

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Anaya, Anderson, Irmak, Lindquist, Purdum, Rinkevich, Schubert, Shea, Wysocki

Absent: LaCost, Nickerson, Struthers, Varner

Date: Wednesday, May 4, 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

Schubert called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

2.0 Vice Chancellor Green

2.1 Distribution of Funds and Ability to Change Apportionment in IANR

Purdum stated that there are concerns with professors in IANR not having the opportunity to change their apportionment even though their responsibilities and interests have changed since they were originally hired. She noted that some people came into the university initially to conduct research, but over time they have taken on more teaching responsibilities for a department. She pointed out that these people are still fulfilling the needs of the university, but in a different way and they should be able to change their apportionment to reflect the changes in their work. She stated that the difficulty in making the change is because of how funds are allocated in IANR. She pointed out that problems arise when annual evaluations are conducted because these people are still being evaluated on their research apportionment, yet most of their time is being spent on teaching for the unit.

VC Green reported that there are three funding streams for the Institute: Cooperative Extension, Teaching, and Research through the Agricultural Research Division. He noted that some funds are formula dollars through the USDA and some are state funds. He stated that he has detected that there is some misalignment in some units between the teaching FTE amount and what is actually occurring in the department. He noted that he previously mentioned the planning process that is currently going on in IANR and stated that one of the teams involved in the process is looking at teaching and apportionment and how it is funded. He reported that one of the Evaluation Reform Team's task is to look across the departments to see if teaching is in line with what is occurring in departments and whether it is meeting the needs of the college. He stated that a report from the team is due at the end of June. He pointed out that if we aren't in line with the teaching expectations we will have to decide how to re-appropriate funds. He stated that he does not think the problem is acute, but it may be occurring in some departments. He pointed out that if the apportionment isn't correct for a person, it is an administrative issue that needs to be addressed.

Lindquist stated that there is a bit of a conflict in how the reapportionment works within IANR. He noted that Regents Bylaw 4.3 states that either the faculty member or the unit administrator can initiate a change in a faculty member's apportionment. However, if there is any disagreement, a college committee will step in to review and consider the change. He stated that the problem is that the Institute does not have a faculty-elected committee that specifically addresses these cases and this needs to be reconciled. VC Green stated that this situation needs to be rectified.

VC Green reported that when the apportionment guidelines were being reviewed last fall he asked the Deans to look at the guidelines to see if the Institute is in alignment with them. He stated that he was informed that the Institute always follows the guidelines. Lindquist pointed out the Institute is generally following the guidelines, but the guidelines are not the same as Regents Bylaw 4.3. He noted that the Institute has long been very clear on the percentage of responsibilities for each faculty member.

Shea stated that the problem is that there is a limitation or barrier for faculty members to change their apportionment in the Institute because each person's salary is different. If a faculty member wanted to trade 10% of his/her research appointment for another person's 10% teaching appointment, the amount of money allocated for each would not be the same amount. As a result, apportionments cannot be changed even when both parties agree. Shea said he was told that this limitation is at the dean's level. He stated that he has heard that this is because dollars for research, teaching, and extension cannot be mingled. He noted that the Chancellor recently made a comment to the Executive Committee that this is a matter of how the deans handle the funds because it is not a stipulation from the Regents. VC Green pointed out that formula funds can only be used the way they are mandated, but there has to be more flexibility in the funding stream. Purdum suggested that a pool of flex money could perhaps be created from the funds that will become available from retirements and this could help facilitate apportionment changes.

Shea pointed out that it has taken a very long time to implement some changes in apportionment because of the inflexible funding system. He noted that some people have not been able to change their apportionment at all because of the funding barrier and this has resulted in faculty members being evaluated in a negative way because their activities are not aligned with their apportionment. VC Green stated that this is obviously an issue. He noted that this issue relates to integration and he has challenged the three deans of the Institute to do a better job of integration.

Purdum stated that the Executive Committee will be looking forward to seeing the Evaluation Team's report.

