

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** Anaya, Guevara, LaCost, Nickerson, Rinkevich, Shea, Varner

**Absent:** Irmak, Lindquist, Purdum, Schubert, Struthers, Wysocki

**Date:** Wednesday, October 26, 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**

#### **2.1 Meeting with Associate VC Cervený**

Griffin reported that the Executive Committee will be meeting with Associate VC Cervený on November 30 to discuss student recruiting.

#### **2.2 Meeting with Matt Hilgenkamp, ASUN**

LaCost reported that the Executive Committee will be meeting with Matt Hilgenkamp of ASUN to discuss employee plus one benefits and a student bereavement policy.

#### **2.3 Tentative Meeting with Graduate Student Association**

LaCost reported that a tentative meeting with Sylvia Jons of the Graduate Student Association has been set for November 16.

#### **2.4 TeamMates**

LaCost stated that she sent Walter Powell of LPS an email message about him making a presentation to the Senate in December on the TeamMates program. She stated that Powell indicated that Dr. Osborne will not be able to make a meeting that day, but Dean Waller from IANR is on the Board of Directors for the LPS TeamMates program and he will try to get him to speak at the meeting. She stated that it would be helpful to have other people from campus who participate in TeamMates to speak to the Senate about their personal experience with the program.

### **3.0 Approval of 10/19/11 Minutes**

The Executive Committee discussed possible revisions to the minutes. Anaya moved for approval of the revised minutes. The motion was seconded by Nickerson. The motion was approved.

### **4.0 Unfinished Business**

#### **4.1 Proposed Revisions to Emeritus Policy**

LaCost reported that she has not heard back from the Emeriti Association about the proposed revisions to the Emeritus Policy. The Executive Committee stated that LaCost should respond back to Provost Pratt on the changes the Committee has suggested.

Varner asked if the proposed should be taken to the full Senate. LaCost noted that the policy is a Board of Regents policy and Provost Pratt is merely looking for some feedback from the Executive Committee. She pointed out that Provost Pratt specifically requested in her email message that major changes not be made to the proposed changes.

Shea noted that the policy states that emeriti faculty members are not invited to attend department meetings. He asked if this has always been the case. LaCost stated that emeritus faculty members do not attend her department's meetings because sometimes confidential information is discussed. Guevara pointed out that departments may not want to have the outside influence of former faculty members and this may be particularly true for those currently running the department. He noted that departments need to move on and grow with new faculty members. Shea stated that attending faculty meetings can be a way for emeritus professors to keep up with a department. He suggested that emeriti faculty members could ask to attend a departmental meeting.

Varner asked how much autonomy each department has in making its own rules regarding emeritus faculty. LaCost noted that the policy uses the word "may" frequently indicating that many of the statements are of discretionary power.

Shea pointed out that in the case of attending department meetings the policy specifically states that emeriti faculty members do not attend. Nickerson noted that it is difficult to get things accomplished in department meetings with active faculty members and adding more people to a meeting could make things more difficult. LaCost stated that it would be more uncomfortable to ask someone to leave a meeting than to state that departmental meetings are only open to active faculty members. She stated that she is comfortable with the policy on this issue. Guevara agreed.

LaCost stated that she will respond back to Provost Pratt noting the Executive Committee's suggested revisions to the policy. She reported that she will contact the Emeriti Association and tell them that they should contact Provost Pratt directly if they have suggested revisions.

## **5.2 APC Responsibilities**

Shea noted that although it may be difficult for the APC to accomplish all of their assigned tasks, he does not think the responsibilities should be changed. Guevara wondered if some of the comments made by the chair of the APC came from frustration on the APC being bypassed by the administration. Shea pointed out that changing the responsibilities to reflect how the APC has been operating recently could potentially limit or restrict faculty governance and faculty input. Guevara noted that the administration needs to be reminded that the UNL Bylaws state that the APC shall formulate and recommend to the Faculty Senate, to the Colleges, and to the Chancellor goals for UNL.

Shea suggested that whenever a new chancellor or other upper administrator is hired the APC and the Senate Executive Committee should meet with this person to review the bylaws with him/her and to begin communications early on. He noted that the APC also needs to be provided the resources necessary to fulfill their responsibilities.

