

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Anaya, Bender, Guevara, LaCost, Nickerson, Reisbig, Rinkevich, Schubert, Woodman, Wysocki, Zoubek

Absent: Purdum, Ruchala

Date: Wednesday, August 22, 2012

Location: 201 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 to Order

Schubert called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

2.0 Chancellor Perlman/SVCAA Weissinger

2.1 Sentiments on Proposed Changes to Curriculum Committee's Process for Handling Course Changes

SVCAA Weissinger stated that her sentiments on the changes are very positive. She noted that conversation on the subject originated with the Academic Planning Committee but she does not know if that is where the original idea came from. She noted that some members of the UCC spoke with the APC about the proposed changes. She asked if the Senate had been a part of the conversation. Schubert stated that the Senate and the Executive Committee only found out about the proposed changes by chance.

Schubert reported that the Executive Committee felt that the Senate needs to discuss the proposed changes because there is more expertise with the various senators about the process. He stated that the Executive Committee has felt bypassed in the process even though the UCC is a Senate Committee. He noted that there is concern that the UCC will not look at curriculum changes until late in the process. SVCAA Weissinger stated that this is a matter for the UCC and the Senate to discuss.

Nickerson stated that he is in favor of simplifying and shortening the process for making curriculum changes. Reisbig pointed out that with the proposed changes there is a lack of the larger oversight of the UCC and with colleges communicating with each other on curriculum changes which could result in the removal of a course that is required by other colleges. She stated that a new mechanism needs to be created that will allow the colleges to communicate with one another better about these changes.

Woodman stated that the proposed changes bypass communications within the process. The way that the changes are written is that the moment the college approves a change it goes straight to Registration & Records without review from the UCC. He noted that there is concern that this could result in errors that could impact students and departments.

SVCAA Weissinger asked if the Executive Committee's concerns were discussed with the UCC. Schubert stated that the former chair, current chair, and the Director of Undergraduate Education presented the ideas to the Executive Committee but it was not clear after the discussion what improvements would be made. He stated that the Executive Committee wanted to know if the changes were vetted with SVCAA Weissinger and what her sentiments were on it. SVCAA Weissinger stated that she learned of the proposed changes by being a member of the APC. She stated that as a faculty member she sees the benefits of making the changes. Nickerson asked if she has any objections to the changes as an administrator. SVCAA Weissinger stated that she is not sure if her opinion as an administrator matters as this is in the purview of the faculty.

Guevara stated that the big picture is that when you bypass the colleges in the process it could have negative impacts on other programs. He noted that recently one of the colleges wanted to eliminate some courses but did not check the impacts these eliminations would have on programs in other colleges. He pointed out that this could be very detrimental if students are recruited for a particular program thinking that they would be able to take specific courses outside of the department for their program but only to find out that the courses were removed. SVCAA Weissinger noted that a department can stop teaching courses without formally deleting the course through the UCC. She agreed, however, that there needs to be a mechanism to make sure that programs and colleges communicate with one another as curriculum changes are made.

2.2 Update Provided on Survey of Non-tenured Faculty Members (Schubert)

Schubert stated that he will be providing a summary of the results of the survey to the Senate at the September 11 meeting but wanted to provide the administrators with a brief update. He stated that at the last meeting of the Executive Committee a subcommittee was created to look at the bylaws of each college and department to see how non-tenure track faculty members are classified and if they are given any rights within the department or college. He stated that he is anticipating the subcommittee making suggestions or recommendations about non-tenure track faculty members.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he recently had a conversation with the APC concerning the elaborate nature of our procedures for promotion and tenure and the bureaucratic process it entails and the amount of resources that the process requires. He suggested that it might be useful for the APC and the Senate to look at the bylaws in the university to see if we can streamline the process which would allow for a more focused look at individual cases. He noted that the current process consumes an enormous amount of faculty time for both tenure and non-tenure track faculty members.

Nickerson asked if the Chancellor is talking about all faculty members. Chancellor Perlman stated yes, although he thinks the bylaws are very limited in how we help non-tenure faculty members to achieve tenure and promotion.