2.2 Mentoring New Deans

Lindquist stated that because there are several new deans on campus the administration and Senate Executive Committee need to work together as a team to help the new deans adjust to their position. VC Green agreed that there has been a large turnover in

administration. He reported that Dean Drummond from Architecture is stepping down as Dean and Dean Dickey from Cooperative Extension is retiring. Anderson reported that Dean Oliva is leaving to become Provost of the Fashion Institute of Technology. VC Green stated that change in administration is a natural cycle and these changes present us with both an opportunity and a challenge.

VC Green reported that both he and SVCAA Weissinger are looking at ways to better empower departments and to make department heads more empowered in their roles. He noted that to accomplish this will take a lot of mentoring.

Shea stated that the recent changes in administrators provide us with a tremendous opportunity and the chance to align the new deans and implement changes in administrative procedures.

VC Green pointed out that the texture of the campus is changing and there are more cross disciplinary kinds of efforts taking place. He noted that how departments operate has changed and it has become apparent that top down administration does not work as well.

Purdum stated that in the last five years there seems to be a growth in the number of associate deans in the Institute. She asked how much of the funds are going towards these new associate deans. She pointed out that some of these new associate deans have come up quickly and some of the searches to fill these positions have been very limited. She asked why these positions were created and how they are going to serve the faculty. VC Green stated that this is one of the reasons why he has set up the teams to review operations in IANR. He reported that he told the teams that they need to find a way to make administration more efficient, and less bureaucratic, and he wants to fully understand the role of every position and its necessity. Shea stated that it is reasonable to re-evaluate administrative positions periodically because roles evolve over time. He noted that if the end point is elimination of certain administrative positions, there likely will be some initial negative reaction, but he thinks people should expect these kinds of changes over time.

VC Green stated that the way to create these changes is with turnovers. He pointed out that there is nothing that says we have to be locked into an existing structure and if the time is right to rethink the administrative structure of the Institute then we will do it. He suggested that it might be the right time to put extension and research together. He stated that he does not know if this will happen but he plans on taking a look at the idea. He noted that retirements provide the opportunity to consider changes.

2.3 Update on Dean of Graduate Studies Search

VC Green stated that he has not had the opportunity to speak with SVCAA Weissinger about the search so he is unable to provide an update.

2.4 Update on Dean of Agricultural Research Division Search

VC Green reported that four candidates were brought in for on campus interviews. He stated that his office has received a lot of input on the candidates and the input has been

fairly consistent. The result is that a candidate has emerged as the top candidate and discussions with the candidate's references are now taking place. He stated that he feels that we are in good shape with this search and he hopes that it will be successful.

2.5 Upcoming Issues

VC Green reported that the Water for Food conference just concluded and it was very successful. He stated that there were approximately 500 attendees from 26 different countries. He noted that some major international agreements were signed during the conference and overall there were great discussions.

VC Green stated that five finalists have been identified for the Executive Director of the Water for Food Institute. He noted that there was a deep pool of candidates and nine airport interviews were conducted. He stated that four of the final candidates are international. He pointed out that this is a complicated interview process because the Executive Director will be interfacing with UNO, UNK, the Medical Center and UNL, although primarily with UNL. He stated that Central Administration hopes to have the search process completed by the end of June.

Purdum asked if Dr. Fritz, who has been serving as Interim Dean of ARD, will go back to the Associate VC position when the new ARD dean is in place. VC Green stated that this is unknown at this time, in part, because there are some key roles that are vacant. He pointed out that Dr. Fritz would be welcomed back as Associate VC. He stated that if she assumes another position as an interim he is considering asking someone to fill her role for the time that she is serving in an interim position.

Lindquist noted that we now have the VC of the Institute and SVCAA positions filled. He asked what their short term goals are and what they want to do with the campus. VC Green stated that the AAU situation has consumed a great deal of their collective time and the budget situation hit immediately and they have not had much time to work on joint efforts. He reported that they are having discussions on how the deans and department heads can be empowered. He stated that they are working together on the Life Sciences to make further progress. Dr. Green reiterated that he and Dr. Weissinger are tremendous colleagues and have been working together as a team since the day he arrived on campus.

