

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Baesu, Bearnese, Boudreau, Eklund, Kopocis, Krehbiel, Lott, Minter, Paul, Weissling, Zuckerman

Absent: Kolbe, Latta Konecky

Date: Tuesday, February 14, 2023

Location: 201 Canfield Administration

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 (*Minter*)

Minter called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m.

2.0 Chancellor Green/VC Boehm

2.1 **Are there any plans to improve meal reimbursement allocations? They do not even cover the cost of a meal even in rural areas.**

Chancellor Green noted that several years ago after a lot of conversations, the University went to a per diem rate which is the same rate as the state's per diem rate. He pointed out that the rate is determined by the state and not the university. He stated that where people really get caught with the per diem rate is if they are traveling just part of the day because they do not receive the full per diem.

Bearnese reported that the issue was raised by some Extension Educators, and she suggested that this information be more widely communicated to the faculty since there are many new faculty members.

2.2 **Discrepancies in the granting of maternity leave. Supervisors seem to be interpreting the policy differently.**

Minter stated that the policy which is on the Human Resources website states that maternity leave is ordinarily for eight weeks, but it can be more depending on the circumstances. She stated that the policy seems flexible, but it is not clear that the same principles are being applied across the campus when granting maternity leave. Bearnese noted that the issue has been raised by some employees who are new mothers pointing out that they submitted the same paperwork but were allocated different maternity leave time. Minter suggested that there may need to be some guidelines for supervisors and administrators.

Chancellor Green questioned whether the decision was made at the department level. Weissling stated that it was her understanding that the decision occurs at the college business center level. VC Boehm stated that he appreciates hearing these concerns and noted that there is an IANR leadership team meeting on Thursday, and he will discuss the

issue. Chancellor Green stated that there needs to be consistency across UNL with the granting of maternity leave and said that he will have the issue investigated.

2.3 Some state governments are moving to limit/constrain educators. Have you had any conversations across the state or with government leaders about efforts to curb teachers' work in UNL classrooms or Extension Educators' work in communities?

Minter pointed out that with what is occurring in some states and what is happening at the K-12 level, some faculty members are wondering whether the effort to limit or constrain educators in higher education in Nebraska is on the horizon. Chancellor Green stated that there have been a few proposals but there has been no state legislation that would restrict any educator.

Minter stated that it can be difficult during the university's budget negotiations to balance having hard discussions on other topics. Chancellor Green reported that some university employees have asked whether they have the right to speak on issues being debated by the legislature or in the government sphere. He pointed out that as long as someone is testifying or speaking as a private citizen, not as representing the university, they have the right to speak. VC Boehm stated that if speaking as a private citizen employees need to remember not to use university letterhead or equipment when corresponding with the legislature.

2.4 IANR Faculty Expectations Regarding Shared Governance, Service, and Culture/Climate

VC Boehm noted that last spring there were discussions with the Executive Committee about service, how it is embraced, celebrated, documented, and how to protect the rights of faculty and staff to be engaged in service without being penalized in anyway. He had suggested then that he would engage with the IANR Faculty Liaison Committee to ask them to have a wide conversation about service across IANR which they did. He reported that the Committee engaged with AVC Bischoff and received good input from IANR promotion and tenure chairs, academic leaders, IANR Senate representatives, and others and then drafted a position paper "Faculty Expectations Regarding Shared Governance, Service, and Culture/Climate for IANR." He noted that the paper explains the ethos of IANR and the expectation that faculty are to be engaged in service and shared governance. He pointed out that the paper not only provides baseline expectations for faculty responsibilities in shared governance, but also for faculty responsibilities for advancing their scholarly professional organizations, and mentoring.

VC Boehm stated that there are service activities that faculty members participate in that go above and beyond what is expected, and he noted that IANR will be making temporary adjustments in service apportionments for those faculty members that participate in these kinds of activities. He reported that the Liaison Committee felt that implementing a temporary increase in the service apportionment is a tool that could be used when a faculty member takes on additional service work such as chairing a promotion and tenure committee and other significant service commitments as highlighted in the position paper. He pointed out that making a permanent adjustment to

a faculty member's service apportionment would require the agreement of all parties involved and if no unanimous agreement was reached, a lengthy process would need to be followed. He noted that having a temporary adjustment allows a change in apportionment for the length of time that a faculty member is involved in additional service work and once that work is completed the apportionment can easily be adjusted back to where it was prior to the additional service. He stated that the intent is to take the position paper and work with unit leaders to see where temporary service apportionments need to be made.

Minter stated that she values the orientation for accounting the service which is done different in IANR than Academic Affairs. She stated that she appreciates that the document lays out for a newly hired person the guidelines for shifts in apportionment. VC Boehm noted that we are all one university and that when he first started at UNL, IANR and OAA worked collaboratively to harmonize promotion and tenure forms and process across UNL. He stated that it is in the subcultures of the campuses where nuances occur, and some of these subcultures may raise some challenges. Minter pointed out that the position statement only holds true to the extent that the people making the decisions are held to it, and she hopes that across the campus we can have more documents that outline the principles of what we share across UNL. VC Boehm stated that these kinds of statements or guidelines are often needed when people are not being treated equitably. He stated that he appreciates that the Executive Committee raised the issue because it is healthy to have these kinds of discussions. He pointed out that true shared governance begins at the local level.

Minter noted that originally the Executive Committee pushed for a minimum service apportionment, but she believes that the position statement is a great compromise because it takes into account that having a minimum service apportionment might not be tenable because of the different kinds of funding streams for different positions, yet it articulates the ground rules for service and shared governance work.