2.3 Expectations of the Faculty for the Academic Year

Schubert asked if the Chancellor has any particular expectations of the faculty beyond the traditional expectations. Chancellor Perlman stated that he sees two parts of the Senate's role in two general categories: the welfare of the faculty within the confines of the university, and the contributions the faculty makes towards the substantive growth of the university. He thinks through individual departments the faculty can find ways to increase enrollment and he wants the faculty to focus on this effort and would like the Senate to think of how the faculty can be involved in the enrollment process and how the administration can help facilitate this role.

Schubert stated that enrollment has been a topic of conversation in the past and will continue to be discussed by the Executive Committee and the Senate. He stated that if the faculty could get some hints of what faculty members can do to improve enrollment that would be very helpful.

2.4 Update on Searches for Deans

SCAA Weissinger reported that Professor Kim Wilson, College of Architecture, has agreed to serve as interim dean for a three year period. She noted that the faculty of the college is very pleased that she will accept this role and having her in this position will allow the faculty to make decisions on where the college's focus will be in the future. She stated that the industries related to the job market in Architecture is very complex right now and the faculty have a lot of ideas about niches and research programs in Architecture that would serve the campus and students.

SVCAA Weissinger reported that she recently met and had a good conversation with the faculty of the Journalism College. She reported that Professor O'Hanlon has agreed to serve as interim dean and the college feels good about his leading the college during this transitional time.

SVCAA Weissinger reported that Professor Nancy Busch is serving as interim dean of the Libraries. She noted that Professor Busch has a lot of experience and is an academic librarian and has been the associate dean in Libraries. She stated that the faculty of the college has a great deal of confidence in her and after consulting with the faculty, she offered Professor Busch a three year interim dean position which she accepted. She noted that libraries are changing greatly and the faculty of the Libraries has already been involved in over the horizon thinking to adjust to these changes and she believes this will continue. She stated that she thinks all of the colleges are in very good situations.

2.5 Possible Task Force to Deal with Short Term Housing Needs for University Guests

Schubert reported that he recently began conversations with some directors of centers and is now emailing them to gauge a need for having a housing facility for campus guests. He noted that most of the Big Ten schools have these accommodations. He reported that he immediately received numerous responses agreeing that there is a real need for such a facility. He stated that he will contact VC's Paul and Jackson to see if a task force can be created and he wants to have discussions to create ideas on who should participate in the

task force and how to determine how large a facility is needed. He stated that he hopes to put this into a reality in the future.

2.6 Upcoming Issues

Chancellor Perlman reported that in his meeting with the APC there was a conversation about how the faculty could be more directly involved in planning activities and to be more proactive rather than reactive. He stated that he essentially agreed and that right now the key place in planning is with the Enrollment Management Council and he has agreed to put an APC representative on the Council. He noted there is currently good representation from the colleges and suggested putting a student on the Council as well. He pointed out that enrollment might be down further than we thought and it is the one area that we can have some control over to increase revenue.

Chancellor Perlman reported that everyone will be given the opportunity to provide input into the campus master planning process. He stated that the consultants on the project will be back in September to hold open houses and will listen to the comments and concerns of people. He noted that the plan will drive the campus in terms of building, transportation, and how the campus links with Nebraska Innovation Campus, the Antelope Valley Project and the Pinnacle Bank Arena. He stated that the master plan will raise critical issues for us as we contemplate growing larger.

Nickerson asked if the master plan will have a new life sciences building. Chancellor Perlman stated that the plan will outline where buildings can be constructed as opposed to what buildings will be constructed. Nickerson stated that he can see three or four locations for a life sciences building and can see arguments for constructing them at all of these locations. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that as long as they are in spaces designated as sites for construction they could be considered. SVCAA Weissinger stated that the planning process will be influenced by enrollment growth and faculty growth.

