

UNL FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
East Campus Union, Great Plains Room
November 2, 2010
Presidents Barbara LaCost, and John Fech Presiding

1.0 Call to Order

President Elect LaCost called the meeting to order at 2:32 pm.

2.0 Announcements

No announcements were made.

3.0 Chancellor Perlman

Chancellor Perlman reported that the state deficit continues to get worse but there are two more forecasting board reports that will come out before the legislature has to finalize the budget next spring. He noted that the university will need to get ready for what might be a significant budget reduction and he wants the campus to be as prepared as we can for the cuts.

Chancellor Perlman announced that part of the tuition increase has been set aside as a reserve and each of the campuses will receive some of this money. He stated that he is considering using this one time money for funding projects that will potentially provide more revenue for the university. He stated that he is thinking about having some funds available for faculty members to use for making the teaching enterprise more efficient. He noted that the announcements will probably be made fairly soon and he hopes that faculty members will respond. He stated that some one time funds could also be used for energy conservation projects.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the administration is looking hard at the transfer process. He reported that we are not as friendly as some other universities with transfers. He noted that we have a significant number of students transferring in from two and four year schools and the process seems time consuming for faculty members and lengthy for the students. He reported that he is seeking some outside expertise with respect on how we might alter the process to make it better. He noted that allowing more transfer students to enter UNL will help to increase revenue.

Chancellor Perlman reported that we are still struggling with the six year graduation rate. He noted that this does not reflect the institution failing because we still have a significant number of students who ultimately get a degree, but we are lagging behind our peers in terms of the percentage of students who take six years to graduate. He stated that he is hoping to seek external help to assist us in figuring out ways to enhance our graduation rates. He pointed out that it helps us to get students through the system faster.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the voluntary separation incentive program (VSIP) closed yesterday and while he is not prepared to give the specific results of it yet, there are a considerable number of senior faculty members who have applied for it. He pointed out that there are still several stages yet in the process so no firm numbers are available yet. He noted that the voluntary separations will provide some resources in the second year of the biennium. He reported that the deans are working hard to determine how they can cash flow the funds needed when the VSIP program goes into effect. He pointed out that we will be losing some talented people and there will be a tradeoff with the program.

Chancellor Perlman urged the faculty to think about the teaching process. He pointed out that there is no certainty that the way we teach now is the best possible way to teach, and that it will be the way we will teach in the next five or ten years. He stated that now is a good time for us to look into new ways of teaching. He stated that he hopes that the faculty will think seriously about this issue.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the SVCAA search is proceeding nicely and that airport interviews have been conducted. He stated that an announcement will probably be made soon about the candidates that will be coming to campus for interviews. Hopefully campus interviews will be conducted in November and early December. He stated that it will be important for us to move quickly on these interviews and realizes that it will be a burden on the faculty to have interviews staged so closely together at such a busy time of the year. He stated that he hopes the process will give the campus community comfort about the credentials and

aspirations of the candidates and provide the campus the opportunity to hear why the candidate wants to be at UNL.

Chancellor Perlman stated that by the first of the year we will probably have a developer for phase one of Innovation Campus and that all of the legal documents required will be in order. He stated that having a developer will allow us to begin working on the infrastructure. He noted that a presentation on Innovation Campus was recently made to the City Council and they should vote on it next week.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he recently received a report from the life sciences executive committee. He noted that the life sciences initiative was created to develop a loose informal structure to bridge the gaps between the life sciences. He pointed out that the life sciences is not an exclusive club and people from many disciplines on campus can be included in the life sciences. He reported that the life sciences executive committee worked for a year on how to bridge the gaps. Recently there was a retreat on the life sciences where two experts spoke on where the life sciences are heading. He stated that breakout sessions were held and faculty members engaged in discussions about the life sciences. He noted that no administrators were at the retreat so he hoped the faculty members felt comfortable to speak freely. He encouraged faculty members to look at the report written by the life sciences executive committee: (<http://www.unl.edu/ucomm/chancellor/lifesciences/docs/FLS-Report.pdf>) He opined that the report is extraordinary. He pointed out that administrators do not have a monopoly on thinking and faculty input is needed in order to determine where we want to go with the life sciences. He stated that he will need to get more information before he can accept the recommendations of the report, but he thinks this is an extraordinary step towards making a difference in the life sciences. He pointed out that the life sciences can include people from the social sciences, humanities, and arts.

