

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** Bender, Dawes, Fech, Lee, Leiter, Purcell, Reisbig, Steffen, Vakilzadian, Woodman

**Absent:** Hanrahan, Konecky, Rudy

**Date:** Tuesday, July 5, 2016

**Location:** 203 Alexander 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

Woodman called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.

### 2.0 Chancellor Ronnie Green

#### 2.1 Searches for Vice Chancellor of IANR and Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost, Dean of Graduate Studies

Chancellor Green stated that the searches for the two Vice Chancellor positions are currently underway, with the searches initiated earlier this May. He said that one search firm is managing both positions. He continued that screening meetings will occur in early August and that there are aggressive timelines for both positions; the goal is to have finalists on campus mid-September/early October and starting in their new positions January 1<sup>st</sup>.

Chancellor Green stated that the ultimate goal is to rename the SVCAA title to Executive VC and Provost; however, the title cannot be renamed to include provost at this point since the Board of Regents approval would be required for the University system. He did state that provost duties are specified in the position description though.

Lee inquired about the reason for the reconfiguration of reporting structures. Chancellor Green stated that ultimately the VC for Student Affairs will report through the Executive VC role. He said the rationale for the change is to develop stronger integration between academic and student affairs and to eliminate redundancy where it exists. Specifically, he stated that there are programs in Student Affairs that were also in Academic Affairs such as international student programs where some duplication occurs and following the restructuring these efforts will be able to work together in a more integrated way.

Regarding Research and Economic Development, Chancellor Green noted that very few universities nationally are structured in the same way that we are currently. He stated that at most universities research reports through the chief academic officer. He noted that former Chancellor Perlman had changed the structure appropriately 15 years ago to elevate the research enterprise. Chancellor Green stated that such was necessary at the time and that currently the academic enterprise needs to again be more integrated with research. Further, he noted that the Economic Development side will still report to the Chancellor and that Research and Economic

Development will be separated out. He noted that the Executive VC will be tasked with how it should look. He clarified that none of the transitions will happen until the new hires are in place.

Woodman inquired if the IANR process will be affected as well. Chancellor Green replied, no, that this model is already largely in place in the IANR structure.

Chancellor Green continued that former Dean of Graduate Studies and Associate VC for Academic Affairs Lance Pérez was recently appointed as Interim Dean of the College of Engineering. He added that a three-year interim appointment was set in order to reset some aspects within the College. He stated that an announcement will be coming out later this week regarding the interim appointments for both the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Associate VC for Faculty Affairs roles which will be separated out once again. He noted that a free standing Dean of Graduate Studies will help with the current need of growing our graduate programs over time and that the new EVC/Provost will be tasked with hiring in this role in addition to the interim Associate VC for Faculty Affairs.

### **2.1.1 Who will VC for finance and VC for student affairs report to in upper administration reorganization?**

Chancellor Green referred to his previous comments regarding the changes for the VC for Student Affairs and stated that there will be no change in the VC for Finance reporting structure.

### **2.2 Are there any differences in hiring process between academic units, regarding input from search committees, chairs and deans?**

Chancellor Green stated that he is not sure at this point, but that there is a sense there are differences among Colleges. Woodman asked if these differences were in terms of search committees being able to make recommendations versus specific rankings, the role of Chairs and Deans in the process, and specifically from where the hiring decisions come. Chancellor Green stated that faculty hires are made based upon the search committee's recommendation or departmental recommendation. He added that with administrative positions the search committees make a recommendation to the hiring authority whether or not they are acceptable candidates, but in unranked order. Purcell asked about the hiring model that pertains to Extension Educators. Chancellor Green stated he was not sure of the specific process that is used for Extension. Woodman stated that in his department, search committees are only able to identify candidates as acceptable or unacceptable with an implied, rather than formal ranking. Vakilzadian inquired about the process for Programs of Excellence (POE). Chancellor Green stated that POE's should not be treated any differently than other faculty lines although the direction for the POE comes from the administration.