Schubert asked if the Chancellor's message about UNL's discontinued membership in the AAU adequately addressed the issue. VC Green reported that the administration worked on the message and thought carefully through it. He stated that it was very unfortunate that the campus did not know about it, but the campus couldn't be informed because of the uncertainty of how the vote would go and AAU wanted to keep the voting private. He pointed out that it is never good to be eliminated or asked to leave a national organization. He noted that the effect of no longer being a member of the AAU will impact some areas more than others. He stated that it is important for people to remember that the work we do today is no different than the work we have been doing and losing membership has not changed the importance, impact or the quality of what we do. He noted that it was hard for the campus to lose membership but it might turn out to

be a net positive as it might just make us work harder and focus in an improved way. He pointed out that the criteria used for determining membership was done in such a way that it makes it clear that the AAU is biased against the land grant universities in the organization. He reported that all of the land grant universities voted to retain UNL while the private schools voted against our membership.

Schubert appreciated VC Green's candor in speaking on the issue. He asked if the VC could envision Nebraskans perceiving the university differently because of the elimination of our membership with the AAU. VC Green stated that there are some disciplines where membership in the AAU is more meaningful and important and he understands this. He pointed out that we are already in the top tier of universities in the growth of our research program and in a number of other areas, so removal from membership of the AAU is not going to change what we do here. Anderson noted that the AAU seems to have a vision that they are not going to include land grant universities and that they will continue to purge these institutions from their membership in the near future. VC Green stated that there are several more land grant institutions that are on the list for possible elimination. He pointed out that we need to make the best of the situation and move forward.

Anderson stated that he believes the Chancellor has it right in that the issue of UNL losing membership in the AAU will be forgotten about after a month or so. Schubert asked if the Executive Committee needed to make a formal comment on the issue. Purdum noted that there are faculty members who seek to work at an AAU institution and she pointed out that this could affect our ability to recruit faculty members. Anderson stated that it sounds like membership in the AAU is going to become very fluid and that it may be getting rid of more institutions. Wysocki suggested that the Executive Committee revisit the issue in six months to see if there are impacts from the loss of membership. Anaya stated that it will be interesting to see how this change could affect candidate pools. She pointed out that some people might actually find UNL more attractive because there may not be as much pressure on research. Wysocki wondered if there will be impacts from an administrative position and if people will lose grants or research collaboration efforts because of the change. Anderson stated that he plans on asking Dean Oliva if the loss of the membership will impact the viability hiring the next dean of the Hixson-Lied College of Fine and Performing Arts.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Summer Executive Committee Schedule

Griffin reminded the Executive Committee that the summer schedule goes into effect for the Committee and meetings will only be held every other week.

4.0 Minutes of 4/27/11

The minutes of 4/27/11 were approved with revisions.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Update on Suspension of Pay Policy

Lindquist reported that he spoke with Attorney MaryKay Hansen who asked if the Faculty Senate has the purview to deal with a suspension of pay policy since it is a legal issue. He stated that he informed her that the Senate can develop a policy. He noted that she is continuing to work on reviewing the issue and hopefully she will respond back to us in two weeks. He pointed out that the Executive Committee can always discuss the issue which might be particularly helpful for the new members.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Safety Issues for Employees and Students

Purdum pointed out that there is considerable construction taking place on campus and she believes there have been some serious safety issues for employees and students. She wondered whether construction workers go through a safety training course to insure that people working in and around buildings are not injured. She asked the Executive Committee if this is an issue that needs to be discussed with VC Jackson. She noted that some of the construction work can have significant impact on the productivity of faculty members.

Schubert suggested that the Institute should try to address this concern since the work Purdum is referring to is taking place on East Campus. Anaya suggested asking what the plans are for construction on East Campus and how employees are expected to get into their buildings.

Wysocki noted that construction is going on at the Peter Kiewit Institute and it is his understanding that the new research space will not be distributed by the department but by the PKI administration and that decisions will be based on the amount of research funding that is obtained by a faculty member.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:16 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, May 18, 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.