

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Anaya, LaCost, Lindquist, Purdum, Rinkevich, Ruchala, Shea, Woodman, Wysocki

Absent: Guevara, Reisbig, Schubert, Zoubek

Date: Wednesday, March 7, 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 3:02 p.m.

2.0 Vice Chancellor Green

2.1 Plans to Increase Endowed Professorships

VC Green reported that there has been discussion at the administrative level about raising funds to support 20 – 25 new Presidential Chairs with in IANR. He stated that additional Presidential Chairs might be new faculty members and some might be existing faculty members and these endowed chairs would be across the different disciplines in the Institute. He noted that approximately \$85-\$90 million would be needed to adequately fund all of the new Presidential Chairs.

VC Green stated that discussions are occurring with the University of Nebraska Foundation about the proposed Presidential Chaired positions. He noted that currently the Foundation requires \$2 million funding for these endowed positions, but he feels that today at least \$3 ½ million is needed to allow a portion of the money to be used for research and the other to be endowed. He pointed out that doing this would further help build programs within the Institute. He noted that \$2 million for endowed professorships is not enough to compete against other universities.

Woodman asked if the endowed professorships would be in traditional IANR departments or for the Nebraska Innovation Campus (NIC). VC Green stated that while brainstorming the idea of the Presidential Chairs there was discussion on how some of these positions would play some role with NIC, but it will depend on how the actual faculty position is structured. He noted that there are a few people already on campus that could receive a Presidential Chair and the areas they are leading will have a role in NIC, but this is not conditional for receiving the Chair. He stated that the idea is just conceptual at this point and he is just looking at the growth model.

2.2 IANR Public Image – Looking Forward

VC Green reported that there has been discussion in IANR about creating a new image identity. He pointed out that many people outside of the university do not know what

IANR stands for and we need to find words that can be used to describe ourselves beyond our acronym. He noted that most people think it has something to do with agriculture, but that is about all they identify with the name IANR. He pointed out that the name will not be changed, but we need words that will better describe the Institute. He stated that some prototypes have been developed but nothing has been decided yet. He stated that the idea is based on the concept of growing a healthy future. He noted that food, fuel, and water are themes of the Institute, but included in the Institute are the areas of human sciences, child, youth and family studies, and social sciences. He reported that completion of the effort is near and overall it has been a good process with a lot of feedback from the faculty and stakeholders. He noted that words considered in defining the Institute included rural landscapes and community and sustainability, human health and land health.

Shea reported that it was strongly suggested at a faculty meeting that sustainable is a word that should no longer be used and asked if this is correct. VC Green pointed out that the word sustainability means so many different things to so many different people. Shea asked if it was still appropriate to talk about things like sustainable crop production. VC Green stated that using the word is not frowned upon. He thinks the debate on the term sustainability relates to how people define it, such as debates on conventional crop production versus organic production. He noted that the front end of his recent presentation to IANR had strong emphasis on sustainability issues around agriculture, but he is aware that the word can be a lightning rod for some groups on some issues.

2.3 Role of Associate VC Larkins in the Life Sciences

VC Green stated that Dr. Larkins will be coming to campus July 1 and will be the new Associate VC for the Life Sciences across the campus. He will report to both himself and SVCAA Weissinger. He stated that Associate VC Larkins is coming in as a coordinator of the Life Sciences, but he will not have a direct budget or any budget authority. He reported that Dr. Larkins will have a role in strategizing the Life Sciences on NIC and determining the role the Life Sciences will play there. He stated that Dr. Larkins will be responsible for mentoring faculty members and will help in attracting and bringing in National Academy members. He noted that he thinks there are faculty members already on campus that are worthy of being a member of the National Academies and that Dr. Larkins will work as a mentor in that regard.

VC Green pointed out that Associate VC Larkins is a distinguished plant geneticist and served as a consultant to VC Paul previously. He noted that Dr. Larkins was recently a part of the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology invited by President Obama to counsel him on where we need to go with agricultural research and education in the future.

Purdum asked if Associate VC Larkins will have any connection with student recruitment and growth in interdisciplinary research. VC Green stated that Associate VC Larkins will be involved with graduate student programs in the life sciences in particular.

2.4 Water Center

VC Green noted that the Water Center has been a long standing part of UNL since 1962. He noted that it was created by a federal mandate and deals with all aspects of water and water use. He stated that the Center was housed in the School of Natural Resources and Professor Dvorak served as interim director, however, Professor Dvorak is now interim chair of Civil Engineering and Professor Suat Irmak was recently named interim director of the Water Center. He reported that the Center has now been moved into the Water for Food Institute although no changes have been made to the Center's responsibilities. He noted that the reporting line of the interim director goes back to him and a search is being conducted for a permanent director.

