

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Irmak, LaCost, Lindquist, Nickerson, Purdum, Rinkevich, Schubert, Shea, Struthers, Wysocki

Absent: Anaya, Varner

Date: Wednesday, September 28, 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

LaCost called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

2.0 Chancellor Perlman/VC Green

2.1 Strategies for Doubling Research Funds and Plans for Rewarding Units for Significant Accomplishments Relative to UNL's New Academic and Research Goals

Chancellor Perlman reported that the primary strategy is the development of an incentive structure for units on campus but plans are not far enough along for him to be specific. He noted that resources will be one component of the incentives and some of this will come from reallocation of VSIP and other positions. He pointed out that how the money is allocated will depend on how departments meet their goals. He stated that he believes we are well positioned to be able to reach some of the goals he discussed in his state of the university address and pointed out that we haven't yet captured some of the research funding that will be available from the Water for Food and other programs. He believes we are well positioned on the research side of things but the downside might be with federal research funding. He noted that research funds could be reduced through the balancing of the federal budget. He stated that SVCAA Weissinger and VC Green are working on developing a set of incentives and policies to reward units.

2.2 International Activities: Plans for Growth, Restructuring of International Affairs Office, Faculty Involvement in International Programs

Chancellor Perlman reported that the administration has reviewed the Office of International Affairs and there has been some movement in terms of personnel. He stated that currently the administration is trying to figure out, and is moving towards the conclusion that there are multiple aspects of International Affairs that may not need to be housed in the same unit. For instance, recruiting international students and serving international students by helping them get integrated with the campus are two different things. He pointed out that there may be some services that do not even need to be centralized in one office. He noted that how colleges position themselves internationally might be different from other colleges so they may have other needs that would not

necessarily come from an International Affairs office. He stated that we need to be better in all areas of International Affairs.

LaCost reported that she has had feedback from international students that they have difficulty integrating with other students and the campus. She asked who should be contacted to help these students because they need to blend more with the campus. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that this is one of the problems because there really is no one person that can help these students.

2.4 Plans for Coordinating Departments and College Recruitment Practices

Chancellor Perlman noted that this is a discussion that needs to be held with the Vice Chancellors. He stated that he is aware of discussions that are taking place about centralizing some scholarships when possible.

2.5 Coordination of Recruiting in CASNR & IANR

Purdum asked what kind of assistance units will have to help increase enrollment of students in CASNR. She pointed out that the increased number identified by VC Green in his recent speech is high. VC Green reported that he recently met with IANR faculty and staff and talked about what IANR's goals should be relative to the Chancellor's goals announced in the state of the university address. He noted that roughly 3,000 students are enrolled in courses relating to agriculture and natural resources and he proposed that this number be increased to 4200 by 2017. He stated that if we continue on the road that CASNR has been on, we will meet the number of undergraduate students he indicated. He admitted that increasing the number of graduate students by 400 will be more challenging but there are opportunities for international student recruitment. He reported that we are expected to announce an agreement with Brazil that will bring a number of undergraduate and graduate students to the campus. He pointed out that the students from Brazil could eventually make up 20% of the intended increase in students.

VC Green stated that in terms of recruitment he needs to look at how we invest our resources and how we leverage our departments. He noted that he met with people in Extension across the state and they do not feel fully leveraged at this time. LaCost stated that Varner had a question about extension educations not having contacts in the various departments that could assist with recruiting potential new students. VC Green noted that this is probably referring to extension educator faculty who are not faculty members in a specific department. He reported that he met with the extension faculty in the northeast district of the state yesterday and they raised this issue. He noted that the extension educators are on the front lines with the public and they want to be more connected with departments, not only in IANR, but more generally across the university. He stated that he has shared information with SVCAA Weissinger on how difficult it is for the extension educators to get access to city campus departments. He noted that it would be particularly helpful for the extension educators to have access to all departments, particularly when there is a student that is interested in a specific program. He stated that he would like to have the extension educators talk with SVCAA Weissinger about this.

Purdum pointed out that it would be helpful for everyone to know what the Vice Chancellor's plans are so everyone can work together. She noted that having coordination all the way through is helpful. VC Green stated that this is a fair suggestion. He noted that CASNR has been in a growth mode for six or seven years and we want to continue with a 7 – 8% growth rate, although this will take some investment and we will have to look hard for students out-of-state to meet this goal.

