

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

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

**Absent:** Anaya, Irmak, Schubert

**Date:** Wednesday, June 29, 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

LaCost called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

### 2.0 Announcements

#### 2.1 Report on Health Care Audit

LaCost reported that she called VP Dietze to see if there has been any report yet on the health care audit but he was out of the office. She noted that there was no mention of a report at the recent Board of Regents meeting.

#### 2.2 Meeting with Chancellor Perlman Cancelled

Griffin reported that the Executive Committee will be unable to meet with the Chancellor on July 27 as he will be traveling. She noted that the Executive Committee is still scheduled to meet with SVCAA Weissinger on that date.

### 3.0 Approval of 6/16/11 Minutes

Rinkevich moved and Anderson second approval of the minutes as revised. The motion was approved.

### 4.0 Unfinished Business

#### 4.1 Draft Letter to Chancellor Perlman on Suspension of Pay Policy

LaCost noted that she sent out a draft letter that will be sent to Chancellor Perlman informing him that the Executive Committee does not feel that it can create a suspension of pay policy without infringing upon existing faculty rights and protections. The Executive Committee then worked on refining the letter. Shea moved that the letter be sent as drafted with the changes discussed. Wysocki second the motion. The motion was approved.

#### 4.2 Executive Committee Policy

Shea stated that he suggested in the last meeting that an Executive Committee attendance policy be created analogous to the Senate attendance policy that is already in place. He estimated that the Executive Committee meets 36 times in 12 months and suggested that Executive Committee members cannot miss more than one third of the meetings in a six

month period which would equate to approximately six meetings. He stated that after six absences the Executive Committee member would be notified similar to the procedure used for notifying Senate members. He stated that if there is no adequate explanation for numerous absences the Executive Committee may take action to remove a member.

Griffin reported that she checked the number of absences for Executive Committee members during the past academic year as suggested by Anaya last week. She noted that she reviewed absences of the Executive Committee members from August through mid-April, before the new members started their terms. She pointed out that she excluded the faculty member who rarely came to meetings this last academic year and was removed from the Executive Committee during the spring semester. She reported that the average number of absences for Executive Committee members was 5.75 and the median was 4 absences, and the member with the highest number of absences was on jury duty for several weeks during the time frame reviewed. She pointed out that it is very rare that any Executive Committee member has excessively missed meetings.

Nickerson stated that he is not sure that a policy is necessary since it is rare that an Executive Committee member misses a significant number of meetings. He stated that he is not interested in punishing people for having to attend to other duties. He stated that from his perspective, expecting people to attend meetings is sufficient. He noted that most Executive Committee members attend 80 or 90% of the meetings and he does not like over regulating membership on the Committee. He noted that if someone is going to miss a lot of meetings they should resign allowing the Senate to replace them. Purdum pointed out that it takes time to document attendance and having to replace someone will take some time as well.

Griffin reported that she contacted Custom Support Coordinator Corrie Svehla to check on the feasibility of electronically accessing the Senate meetings and Executive Committee meetings. She stated that Svehla believes that Adobe Connect can be used for the meetings. This would allow people to observe the meeting if they cannot attend the meeting in person and might reduce the number of absences for both the Senate and Executive Committee meetings. She noted that Svehla suggested that members at the Senate meeting could submit questions or statements during the meeting via email. She reported that Skype or something similar could be used for the Executive Committee meetings. Anderson stated that the idea of accessing remotely would be of great help. Varner noted that for people off campus this would be very helpful. He stated that any options would be very plausible. Purdum pointed out that more than likely both the East and City Campus Unions are already set up for Adobe Connect.

LaCost noted that there did not seem to be a formal motion to create a policy. Rinkevich stated that he would be inclined to vote that there be no formal policy.

## **5.0 New Business**

### **5.1 Untenured Faculty Members on Deans Search Committees**

The Executive Committee discussed concerns of having an untenured faculty member serve on a dean's search committee during the year he/she is going up for tenure. It was

noted that a dean's search takes a significant amount of time. Shea pointed out that search committees might want to have a junior faculty member's perspective. LaCost stated that the Executive Committee might want to discuss the issue at some time with SVCAA Weissinger.

