EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Adenwalla, Belli, Dawes, Fech, Hanrahan, Latta Konecky, Lee, Leiter, Peterson, Purcell, Rudy, Vakilzadian, Woodman

Absent:

Guest: Associate VC Judy Walker

Date: Tuesday, September 12, 2017

Location: 201 Canfield 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 (Purcell)
Purcell called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

2.0 Chancellor Green
2.1 Invoking Procedures for Significant Budget Reallocations and Reductions
Chancellor Green reported that at the Town Hall meeting held on September 6th he covered in some detail the current budget framework and how we will proceed with handling the budget cuts this fall. He noted that a total of $17 million will be cut from UNL’s budget, but $11 million of our cuts will be covered through the budget efficiencies determined by Central Administration. He noted that the $11 million are cuts that are made outside of the purview of the Academic Planning Committee. The remaining portion of our cut is $6 million, but he is asking that another $2.5 million be identified should we need it to cover additional cuts. He pointed out that the $2.5 million was determined by taking 1% of our state appropriated funds. Purcell stated that she thought the $2.5 million was to be used for strategic planning. Chancellor Green stated that he hopes that it will be available for the planning, but in the event there are more cuts we will be prepared.

Chancellor Green stated that he met with the Academic Planning Committee the afternoon of September 6th to invoke the procedures and now through mid-October the budget framework will be developed. Phase II will then come next and this is when the Deans will identify their proposed cuts. He reported that these proposals will be reviewed by the APC which will probably complete the review process in early spring.

Hanrahan asked if the Vice Chancellors will make their suggestions in mid-November and whether the Deans are working on identifying cuts now. Chancellor Green stated that the Deans have already been at work and in mid-November the Vice Chancellors will present their recommendations to him. He noted that the senior administrative team is looking at all kinds of options and what he is telling the Vice Chancellors is that we want to design the cuts in the optimal way for the campus which could result in a combination
of vertical and horizontal cuts. Lee pointed out that if the cuts involve tenured faculty members they have to be vertical cuts. Chancellor Green stated that he is aware of this. He noted that he will be meeting with the APC next week to have further discussions on the budget cutting process.

Adenwalla asked who makes the decision on what to cut. Chancellor Green stated that the proposed recommendations from the Deans and Vice Chancellors will be presented to the APC in mid-November and that is when the deliberations on the budget will occur. Adenwalla asked if the process will be transparent to the faculty. Chancellor Green stated that the effort will try to be as transparent as possible, but we also need to protect all of the programs and people as much as possible.

Woodman asked if metrics are being used in determining possible budget cuts. Chancellor Green stated that metrics associated with programs will be considered, but Deans are not being told that they have a specific amount of money to cut from their budget. He is asking the Deans to come back with proposals of anything that could be put on the table. Hanrahan asked what would happen if Deans only propose a small amount of cuts. Chancellor Green stated that the Deans understand the position that the campus is in and he does not anticipate this happening. He stated that the budget cutting process is going to be looked at across the campus as fairly as possible.

Purcell noted that the procedures for the budget cuts state that administrators, faculty, staff, and students are to be consulted and asked the Chancellor to keep the Senate Executive Committee involved.

Belli asked if the procedures emphasize vertical cuts. Chancellor Green stated that this is a decision that has to be made in the development of the budget framework. He noted that some things such as how salary increases are handled would be considered a horizontal cut and the budget cuts will probably be somewhat a hybrid of horizontal and vertical cuts.

Hanrahan stated that the Deans and units will be looking at different metrics and asked if those metrics and guidelines come from the administration. Chancellor Green stated that the obvious metrics: number of students, number of graduate students, demand for the program, and productivity metrics for the discipline will all be taken into consideration. He noted that both quantitative and qualitative metrics will be used. Adenwalla asked if programs will be weighted. Chancellor Green stated that a number is not being calculated for every program on campus. He pointed out that when programmatic cuts are being considered it becomes relatively easy to use straightforward metrics.

