

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** Anaya, Guevara, LaCost, Purdum, Rinkevich, Schubert, Shea, Woodman

**Absent:** Lindquist, Wysocki

**Date:** Wednesday, February 8, 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 3:11 p.m.

### **2.0 Announcements**

#### **2.1 Future Executive Committee Meeting Guests**

Griffin reported that Mary Niemiec, Associate Vice President and Director of Online World Wide, will be meeting with the Executive Committee on February 22. She announced that CIO Mark Askren will be meeting with the Committee on March 28,

#### **2.2 IANR Faculty Meeting**

Purdum reported that there is a meeting on Friday, February 10 for IANR faculty. She noted that Vice Chancellor Green will be speaking about IANR's plans to reach the goals established by the Chancellor.

#### **2.3 Office of Research & Economic Development Faculty Forums**

Shea reported that he attended the forum on East Campus but did not realize that the forums were taking place until VC Paul mentioned it at the Faculty Senate meeting on Tuesday. He noted that only about 12 or 13 people attended. He asked if anyone knew when the forums were originally announced and whether faculty members received an email message about the forums. LaCost stated that she believes there was an announcement in the Daily Nebraskan on the forums.

Shea reported that plans on how we are going to reach our research goals were laid out at the forum and those in attendance had some ideas and suggestions for the Research Office. He stated that the information at the forum was more inclusive and broader and not just about bringing more money into the University. He noted that he thanked VC Paul for speaking to the Faculty Senate on Tuesday and said that VC Paul was happy to come and speak and would be happy to do so again.

Shea stated that he was glad Purdum asked the question about how the Office of Research & Economic Development uses the overhead money it gets from grants at the Senate meeting. Purdum stated that she did not expect to hear VC Paul speak about the percentages of the overhead the way he did. LaCost pointed out that this is probably how

the administration is handling the budget. She noted that the Dean of her college refers to the tax that the college has to pay back to the Chancellor. Purdum stated that according to what VC Paul reported, it seems that the colleges get a percentage of the overhead after the Office of Research & Economic Development has taken care of its budget. She stated that it appears that the Research Office's budget needs keep on expanding, especially for personnel. She suggested that if the Executive Committee wanted more information on the Research Office budget we could ask him to attend an Executive Committee meeting to delve into the budget further.

Woodman asked if the funding agencies set some guidelines on overhead money and how it can be spent. Schubert stated that each funding agency negotiates with the University how much money will go for overhead. He stated that the percentage for overhead can change each year and industry grants are different from federal grants. LaCost noted that some agencies will only provide 9% for overhead. She pointed out that there has been a tremendous increase in the amount of institutional compliance and IRB has increased its staff from one to seven or more people.

LaCost asked if the Executive Committee wants to invite VC Paul to a meeting to delve more into the budget of the Office of Research & Economic Development. Purdum stated she did not think this was necessary unless there are some red flags that are popping up. She pointed out that the Research Office budget can be viewed on-line.

### **3.0 Approval of 2/1/12 Minutes**

Guevara moved for approval of the minutes as revised. Rinkevich seconded the motion. Anaya suggested changing the word ballots to biographical information in reference to the Honorary Degrees. Shea asked for clarification about the comment made by Regent Hawks and UNO having a complete campus. LaCost stated that she believes Regent Hawks was suggesting that there should be a combined campus for UNO rather than just separate sites. The minutes were approved.

### **4.0 Unfinished Business**

#### **4.1 Survey for Professors of Practice and Research Professors**

LaCost noted that it is not necessary to get IRB approval if the results of the survey are not for publication. Woodman asked if it would take a long time to get IRB approval on the survey. LaCost stated that this kind of survey would be approved easily and she will submit it for IRB approval. Anaya suggested that the IRB approval could be placed on the front of the survey. Woodman noted that the College of Arts & Sciences recently sent out a similar survey. Griffin noted that the introduction does not state why the survey is being conducted. LaCost stated that the IRB will make sure that the intent is stated.