2.5 Will Faculty Hired for the Water Center and other Centers have any Educational Responsibilities?

Purdum pointed out that this relates to cluster hires. VC Green stated that the Water for Food Institute is a virtual institute with faculty members from across the four campuses. He reported that faculty members associated with the centers have tenure home departments and will be hired in the same way that other faculty members are hired.

VC Green reported that about a year ago a gap analysis was conducted and it was determined that the campus has some deficiencies in the water arena. It was then decided that there should be a cluster hires to initially address these deficiencies. He reported that these positions are being leveraged with funding from the Water for Food Institute. As a result, a search for a group of five faculty members is being conducted. He noted that the searches are being conducted by one search committee and currently two offers are out, a target hire is being considered, another position is about to be interviewed and a position description is being re written for the fifth position. He reported that these people are being hired with mixed apportionments and there are teaching FTE's, extension, and research appointments included in the cluster hires. Purdum asked what departments the cluster hires will be made in. VC Green stated the positions were not necessarily tied to a specific department and the plan is to determine where the person will fit best once a decision is made to hire. He noted that of the two offers that are out, one of them will go into the School of Natural Resources with a majority of the appointment in research along with some teaching. He stated that he is currently negotiating with someone that would be in Agronomy and Horticulture. He stated that two of the positions are for full professors. He noted that the search committee felt that teaching was under represented in the apportionments of duties and asked that this be changed before the search progressed.

Shea stated that he received a memo from Interim Director Irmak stating that people should use the full new name of the Water Center. He asked if it is okay to refer to it as the Water Center rather than using the full title all of the time. VC Green stated that in print the full name should be used. He pointed out that it can no longer be called the UNL Water Center because it is now part of the Nebraska system under the Water for Food Institute so it is now referred to as the Nebraska Water Center. He noted that President Milliken wants people to identify our water efforts under the University of Nebraska.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Student Bereavement Policy

Griffin reported that she sent ASUN President Lane Carr a copy of the revised student bereavement policy and he plans to present a motion to the ASUN to approve the policy.

4.0 Approval of 2/29/12 Minutes

Wysocki moved for approval of the revised minutes. Ruchala seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 IRB Status of Professors of Practice Survey

LaCost reported that the Executive Committee has received approval from the IRB to conduct the professors of practice survey.

Purdum reported she was asked why the professors of practice were being surveyed rather than tenured professors being asked whether they have problems with professors of practice. Shea said he thought the intent was to determine if there are problems specifically related to non-tenure track faculty members. He noted that several incidences have occurred that indicate that these non-tenure track faculty members are not being treated as suggested by the Committee that prepared the original proposal and UNL administration when the positions were first created.

Purdum stated that she was asked if the survey includes a question on whether professors of practice receive a salary increase when they get a promotion. Woodman stated that they do receive a salary increase, at least in his college.

Griffin stated that she will put the survey on Zoomerang and will have it ready for the Executive Committee to review before it is sent out.

5.2 Update on Pamphlet Distribution in Classroom

LaCost reported that she received a message from VC Jackson's office staff who stated that after reviewing existing policies it was determined that no policy exists that people are required to get permission to distribute pamphlets in a classroom. She did note that people may need to get permission to post notices on blackboards in the various colleges. Woodman pointed out that if a policy existed it would be virtually unenforceable.

5.3 CIC Faculty Leadership Conference at UNL

Griffin reported that she contacted Susanne Garrison of the CIC about this issue but has not received a response. LaCost pointed out that we need to get into the cycle of hosting the faculty leadership conference for the Big Ten schools. LaCost stated that she will follow up on the matter.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Review of Senate Meeting

The Executive Committee agreed that Executive Director Dan Duncan gave a very good presentation on Nebraska Innovation Campus. LaCost noted that he presented a more cohesive picture of the NIC than she has heard before.

Shea stated that he was surprised that there were no questions for Kris Baack of TeamMates after she spoke about her experiences with the program because there seemed to be additional questions after last month's presentation on the program.

6.2 Report on the Board of Regents Meeting

LaCost reported that at the Board of Regents meeting the Faculty Senate's revisions to the Rules of Order and the Academic Rights & Responsibilities procedures were presented as a report to the Board but she did not think they took a formal vote on the procedures. Lindquist pointed out that the Board just needs notification that changes were made once General Counsel has reviewed and approved the changes. Shea stated that we need to know if they are implemented immediately. LaCost stated that she would check on this.

LaCost reported that Provost Pratt discussed research awards and VC Paul gave a follow up presentation. She stated that the goal of the strategic framework for UNL and UNMC is to increase federal research awards from all federal agencies at a rate 20% higher per year than weighted total national federal awards per year on three-year rolling average. She stated that a proposal was made to change the research metric for reporting research expenditures instead of awards and this is similar to how it is reported by the Big Ten universities. She reported that UNL's research plan is to increase total expenditures by \$300 million by 2017 (it was \$191 million in 2011).