Woodman pointed out that there are problems with numerous existing facilities, and while he understands wanting places that will accommodate enrollment growth, some facilities are breaking down. He asked if the master plan will think about these kinds of issues. Chancellor Perlman stated that the master plan does not directly look at the deferred maintenance issue. He stated that we pretty much know what buildings need attention. SVCAA Weissinger pointed out that the recent renovations of the Chemistry labs are the kinds of commitment we want to make in terms of deferred maintenance. She stated that we want to make nicer spaces for faculty and students and the administration is determined to find resources to address these issues. She noted that the Chemistry labs are very good now and the cost of renovating the four labs was less than two million dollars. She pointed out that 1500 students go through these labs during a semester and many of the Chemistry professors have developed new pedagogies because of the newly renovated labs. She noted that improvements in facilities are just not for the STEM fields, and that we will continue to look for affordable investments that impact large numbers of students and create nicer spaces for faculty to do their best teaching.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the realities of budgeting is that constructing a life sciences building requires a significant amount of money (\$40 million) and a project like this needs a fund raising campaign. He stated that if improvements can be made with a couple of million dollars, this might be doable by pulling money from different sources. Woodman asked how the Chancellor would advise faculty members to go after the kinds of funds for building improvements. Chancellor Perlman stated that this is a good question and the answer is a bit random. He stated that part of the answer is to have department leadership that will pursue the issue. He noted that someone suggested that he walk through the Chemistry department to see what shape it was in and he did, but what really pushed the renovation of the labs was the commitment of the faculty in the department in determining what direction it wants to go. He stated that the faculty in the life sciences needs to see what the life sciences are going to look like in the future, how it will serve the students, and the creative implements that can be generated by having a new facility.

2.7 New Computer Software Installation Policy

Woodman stated that Information Services just recently sent out a policy requiring that all software purchases be made through a requisition, installed by an IS person, and then the computer checked to see all of the software that is installed on it. He asked if the policy is an effort to get people to use the same software or that everyone adheres to computer policies. He noted that software programs are available from many places, some of them free, and questioned whether the policy is going to be hamstringing the faculty. SVCAA Weissinger stated that these are legitimate issues and somewhat exacerbated by the way the policy was rolled out.

Chancellor Perlman stated that there is a balance that needs to be achieved. He stated that standard software is really a commodity and the cost to the university is enormous for trying to support software that is just a personal preference for someone. He noted that there was significant savings by all of us being on one email system. He stated that he does not care what kind of software people put on their machine unless the university has to service it because this is when costs rise.

Woodman asked if faculty members can still get software other than what the university offers. Chancellor Perlman stated that this is still possible and the university cannot prevent people from acquiring software, but they should not expect the university to service it if it is not one of the standard software programs. He stated that he thinks the implication of the policy is that IS will be checking everyone's computer to see what they are doing and this is not the intent of the policy.

Schubert stated that this discussion relates to the issue of faculty members not being allowed to install a program in a classroom that they use for teaching. He noted that he brings his own laptop to the classroom to avoid not having the necessary programs on a computer that allows him to teach. He suggested that perhaps each faculty member should be provided their own laptop that they can use for teaching and removing the classroom computers.

Chancellor Perlman stated that this raises a different issue for general classroom use and this is one of the reasons why we need to have as consistent a platform as we can. He pointed out that instructors can use their own laptops as long as it doesn't damage or interfere with the proper use of the projection system. Guevara pointed out that sometimes instructors need to use several computers for their courses and removing the classroom computer would interfere with their ability to deliver a course.

Schubert noted that not having the proper software on computers is a recurring problem for instructors and is something that people across the campus are complaining about. Chancellor Perlman stated that he does not doubt that this is a problem here and at other institutions. He noted that there is a belief within the IS structures of research institutions that there are millions of dollars being wasted because of how the computing systems at universities have developed. He stated that he understands the instructors' frustrations but it is a question of whether there is \$10 million that could be saved in IS costs and that could be used to help support academics. Woodman stated that many of these issues could be resolved when we go to the cloud.

SVCAA Weissinger noted that there needs to be good communication between the faculty and CIO Askren and Associate VC Perez about the faculty concerns so they can understand what the faculty needs and so the faculty can develop a sense that nothing nefarious is occurring. She stated that there was no intent to investigate anyone's computer. Chancellor Perlman noted that he was very concerned when he first saw the email message and contacted CIO Askren about it because he knew the faculty would be upset by it.

Schubert pointed out that the university needs to make sure that we are not cutting ourselves off with services. He noted that improvements need to be made, but not just streamlining changes to reduce costs. He stated that the trustworthiness issue needs to be readdressed. He pointed out that the lack of trust might be a result of a lack of communications between the administration and the faculty.

