

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

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

Absent: Bender, Ruchala, Zoubek

Date: Wednesday, October 24, 2012

Location: Faculty Senate Office

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 Parking

2.1.A. What Sustainability Efforts Are Being Made to Encourage People Not to drive to Campus?

Chancellor Perlman stated that some suggestions have been made but nothing has been very successful. He stated that faculty, staff, and students that live in the community do not have sufficient mass transportation to allow them to travel back and forth from the campus easily. He noted that we try to discourage resident students from bringing their cars to campus with the high cost of parking but this does not seem to have significant impact.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the consulting firm Sasaki working on the Campus Master Plan is paying attention to the internal movement on and around campus. He noted that they have some interesting ideas with bike trials between the campuses and with changes to transit routes that would make the transit system more attractive to use, however the plan has its costs. He stated that as more off campus housing for students is constructed in the surrounding areas there will be less of a need for these students to park on campus because they will be able to walk here. He is hoping that this will bring some relief to the parking problems.

2.1.B. Status of Proposed Garage at 18th and R Street

Chancellor Perlman reported that this will be before the Board this Friday and he believes it will be approved. He noted that there is still a little controversy with the proposal to include some housing units on top of the garage. He pointed out that having unregulated student housing that close to campus is a difficult issue.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the Lincoln Journal Star recently reported that two proposals have been made for the Pershing Auditorium site, one of these proposals involves Hallmark Campus Communities Living which specializes in

housing for college students. He stated that this could provide more close, off-campus housing for students. In addition, more housing is going in around the Haymarket area and the Douglas Theaters administration building is going to be torn down and possibly replaced with a nine or ten story building that could have housing. He noted that this is a phenomenon that we need to get used to and that we need to embrace, but also figure out how we can compete with it.

2.1.C. Is Another Parking Garage Really Needed?

Chancellor Perlman reported that the new dorm at 18th and R Street is consuming considerable parking and we need a garage to accommodate parking for the students that will be in this dorm. He noted that the proposal for the garage will include housing and an additional 200 stalls will be built to accommodate the residents of the garage apartments.

Nickerson asked if the garage will still be built if the housing component of the garage is not approved by the Board of Regents. Chancellor Perlman stated that we have to build the garage. Nickerson asked if it is possible to add housing onto the garage at a later date. Chancellor Perlman stated that this would add considerable expense to the construction of the garage because the foundation would have to be made stronger. He reported that the current design is to have some of the apartments on top of the garage and some wrapping around it.

LaCost asked if the Coordinating Commission for Higher Education plays a role in the approval process of building the garage and housing. He stated that the Coordinating Commission has to approve the financing of any new building on campus and approval has already been given for the garage.

Schubert asked how the arguments are going to be made for the Board to support the building of the new garage with housing. He pointed out that even though the apartments in the building will be managed and operated by an independent firm, the public perception will be that it is university housing. Chancellor Perlman noted that we can't control people's perception and pointed out that we get blamed for anything students do whether they are on campus or not. He reported that we have negotiated arrangements with the developer that should address the concerns of the Regents. He stated that if the property is not properly maintained we have the right to buy the property back for slightly less than fair market value. If the housing is operated in a way that we do not like we have a similar opportunity to buy back the facility at an established price or if we want to buy it back for any reason we can do so at a fair market price. However, economics will play a role in whether we are able to purchase the housing units.

Schubert asked how these apartments can address the need for short-term faculty housing. Chancellor Perlman thinks that some of the apartments could be combined to create two short-term faculty housing facilities. He noted that we would probably have to pay the lease for the period of time that someone is in residence and the center or department bringing in the person would be charged

for the lease. He stated that one question about this is who would clean the apartments, but he thinks there is real possibility to provide some kind of short-term faculty housing.