## **5.2 Search for Dean of Agricultural Research Division**

Purdum asked if there was any official word about why additional candidates are being brought in for interviews. Shea stated that the faculty of the School of Natural Resources was informed by their Director that additional candidates were coming to campus. Purdum stated that her department heard that all four candidates that interviewed on campus were still in the pool.

Lindquist reported that the search committee was originally asked to select the top seven candidates. He stated that out of those candidates one is not being considered, four have come to campus, and now the remaining two from the pool are being interviewed. He pointed out that the other option was to call a failed search and to begin the process over again. If this happens the new search would be a targeted search.

Shea stated that of concern is that departments are hearing different things at different times and that no official statement has been made on the search.

## **5.3 IANR 2025 Goals**

Shea pointed out that the Institute's 2025 goals are very specific, most of which the faculty and the Institute do not have control over. Purdum stated that faculty members she has spoken with are very concerned with the goals because they many of them are unattainable. Shea agreed, but noted that many of the goals seemed to be acceptable to unit administrators, which is a serious problem. Varner pointed out that having specific goals might have started with the NIFA process because people are looking for more tangible results. Wysocki stated that the goals should state that the Institute is working to facilitate achieving some of these goals, but not to implement them. Varner asked what Wysocki meant by not implementing the goals. Shea stated that the faculty cannot make people do things that would be necessary to reach the goals listed in the 2025 goals. Varner pointed out that the goals are trying to motivate people. Shea pointed out that it is the way the goals are presented that is problematic.

Purdum noted that the faculty members all have lofty goals that they are trying to attain. Shea asked if the faculty really has the power to make some of the changes listed in the goals. He pointed out that if the goals are not reached the faculty will be held accountable. Varner stated that he thinks a private citizen would rather see lofty goals that the university would try to attain. Shea asked if the faculty really have the power to make all of the changes listed in the goals. Varner stated that the university is making a difference in attaining some of the goals, but it is not the only factor in having success with the goals.

Struthers asked if the list of goals is published. Shea stated that they are probably on the IANR website (<http://ianrhome.unl.edu/>).

Purdum stated that she is concerned that a lot of people in administrative positions in IANR are being moved around into other positions. She stated that she does not think there has been a lot of discussion about how many ARD deans are needed and changes are being made without faculty input. She stated that it appears that the number of administrators is increasing. In the meantime, faculty members are being asked to pick up additional teaching loads, and yet no new faculty members are being hired. She noted that this is particularly troublesome for faculty members who have a 50-50 split appointment with extension. If these faculty members increase their teaching load they are unable to put as much work into their extension appointment, but they get evaluated by the dean of extension because 50% of their salary is being paid by extension. Shea noted that this was discussed with VC Green and he seems to recognize this problem.

Struthers noted that a full time teaching load appears to be defined differently for the various departments and colleges on campus. She asked what is considered a full time teaching load in CASNR. Lindquist stated that in CASNR teaching loads are very specific. He noted that faculty members who teach large classes are given more credit for their teaching load. Anderson stated that there is no difference in the School of Music between large and small classes.

Purdum stated that the Executive Committee should ask SVCAA Weissinger what is being done with FTE's and teaching shortages. Nickerson stated that he believes there is going to be an increased number of professors of practice to relieve teaching needs. It was pointed out that SVCAA Weissinger reported at the June 1 Executive Committee meeting that VSIP money given to departments for permanent lines must be used for tenure track positions. Purdum noted that it will take about a year to fill tenure track positions.

Anderson pointed out that there will more than likely be an abuse of Professors of Practice. He stated that he knows of an adjunct professor who has a 7-7 teaching load. Rinkevich stated that this is an example of abuse of Professors of Practice.

Varner noted that VC Green had mentioned in previous discussions about getting a replacement for dean of extension because Dean Dickey will be retiring next year, yet there was also discussion about having the dean of agricultural research take over some of the responsibilities of the extension dean. He questioned whether the upcoming interviews will be for a research dean or an extension dean. Shea stated that this is something that people need to consider because the research dean might be asked to take over extension duties. Nickerson pointed out that there needs to be some clarification from VC Green about what his intent is with the dean of agricultural research. Purdum stated that it is her understanding that the dean of extension will be replaced but not the associate dean of extension.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:13 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, July 13, 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.