Lee stated this his sense of the process within the College of Arts and Sciences is that faculty get to choose who is hired. He added that it sounds like in other Colleges that the Chairs seem to make much more independent decisions. Chancellor Green noted that he is aware that in the College of Engineering that the process is different in that the Chair does have that discretion in hiring of faculty. Leiter stated that in the Law College the faculty have extensive debate about all of the candidates and then rank them and make specific recommendations to the Dean. He said that the faculty are able to make very clear recommendations for hiring.

Chancellor Green stated that the hiring models are designed to have plenty of opportunities for faculty to vet the candidates. He said that the chances for an inappropriate candidate to be hired is very unlikely. He identified that the vetting process works. Further, he noted that what it is designed to prevent is any agenda to either hire a person before the process or over the objection of the faculty.

**2.3 How many vacancies need to be filled due to last year's VSIP? How will you balance cluster hires to create new disciplines with departmental needs? How will you allow deans to distribute available lines to support areas of growth and need?**

Chancellor Green reported that all positions from the people who retired in June 2015 have been reallocated back to the colleges. He added that not all have been hired yet and that several colleges have taken the opportunity to phase those positions over a 2-3 year period of time. In terms of redistribution of positions, he stated that when the hiring plan was done proposals were taken from all of the colleges regarding what they would best do with the VSIP lines and then the proposals were competitively selected. He noted that there was a slight shift out of CEHS and a slight shift into CBA and Arts and Sciences. He added that this process was all done a year ago prior to former SVCAA Weissinger transitioning out of the SVCAA role last summer. Further, he noted that it is the responsibility of the Deans and SVCAA to make sure departmental needs are covered.

**2.4 Plans to increase enrollment and faculty to meet the new needs**

Chancellor Green reported that enrollment is a big subject of the upcoming senior leadership retreat. He stated that this topic is among the six grand challenge questions for the retreat. He noted the primary question is how do we actually plan for and develop smart growth in enrollment? Further, he stated that the university has struggled with only having a generic plan for growth. He elaborated that a strategic plan needs to be in place for where the growth is to occur.

Vakilzadian asked about plans for expanding the College of Engineering. Chancellor Green stated he thinks determining where the college currently stands and how it needs to expand is a fairly big task that needs to be thoroughly thought through over the next year. He stated in the next year that the Engineering faculty needs to come together regarding the direction of the College. He clarified that he did not think that the strategic plan or vision was necessarily wrong, it was just that faculty as a whole were not on board. He noted that faculty will need to critique the current vision, faculty size, infrastructure, the Lincoln and Omaha model, etc. Vakilzadian asked if everything then was on the table for possible revision. Chancellor Green stated that the faculty need to decide if the current vision and implementation is the vision the college should be pursuing.

Purcell noted that a concern she hears from small town Nebraska is that youth don't want to come to UNL because it's too big. She stated that the word that you can find your place on campus still needs to get out. Chancellor Green stated that there are two elements to addressing this issue with one being that our Colleges need to be engaged more heavily with recruiting and working more with incoming students so there is a cohort and community that they come in to. Further, he stated that the second element that is being looked into is the Honors Program. He noted that since Dr. Patrice Berger, Director of the UNL Honor's Program, is retiring that this

upcoming leadership transition will be a good opportunity to explore where the Honors Program is nationally. He identified that growth has occurred at other universities through building larger community around the Honors Program. He added that we have a good honors program, but that he thinks it could be three times as big as it is. He noted he has seen other universities tripling or quadrupling their investment in their Honors Program and reaping many benefits.

Woodman identified that there are not many real or exclusive honors courses that he is aware of and that there does not appear to be any established community unless they live in Neihardt Hall. Chancellor Green stated that Neihardt Hall needs to be rebuilt and at the same time maintain the history of those who have gone through the program. Lee inquired about addition of scholarships. Chancellor Green agreed that there needs to be more scholarship money available to grow the program.

