

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

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

Absent: Berg, Franti, Konecky

Date: Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Location: Faculty Senate Office

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

Lindquist called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Interview of College of Engineering Dean Candidate

Lindquist noted that the Executive Committee will be interviewing the first candidate for Dean of the College of Engineering on Wednesday, February 23, at 8:45 in 208 Canfield Administration Building.

3.0 Approval of 2/9/11 Minutes

The minutes were approved with revisions.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Objects on Loan Inventory

Lindquist stated that he thinks there is some misunderstanding regarding the objects on loan inventory requests. He reported that he spoke with Assistant Vice Chancellor Chauche, Financial Services, regarding this issue. He stated that the intent of the inventory is to list major items that faculty members or graduate students are using at home. He pointed out that this does not include all of the items in a faculty member's office or lab.

Schubert stated that he has received numerous email messages from faculty members in the College of Engineering, but he has not had the opportunity to assemble all of the responses yet. He stated that there is great concern about this issue. He noted that the chair of his department has sent a message to the faculty suggesting that they not respond to the inventory request until the Senate Executive Committee has had the chance to discuss the issue with VC Jackson. He reported that there has been no new description of what is needed for the inventory in his college.

Nickerson asked if there was any mention of the instructions for the inventory being changed. Lindquist stated that Assistant VC Chauche's response was that he believed

someone in the College of Engineering was a little over zealous with interpreting what was to be inventoried.

Lindquist stated that Assistant VC Chauche will be sending him the training material about the inventory. He stated that he will send this to the Executive Committee. He noted that if the training material is clear on what should be done and it is determined that the Engineering College is taking the inventorying to the extreme, the Executive Committee will let the college administrators know of the error and that it should be corrected.

Schubert stated that he will convey back to his department chair that the President of the Faculty Senate is in conversation with VC Jackson's office and until further clarification, the inventory should be suspended.

Nickerson pointed out that this is another example of over zealousness by some people which is creating more work for faculty members. Lindquist stated that he informed Assistant VC Chauche about this problem. He reported that Assistant VC Chauche indicated that there will be some things coming down that we will not have any control over.

Shea noted that this is one of the problems when we carry decentralization to an extreme. He pointed out that each college has its own guidelines on the academic side of things but for business processes there should be standard UNL wide procedures and policies.

Shea asked if Assistant VC Chauche seemed willing to fix the problem. Lindquist reported that Assistant VC Chauche is interested in fixing the problem.

4.2 Keys

Lindquist reported that the Police oversee security on campus but each unit has someone who is in charge of the keys. He stated that generally, the person in charge of the keys within a unit is the person who is responsible for distributing keys. He pointed out that the task is not as daunting as was indicated in last week's (2/9/11) Executive Committee meeting.

Lindquist stated that he discussed with Assistant VC Chauche key card access but this is still in flux. He asked if the person managing the keys in a unit would be responsible for managing key card access. He stated that he was told the person would be responsible for access for the people in that unit and this person would be the individual who interacts with the Police. He stated that if anyone has more specific information and questions about the keys they should let him know and he will contact the appropriate person.

Shea stated that when there are any changes or adjustments in a campus-wide policy a broadcast announcement should be sent out to the campus because it would get more people's attention. He stated that if everyone was told what the rules are then more people will know and they can ask questions directly. Lindquist stated that he is not sure when the key policy was changed, but he will check his email to see if a message was

sent out. If not, he will contact Business & Finance to suggest that they notify the entire campus-wide message.

4.3 Report on Proposed Parking and Transit Services Plans (McCollough)

McCollough stated that she did not have the opportunity to review the plans thoroughly but will report on them next week.

5.0 New Business

5.1 APC's Revision to Budget Reduction Procedures

Lindquist stated that he did not see any major changes to the Procedures that would cause concern. Shea stated that he thinks some of the changes were improvements in some areas. McCollough stated that the addition about the public hearings was a good addition.

McCollough moved that the Executive Committee bring the revised Procedures to the Senate on March 1. The motion was seconded by Flowers.

Griffin asked if the motion to approve the revised Procedures should be an emergency motion. Shea pointed out that we need to get the Procedures voted on as quickly as possible because of the upcoming budget cuts.

The motion to bring the Procedures to the Senate was approved.

Lindquist asked if there were any objections to bringing the Procedures forward as an emergency motion. There were no objections. He stated that he will declare it as an emergency motion.