Schubert suggested adding the question of whether people in these positions have been promoted. Woodman pointed out that the positions are fairly new and that some people may not be aware of what is required for them to receive a promotion. Anaya suggested asking if the respondent has gone through the promotion process. Guevara suggested adding the question, do you have access to your department bylaws. LaCost stated that

anyone with further comments should send them to her and she will revise the draft questionnaire.

#### **4.2 Response to Concerns with Housing International Visitors**

Schubert stated that the responses received from the Office of Academic Affairs are insufficient and do not address the concerns that were raised with the SVCAA Weissinger during the January 18 Executive Committee meeting. He noted that the question was how the faculty can use university housing for international guests without having to obtain a university identification number. He pointed out that people coming for short term collaboration with a faculty member do not have a university ID because they are not affiliated and it is pointless to affiliate them with the university for a three day visit. Guevara noted that the Chancellor had pointed out that we house people without university ID for short periods of time during the summer. He suggested that the Executive Committee ask the SVCAA directly how to get housing for an international visitor without a university ID. LaCost stated that she will contact SVCAA Weissinger and ask how an international visitor can be housed on campus. Woodman wondered if Big Ten schools have some kind of set up that allows them to house international visitors for a short period of time.

Purdum pointed out that this problem needs to be kept on the agenda until it is fixed.

### **5.0 New Business**

#### **5.1 Agenda Items for Chancellor Perlman and VC Green**

LaCost noted that the Executive Committee will be meeting with the Chancellor and VC on February 15.

Purdum suggested asking what the administration's plan is for meeting the 2017 enrollment and recruiting goals. Will the number of faculty increase before student enrollment increases? She pointed out that faculty members in IANR are already feeling squeezed by the student to faculty ratio and they do not know how they are going to be able to serve 41% more students in her department. She reported that student enrollment has increased but faculty FTE's have gone down and she believes this is the case throughout IANR. She asked how departments can increase student enrollment by 41% without having more classes and more sections. Guevara stated that this happened in his department and data was presented to the administration showing the student/faculty ratio, but the response was that the department had to figure out how to deal with the problem. He reported that as a result, more lecturers teaching half loads were hired and class sizes increased.

Woodman pointed out that the Chancellor stated that the faculty needs to become more efficient. He questioned where the administration projects there will be an increase in faculty members.

Purdum asked what the consequences will be if departments are unable to reach their goals. She stated that faculty members want to see more concrete plans on how to increase student numbers and the faculty/student ratio in teaching.

Guevara stated that it is his perception that the administration is going to increase the faculty in areas they consider a priority and other departments will have to become more efficient in order to meet the demands of having a larger student body. Shea stated that he doesn't think the administration knows which disciplines the students will major in. He stated that all departments are supposed to try and recruit as many students as they can and then there will be a clearer picture of where the resources need to go. He stated that he doesn't think what departments the students major in is a concern for the administration. He stated that the question is whether each department is supposed to increase their student enrollment by a specific amount. Woodman pointed out that Admissions should be able to make an estimate of what departments the students are interested in. He noted that courses in Biological Sciences are packed and even if approval is given to build more laboratories, it will take some time to construct these facilities and in the meantime classes are overcrowded.

Purdum wondered if there is a business plan which shows where growth is expected and where resources will be needed. She noted that this ties into our target areas of strength which she believes is where the administration will focus its resources. She pointed out that recruiters will need to point out our strengths to attract prospective students. Shea wondered what the lures are for attracting more students. LaCost stated that she has not heard specifics but has heard of some target areas. She noted that in her college everyone is to have some kind of international experience. Guevara questioned whether this international experience is going to be funded. He pointed out that this has been discussed for years but the university has invested minimally in international affairs.

