

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** Guevara, LaCost, Lindquist, Reisbig, Rinkevich, Ruchala, Schubert, Shea, Woodman, Wysocki

**Absent:** Anaya, Lindquist, Zoubek

**Date:** Wednesday, April 4, 2012

**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 3:03 p.m.

### 2.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

### 3.0 Approval of 3/28/12 Minutes

Wysocki moved to approve the minutes as revised. Rinkevich second the motion. The motion was approved.

### 4.0 Unfinished Business

#### 4.1 Survey of Non-tenure Track Faculty Members

The Executive Committee made final revisions to the survey. The survey will be sent out next week to non-tenure track faculty members.

#### 4.2 Enrollment Plan: Campus Blueprint

LaCost reported that one of her main concerns is with faculty/staff engagement with students and coordinated versus intentional academic advising. Reisbig wondered how the Enrollment Management Council determined what we need to do to recruit students that normally don't come here, and what we need to do to retain students. She wondered if there are plans to evaluate the proposed recruiting and retention efforts to see if they are successful. LaCost questioned where the pre development data used by the Enrollment Management Council comes from.

Purdum stated that she would like to know how college administrators are planning to communicate to faculty and departments about recruiting and retention efforts. She noted that discussions are occurring in her department about where the bottlenecks are for getting more students. She pointed out that there needs to be a good flow of communication between the departments and the administrators if the Chancellor's goals are to be attained. She stated that she did not think the Blueprint has a good description of how this will work. Woodman noted that there is a class in Biological Sciences that typically closes before sophomores even have a chance to register because the demand is

so high. He pointed out that this is a major bottleneck for students wanting to progress through their academic courses.

LaCost noted that the Legislature is more than likely not going to give the university more funding so having new buildings constructed may take some time. Purdum pointed out that on east campus renovation of existing space is what is really needed. She surmised that bottlenecks for students are probably occurring in the physical and biological sciences because of the lack of lab space. She stated that her department identified the need for using labs in the evening as well as during the day. She noted that it is this kind of information that the administration needs to receive so appropriate plans can be made to resolve the bottlenecks. Ruchala asked if Purdum's department has the resources to make these kinds of changes. Purdum stated that if enrollment goes up gradually the department feels it can develop and allocate resources, but help is needed with funding personnel and for some remodeling to occur. LaCost asked if the chairs and deans have been approached about it. Purdum stated that they have been approached. LaCost asked how the idea of renovating space was received. Purdum stated that her department was told that renovations would not occur until we can get more tuition dollars but we need the proper facilities to accommodate more students.

LaCost wondered what ways faculty members can deal with increased enrollment before the needed classrooms and labs are built. Woodman noted that the Blueprint calls for maintaining academic standards, but the Chancellor has said that faculty members need to be creative in handling the overflows and suggested having lab classes every other week. He pointed out that the faculty in biological sciences feels that doing this would not be maintaining our academic standards. He stated that there has been a plan to expand Manter Hall for about five years and plans have been drawn out for it but it still has not happened.

Shea stated that there should have been more discussion about the infrastructure and other needs that will be required if we increase enrollment by another 5,000 students. He noted that these discussions should have occurred before announcements were made to increase the enrollment. He pointed out that there should have been more consultation with the faculty.

Ruchala questioned what kinds of students are being recruited. She pointed out that recruiting students for specific programs can be very different from recruiting generic students who could be at a risk of dropping out. She stated that if the idea is to recruit generic students, infrastructure and personnel will be needed across the boards and this kind of plan will not help to retain students. Reisbig stated that the one question is whether we will be recruiting students that we will be likely to retain beyond their second year at UNL. Ruchala stated that we need to do something different to recruit better students. She noted that her daughter chose to go to Indiana University because they offer much more than we do. She stated that if we are looking for a quality experience for high quality students we need smaller class sizes and a higher intensity of commitment to these students. She pointed out that the resources in the business college here cannot compete with the resources of Indiana.