Purdum asked if units will receive help with teaching overloads and if there will be more connectivity with departments. VC Green reported that previously the Deans Council handled many of these matters, but beginning in August a new model has been used. He stated that all department heads and deans in IANR will be meeting together once a month to discuss issues such as prioritization of implementing plans to deal with increased enrollment and teaching loads as well as the implementation of recommendations resulting from the IANR to 2025 process. LaCost asked if this is linked to the Chancellor's plans of providing incentive funds to departments.

VC Green reported that the IANR to 2025 process has been very productive for the campus but we have a lot of work ahead of us. He noted that 51 recommendations have been generated from the process, 30 are being implemented now and another 10 are in the planning for implementation. He stated that another 11 of these recommendations will be presented to the Chancellor for wider university discussion. He pointed out that these recommendations are on issues that impact all of us on campus, particularly research funding and recovery of funds. He stated that more information can be found on the web (<http://ianrhome.unl.edu/ianr-2025>).

2.6 Vision for the Rural Initiative (RI)

Chancellor Perlman reported that the RI is an exciting opportunity. He noted that recently there have been listening sessions around the state with public policy makers and the public to determine how the university can be most helpful. He noted that the Water for Food Institute is part of the RI.

VC Green reported that the RI has been in place since 2002 and was originally a system-wide rural initiative that receives about \$800,000 a year in funding. He stated that recently President Milliken had a review of the program to see if we are achieving the initial goals of the RI. An external report was done and the review said that our motivation is right but the funding is woefully inadequate and that currently it is really more of an IANR initiative. He reported that President Milliken asked him to look at the RI and he studied it further. He stated that he agreed with the report and developed a concept of what should be done in the next phase. He stated that the RI needs to be set up so it is a system-wide effort to make it more comprehensive. He reported that a concept has been developed around seven areas for a proposed Institute for the Rural Future: rural legal practice and policy, rural health and nutrition, youth development and rural education, agri/ecotourism and recreational development, and rural infrastructure and transportation. He stated that the plan was presented to the Chancellors for review and they were enthusiastic about it, but we will have to find new money to support it and we may have to get private funding. The concept was also shared with the Board of

Regents in January and they supported it being further developed. He stated that since this past January he has been engaging with faculty members across the system about the RI. He noted that approximately 140 faculty members are involved. He reported that he has started a series of focus groups and has met with a majority of the state senators and with some private foundations to see what they think of the plan and whether it is an appropriate mission for the university. He stated that he has had focus groups in Grand Island, Kearney, Norfolk, and the greater Omaha region as well as with faculty at UNO and UNK. There are additional focus groups planned for this fall in other regions across the state and for faculty at UNMC and UNL. He reported that he is collecting data around the concepts of the plan and has started talking to private donors. He stated that he will be in Washington DC in two weeks to talk to the Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack about it. He noted that the Secretary may come to Nebraska to discuss the RI and to see if he will support it.

LaCost asked if he is getting a lot of interesting feedback. VC Green stated that he is and from very diverse groups. He has been meeting with bankers, business owners, farmers, secondary education officials, economic development professionals, local and state elected officials, and private citizens and they all have been very informative groups to listen to.

Purdum asked who the key person is on the RI project. VC Green reported that it has been primarily him until recently but he has now developed a team to assist him. He noted that the team is comprised of people in the RI in the past and from the other campuses as well. He reported that the team is in the process of planning a national conference next May to address questions about rural initiatives. He stated that the reality is that we have a lot of expertise across the campuses in areas like rural medicine and rural education as well as other areas. The challenge is that people associated with the RI are not well connected.

2.7 Upcoming Issues

Chancellor Perlman reported that a press release should be out soon regarding recent international activities. He stated that an agreement has been signed with Xi'an Jiaotong University forming an American Culture Center at Xia'an Jiaotong University. He noted that this will provide system-wide opportunities for faculty members from a broad range of disciplines to go to China to teach. He stated that we are hoping to receive a \$100,000 grant from the US Embassy in China to assist with the agreement.

Nickerson noted that Professor Meagher is leaving UNL. He asked what will happen with the Biological Process Development Facility (BPDF). Chancellor Perlman reported that the BPDF is in good shape and there will be a search for another director.

