

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Anaya, Guevara, LaCost, Nickerson, Rinkevich, Struthers, Wysocki

Absent: Irmak, Lindquist, Purdum, Schubert, Shea, Varner

Date: Wednesday, October 19, 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 3:09 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

3.0 Approval of 10/12/11 Minutes

Anaya moved for approval of the minutes as revised. The motion was seconded by Struthers. The motion was approved.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Proposed Revisions to the Emeritus Policy

LaCost reported that she received an email message from Emeritus Professor McShane stating that the Emeriti Association is very interested in the proposed changes to the Emeritus Policy and the Association would like to make comments on it before the Executive Committee responds to Provost Pratt.

Griffin reported that Shea sent in comments about the policy. Shea's comments were that there must be a fair balance between appropriate privileges for emeriti professors and minimal burdens on units and resources. The policy also must protect against taking advantage of emeriti (uncompensated services) in carrying out the mission of departments or the University. Varner sent in comments asking if departments will need to provide computers to the emeriti professors or whether they could bring in personal laptops and connect to the UNL network. Do library and email privileges automatically continue or will emeriti professors have to submit a request for these services. Who will provide the IT support for emeriti? Will the policy jeopardize athletic event tickets? Add extension/outreach in the introduction of the policy.

LaCost noted that access to an office, network or IT services will probably be at the discretion of the Dean or Director in consultation with a department chair.

Guevara stated that he has concerns with emeriti professors competing for the same internal resources as active faculty members. Nickerson suggested that the word external

be included in the policy in regards to emeriti faculty applying for grants. LaCost agreed pointing out that emeriti faculty members would be in competition with people who are on tenure track positions. Nickerson noted that the Research Council grants usually give preference to people who are early in their careers. He stated that he does not think emeriti faculty would be considered for Layman grants. He stated that mostly emeriti professors need an office and the ability to have access to the network, and remain identified with a department when sending in papers.

Anaya noted that emeriti faculty automatically receives library privileges but people who simply retire from the university do not. She pointed out that the Libraries' contracts often state who can have access to the information that is being provided so granting library privileges becomes a legal issue.

LaCost stated that not every faculty member who retires is eligible for emeritus status. Anaya noted that emeritus status is granted by a vote of the faculty members in a department.

Guevara noted that the policy goes back to 1949. LaCost stated that the revisions remove some things and brings the policy up to date with by including language relating to access of information technology.

Struthers pointed out that the policy states that "unless renewed, the assignments end with the University fiscal year". She asked if emeritus status is voted on each year by departments. Anaya stated that she does not think the status is voted on by the faculty in her department each year. Nickerson agreed noting that it is not voted upon in Biological Sciences either. Guevara stated that he believes department chairs just sign off on the renewal unless there is some cause not to.

Guevara noted that the policy states that official notices and communications made by emeriti faculty members "will all be accommodated using, where necessary, the United States mail." Anaya pointed out that electronic communications should be added to this section.

The Executive Committee agreed to wait to see the Emeriti Association's concerns before sending their comments back to Provost Pratt.

4.2 Academic Planning Committee Responsibilities

LaCost noted that Professors Bryant and Lahey met with the Executive Committee last week to ask for help in implementing the responsibilities of the APC or to change the charge of the APC to reflect current practices. She stated that the question is how do we become more proactive in faculty governance, particularly in regards to the goals of hiring 160 new faculty members. She pointed out that the faculty needs to be engaged in determining the criteria for these new hires.

Wysocki noted that there was limited membership at the meeting and suggested that further discussion be held next week. LaCost stated that she wants people to really

consider this issue. She stated that she is willing to meet with small groups of senators to talk about the needs for new faculty members in their departments. She pointed out that the faculty needs to engage in this process and it is a crucial element for the faculty to have input on. Nickerson stated that presumably each department is already identifying its needs. LaCost noted that the Executive Committee discussed possibly talking about this at a Senate meeting. Griffin pointed out that the senate packet will be sent out on Tuesday and suggested including a message to the Senators asking them to be prepared to speak about whether their departments have had discussions on hiring. Wysocki stated that he has heard that every department in his college will have at least one new hire next year. Anaya pointed out that there has been a lot of concerns in departments with all of the VSIP retirements and the need to replace these people.