Chancellor Perlman noted that the Senate will be receiving a report from the Chancellor's Commission on Sustainability (CCS). He noted that the CCS has worked very hard and that it has been difficult to get focus on the issues because they are so expansive. He stated that the CCS has worked well together and with the administration and he is encouraged to hear what they have to say.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women (CCSW) has been very helpful to him in pointing out things around the campus that have a differential impact on women. He noted that there are currently no major issues, but most people are familiar with the various issues that impact women. He noted that the CCSW has brought things to his attention which, as a male, he probably would not have noticed.

Chancellor Perlman noted that the Senate is going to consider a motion for expanding the Academic Planning Committee (APC). He stated that the APC plays a critical role, increasingly so, with the budget process. He pointed out that adding two more faculty members will alter the balance between the faculty and administration on the committee, but he has no real concerns about the proposal. He stated that there is a lot of work for the faculty members on this committee and that it makes sense to add more faculty members to help with the workload. He noted that currently the Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development is a non-voting member on the APC. He urged the Senate to consider whether to add the Vice Chancellor as a voting member. He pointed out that this is just a friendly suggestion and not a condition for his support of the proposal.

Professor Franti, Biological Systems Engineering, asked how the private sector interest is going for Innovation Campus. Chancellor Perlman stated that he has been a little reluctant to make specific proposals to private sector companies until more progress is made in the development of Innovation Campus. He indicated we will be seeking those companies that can interact and support specific interests of the university. He reported that there are some opportunities that will allow development to get started and serious conversations with some companies will probably take place in the spring. He noted that the agricultural research building seems to have some growing possibilities.

4.0 Approval of 10/5/10 Minutes

Professor Peterson, Agricultural Economics, moved for approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded by Professor Flowers, Psychology. The motion was approved.

5.0 Committee Reports

5.1 Research Council (Professor Awada)

Professor Awada noted that the report is a summary of the activities that the Research Council has done for the 2009-10 academic year. She reported that the Council is composed of twelve faculty members from across

the disciplines. She stated that responsibilities of the Council include advising the Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development and the Interim Dean of Graduate Studies on matters that they bring to the Council for discussion. She stated that the Council selects and hosts the Nebraska Lecture Series and provides grants to faculty members. She noted that these grants are typically for \$3,000 and are awarded to faculty members from a variety of disciplines. She reported that the Faculty Senate President assigns faculty members to the Council upon recommendations made by the Committee on Committees.

Professor Awada reported that this year the Council is working on assisting with the agricultural policy retreat and is urging the Board of Regents and to continue to support the Board's current policy on stem cells research.

Professor Awada stated that the Council selected three speakers for the Nebraska Lecture Series. They are: Professor Susan Sheridan, who is to speak on November 30; Professor Margaret Jacobs, who will speak in spring of 2011; Professor Don Wilhite who is scheduled to speak during the fall 2011 semester.

Professor Awada reported that the Council received 59 grant requests and awarded over \$300,000 in grant funding. She pointed out that grant funding is high for new faculty members applying for research grants. She noted that 86 grant requests have already been received this year.

Secretary Shea stated that it is his understanding that the Vice Chancellor has a separate advisory board. He asked what the relationship is between the Research Council and the advisory board, and if she, as chair of the Council, is present in the advisory board meetings. Professor Awada reported that the advisory board advises the Vice Chancellor on more research related topics such as how to pursue grants. She stated that she does attend the advisory board meetings and brings information back and forth between the Council and the board.

Secretary Shea asked if Professor Awada had anything she wished to share from the advisory board. Professor Awada stated that the advisory board has not met yet this year and an update of last year's efforts is currently taking place. She noted that the advisory board is more of a discussion type of committee.