VC Boehm stated that the plan is to have the position statement on IANR's website by next week.

2.5 Budget Cutting Process

Chancellor Green reported that the budget cutting process will be rolled out next month.

2.6 Michigan State University Shooting and Security at UNL

Chancellor Green noted that we are all thinking about our colleagues at Michigan State University as they deal with the aftermath of the terrible tragedy that recently occurred on campus.

Weissling asked if our security is prepared here at UNL to deal with incidents of threats or violence. Chancellor Green stated that the building coordinator in every building on campus is supposed to have an emergency preparedness plan available. Weissling pointed out that not all building plans are readily available, and she said that there is not a process for informing everyone of a plan and what people should do.

VC Boehm stated that in Agricultural Hall they have invited the UNL Police to hold active shooter training and to discuss the emergency plan for the building. Chancellor Green noted that there was an active process across campus several years ago where UNL Police would go across campus holding workshops in buildings for faculty and staff.

Baesu asked if training or instructions on what to do in case of an emergency can be sent to the faculty and staff. Weissling noted that there is a lot of good information, including a training video on active shooter training, on the UNL Police website <https://safety.unl.edu/>. The Executive Committee discussed having Director of Emergency Management Preparedness Mark Robertson to speak at the March 7th Senate meeting. The Executive Committee also discussed whether active shooter campus safety is taken into consideration with the construction of new buildings.

3.0 Discussion on EM 16 with Information Technologies and Services Committee Chair Professor Leiter

Minter reported that the Executive Committee charged the ITSC to look at the Faculty Senate's Policy on the Acceptable Use of Software Systems Management & Deployment Tools to see how it conflicts with the revised EM 16 policy. Leiter stated that the ITSC reviewed the Senate's policy which was passed in 2014, noting that the policy was primarily the faculty's objection to ITS inserting software onto computers and provided faculty with the ability to opt in on whether they wanted to have the software installed. He stated that the ITSC thinks the Senate's policy is now unnecessary and is duplicative and suggested that the Senate could either sunset it or repeal and remove it, or the Senate could try to harmonize it with EM 16. He pointed out that with the new Microsoft network it would be difficult for a faculty member to opt out of having software installed if the person is using university system functions.

Leiter stated that ITSC has been discussing EM 16 and CIO Tuttle has been involved in the discussions. He noted that last year the President's Office updated the 2000 version of EM 16 after the UNMC security breach which heightened the university's concern for ransom ware and hacking attacks. He noted that another influence was the university's liability insurers felt that our policy lacked certain safeguards to protect some confidential items. He stated that some of the revisions are common sense, such as you can't use university computers, whether they are purchased by the university or through a grant, for illegal or unethical purposes. However, he stated that there are some issues with the latest version of EM 16 that are cause for concern.

Leiter stated that one problem currently with EM 16 is the wording of Section 7. Privacy which begins with the statement "user privacy not guaranteed." He stated that this is extreme language given that further in the paragraph it states that the university respects the employee's privacy except for incidents of misuse which are outlined in Section 6. Misuse of Computers and Network Systems. He pointed out that every member of ITS must annually sign a letter of confidentiality which essentially states that they cannot breach anyone's data.

Leiter stated that he is unsure about whether the faculty have any authority to amend EM 16, but he believes that at least the questions and concerns that have been raised should be answered. He reported that the ITSC supports the idea of creating an ad hoc committee that could work with the President's Office and General Counsel to go through the questions that have been raised or discuss language in EM 16 that is either poorly worded or too strongly worded to come up with some compromised language in the document. He believes this is a reasonable approach and one that he hopes the President's Office would be open to discussing. Zuckerman stated that it makes sense to have an ad hoc committee meet with the people from the President's Office to address the concerns, but another major issue is the lack of shared governance and why faculty members who are experts in cybersecurity were not consulted when EM 16 was being revised. Minter wondered to what extent the President's Office is tied to consulting with faculty from the individual campuses. She believes that the President's Office thinks that the CIOs from each of the campuses are working with the faculty.

Weissling stated that she has heard faculty members with expertise in cybersecurity say that having the end point management system is not a good choice because one breach could impact everyone's computer. Leiter stated that he has not heard this or specific objections about it. Minter noted that a professor from Electrical and Computer Engineering has said that everything being protected through Cortex could be at risk of single point of failure. She stated that the question of who judicates if there is a breach is something that needs to be addressed.

Minter reported that she spoke with the Faculty Senate Presidents at other campuses regarding concerns about EM 16. She noted that UNK has not changed their position on it but invited her to send information on what the concerns are. She stated that she did receive some feedback from a couple of Big Ten universities noting that the University of Michigan has an interesting policy because it includes a privacy dashboard which visually displays how secure your computer is.

Minter stated, that providing that the Senate approves the formation of an ad hoc committee, she asked what the charge of the committee should be and who should be on it. Leiter noted that when EM 16 was revised there was little or no discussion with faculty members so it appears that consideration was not given to the possible ways the policy could be misused or how it could impact different kinds of teaching and research. He suggested that the charge be written to refine the policy to get the details correct to address these issues.

The Executive Committee then discussed how large the ad hoc committee should be and possible committee members. Leiter volunteered to serve on the ad hoc committee.

4.0 Unfinished Business

No unfinished business was discussed.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Faculty Names for Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Search Advisory Committee

The Executive Committee suggested possible faculty members to serve on the VC for Student Affairs Search Advisory Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, February 21, 2023, at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in the Nebraska Union, Big Ten Conference Room. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Signe Boudreau, Secretary.