VC Green reported that there have been some recent changes in personnel in IANR. He noted that Dr. Archie Clutter, our new Dean of the Agricultural Research Division on Monday, September 26. He stated that the Associate Vice Chancellor position, which has been vacant for nearly two years, will be filled by Professor Ron Yoder effective October 5th. He stated that he has asked Professor Milford Hanna, who just recently retired

through VSIP, to come in as a temporary replacement as head of the Biological Systems Engineering department. VC Green reported that a search will be conducted for the Dean of Cooperative Extension Division because Elbert Dickey will be retiring next June.

Shea asked how involved the VC is with the Nebraska Research Initiative. VC Green responded only tangentially because it is really run out of the Office of Research and Economic Development. He stated that VC Paul will vet with him and others on campus when in the last round of reviewing proposals but the majority of the work is handled by VC Paul's office.

Shea noted that the faculty has just been notified about the current NRI funding opportunity but he finds it disappointing and frustrating that there is such a short time frame for submitting proposals. He stated that another issue is that the stated purpose of the NRI RAF is to encourage economic growth which he assumes is for the State, yet the areas of research solicited are very broad. He noted that for some areas it is hard to see how in a short term way they are going to promote economic growth for Nebraska. He pointed out that unless the proposal has a strong economic component to it, it likely won't have a chance of getting funded. VC Green stated that he was taken aback by the deadline too. He reported that the person now in charge of the NRI is Associate VP Susan Fritz who has recently become responsible for the NRI at Central Administration. He suggested that anyone needing more information should contact Associate VP Fritz.

Shea stated that another issue he is hearing is the proliferation of student fees. He noted that people are saying that the advertisements of UNL having a lower tuition rate than other Big Ten schools is misleading because the special fees raise the entire cost of going to school here. VC Green stated that this was raised by some of the Regents at a Board meeting. He reported that the Regents challenged the Chancellors in a couple of instances regarding whether there is any misrepresentation of the cost of the education when the Regents are trying to keep the lid on tuition but student fees are increasing. He stated that he does not know if this concern is widespread but he is aware of it in CASNR. He pointed out that the Regents do have their vision on this issue and are watching it.

Shea stated that he has heard that the special fees attached to some courses are not being used to improve the course. He noted that the Executive Committee brought the issue up to SVCAA Weissinger and she told them that it is a hard rule that course fees are supposed to go back to the course. He stated that he is not sure of the extent to which that this is really happening. VC Green stated that he will be having a meeting with the Dean of CASNR and will check with him on this. Purdum pointed out that the fees go back to the department head, but after that it is not clear how the money is used.

Purdum asked about tuition differentials. VC Green stated that tuition differential rates went to the Board and were approved earlier this year for CBA and Engineering. He noted that the concerns about these rates were well vetted by the Board of Regents as well. LaCost pointed out that first time college students and their families are often surprised when they see the extra fees that are put on courses. Purdum noted that some

students might get more for some of their fees than others. She stated that we need to look at the benefits of the student fees. Lindquist pointed out that some of the fees are voted on by students while others are laced onto courses and put on by the university.

Struthers noted that fees for her courses go back to the dean. Lindquist stated that course specific fees are supposed to go back to support the course. Nickerson pointed out that he does not think this happens very often. Purdum stated that the special course fees come back to the department as a budget item. Shea noted that colleges probably handle the flow of funds differently. He stated that he thinks in IANR some funds are allocated to the units in association with certain programs or Institute/College objectives. He pointed out that, for example, the deans' offices may think they have allocated a certain amount of money for graduate student stipends but not all of that money may be used that way in some departments. LaCost noted that the unit heads should be accountable to the dean.

Purdum suggested that the Executive Committee follow up with VC Green about the use of the special fees at the department level. She stated that the Executive Committee might want to discuss the issue with ASUN too.

Irmak pointed out that the special fees are supposed to be used for the students' benefit and this could be done through faculty hires, teaching infrastructure, and other indirect improvements. Wysocki stated that the benefits should be useful to those students who are paying for the special fees for a particular course.

Schubert pointed out that the discussion implies that the administration is doing something wrong but this cannot be proven. He stated that if students feel that a course is too expensive than they need to speak up about it. Lindquist agreed that we do not have a lot of knowledge about what is really going on. If there is concrete evidence then the issue can be addressed, but it is appropriate to ask the question. He noted that all student fees are spelled out clearly for the Board before they are approved.