Purdum asked if the Blueprint has a plan for identifying at risk students. She noted that identifying these students early could help to retain more students. Guevara pointed out that the plan is to bring in 5,000 students, not necessarily to make our university better. He stated that the idea is to bring the students in first and then to build the needed labs and classroom space. Ruchala stated that the plan is looking at the outcomes before looking at the inputs that are needed. Guevara noted that reducing the required credit hours to 120 is the first step in getting more students, but not in getting more quality students. Shea noted some have concerns that quality is being exchanged for quantity. Requiring 120 credit hours allows us to turn out more graduates in a shorter period of time and this appears to be the goal.

Woodman wondered if any data is available on how many students have their ACT scores waived or bypassed to get into UNL. Purdum pointed out that three criteria are looked at in accepting students: ACT score, class ranking, and GPA. She stated that if the class ranking and GPA are high, a student can be admitted with an ACT score that is slightly below the required score. Ruchala stated that data should be collected on the ACT scores of students who decided not to come here and those that came but left after a year to see if there are any correlations.

Ruchala stated that one of the questions that should have been raised in drafting the report is what our educational objectives are for the students, and what other programs are doing.

Reisbig asked if some of the concerns of the plan could have been avoided if faculty members were consulted more before the plan was written. Shea stated that if the faculty could have provided more input earlier in the process the administration would be more aware of the implications and consequences of the plan. He noted that the faculty will have to be responsible for dealing with the outcome of the plan. Reisbig pointed out that systems won't change unless there is strain put on them and strain allows a system to grow and adapt. Shea noted that there is already strain on the system.

Ruchala stated that a problem that she is encountering with some international students, particularly those from China, is their inability to be able to write or speak English. She noted that the first wave of students from China five or six years ago were fairly proficient in English, but students are now coming in that cannot do the work because of the language barrier. Woodman stated that the students transferring in from China probably do not have to meet the TOEFL requirement which is unfortunate because it really hurts the student.

Woodman stated that another example of no consultation with faculty occurring is with the parking issue. He stated that the idea of having assigned parking lots is very problematic. Guevara stated that the cost of parking is also very problematic. Shea pointed out that having assigned parking lots for people who have to go between the campuses would cause difficulties and taking the bus is not always an easy solution. He noted that parking should facilitate faculty and staff members to do their work rather than

making it more difficult. Wysocki pointed out that there is no bus running between the PKI campus and UNL. Shea stated that faculty members are expected to do more and the administration needs to make it easier to get to either campus. Wysocki suggested that this issue be raised with SVCAA Weissinger and VC Green. Ruchala noted that she takes the bus and uses it to get between the campuses and has not had any problems. She pointed out that she has not had to wait more than ten minutes for a bus. Woodman stated that for others living on the outskirts of Lincoln or out of town it is not possible to take a bus into work.

Griffin pointed out that there are many faculty and staff members who cannot afford to park in the garages or on campus because the cost of parking is so high. Shea stated that he has suggested in the past that there be a differential parking rate for staff members and lower paid faculty members, but that idea did not have strong support. Griffin noted that the majority of parking permit holders are staff members and faculty rates would have to be raised extremely high in order to make up for the loss in revenue from staff members and this is the reason why there are not differential rates for employees. Purdum reported that she has observed more people sharing rides to work because of the high gas prices. Schubert stated that he thinks the parking issue and bus system are something that the Executive Committee needs to focus on.

Guevara questioned whether parking fees are going towards supporting things other than parking. Purdum stated that this is unlikely. She noted that Parking & Transit Services is an independent cost center and self supporting. She stated that Dan Carpenter, Director of Parking & Transit Services is very open about the budget and she believes it is on the web.

Schubert noted that parking fees are being used again to help fund the building of a new parking garage and that parking rates go up whenever a new garage is being built. Woodman suggested that a university tax should be put on football tickets to help offset the cost of building a parking garage. He noted that faculty and staff cannot use the garages they helped to build with their permits on football Saturdays unless they want to pay again to park in a garage.

Schubert suggested that parking rates at the other Big Ten schools be reviewed. Wysocki reported that faculty and staff pay \$204 a year for a day and night parking permit at UNO and reserved parking spaces are \$600 (compared to UNL's \$564 for a surface lot, \$636 for garage, and \$1044 for reserved for the 2012-2013 year).