Shea asked if the responsibilities should include language outlining what the APC must or should approve. LaCost noted that the responsibilities currently give the APC power to recommend and formulate. Shea asked why the APC shouldn't have the authority to approve or not approve UNL goals put forward by the Chancellor. He noted that he and LaCost are attending a Big Ten faculty leadership conference later this week and he is interested in learning how the other Big Ten schools handle faculty governance. Nickerson suggested revisiting the issue after the conference.

Shea stated that now would be a good time to see if the current responsibilities are the way the APC should operate or if changes should be made. He pointed out that the faculty might want to ask for more authority if we find out that the other Big Ten faculties have a larger role in faculty governance.

Anaya stated that while it is great to consider whether the APC should have a changing role but the question really is who holds the administration accountable and who is managing them to make sure that they are adhering to bylaws. She asked who has the authority to make sure the administration is accountable to the bylaws. Guevara pointed out that the APC did have influence in retaining a faculty member's position in the recent budget cuts.

The Executive Committee agreed to discuss the issue further at its next meeting.

## **6.0 New Business**

### **6.1 Report on Meeting with Outside Consultant for Parking & Transportation Services**

LaCost reported that she was unable to attend the meeting with the outside consultants for Parking & Transportation Services. She stated that she spoke with someone who was able to attend the meeting and learned that the major topics raised were the cost of parking and issues relating to transportation. LaCost stated that she will contact Dan Carpenter, Director of Parking & Transportation Services, to see if other issues were discussed and how the consultants will be gathering information on campus.

### **6.2 Report on Meeting with Kelly Bartling, Manager of News, and Troy Feddersen, Editor, Scarlet and UNL Today**

Griffin noted that she was recently informed that the Faculty Senate office would not be able to send email messages to the faculty and that all communications had to go through University Communications. She reported that she met with Bartling and Feddersen of University Communications and explained that the Senate needs to be able to communicate with its constituents, the faculty, on occasions. Bartling informed her that the administration is trying to limit the number of campus-wide emails and wants communications to go through one office. Griffin stated that having an email list for

academic faculty only is what the Senate needs. Bartling agreed that such an email list could be created and stated that she would authorize Dave Spanel from Information Services to work with Griffin on developing such a list.

Griffin reported that there was also discussion on possibly creating a faculty newsletter that could be distributed quarterly. She noted that this has been considered in the past by the Executive Committee. Anaya stated that it would be nice to have a newsletter because it could provide the faculty with a concise overview of what the Senate is working on and a calendar of upcoming events and deadline dates could be included. LaCost pointed out that a newsletter stays viable for a little longer than the UNL Today publication.

Nickerson stated that he likes the newsletter idea but wondered how much resources it would take. Griffin reported that Bartling suggested a Journalism student could either be hired or work on a newsletter as an intern. Anaya stated that a newsletter could be informative and directed to faculty concerns.

Shea asked how a newsletter would be distributed. Griffin suggested that it could be sent by email. Shea stated that a newsletter would be a good and different way to communicate with the faculty. He stated that one problem could be having too many people drafting the newsletter. Nickerson stated that an editor would almost certainly be needed. He pointed out that the Executive Committee could collectively help as an editor. Anaya noted that there are ways to split this responsibility up so that it is not too time consuming. Shea stated that the Executive Committee would need to at least look it over before a newsletter went out.

Shea stated that having a faculty newsletter could be a mechanism for getting faculty more interested in faculty governance by providing information that is pertinent to faculty members. He stated that committees and the work that they do could be highlighted in a newsletter.

Griffin suggested the Executive Committee meet with Bartling and Fedderson to discuss the possibility of a faculty newsletter. The Executive Committee agreed that a meeting should be arranged. Shea pointed out that the information in a newsletter or in our email messages needs to come from the Executive Committee and communications from the Senate should not be controlled by the administration. He believes it would be okay to have University Communications look over the newsletter to make sure the information included is correct.

Griffin stated that she will contact Bartling and Fedderson to arrange a meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:43 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, November 2, 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.