Professor Franti, Biological Systems Engineering, asked if the amount of money available for the Research Council has changed over the years and whether the Council expects a change in the available funds with the capital campaign that is currently being conducted. Professor Awada stated that there has been a slight decrease in funding because revenue from the Foundation accounts has dropped due to the recession.

Professor Schubert, Electrical Engineering, noted that there are no engineering professors on the Research Council which he thinks is odd given that engineering does a lot of research and brings in a substantial amount of grant money to the university. Professor Awada reported that the distribution of the faculty members on the Council was determined by the Faculty Senate. She suggested that the Senate may want to discuss whether the distribution needs to be changed. Coordinator Griffin pointed out that the disciplines are defined as arts & humanities, social and business sciences, biological sciences, and physical sciences. She stated that the departments in the College of Engineering are defined as the physical sciences, but several other departments across the campus are also defined as physical sciences and representatives can be from any of the departments listed under physical sciences. She noted that frequently not enough faculty members volunteer to serve on committees. Secretary Shea suggested that the Executive Committee could review the syllabus of the Research Council to see if any changes are needed.

Professor Carlson, Veterinary & Biomedical Sciences, asked if the Council annually advises who should be on the Council. Professor Awada stated that the appointments are made by the Faculty Senate President with advisement from Vice Chancellor Paul.

Professor Awada stated that the Council has diverse topics to discuss on a monthly basis and some things have been discussed about Innovation Campus.

5.2 Chancellor's Commission on Sustainability (Dean Drummond)

Dean Drummond reported that the Commission has been in place for two years now and consists of sixteen members: three faculty members, three students, and the rest are key staff members from human resources, institutional research and planning, and physical facilities. He noted that Chief Information Officer Askren is an ex officio member.

Dean Drummond stated that the idea in forming the Commission was to create policies regarding sustainability on campus. He pointed out that sustainability issues are broad and are interconnected:

education, the physical plant, water issues, recycling, and numerous other issues. He reported that the Commission is working on 25 initial categories.

Dean Drummond stated that a great deal of research is being conducted by the members of the Commission. He stated that the Commission is developing some broad general statements for the Chancellor, but the desire is to make more specific statements on sustainability. He noted that sustainability issues from the economic and environmental views are being reviewed.

Dean Drummond reported that Vice Chancellor Jackson has been reporting to a national board on sustainability efforts here at the university. Previously the campus has received a D+ grade but this year we received a grade of C+ and the hope is that further improvements will be made resulting in a higher grade. He pointed out that detailed comparisons will take place once we are in the Big Ten.

Dean Drummond stated that the Commission does not have any recommendations for the Senate at this time. He noted that the Chancellor does not want public statements made about the Commission's recommendations until major policy recommendations have been developed. He reported that the Chancellor is already working with some people on campus on sustainability issues and the students are already doing a lot in terms of recycling efforts. He noted that the goal is to provide long term sustainability for the campus.

Dean Drummond reported that directives have come from President Milliken's office that all new buildings at the university will have to meet LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) standards. He stated that four UNL buildings have received LEED certification. He noted that President Milliken wants all buildings to perform at the highest standards.

Dean Drummond stated that the Commission is also working hard on developing educational policies and several degree programs and curriculums dealing with sustainability are being proposed. He noted that the current faculty representatives on the Commission are very excited about these prospects.

Dean Drummond reported that the Commission meets twice a month and members are very diligent with their work and in bringing their expertise to the table. He stated that this is a three year commission, but he is hoping that great strides will be made during this time. He noted that 20 major policy statements will be submitted to the Chancellor, hopefully next month.

Professor Hubbard, School of Natural Resources, is wondering if there are some committees of the Big 12 that some of our faculty members serve on and whether these faculty members will be leaving these committees once we switch to the Big Ten. Dean Drummond stated that he thinks the Chancellor and Interim SVCAA have great expectations in going to the Big Ten. He noted that the Chancellor has asked everyone on campus to get engaged with the Big Ten. He stated that he thinks we need to take the initiative to make sure that we are involved in Big Ten activities relating to sustainability.