Purdum stated that it would be helpful if there are specific examples of course fees not being used properly when discussing the issue with the administration. Lindquist stated that if a professor took a complaint about not getting the special fees for a course to the department head and it wasn't resolved then the Senate could get involved.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 National Academy of Science Members of the Big Ten

Nickerson reported that he received information from Professor Van Etten, Plant Pathology, regarding the number of National Academy of Science members from the various Big Ten schools. He noted the following: Nebraska – 1, Iowa - 3, Purdue – 4, Wisconsin – 38, Illinois – 24, Northwestern – 18, and University of Chicago – 37. He pointed out that that these figures may include people who have retired. Lindquist asked what the membership total is for the National Academy of Science. Nickerson stated that it is about 2000 living members from the USA (with ca. 1000 foreign associates) with 72

new members elected each year. They just voted to increase this number to 80 per year for the next 5 years.

3.2 Meeting with ASUN External Vice President

LaCost reported that she met with ASUN External Vice President Matt Hilgenkamp to discuss working with ASUN on future issues that affect both the Faculty Senate and ASUN.

4.0 Approval of 9/14/11 and 9/21/11 Minutes

Schubert moved to approve the 9/14/11 minutes as revised. Rinkevich second the motion. The motion was approved. The Executive Committee approved the 9/21/11 minutes pending revisions by ASUN President Carr.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Suspension of Pay Procedure

LaCost reported that she contacted the Chancellor and told him that the Executive Committee continues to grapple with the procedures. She asked specifically where the ruling is stating that the Chancellor has the right to suspend a faculty's pay. She reported that the Chancellor said that state law gives him the authority and the Board of Regents said he has the right to suspend a faculty's pay if he/she does not teach the assigned course.

LaCost noted that if a Chancellor is going to suspend an untenured faculty's salary, the faculty member should be notified and should consider filing a complaint with the ARRC. Schubert pointed out that most faculty members are paid over a full year for work they do in nine months so the argument of being able to suspend a faculty's pay is not logical.

Lidquist moved to table the discussion indefinitely. The motion was second by Schubert. The motion was approved.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Conflict of Interest Policy Draft

Lidquist reported that there is a new draft UNL policy on conflict of interest. He stated that the document will eventually go to the Faculty Senate for a vote and the university has to have the policy in place by August 31, 2012 (according to federal regulations). He noted that there will need to be some additional work done on the draft and he is asking Executive Committee members to send him comments. He pointed out that UNL's policy will have to follow federal rules and must comply with the Board of Regents' policy. He stated that there are no clear guidelines in the document and there needs to be a definition section as well. He stated that differences between things like financial conflict of interest and conflict of commitment need to be spelled out in the policy.

Purdum asked who put the draft together. Lidquist reported that about two years ago a committee was formed to create a new UNL policy but some committee members have left the university and the federal government was making changes to some of the

regulations. He stated that some of the remaining committee members worked on the new draft. He asked that people look over the draft and provide him feedback on the document.

6.2 Upcoming Senate Meeting

Lindquist asked if there was going to be an emergency motion to the Senate as a follow up to the Employee Plus One Benefit resolution passed by the Senate in December 2010. He asked if President Carr of ASUN was going to be speaking to the Senate about why the students feel this is valuable benefit that needs to be offered by the university.

LaCost stated that she contacted President Carr who indicated that he would possibly be speaking at the Senate meeting. Griffin stated that she will contact President Carr to see if he definitely plans on coming to the Senate meeting.

Nickerson suggested that we make a public statement reaffirming the resolution that the Senate previously passed on the Employee Plus One Benefits. LaCost asked if it should be an emergency motion. Lindquist stated that it should be an emergency motion because the students will be speaking about at the next Board of Regents meeting.

LaCost reported that she received an email message from Emeritus Professor McShane about changes he is suggesting to the proposed revisions to the ARRC procedures, in particular section 7.2. She stated that she will send McShane's email message to the Executive Committee for their review.

Griffin reported that there will be a test run of streaming the Senate meeting. Schubert stated that it needs to be determined whether senators will be counted towards the quorum if they only stream the meeting and it needs to be decided whether to accept comments and questions from anyone or just senators. He stated that these questions need to be discussed with the Senate. The Executive Committee will discuss the issue further at its next meeting.

6.3 Faculty Senate Award for Faculty Governance

LaCost reported that Emeritus Professor McShane informed her that the Emeriti Association wants to work with the Executive Committee to possibly create an award for service to faculty governance. She noted that the award would parallel the James A. Lake Academic Freedom Award. Lindquist stated that he thought it was a great idea. The Executive Committee will have further discussion on the subject.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, October 5, 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.