SVCAA Weissinger stated that these are broad issues that need to be discussed with CIO Askren. She stated that she would like Associate VC Perez to be a part of the discussion since he is involved with instructional technology and suggested having some high end technology users from the faculty involved in the discussion as well. She noted that CIO Askren is a very responsive leader and concerned with the faculty's needs. Schubert reported that the Executive Committee is in the process of setting up a meeting with CIO Askren.

SVCAA Weissinger reported that the general manager of NETV is going to retire and since NETV is a UNL affiliate and supports a fundamental mandate from the state legislature to deliver educational television across the state, she will be responsible for conducting a search to get a new director. She noted that NETV is very well poised economically and has a lot of support from the general public. She pointed out that the director's position is governed by the UNL Bylaws and therefore she must follow the guidelines for conducting a search and to adhere to Human Resources policies and

guidelines. However, the composition of the search committee will be very different from a dean's search because there are so many other constituents associated with NETV. She noted that the Bylaws calls for there to be a plurality of faculty members on the search committee and she is asking a UNL faculty member to chair the committee, and she will be sending a list of the search committee members to the Executive Committee for its review.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Changes to University Vehicle Rental Policy

Schubert reported that he raised concerns with Patrick Barrett, Director of Transportation Services, about the vehicle rental policy, particularly with the definition of personal use and the time cars can be used for business purposes. As a result, Transportation Services is revising its policy to define personal use according to IRS definition and changing the time a vehicle can be used. He pointed out that with the changes a person can now take the rented vehicle home to load or unload luggage and the car can remain at the residence if someone comes in very late as long as the car is being used for business. He noted that the changes comply with state laws.

4.0 Minutes of 7/25/12

Rinkevich moved for approval of the minutes as revised. Wysocki seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Executive Committee Goals

The Executive Committee made a couple of minor revisions to the Executive Committee goals for the 2012-2013 academic year.

Reisbig asked if the goals should include reviewing the promotion and tenure procedures for pre-tenure people as mentioned by the Chancellor. Schubert stated that the procedures should be reviewed and asked if this should be included in the goals. Guevara noted that there is frustration from the administrators in having to look at all of the large files but he is also interested in all of the work that must be done to put a promotion and tenure file together. Along with this is why professors of practice have to re-submit their entire files every five years to have their contract renewed. He noted that looking into the promotion and tenure process will be helpful not only to tenure track faculty members, but others as well.

Wysocki pointed out that the Executive Committee has already determined its goals for this year and he feels that looking into streamlining the promotion and tenure issue is a goal for the future. Nickerson pointed out that the APC may be looking into this and wondered if they will be doing the work on this or perhaps working with the Executive Committee. Bender suggested that the Executive Committee invite Professor Harbison, chair of the APC, to exchange agendas to see what both groups are working on this year.

LaCost moved to approve the goals. Motion seconded by Zoubek. The motion was approved.

5.2 Proposed Changes to Student Code of Conduct

Griffin reported that she contacted Dean Hecker and Marlene Beyke, Director of Administration-Student Government for ASUN, about ASUN's proposed changes to the Student Code of Conduct but has not received a response from either one of them.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Committee Member Needed for Honorary Degrees Committee

Griffin reported that there is an opening on the Honorary Degrees Committee that needs to be filled. Nickerson stated that there should be a more diversified group of distinguished faculty members on this committee. He stated that more senior, successful researchers that have an idea of who deserves an honorary degree need to be on the committee. A faculty member was suggested for the committee and Griffin stated that she would contact the person to see if they are willing to serve.

6.2 Recognition of Regents

Schubert reported that he received a request from a faculty member to have the Senate recognize outgoing Regents Hasselbrook and Wilson for their efforts in supporting gender equity and the employee plus one benefit. He stated that he was not sure whether this is a good idea. Guevara pointed out that this is a very political issue that could put the Senate in a difficult position to defend. Schubert noted that a faculty member could, as an individual, thank a Regent for his/her work.

Anaya suggested that the faculty member be informed that other avenues are available to provide Regents with recognition.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, August 29 at 3:00 pm. The meeting will be held in the Faculty Senate Office. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and David Woodman, Secretary.