Professor Hubbard asked if the 20 major policy statements will be publically available. Dean Drummond stated that this will be up to the Chancellor. He noted that the Commission has had several meetings with the Chancellor to discuss what the protocol is for dealing with these policy statements. He pointed out that most of the policies are not controversial, except perhaps some of the smoking policies.

5.3 Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women (Associate Director Deeds)

Associate Director Deeds reported that she is the Associate Director of Student Involvement and has been appointed to the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women (CCSW). She stated that the CCSW is comprised of three councils: faculty, staff, and student councils. She reported that the full Commission meets once a month. She noted that the Chancellor meets with the individual councils and also with the full Commission.

Associate Director Deeds reported that the CCSW is looking at UNL's family friendly policies, retention issues, and communication access. She stated that the CCSW wants to make people aware of the Commission and what it is doing.

Associate Director Deeds noted that last year Dean Poser was able to get the Lincoln Public School system to coordinate its calendar with the university's calendar. She reported that Lincoln Public Schools has changed their calendar again and it is no longer compatible with the university's calendar, but the Commission is continuing to identify ways to address issues for those faculty, staff, and students who have children.

Associate Director Deeds stated that the CCSW had received a lot of positive feedback on the campus lactation policy. She noted that family friendly spaces are available on campus. She reported that the staff council recently had a presentation about family leave and the child care facility on campus. She noted that the presentation was well attended and the faculty council is considering having a similar presentation.

Associate Director Deeds reported that the faculty council periodically holds open meetings to hear faculty women's concerns. She stated that a recurring theme is the need for mentorships for new female faculty members. She pointed out that having mentors is not common across all departments, especially for women. She pointed out that mentors can help to engage the new faculty member and to assist them in their careers.

Associate Director Deeds stated the CCSW will be accepting nominations for the Chancellor's Award for Outstanding Contributions to the Status of Women in February and recruiting new members for the Commission during the spring semester.

7.0 Unfinished Business

7.1 Motion on Employee Plus One Benefit

President Elect LaCost stated that the motion comes from the Executive Committee and therefore does not need a second. She noted that the motion will be voted on in December and she recommends that senators speak with their colleagues about the motion. She stated that anyone with amendments should send them to either President Lindquist or Coordinator Griffin before the December meeting, preferably before November 30 when Senate packets will be emailed.

President Elect LaCost stated that there can be some preliminary brief comments on the motion.

Professor Peterson asked if the proposal is being coordinated with the other campuses, if the wording is the same, and if it will be handled at the system level. President Elect LaCost stated that each of the campuses have either addressed the issue recently or will be in the near future. She stated that she is not sure if the motions will have the exact language, but she thinks they will be very similar.

Professor Falci, Sociology, asked how the motion relates to domestic partnerships. She asked if a faculty member would be able to insure a domestic partner's children with this motion. President Elect LaCost stated the motion does not specifically spell this out but the idea is that children would be covered.

Professor Falci asked if an elderly parent and a domestic partner would be covered under the motion. She noted that this would make the motion as more than just plus one for benefits. President Elect LaCost noted that the Executive Committee discussed this issue. The answer is that they would need to be tax dependent.

Professor Peterson pointed out that the Senate has repeatedly called for domestic partner benefits and the approved motions were presented to the Board of Regents, but the Board has never approved domestic partner benefits. Professor Falci pointed out that she would be comfortable with using the term domestic partner in the motion.

Professor Carlson asked if anyone has looked at the actuarial impact to adding another group to the insurance. President Elect LaCost stated that she was not sure. Professor Peterson reported that Emeriti Professor Wolf looked at this information for strictly domestic partner benefits and stated that the increase would not be very much, but the Board's attitude is that it would break the university financially.