Woodman asked for clarification on reporting expenditures rather than awards. LaCost stated that reporting the expenditures provides a better picture of what we are actually doing with the research funding.

LaCost reported that a presentation was given on the Rural Futures Initiative. Purdum stated that this is a new group that has been created by VC Green. LaCost stated that focus groups with the NU community and stakeholders have been held since last July and there will be a rural futures conference in May.

LaCost noted that her department would be very interested in the initiative. She stated that the department probably does not work with the Extension Educators and there should be more coordination with Extension.

LaCost stated that there was a report on fire safety and UNL had zero inspection deficiencies but there were 50 deficiencies in the Greek houses at UNL.

6.3 Research Standards for CBA

Lindquist reported that he received a phone call from a faculty member concerned about new policies being imposed on the faculty of CBA on how research will be evaluated. He noted that the issue came up last year and it appears that the Dean is trying to push forward again with implementing new standards. He pointed out that he informed the faculty member that this is an issue within the college unless it is believed that there is a possible violation of academic freedom. He reported that he encouraged the individual to speak with other faculty members and let the Dean know their interests.

Ruchala stated that last year a proposal was made to increase the research standards for CBA faculty members and it was voted down by the faculty in part because there were no procedures in place that would allow for the transition of the standards. She stated that it is her understanding that the standards have re-emerged with only minor changes that did not represent the concerns that were expressed by the faculty when the standards were first voted down. She stated that it is her understanding that the standards are just going to be put into place without the faculty of the college being able to vote on them.

Ruchala stated that another issue is that a department within the college is going to be split, but it is not known whether this will create another separate department. She pointed out that this impacts governance procedures such as representation on college committees and representation on the Faculty Senate. She stated that there is also some question about whether a vote was taken in the department to see if they agreed with the split. Wysocki asked if the Board of Regents would have to approve the creation of a new department. Lindquist asked if the department is being split into two separate departments or two different programs. Ruchala stated that it is unclear what is happening. Griffin suggested that the Faculty Senate should make an inquiry because if a new department is created they would be allowed to have a representative on the Senate.

Purdum pointed out that changes to the research standards would affect evaluation criteria. She believes the faculty members have the right to know what criteria they are being evaluated on. Ruchala stated that she is on a three year review committee and there is confusion regarding the research standards and whether they are being changed. She wondered what will happen to present faculty members and how they will transition into the new standards. Woodman asked if someone can just change the evaluation process. Ruchala pointed out that in the past changes would have to be voted on by the college and changes would represent a change in the contract that a faculty member has with his/her department.

Purdum stated that the majority of evaluations and expectations are handled within departments. Ruchala asked whether a Dean's standards can be imposed on the faculty of a college without the faculty approving the standards. Purdum stated that the faculty members of the college need to speak up about their concerns and the faculty advisory committee of the college should discuss the concerns with the Dean.

6.4 Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee

Lindquist reported that he and some members of the FCAC met with Associate to the Chancellor Nunez to further review data on faculty salaries. He noted that earlier in the academic year there was interest in obtaining more detailed information, particularly in regards to gender issues on salaries. He reported that information on salaries of lecturers and professors of practice was provided but that this information will be further separated by college. He stated that the FCAC will be meeting at the end of April and anyone who thinks the committee should be addressing specific concerns should let him know.

Anaya pointed out that it is obvious that there are some fields that are predominately women. She asked if this impacts the figures on salaries. Lindquist stated that two sets of salary information on gender are given to the FCAC. One set includes the Libraries, the other does not and overall there is little difference in the outcome of the analysis among these two datasets. He stated that Professor Falci, a Senate member, requested more advanced analysis last year and it sounds like she will be working with Associate to the Chancellor Nunez to get this information.

Purdum asked if there has been discussion about compression of associate professors' salaries, particularly in CBA where the compression is the highest. Ruchala stated that the compression is due to new faculty members coming in at much higher salaries. She noted that there is a shortage of faculty in accounting and the demand is for huge premiums. She stated that it is not uncommon for new faculty members to come in with salaries \$30,000-\$40,000 higher than Associate Professors. Purdum asked if there will be any adjustments at the associate level. Ruchala stated that this is highly unlikely.

6.5 Agenda Items for Chancellor Perlman and SVCAA Weissinger

- Update on Search for Dean of Architecture
- Housing Issue for International Visitors
- Splitting Departments
- SVCAA Weissinger's plan to visit with departments to help formulate her goals
- Current enrollment trends – how are recruiting plans going
- Enrollment Management Council Plan – where is it?
- Summer Sessions – How is it being managed within the Colleges?

The meeting was adjourned at 5:11 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, March 14, 2012 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.