Reisbig stated that one suggestion to help with parking is to provide more education on using the bus system. Ruchala wondered why rates for east campus are not cheaper since there is ample space for parking. She stated that people could park in east campus and taken the bus to city campus if needed. Purdum pointed out that she parks in a remote lot on east campus and has to walk a shorter distance to her office than someone parking in a garage on city campus.

LaCost stated that she will draft the responses on the Blueprint and send them to the Executive Committee for review before forwarding them to Dean Cerveny and Associate VC Goodburn.

#### **4.3 Executive Committee Elections**

Griffin reported that Anaya and Guevara are interested in running for President-Elect, Woodman is interested in running for Secretary, and Rinkevich (College of Arts and Sciences) and Bender from the College of Journalism and Mass Communications are interested in running for election to the Executive Committee.

#### **4.4 Follow up on Meeting with CIO Askren**

Rinkevich noted that a lot of money became available after 13 people were let go from Information Services. Woodman pointed out that some of the people were from Extended Education. LaCost stated that it was clear that none of these people anticipated losing their job.

Woodman asked if Schubert was satisfied with CIO Askren's response to his questions regarding the need for computer labs and having appropriate software for students to use. Schubert stated that he is not satisfied with the response and believes that the Executive Committee should take the issue up with the Chancellor who appointed the members of the IT Task Force that looked at cost efficiencies. He pointed out that none of the members of this group included faculty from either Electrical Engineering or Computer Sciences, the very disciplines that know the most about information services and can provide pertinent input. He stated that it is not shared governance when a Chancellor defines his own committee. LaCost suggested speaking to the Chancellor about the Executive Committee's concerns with the IT Task Force and the report.

Shea noted that Professor Brooks, Chair of the Information Technologies and Services Committee, gave a report to the Senate on Tuesday and stated that while the IFSC initially supported the appointment of a CIO, it was disappointed in the way things are working because the IFSC is not being allowed to provide input into decisions that are being made regarding information technology. Woodman pointed out that some decisions, like switching over to Microsoft 365 for the email system, were made at Central Administration.

Schubert asked if there is any policy on the use of computers and the internet. Griffin noted that there is a policy:

<http://www.nebraska.edu/docs/president/16%20Responsible%20Use%20of%20Computers%20and%20Info%20Systems.pdf>.

Schubert noted that people are encouraged to use the internet. He pointed out that he was struck by two things CIO Askren said when he met with the Executive Committee last week: 1) that IT scans every device on campus and can look at everything a person views on the internet, whether it is work related or not, and 2) they cannot guarantee the security of the data and this is why they are moving to the cloud. He noted that someone could request to analyze the scanning of the devices to see how often faculty and staff members are using their business computers and the internet for personal use. Guevara

pointed out that even if people use their own personal computers or phones but are accessing UNL's wireless service, the devices can be scanned.

Schubert stated that of real concern is security and storing emails and other work in the cloud. He pointed out that the campus currently has its own servers that it controls, but putting things out into the cloud means that people other than UNL IT personnel can see what is going into the cloud. Schubert stated that the issue of security needs to be raised again and clear announcements should be made to the campus explaining where the stored information is going. He pointed out that computer hackers can get your IP address and can scan your information on your computers and the campus needs to be aware of this.

Shea noted that faculty and staff members were previously told they can use their university email address for personal communications but this may not be a good idea. Schubert pointed out that public access to records allows people outside of the university to review email messages that are sent through the university's system and people need to decide if they want others to have access to their personal email messages.

The Executive Committee agreed to put the issue on the agenda for the next meeting with the Chancellor.

## **5.0 New Business**

### **5.1 Report on Deans and Directors Meeting**

LaCost reported that Associate VC Wilson has been assigned as official international officer and his job will be to provide coherence to all of the international programs at the university. She noted that the International Affairs Office will remain as a service unit. She stated that it was not mentioned whether a director will eventually be hired to oversee the IA Office. Purdum pointed out that IANR is hiring a director of global engagement and her understanding is that the administration will see if a director is still needed for IA.

LaCost reported that Director of the Water for Food Institute Roberto Lenton and Director of the Nebraska Center for Energy Sciences Research Mike Nastasi gave a presentation. She stated that VC Green spoke on the Rural Futures Initiative and noted that there will be a free workshop related to the Initiative.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, April 11, 2012 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.