Professor Zorn, Finance, suggested that someone with expertise in actuarial science should look at the issue to see what the potential costs would be. Professor Falci pointed out that the university should consider the cost of not having this benefit. She noted that quite a few faculty members have left the university because we don't offer this benefit. Professor Peterson stated that in the Big 12 only the two Kansas schools and Nebraska don't offer this kind of benefit.

Professor Marks, School of Music, asked if there is a greater chance the Board of Regents will agree with the motion and approve these benefits. Secretary Shea stated that many people hope that the Board will see the value of having this benefit. He noted that the effort to pass this kind of resolution is occurring simultaneously on all of the four campuses. He pointed out that the Executive Committee discussed the issue with President Milliken recently and his comments are summarized in the October 20 Executive Committee minutes (<http://www.unl.edu/asenate/exec/10oct20mins.pdf>). He reported that his recollection of President Milliken's comments is that the President believes this is an important issue that will need to be addressed in some

fashion. He pointed out that there is some renewed attention to the issue and the Senate is doing the best that it can. He stated that the Executive Committee would be happy to hear any suggestions on the motion.

Professor Zorn stated that a motion has a better chance of being successful when it is framed in such a way that it shows the least economic impact on the university structure.

7.2 Motion to Add Two More Faculty Members to the Academic Planning Committee

President Elect LaCost stated that the motion comes from the Executive Committee and does not need a second. She encouraged the senators to discuss the issue with their colleagues and stated that the floor was now open for preliminary discussions.

Professor Carlson stated that he was curious how the APC faculty members were elected and wondered if there was an equitable way to make sure that there is an engineering faculty member on the committee. He asked if there is some other way to ensure representation from the academic disciplines. Coordinator Griffin stated that the APC syllabus states that faculty members are to represent the following disciplines as defined in the campus-wide syllabus for committees: arts and humanities, business and social sciences, biological sciences, and physical sciences. She noted that all faculty members receive an email message asking them to volunteer to serve on committees. The Committee on Committees then recommends faculty members to serve, based on the criteria of what disciplines will have openings. The Faculty Senate then has to approve the ballot before it is sent out to the entire faculty body for a vote. She stated that one of the real problems is that few faculty members are willing to serve on committees.

Secretary Shea suggested that senators put more effort into asking their colleagues to serve on committees. He suggested that there could be some further discussions to see whether or not the disciplines described for committees such as the APC are appropriate. He stated that the Executive Committee could discuss the matter.

Emeritus Professor McShane stated that he can describe how the disciplines were originally defined and put into place. He pointed out that the faculty members in some colleges do not volunteer much. He stated that when the disciplines were defined the effort was to see if people could be found who had congenial thought processes and academic procedures. He stated that it is impossible to have representatives from each department or college because there are just too many. He stated that the question was how you assure that certain thought processes were represented on the APC. He pointed out that if representation was based on the size of the college there would be disproportionate numbers because college sizes vary greatly.

Professor Schubert agreed with Secretary Shea that this issue should be discussed. He stated that he has a problem with the expansion because, as pointed out by Coordinator Griffin, it is difficult to get people to serve on committees and he feels that the argument to increase the number of faculty members is not a strong one.

Professor Kranz, Northeast Research & Extension Center, asked if this would be the appropriate time to address the Chancellor's request to have the Vice Chancellor for Research & Economic Development as a voting member of the APC.

Professor Franti, noted that there are already two faculty members from the engineering college on the APC. He pointed out that everyone is busy with work, but faculty members need to support the campus committees and the work these committees do.

Professor Zorn stated that he has served on both the APC and the budget reduction committees and they require a lot of work. He stated that he supports adding two more faculty members and urges the senators to vote for having the Vice Chancellor as a voting member on the APC. He stated that he believes that one of the great things that have happened to academics here is having Vice Chancellor Paul on staff and he believes he is largely responsible for our visibility in research and that he should be a voting member. Professor Sollars, Veterinary & Biomedical Sciences, pointed out that the motion would have to be to approve the Vice Chancellor for Research & Economic Development, and not a specific person such as Vice Chancellor Paul since he will not be Vice Chancellor forever.

