

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Baesu, Bearnes, Boudreau, Eklund, Kolbe, Kopocis, Krehbiel, Latta Konecky, Lott, Minter, Weissling, Zuckerman

Absent: Paul

Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2023

Location: Nebraska Union, Big Ten Conference Room

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 2:40 p.m.

2.0 Chancellor Green

2.1 Protocol for Inviting guest Speakers to University-Sponsored Events

Minter noted that the Kearney Hub recently published a letter to the editor concerning sexist comments that were made by a guest speaker at a recent UNL Amplify event. She asked if the university has protocol or guidelines for inviting speakers to university sponsored events. Chancellor Green stated that we do have policies in place for vetting invited speakers to university-sponsored events, but pointed out that speakers are invited for particular reasons, but the university has no control over what the speaker may actually say at an event – particularly elected officials.

2.2 Status of Incentive-Based Budget Model and Its Effect on the Budget Cuts

Chancellor Green reported that the full-scale implementation of the budget model will not occur yet because of the implementation of currently planned budget reductions. However, he pointed out that the cuts are following the principles of the model and the data from the budget model is being considered with the proposed cuts. He noted that the current proposed budget reductions are for \$10.8 million even though our deficit is \$23.2 million. He pointed out that the plan is that we will be able to capture the additional \$12.4 million of the budget deficit through enrollment management. If the projections for enrollments are not realized, subsequent budget adjustments across academic colleges will follow from the IBBM.

2.3 Are there ways to make the procurement process more streamlined and efficient?

Chancellor Green noted that the idea behind centralizing the procurement and payment process was to make it more streamlined and to capture system-wide savings and efficiencies, but he understands that there is considerable concern with how it is and has been working this academic year.

Eklund reported that he recently traveled with a number of students and there was an issue with his travel card, but it was fixed immediately when he reported the problem. However, the College of Fine and Performing Arts has had difficulty getting honorariums paid and he has had to deal with multiple emails trying to get people paid for the work they have done for his department. Zuckerman pointed out that getting reimbursed is also very difficult.

Chancellor Green stated that with the reimbursement process the business centers on campus are initially involved in the process, but the payment part of it is managed above the centers at the central administration level and this is where there is a backlog. He noted that UNL (as well as the other campuses) the campus has pushed continuously to have this addressed because it is hurting both the institution and the individual faculty members. He noted that at the system level they have been short of staff and are gradually starting to get caught up.

Weissling stated that she recently tried to procure software from a grant account and procurement has become involved in the purchase. On top of it, ITS must approve it and now the students have gone three months without a program that they need for their course. Kolbe pointed out that this is one of the problems with EM 16. He noted that purchases for courses need to be nimbler to make sure that students are getting the resources they need.

Minter asked if it would be beneficial for the Senate to try and document the various problems faculty are encountering. Chancellor Green stated that this would be helpful information to provide to central administration.

Davis reported that some changes were made in January with the travel credit card which made it less restrictive.

2.4 Concerns on IANR's Position Statement on Faculty Expectations Regarding Shared Governance, Service, and Culture/Climate

Minter stated that one of the positive things about the statement is that it makes clear that faculty members can renegotiate their apportionment temporarily, but the rest of the document identifies activities that have been considered service in the past but that the document now identifies as expected work of the faculty. She stated that the Executive Committee has real concerns that the statement creates an inconsistent practice across UNL. She stated that having such a different orientation as to what is considered service creates confusion, especially for those faculty members who hold appointments in both IANR and Academic Affairs. Kolbe pointed out that the Faculty Senate's constituents are all faculty members, and the Senate works hard to ensure that everyone be treated as such but a document like this seems to create a block between the Senate and IANR. He stated that anything below a 5% service apportionment works against shared governance on campus because it does not provide faculty members with the incentive to become involved with committees or the Faculty Senate. Zuckerman pointed out that regardless of a faculty member's position, they should have a minimum of 5% service.

Griffin noted that the number of faculty members who volunteer to serve on committees has decreased considerably from what it used to be and she has serious concerns that the document could impact the number of faculty from IANR who would be willing to serve on the Faculty Senate and/or committees, pointing out that some of the committees are mandated by the Regents Bylaws. She stated that in order for committees and the Senate to work well they need broad representation from across UNL.

Weissling stated that there is a culture change with younger faculty members, and they want, and expect, to be given credit for all of the work that they do. She stated that institutions that will give them credit for all aspects of their work, including service work, are more likely to attract more people than institutions that do not. Chancellor Green agreed that this is a culture change and noted that if things aren't clearly articulated for people, they are not going to do it. He stated that this is a generational culture difference because the traditional model, especially in IANR, is that faculty were expected to do things without having to spell out the percentage for inherent service. He noted that with the culture change that is occurring, it perhaps does make sense to have an apportionment of service defined for faculty members.

Chancellor Green suggested that the Executive Committee meet with VCIANR Boehm and AVCIANR Bischoff to discuss the position paper further.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 ASUN Academic Committee

Minter reported that L.J. Hajduch, co-chair of the ASUN Academic Committee, emailed her about the UNL Sexual Misconduct Prevention Taskforce contacting him regarding the proposed legislation to require faculty to announce trigger warnings either on their syllabus or through Canvas announcement. She noted that he first reached out to AVC Goodburn who directed him to the Faculty Senate.

Minter stated that it is unlikely that the Faculty Senate would require all faculty to issue a trigger warning because not all courses need trigger warnings. She suggested instead that the Center for Transformative Teaching be contacted because the Center provides resources for teaching faculty. Latta Konecky suggested that the recommendation to provide trigger warnings for some courses could be included in Teacher Connect. Weissling pointed out that it would be good to have some education about it.

3.2 Humanities on the Edge

Minter reported that the Humanities on the Edge seminars will be occurring March 30, April 20, and April 27 and topics will be on free speech and academic freedom and the seminars are free and open to the public.

4.0 Approval of March 7, 2023 Minutes

Minter asked if there were any further revisions to the minutes. Hearing none she asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Eklund moved and Latta Konecky seconded approval of the minutes. The motion was then approved by the Executive Committee.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Ad Hoc Committee to Review Impacts of EM 16 Policy

Minter noted that the charge to the committee will be language from the motion that was passed at the March 7th Faculty Senate meeting. The motion called for the creation of an ad hoc committee to look at the trifecta of problems with EM 16: the technology components; how EM 16 is currently impacting academic freedom in teaching, research, and other activities across our campus; and the lack of shared governance in policy making that impacts all faculty.

The Executive Committee suggested people to serve on the ad hoc committee.

6.0 New Business

No new business was discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:16 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, March 28, 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.