Leiter noted that it has been reported that there is a certain amount of money in savings that Central Administration has identified. Chancellor Green stated that there is now a website [https://nebraska.edu/brt](https://nebraska.edu/brt) that has a general description of the areas where savings will come from. He noted that some of these will be implemented sooner than others and the total number is close to $30 million, with $22 million identified to be implemented within the current biennium. He noted that UNL will receive $11.3 million of these
savings to help offset our budget cuts. He pointed out that this does not mean that people should assume that the cuts have all been handled by administration and won’t impact the campus. He noted that there will be both faculty and staff members who will be impacted by cuts. Lee asked if it is possible that departments will no longer have any staff people. Chancellor Green stated that this is not likely. Staff positions that could be affected are in the business services areas. He pointed out that we will not be able to find $8.5 million in savings without some position eliminations.

2.3 Mileage Concerns
Purcell noted that there seems to be four different messages on how the decrease in mileage reimbursement was determined made regarding mileage and the cost of renting or operating a university vehicle. She asked that in the future as budget cuts continue if the message could be kept consistent the same because it is causes stress for faculty and in this case for the Extension staff. She pointed out that gas has now gone up since Hurricane Harvey and she wondered if anything can be done to help the Extension staff members out with the increased cost of driving their personal cars for Extension work. Chancellor Green stated that the cost that he mentioned was based on the explanation given to the Chancellors from Central Administration who went to the State to get the figures.

2.4 Last Minute Changes in Requirements for Promotion and Tenure Files and Waivers for Some Colleges
Walker noted that the Chancellor asked her to attend the meeting to speak about this issue. She reported that there have been no changes in the requirements for promotion and tenure files. She stated that EVC Plowman and VC Boehm jointly sent out a message clarifying the promotion and tenure expectations. She reported that there were two requirements that were a surprise to some faculty members, but which should not have been. One of the items is that all files are expected to have external reviews. She pointed out that the College of Education and Human Sciences’ Bylaws state that the files for promotion from Assistant Professors of Practice to Associate Professors of Practice do not require external reviews, but this has been a requirement in Academic Affairs for some time.

Walker stated that the other item in the memo that caused concern is the documentation request for peer evaluation of teaching. She noted that anyone with a teaching apportionment needs to include peer evaluation of teaching. She pointed out that in the College of Education and Human Sciences (CEHS) and some other colleges, this documentation was considered optional and some promotion and tenure files were submitted last year with no evaluation of teaching. She stated that the files submitted last year were not sent back for lack of this documentation, but the appropriate Deans were contacted and told that for the 2017-18 promotion and tenure process, the documentation will be required.

Walker reported that after speaking with the Interim Dean of CEHS she agreed to be flexible with the promotion and tenure files submitted this year from that college and would provide them a waiver for this year with the understanding that the College will
update their bylaws to be compliant by the time of the 2018-19 promotion and tenure process.

Rudy asked what is considered acceptable forms of peer evaluations. Walker stated that the key element is that the peer evaluations need to be prepared by the unit. They should not be something that the candidate prepares, and it needs to be evaluations other than student evaluations. Rudy asked if an administrator’s evaluation would suffice. Walker stated that she does not think this would be a problem, but suggested that this may be something that the colleges or the Faculty Senate needs to decide. Rudy pointed out that he does not think anyone is arguing that there shouldn’t be excellence in teaching, but what was deemed as acceptable or unacceptable documentation is where complaints have been made.

Rudy asked if other colleges’ bylaws are not in accordance with the requirements for promotion and tenure files. Walker stated that she is not aware of any of the other colleges’ bylaws being in conflict.

Vakilzadian asked if the promotion and tenure files only require one peer evaluation. Walker stated that the colleges need to decide what the peer evaluations look like, but the files will be required to have peer evaluations. She noted that a model of best practices for peer evaluations will be provided and that, ideally, the evaluation should be a formative evaluation that spans over several years and then can be the basis for a summative evaluation at the time of promotion and/or tenure.

Hanrahan stated that there is the belief that the colleges were left to decide whether peer evaluations were necessary. He noted that promotion and tenure files for this year were submitted and then a formal notice was given that stated that peer evaluations have to be included so it seems like the rules have changed. He stated that he is concerned that this could happen again in the future. Walker stated that the final step in the process should be a peer evaluation of the materials that a candidate submits. She pointed out that the rules have not changed and the requirement to include peer teaching evaluations has never been optional, only applicable to those faculty members who have a teaching assignment. She stated that no candidate will be penalized this year for not having peer evaluations in the file. She reported that the Deans are well aware of the need to have peer evaluations and will make sure that the tenure and promotion files will include these evaluations.

