with the Builders Award. Chancellor Perlman stated that this is an award that comes out of his office but he would be happy to have the Executive Committee review the guidelines for the award.

LaCost pointed out that with the natural turnover of members on the Honorary Degrees Committee, members may not be aware of the requirements for someone to receive an honorary degree. Chancellor Perlman noted that it would be helpful to have a policy about the qualifications needed for someone to receive an honorary degree.

Chancellor Perlman noted that once the Board approves someone for an honorary degree, the person's name is put in a pool for three years and he can draw from this pool at any time.

Nickerson stated that it would definitely be helpful if there were some guidelines on the qualifications needed for someone to receive an honorary degree. He stated that when he was on the Honorary Degrees Committee he obtained a print out of the nominees who received an honorary degree over the years, but this list was obtained with difficulty. He stated that he does not think the Honorary Degrees Committee has any uniformity in what qualifications are needed for someone to receive an honorary degree.

LaCost asked if the pool of candidates is depleted. Chancellor Perlman stated that currently it is pretty thin.

Varner noted that the emeriti policy states that the policy covers teaching, research and service faculty members. He asked where extension is covered under the policy. Chancellor Perlman stated that extension faculty members are covered under service.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Luncheon with President Milliken

LaCost reported that she and the other Faculty Senate Presidents met with President Milliken for lunch and he reported that Mary Niemiec is Associate Vice President for Distance Education and Director of Online Worldwide. She suggested that the Executive Committee invite Associate VP Niemiec to a meeting to discuss what progress is being made with Online Worldwide.

4.0 Approval of 11/30/11 Minutes

Anaya moved approval of the minutes. Rinkevich seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Student Bereavement Policy Ad Hoc Committee

Shea noted that Senator Peterson suggested that the existing student absence policy be modified to include language on a bereavement policy rather than creating another separate policy. He reminded the Committee that at a previous meeting a consensus was reached that an ad hoc committee should work on this. Purdum stated that this is an important issue and that we need to work with the students on it.

Griffin reported that the last time substantial changes were made to the policy was in 2000 and the Executive Committee worked on the policy. She noted that the Executive Committee suggested that the chair of the Grading & Examinations Committee should serve on the ad hoc committee. Purdum volunteered to serve on the ad hoc committee.

LaCost stated that she will let ASUN President Carr know and will ask him for two ASUN members to serve on the ad hoc committee.

5.2 Conflict of Interest Policy

Lindquist reported that the committee working on the policy met a few times and the Office of Research & Economic Development is doing the bulk of revising the document. He stated that most of the suggestions made by the Executive Committee and others have been included in the revisions. He noted that in order for UNL to be in compliance with the federal government, a policy will need to be in place by August 2012. He pointed out that the Senate will need to approve the policy. Lindquist stated that faculty members will need to look at the policy to see if it satisfactorily provides protection for them.

Lindquist noted that the draft policy states that a conflict of interest committee will be created to manage conflicts of interest related to research. Shea pointed out that the members of this standing committee are selected by the Associate VC for Research and Economic Development and he has concerns about that. He pointed out that some faculty members are very heavily involved in activities outside the university and he would be concerned if the conflict of interest committee is composed mostly of these people. He suggested that faculty members not as engaged in outside activity should have a voice on the committee to provide some balance. Wysocki suggested someone from the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee should serve on the conflict of interest committee. Varner questioned whether the right representation would be on the committee to look at the various issues that may arise. Purdum suggested that a clause be added stating that the conflict of interest committee would need to be approved by a college committee of the faculty member involved. Lindquist pointed out that the conflict of interest committee is a university wide standing committee.

Lindquist pointed out that the Office of Research and the unit administrator will have an important role in determining whether the conflict of interest is enough to require management. If it is determined that the conflict of interest does require management, the individual and the administrator will need to put forth a management plan that will need to be approved by the conflict of interest committee and then followed.

Lindquist suggested that the Executive Committee carefully read the policy and make suggestions directly to either him or Sara Conrad, Research Compliance Services Manager.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Review of Senate Meeting

Griffin noted that Dean Hecker stated that the Senate will need to be involved in revising the academic dishonesty section of the Student Code of Conduct. Lindquist suggested that the Executive Committee ask Dean Hecker if there is a timeline for when the Executive Committee will see a revision of this code.

Purdum reported that a comment came from the Senate about the email message recently sent by the Chancellor regarding the campus creating a climate where people feel comfortable if they need to report inappropriate behavior. She wondered if UNOPA and UAAD are comfortable with the procedures that are in place. Anaya pointed out that this is referred to as a climate of psychological safety. The Executive Committee agreed that UNOPA and UAAD should be contacted to see how they feel about the procedures.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:11 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, December 14 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.