Shea noted that President Milliken discussed faculty productivity measures and wondered if we are productive enough at the university and whether we have our costs under control. He questioned what kind of measures are being considered and is this issue a true concern at UNL. Woodman noted that the Texas A & M model looks at the number of classes a professor teaches and the number of students to determine productivity of teaching and more quantification is being used in determining evaluations. Shea stated that we are seeing increasing pressure for faculty members to be more productive. He noted that it is getting more difficult to meet or exceed expectations when salary increases are being considered because the expectations seem to be changing. Schubert stated that this ties in with VC Paul's comments at the Faculty Senate meeting. He was hoping that VC Paul would have discussed the level of research that faculty should attain. He noted that President Milliken indicated that we are not productive enough, but faculty members need to know how much productivity is expected and how many courses we need to teach. He reported that his college's numbers in research were compared with other schools and our projected numbers for research dollars per faculty member is ranked 98<sup>th</sup> while many of the other Big Ten schools are ranked first, second, or third. He pointed out that productivity of grants per faculty member is the only tangible thing that can be put into figures for research. Shea stated that the expectations for faculty members have gone up since he first came and this is not wrong, but faculty need to know what exactly the expectations are. Schubert pointed out that the expectations are not written anywhere.

Schubert pointed out that the productivity question isn't about pay raise evaluation. He pointed out that we are at the bottom 20-25% of the Big Ten schools and he wondered where the administration expects us to go in the next five or ten years.

Purdum suggested that there needs to be discussion about shared goals and how the faculty and administration can reach these goals. She stated that there needs to be a conversation between the faculty and the administration about goals rather than just having numbers set for the faculty to achieve. Guevara pointed out that his college did a four-year strategic plan which departments needed to adapt to, but the faculty members in departments were not consulted on where they want to grow and what the plan is to get there. He noted that the faculty members are the ones that have to do the work yet they are not being included in the conversations about the goals. LaCost pointed out that without shared planning the strategic plans are subject to failure. Woodman stated that his department's perspective was to formulate a very strong strategic plan that the Dean would want to include in the college's plan. He noted that the perspectives on the strategic plans might depend on the department.

LaCost asked Purdum where the 41% figure for growth of students came from. Purdum stated that the Vice Chancellor looked at comparative data from surrounding state's schools and determined the goal. She noted that the faculty in her department did not pick the targets and there were no discussions about it before the goal was set. She stated that conversations only occur after the dean has set the goals.

Shea reported that at the research open forum VC Paul made a comment of us needing to hire faculty members who are better than us. He noted that while he understands where he is coming from, the question should have been asked how the new faculty will be better than the ones already here. He stated that VC Paul did mention about our need to do a better job of engaging faculty on campus. Schubert stated that VC Paul's comments were related to research and the need to target people with experience in obtaining large scale grants. He noted that a department or university cannot expect to grow if they do not hire someone who has a lot of experience. He stated that centers will more than likely want to hire a director with significant experience.

Schubert stated that the average engineering faculty member at Northwestern brings in \$664,869 a year in research funding. Guevara noted that our institution does not have the same pull in some disciplines as other places for obtaining grants.

Anaya pointed out that the faculty will not be able to do all of the work needed to meet the goals. She noted that support staff will need to be able to assist the faculty with administrative work, such as travel expense vouchers, which will allow the faculty to devote more time to research.

## **5.2 Special Fees**

Guevara noted that there are a lot of special fees on courses. He asked who checks to see if the special fees are being used correctly. Shea stated that this has been discussed with

the administration and SVCAA Weissinger stated that there are hard rules that these fees have to go to improve the class the fees are assigned to, but he does not think this is always happening. He pointed out that even though there are some concerns, no one wants to come forward to make a formal complaint about it. He noted that there is reluctance in some departments to point out that the chair might be using the funds in other ways. He stated that even though documentation may not be available on how these funds are used, the Executive Committee has heightened the awareness of the situation to the administration.

Woodman pointed out that special fees are often used to repair or replace equipment needed for the course. Purdum stated that the special fees may be handled differently in each department. She stated that in some units the fees may be lumped together and used to purchase things needed for courses.

Schubert stated that if there is clear evidence the Executive Committee can point to a problem to have it fixed, but if there is no clear evidence nothing can be done. He stated that unless the funds are used to purchase office furniture or for something else that is a clear violation of what the fees are for, it isn't a big issue.

Purdum stated that it is the students who should be requesting and audit of how the special fees are used since it affects them directly.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:09 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, February 15 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Administration Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Pat Shea, Secretary.