Walker pointed out that a memo used to be sent out annually in April or May regarding the requirements for promotion and tenure files, but this did not occur for the past five or six years. Only a memo providing the deadline dates for the promotion and tenure process was sent out. She stated that in the future a memo will be sent out earlier in the year to inform people about the process and requirements for promotion and tenure files.

Woodman stated that a concern is that some people have not been aware that they needed peer evaluations and as a result do not have four or five years of evaluations to include in their promotion and tenure files. Walker pointed out that most colleges do a lot of
formative work when annual evaluations are conducted. She noted that there just needs to be something about peer review in the file. Woodman asked if there is a way to formalize the requirements and include this in the memo that is sent out. Walker stated that she can take this to the Deans to see if they want this information included in the memo.

Belli asked what the difference is in files for Professors of Practice when their contracts are being renewed. Walker stated that the documentation required for renewal is at the college level. She noted that the College of Arts & Sciences requires quite a bit of information. Rudy asked how many colleges conduct a post review of a Professor of Practice when their contract ends. He asked if the guidelines for non-tenure track faculty promotions and renewals of contracts are consistent across the colleges. Walker stated that she does not think there is any movement from the Deans to standardize the guidelines. Chancellor Green asked if this was a concern raised in the non-tenure track faculty survey conducted by the Faculty Senate several years ago. Woodman stated that at the time not enough Professors of Practice had gone through the promotion process. He noted that he receives an annual review every year, yet when it comes time for the renewal of his five-year contract, he has been told that the annual reviews are not enough for his file and that he needs to include peer reviews. He is essentially having to put together a promotion file every five years. Walker stated that this is an issue that should be raised with his Dean. Belli pointed out that there needs to be some standardization across the colleges in regards to the procedures and requirements needed for non-tenure track faculty members to be promoted and for contract renewals.

Vakilzadian asked if the Executive Vice Chancellor’s office has guidelines for promotion of Professors of Practice. Walker stated that the Vice Chancellor’s office will say what kind of documentation needs to be submitted, but not the specific criteria of the documentation. She reported that a statement was included in the memo this year that every promotion and tenure decision should be held to the same standard. She stated that the Executive Vice Chancellor’s office is looking for excellent performance by the faculty member.

2.5 Academic Restructuring Plans
Chancellor Green reported that there will be an announcement next week that two task forces are being appointed to evaluate the structure of the campus to see if the colleges are optimized the best.1 He noted that the college structure has been the same for many years now and the question is whether we are optimally structured. One of the task forces will consider the life sciences. He pointed out that there have been at least four reports over the past 15 years about creating a college of life sciences and VC Boehm will head this task force. He noted EVC Plowman will head the task force that will look at everything else. He stated that these are open ended questions and if the task forces determine that no changes are warranted than no changes will be made. Nothing has been pre-determined.

---

1 At his State of the University Address on September 19 Chancellor Green reported that there will be only one task force that will be led by faculty members and VC Boehm and EVC Plowman will serve as ex-officio members.
Peterson asked how the task forces will determine optimization. Chancellor Green noted that there are a number of departments and disciplines that are fragmented. For instance there is a huge amount of investment in the life sciences, but he questioned whether the investment could be better used if there was a different academic structure for the life sciences.

Adenwalla asked who will serve on the task forces. Chancellor Green stated that these will be faculty appointed task forces. Purcell asked Chancellor Green to include Faculty Senators on the task forces. Chancellor Green stated that members of the Faculty Senate will be included on the task forces.

Chancellor Green pointed out that this is a time to address opportunities and we need to look forward with where the campus is going. He pointed out that he is not considering the restructuring because of the budget cuts, rather it is with wanting to build our programs for the future.

Adenwalla asked why administrators are leading the task forces and not faculty members. She stated that faculty are the ones on the forefront of teaching and research and if the restructuring is from a truly academic viewpoint it should be led by the faculty. Chancellor Green stated that he will consider this.

Lee asked if part of the restructuring has to do with branding. Chancellor Green stated that this is true in regards to the life sciences because we want to elevate these programs to the next level, but there is also consideration for some efficiencies as well.