5.2 Revised APC Operating Procedures

Lindquist stated that most of the changes to the APC operating procedures relates to the ones approved by the Senate regarding the addition of two new faculty members and voting rights for the Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development.

The Executive Committee noted that some grammatical corrections need to be made in regards to the quotations. Shea moved that the document be accepted with appropriate corrections to the grammar. The motion was approved.

Lindquist asked if the changes to the operating procedures should be brought to the Senate as an emergency motion. The Executive Committee agreed that it should be an emergency motion.

5.3 Distinguished Educational Service Award Committee

Griffin reported that a faculty member is needed to help select a person for the Distinguished Educational Service Award. Fech reported that this is an award that comes from the Chancellor's office and there is a \$2,000 stipend with it. Anaya and Nickerson volunteered.

5.4 Interview Questions for the Dean of the College of Engineering

The Executive Committee worked on identifying questions to ask the candidates for Dean of the College of Engineering. Shea stated that he would like to know how the Dean is going to deal with aging faculty members who are teaching but who should no longer be in the classroom. He noted that he has heard from students who have encountered this situation in the Engineering College. Schubert noted that he will be out of town for the first two interviews but he will forward some possible questions to the Executive Committee.

5.5 Separation of Unified Engineering Ph.D. Program

Lindquist reported that he received an email message from some Engineering professors who are concerned about the effort to eliminate the unified Ph.D. program. He noted that the email stated that there is serious concern about the lack of faculty governance in the process.

Schubert reported that the unified program goes back to 1973 when the program was first established. He stated that while each department has its own requirements to get a Ph.D. the degree is from the College of Engineering, not a specific department. He stated that the idea to eliminate the unified program has come about very quickly and he is not sure where the idea came from. He stated that, to his knowledge, there has been little discussion about the proposal.

Schubert stated that the faculty of Engineering was told by Provost Pratt that it is unlikely that the Board of Regents or the Coordinating Commission of Secondary Education would approve thirteen new doctoral programs. He stated that the interim dean asked the college for a list of ten possible doctoral programs. He reported that the first six departments have a solid chance because they have a strong faculty base, a large number of students, the resources and facilities, external grant funds, and good academic program reviews. He pointed out that having separate programs could provide great visibility for a department. It is his guess that there will be six separate programs and one unified program.

Lindquist stated that it is his impression that the idea came from a few Engineering people who went to Provost Pratt with the proposal and that there has been little faculty input. He reported that there is now an agreement that the Academic Planning Committee will be involved because they are the group on campus that must approve changes to academic programs.

Nickerson asked who said there could only be seven separate programs. Lindquist stated that the Coordinating Commission states that a Ph.D. program must have at least three Ph.D. graduates per year and not all of the Engineering departments are producing this many graduates.

Shea pointed out that there seems to be serious concerns about the lack of faculty governance with regards to the issue of eliminating the unified Ph.D. program. He stated that all of the parties involved should have the opportunity to participate in discussions.

Flowers asked what is happening with the possible merger of some Engineering departments. Schubert stated that the departments have been restored since the departure of the former dean.

5.6 Agenda Items for Chancellor Perlman and Interim SVCAA Weissinger

The Executive Committee discussed possible agenda items for the meeting with the Chancellor and Interim SVCAA on February 23.

5.7 Funding to Help With Recruiting Students

McCullough stated that she has been checking all over campus to see if there is any money available that can be utilized to help recruit students from under represented areas. Anaya noted that Admissions does have some specific people that will do recruiting but she pointed out that diversity does not have a strong home on this campus. Nickerson stated that there is not a point person that a person can ask these kinds of questions. He stated that if the university wants to increase the student population it needs to have a point person to assist with recruiting.

5.8 Roku Streaming of Courses

McCullough reported that she is meeting with some Information Technology and Extension Education people to discuss the possibility of setting up an agreement with Roku that would allow UNL to have its own station to stream courses. She noted that commercial advertisements could be put on it which would generate some revenue for the campus. She stated that classes streamed through the channel would be copyrighted. She stated that anyone with a Roku can watch the course but if they want to receive credit for it they would have to pay tuition to the university. She stated that people could live stream the course or record it to observe at a later time. McCullough stated that she will keep the committee informed on the progress of this proposal.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, February 23, 2011 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.