Professor Prochaska-Cue, Family & Consumer Sciences, noted that there are two changes involved in the motion. One is increasing the number of faculty members on the committee and the second relates to the number of people that can be from any one college on the committee. She asked why this change is being proposed and whether it came from the APC. Also she asked what time frame is being anticipated for getting the motion approved and elections held to add new faculty members. Coordinator Griffin stated that suggestion to increase the number of allowable representatives from colleges from two to three came from the

Executive Committee. She pointed out that that having more requirements and restrictions on who can serve on committees makes it more difficult to find people who are eligible to serve.

Secretary Shea pointed out that the responsibilities of the APC include not just academics but research and service as well. He takes this to mean that the APC does more than just planning for academics and therefore he thinks the Vice Chancellor for Research & Economic Development should be a voting member.

Professor Schubert stated that he recalls the Executive Committee discussing the number difference between faculty and non faculty members if two more faculty members are added to the APC. He noted that it would be pretty bold if we don't respond to this by not adding the additional administrator.

7.3 Presentation to Professor Roger Mandigo

President Elect LaCost noted that today the Senate would be honoring Professor Mandigo for his many years of service on the UNL Marshal Corps. She encouraged faculty members to attend the commencement ceremonies and to become involved in serving on the Corps. She noted that it is a rewarding experience and it means much to the students and the family of the students to see the faculty attend the ceremonies.

President Elect LaCost reported that Professor Mandigo has shown amazing leadership for the past 31 years in serving on the Marshal Corps. She noted that members of the Commencement and Honors Convocations Committee and the Marshal Corps have been invited to attend the Senate's honoring of Professor Mandigo's service to the university. She read the following comments written by Professor Fuess, Associate Head Marshal:

“UNL is unique among major universities because it actually goes to the effort to ensure that all graduates at commencement receive their diplomas. This is an admirable tradition and it has thrived all these years under Roger Mandigo's skillful leadership of the UNL Marshal Corps. Roger has been a tireless and selfless leader of the UNL Marshal Corps and his dedication has resulted in thoughtful and dignified commencement ceremonies that celebrate the accomplishments of *all* graduates.”

President Elect LaCost asked Professor Isernhagen, chair of the Commencement and Honors Convocations Committee, to make further comments. Professor Isernhagen stated that if Professor Mandigo was telling the story, he would say the devil is in the details. She reported that he saw to all of the details to make sure that each student was taken care of, even when the location of the commencement ceremonies were changed. She stated that the Commencement and Honors Convocations Committee and the Marshal Corps are having a difficult time not having him there to tell them of the details and what everyone should be doing. She noted the Professor Berger has taken over as Head Marshal and he is helping, but everyone misses Professor Mandigo at every graduation ceremony. She stated that the Committee wants to express its sincere appreciation of all of his work. She welcomed his family and was glad that they could come and enjoy this day of recognition, even though Professor Mandigo hates being signaled out for recognition.

President Elect LaCost noted that Professor Mandigo made it personally much easier for her to attend the graduation ceremonies and she thanked him on behalf of the graduating students, administrators, and faculty. She then presented Professor Mandigo with a gift of appreciation from the Senate.

Professor Mandigo thanked the Senate. He noted that in May the largest commencement ceremony was held and while there might be 1800-1900 students sitting at the ceremony, all one has to do is to look up and see that the Devaney Center was filled with 10,000 family and friends. He noted that we are different and that Nebraska really values education and this is not just an event for the student, it is an event for the family. He reported that 70% of eligible graduating students choose to participate in commencement which is a phenomenal number. He pointed out that commencement is a celebration and when we look at ceremonies that get too big we need to focus on the fact that it is a family celebration. He stated that commencement has always been fun for him. He thanked the Senate for the award and the University for providing him with the chance to be involved in such a wonderful ceremony.

A reception for Professor Mandigo immediately followed the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:01 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, December 7, 2:30 p.m. in the City Campus Union, Auditorium. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, and Professor Patrick Shea, Secretary.