2.6 Free Speech Zones and Draft of Free Speech Document
Chancellor Green noted that the campus is still dealing with the August 25th incident that occurred on campus. He stated that there is a policy that outside groups who come to campus to speak need to apply for registration to speak and are designated to a public forum area for flow of traffic and safety purposes relative to the Nebraska Union. As a result of the incident the campus policy is being revised to make it clearer. He stated that also under consideration is our chalking policy for sidewalks.

Chancellor Green stated that a draft statement on freedom of speech and expression is being considered for the campus. He noted that the statement is adapted from the University of Chicago’s statement and input is being gathered from the Deans. He stated that once a more revised draft is developed he will share it with the Faculty Senate.

2.7 Impacts on Graduate Teaching Assistants if they are not funded by Grants
Hanrahan stated that he has heard that departments might lose GTAs and that EVC Plowman has stated that Professors of Practice rather than GTAs should be used for teaching. Chancellor Green suggested that this issue be discussed with EVC Plowman.

2.8 Travel through campus - 16th Street Concerns
Chancellor Green stated that he recently did a case study by driving down Vine to 16th street at 10:00 in the morning and realized how bad the situation is with all of the
pedestrians and traffic. He reported that we are working with campus police and the City of Lincoln about putting measures into place to provide traffic and pedestrian control at 16th and Vine and 16th and R streets.

2.9 Emergency Response Training for Faculty
Chancellor Green stated that he has spoken with Associate to the Chancellor Bill Nunez about this and faculty training can be made available.

2.10 NU Foundation Update
Purcell stated that she has heard reports that the Foundation’s receipts are down. Chancellor Green stated that this is a natural cycle because we are in between fund raising campaigns. He noted that we recently finished a six-year campaign and the next one will not start until 2018-19.

2.11 Campus Climate
Purcell noted that Extension Educators have already been given information on the Employee Assistance Program because stress levels over the budget cuts is high. She also reported that at a recent meeting she was asked by a faculty member to try and slow things down because changes on the campus are moving too quickly. She reported that a student has raised concern over her safety on campus after the recent free speech incident. She stated that something needs to be done to try and calm the campus down. Chancellor Green stated that he will do his best to address these and other issues of concern through his State of the University address. He noted that it was helpful for him to hear the Executive Committee’s concerns about the restructuring and suggested that this might need to wait given the climate of the campus.

3.0 Announcements
3.1 Meeting with Assistant to the Chancellor Tami Strickman
Purcell reported that she visited with Assistant to the Chancellor Tami Strickman to discuss a recent news article about a visiting faculty member who has been accused of Title IX violations. She noted that Strickman stated that the UNL spokesperson had confirmed that the faculty member would not be teaching, however the Title IX investigation information did not come from UNL. It was kept confidential at the campus level.

4.0 Approval of September 5, 2017 Minutes
Vakilzadian moved for approval of the revised minutes. Motion seconded by Peterson and approved by the Committee.

5.0 Unfinished Business
5.1 DACA Statement
Purcell noted that she drafted a statement indicating that the Faculty Senate stands in union with President Bounds and Chancellor Green in support of our students who are enrolled in the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. The Executive Committee reviewed and revised the statement. Peterson moved that the statement be
approved for distribution to our Congressional Delegation and to the press. Latta Konecky seconded the motion. Motion approved.

The DACA Statement is:

The Faculty Senate of the University of Nebraska–Lincoln stands shoulder to shoulder with the President of the University of Nebraska, Hank Bounds, and the Chancellor of the University of Nebraska–Lincoln, Ronnie Green, in support of our students enrolled in the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program. We urge our Nebraska Congressional delegation to work together with their colleagues in the U.S. Congress to find a permanent solution for those enrolled in the DACA program, whereby all DACA students can pursue their own American dream.

As faculty of the University of Nebraska–Lincoln, we are committed to providing quality education to all students. This commitment to excellence to each University of Nebraska–Lincoln student will not waver.

5.2 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Member for Academic Planning Committee
Griffin reported that six non-tenure track faculty members have responded to the call for candidates to run for election to the APC. She noted that the Senate Executive Committee will need to develop a ballot which will be presented to the Faculty Senate for a vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, September 19, 2017 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 203 Alexander Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Joan Latta Konecky, Secretary.