Guevara stated that all departments have a strategic plan for hiring but the money for hiring gets distributed by the administrators to specific colleges. He noted that the hiring should be in line with the needs of the departments.

Nickerson stated that the issue of hiring 160 new faculty members is a complex issue. He pointed out that in his department the physical space required to hire faculty is not available and an extension needs to be put on Manter Hall in order to accommodate more people.

Nickerson stated that he is reluctant to make any changes to the APC's responsibilities. Griffin reported that Shea sent in comments stating the same. Nickerson pointed out that the APC's work is difficult to do well given the limited time the members have to devote to the work of the APC. LaCost noted that the APC has no money or resources to work with.

Wysocki suggested making a provision in the Bylaws about expanding the APC in cases of financial emergencies. He stated that the APC could be kept as it currently is, but in cases of planning for budgetary emergencies a separate committee could be established to do the work. Griffin pointed out that prior to the 1993 creation of the Procedures to Be Invoked for Significant Budget Reductions and Reallocations there was the Budget Reduction Review Committee that dealt with budget cuts. The problem was that the committee was very large and cumbersome and getting work done was a very lengthy process.

LaCost stated that the APC responsibilities will be discussed further at the next meeting.

4.3 Professorship Committee

LaCost noted that the Executive Committee wanted to know who was on the Professorship Committee before endorsing anyone to be on it. Griffin reported that the members of the Professorship Committee are: David Manderscheid, Ellen Weissinger, James Van Etten, Kenneth Price, Marjorie Langell, Mary Uhl-Bien, Prem Paul, Ronald Green, Sherilyn Fritz, and Susan Sheridan. Susan Fritz needs to be replaced because she now works in Varner Hall and Associate VC Perez wanted to replace her with Dean Clutter from the Agricultural Research Division. The Executive Committee suggested

having balance by gender as well as by campus on the Committee. The Executive Committee suggested the following faculty members for the Professorship Committee: Ann Mari May, Economics; Paul Black, Biochemistry, and Anne Vidaver, Emeritus Professor.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Agenda Items for Meeting with Chancellor Perlman and SVCAA Weissinger

The Executive Committee identified the following agenda items for next week's meeting with the Chancellor and SVCAA:

- Departmental Contact Person for Recruiting

- Timeframe for Replacing VSIP Members

 - 160 new faculty members – does it include the VSIP positions or in addition to these positions

- Plans for Restructuring Departments to Help Facilitate Goals

- Plans for Identifying Academic Areas that need to be bolstered or merits enhancement

- Update on the Search for Dean of Fine Arts

- UNL Salary Increases to be in Line with Social Security Increases.

- Changes in Building Priorities as a Result of the New Goals

- Plans to Increase Student Retention Rates

 - Possibility of Limiting the Number of Majors for Students

 - How Many Students Graduating Late are Student with Multiple Majors

5.2 Senate Email Messages to the Faculty

Griffin reported that she was recently informed that the Executive Committee would not be able to send out email messages as it previously has been able to do and that all messages now have to go through University Communications and be approved by a Vice Chancellor. Griffin pointed out that several years ago the Executive Committee asked the Chancellor to have permission to send out emails to the faculty and he approved the procedure. She reported that she will be meeting with Kelly Bartling, Manager of News, University Communications to discuss the issue and will report back to the Executive Committee.

5.3 One Year Appointment Needed for Academic Rights & Responsibilities

Griffin reported that there is a one year appointment open on the ARRP. She suggested contacting a faculty member who just ran for election to the ARRP but did not get elected. LaCost approved this idea.

5.4 Upcoming Meeting with Outside Consultant about Transportation Demand Management Strategies and the Parking and Transit Services Operations

LaCost reported that she received an email message from Parking and Transit Services Director Dan Carpenter inviting her to attend a meeting with the outside consultant who has been hired to look at best practices and issues relating to transit services. She asked the Executive Committee if there were any issues that they wanted raised. The Executive Committee suggested asking if parking costs are going to continue to rise and to

investigate how the cost of the building the parking garages are funded. LaCost stated that she will report back to the committee about the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, October 26, 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.