### **2.5 Broader meaning of rigor, beyond students taking 15 credit hours per semester**

Chancellor Green identified that this entails rigor of the curriculum and the degree to which students are being appropriately challenged in their programs. He stated that he intends to work with the academic enterprise to assess rigor across the campus relative to our peers. He added that he also plans to explore whether or not ~~in fact~~ there is any systematic grade inflation. He noted that this requires us to introspectively look and ask about the level at which we challenge our students. Further, he said that one of the grand challenge questions on the agenda for the upcoming senior leadership retreat involves rigor: What does rigor mean? How do we assess it? How do we know it is at the level we want it?

### **2.6 Were there items in the Black Lives Matters meetings with the previous Chancellor that could impact curricula and programs?**

Chancellor Green stated that there was one item that relates to the ACE 9 requirement regarding global awareness. He said that the outcome description was reviewed in terms of whether or not it addressed diversity and it was determined that that there is a lot of emphasis on global and a lot less on diversity. He added that Associate VC for Academic Affairs Amy Goodburn and her team in concert with the academic deans are looking into this and determining how to ensure that diversity has a stronger emphasis.

### **2.7 What is the next step for Extension Educator Resolution?**

Chancellor Green stated that this has to be recommended out of our system to the Board of Regents since it is asking for a change in the Bylaws. He stated that he will give this to Interim SVCAA Kostelnik and ask her to get it written up for submission to the Board of Regents. He specified that, yes, he is in favor of the changes since it was vetted all the way up through Extension and the larger faculty.

### **2.8 LR 509 interim study to examine the funding history, programs and services offered by the Cooperative Extension Service of the University**

Chancellor Green stated that this has come out of the legislature this past session to help inform them about future decisions. He said the passage of this study bill was sort of a surprise but in another way not since members of the Appropriations Committee had been asking these kinds of questions in the past, just not formally. He said the root of this has to do with understanding what the relationship is between Extension and the Rural Futures Institute. Are they overlapping,

independent, or redundant? He added that it became formal because in the previous budget cycle there was an increased funding request for the Rural Futures Institute that included hiring of Extension faculty. He noted that he is not sure of the timeline but that it will likely be into September/October when we will be given the questions they want answered. Purcell asked if just a written report will need to be made by the University. Chancellor Green specified that we will be sent a list of questions that they would like to have answered. He said it is not like a review and that they will just be simple, straight-forward questions. Purcell noted that it seems strange that they are inquiring about the history as opposed to the future. Chancellor Green stated that they want to see where we are relative to other states. He said that the legislature has heard that other states have evolved funding extension over time at a much lower rate than before. He said that we've maintained our funding base over time. He noted that he thinks it is largely related to clarification regarding the Rural Futures Institute.

**2.9 Reaction to study on the Athletics department; who will be responsible for making the changes recommended in the study? Any comment or updates regarding the two Title IX complaints regarding athletics?**

Chancellor Green stated that this review was called for by President Bounds because of some concerns raised regarding whether the athletics leadership was engaging enough with the public. He said President Bounds decided late last fall that it was the right timing so that the new Chancellor would be given a timely assessment regarding the athletic department. He stated that the review concluded that the athletic department was being run very well and that the leadership is highly positive. He said that athletics is doing well across the board financially and in terms of being a national leader in student success and life development skills. He said that Athletic Director Shawn Eichorst desires to and will be more communicative with the public, while he does agree with Eichorst's belief that you put your coaches and students out in front and not yourself as much as possible. He said that Eichorst is addressing the fact that some athletics supporters and the press want more attentiveness from him directly. He noted that there have been a lot of public appearances in the last month and a half and that there will be more of this in the future. He added that both he and President Bounds will join Eichorst and other athletic department leaders as often as possible.

Chancellor Green stated another opportunity for improvement was that some of the coaches felt like not all of the information filtered down to them as it should have. He stated that he felt this was an unfair conclusion of the review since the current climate of athletics has had to become much more compliance-oriented, particularly around student behavior. He said that the Athletic Director has had to enforce more rules and consequently coaches have been given less autonomy in setting rules themselves. He noted, however, that the University has consistently held itself to higher standards than are set by the NCAA. In summary, Chancellor Green stated that the review has been very helpful for him and the Athletic Director and his team. He said that it was a very positive review and very affirming of the leadership. He added that through this he has been learning a lot about the athletic department and has been very impressed with their organization.

Chancellor Green stated that he cannot disclose anything about Title IX except that processes are proceeding.

## **2.10 Services to improve student retention and comment on the level of the tutorial services on campus**

Chancellor Green stated that this is one of the areas that will be discussed within the context of his upcoming senior leadership retreat. Purcell noted that Athletics does a great job with offering tutorial services, but that we need to have more support for all students.

Woodman stated he had conducted a review of the biology department at another university and was very impressed with how the faculty had strong knowledge of what their students were doing after they graduated. He said that even though he is heavily involved with the education of pre-health students, he does not know what happens after his students graduate unless they personally inform him. He said that at this other university the faculty had lists of every student majoring in the discipline and what they're doing afterward and this would help with the recruitment of new students. Chancellor Green stated that most Colleges on campus do fairly thorough senior exit data collection on their students and at least know what they are planning on doing next. He said that he does not know if this is done universally.

Steffen inquired if there are any thoughts of using social media to help track students after graduation? Chancellor Green stated that there are some alumni associations that have gone pretty heavily into social media networks to connect. He said that the challenge is the percentage of students who will subscribe to any one social media format and then not knowing when that will change.

## **2.11 Planning processes for the short, medium and long-term goals he discussed in the Executive Committee's interview with him. What are the short-term goals?**

Chancellor Green stated that both longer term vision and short term goals will be emerging for the upcoming senior leadership retreat. Among his grand challenge questions for the retreat are: What is smart enrollment? What does being a flagship university for the University of Nebraska mean? How do we determine if there are areas in which we should be an international leader when we are not? He stated that at the top of the list will be to review our budget model. He stated that we currently have a fixed incremental budget model. He said that our current budget model needs to be investigated particularly before any discussions about enrollment growth can be strategized. Lee inquired if there are other sorts of budget models that are being explored. Chancellor Green stated that a hybrid RCIM model, amongst other options are likely to be explored. He said that non-academic services have had the most proportional increase in budget over time. He added that he thinks that academic units should be able to project what will be needed rather than just getting the same amount of dollars every year. He said that this will likely be a 2-year process, at a minimum.

## **2.12 Would he consider presenting the yearly university budget to the Senate and Senate Executive Committee in a broad, general white paper?**

Chancellor Green stated yes, he enthusiastically supports this. Lee asked what that APC's role is in determining the budget model. Chancellor Green stated that if this is going to be a major change in how the university operates that this will have to be brought to the faculty. He said that it will be a campus-wide iterative process and that it will be two years out before we can change

since we operate on a two-year budget cycle with the legislature getting ready to approve the upcoming budget.

### **2.13 Other issues**

Chancellor Green identified that one of the challenge questions for the upcoming senior leadership retreat has to do with UNMC, especially on the research enterprise regarding areas including how we can do joint research and be more engaged in healthcare design and delivery.

### **3.0 Approval of June 21, 2016 Minutes**

Purcell moved for approval of the revised minutes. Motion seconded by Lee and approved by the Executive Committee.

### **4.0 New Business**

#### **4.1 Questions for Susan Foster**

Lee stated that he most wants to know how the AAUP recommendations about due process are being incorporated. He said he would like to see a series of steps and procedures and wondered if this was going to be done. Leiter added that he wanted to know how the office sees the person that is being reported against. Is there a stronger emphasis on the rights of the potential victims than on the accused?

The committee developed additional questions including:

What are the rights of the faculty/staff in this process? What faculty protections are in place?

How does she make the determination of what constitutes harassment?

What portion of the cases come to her directly or come through a responsible employee?  
Are you willing to come to the full senate and make a presentation?

Is the accused notified immediately of the nature of the complaint? Can supporting documents be brought into initial meetings?

How does she decide when a person can bring in a lawyer or not?

What is the burden of proof required before a violation can be substantiated?

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, July 19, 2016 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 203 Alexander Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Allison Reisbig, Secretary.