2.2 Update on Plans to Privatize Health Care Facilities

Chancellor Perlman reported that there has been one response, from Bryan Health, to the RFP. He pointed out that an evaluation committee that is broadly represented with students, faculty, and staff members will be reviewing the proposal. He noted that the evaluation committee has developed a series of questions to see what Bryan's intentions will be on a whole range of issues. He reported that once the evaluation committee is satisfied with the answers there will be a public presentation of Bryan's proposal. He stated that anyone who wants further input into this should speak up. He stated that if the proposal goes forward it will not get to the Board of Regents until January.

Woodman asked what the destiny of the University Health Center property will be if no privatization plan materialized and whether the new CBA building will take over the site. Chancellor Perlman stated that the new CBA building will be on the southeast corner of Vine and 14th street and it will only be allowed to stay in the footprint that is allotted for the building. This does not include the Health Center property. SVCAA Weissinger noted that the Health Center property could become a prime site for an academic building.

2.3 Status of International Affairs – Will Peter Levitov Be Replaced?

SVCAA Weissinger thanked the Executive Committee for asking for the update. She noted that previously International Affairs loosely dealt with international affairs in three different ways: it provides some coordination of international student organizations and a possible place for international students to meet, it provided advising to international students on visas and related matters, and it had a study abroad program. She stated that functions are now being met in a new way. She reported that VC Franco and the Student Affairs office have taken up the cultural development and activities of international students including assisting international student organizations.

SVCAA Weissinger reported that the International Student and Scholar Office (ISSO) relocated to Seaton Hall and the office is now being supervised by Associate Dean Laurie Bellows. She stated that the office is fully engaged in all of the functions they had before and are still providing all of the support that faculty and staff need with visa issues. She stated that all of the activities of Levitov's work are now fully supported by professionals in ISSO and a message was recently sent out to Deans, Directors, and Department Chairs/Heads by Associate Dean Bellows describing the ISSO and what it can offer. She pointed out that ISSO is still following all of the University's policies as before but there is a new website (<http://isso.unl.edu/>) that will provide detailed information about visa types and immigration regulations. She noted that Levitov's work focused

on faculty visas, international visitor's visas, and more specialized visas. She stated that these services are still fully supported by the ISSO.

SVCAA Weissinger stated that the Education Abroad office now has a very focused, professional staff that is being overseen by Associate VC Wilson. She noted that Chancellor Perlman is determined to house this Office in the City Campus Union. She reported that the office now has a new website that is much more informative (<http://educationabroad.unl.edu/>) and the Office has purchased a product called Studio Abroad that will keep track of which students are studying abroad, where they are, and allows direct contact with the student.

Schubert noted that he has not seen the memo from Associate Dean Bellows sent out about the ISSO. He pointed out that the website does not provide information on green cards. SVCAA Weissinger stated that she will forward the email message to Griffin for distribution to the Executive Committee. Schubert stated that the question is who faculty members should talk to about these kinds of visas. SVCAA Weissinger stated that the ISSO as a whole is handling these visas, but Steven Mattos is a person to contact. She stated that her experience has been that the services provided by ISSO are better now.

2.4 USStratCom and Implications for Research on Campus

Chancellor Perlman reported that the university is now in a partnership with the United States Strategic Command (USStratCom) based at Offutt Air Force Base. This partnership has created a University-Affiliated Research Center (UARC) and will serve as a primary research and development center that supports U.S. Strategic Command missions. He reported that UARC will enable us to get contracts with other government agencies. He noted that we are now the only university on the mainland that is in contract with the Department of Defense that is not a member of the AAU. He pointed out that it was a competitive process to get the contract and we had to demonstrate that we have faculty members whose research aligns with UARC.

Chancellor Perlman reported that USStratCom is the unit within the Department of Defense that is responsible for cyber security and biological weapons. He noted that we have strength on the biological side and with our laser work we can be involved in nuclear detection. He pointed out that \$84 million can be distributed by USStratCom over the next five years but we have to compete for the contracts that fall under this money. He noted that universities have to show that they have been doing research with defense contracts totaling \$5 million a year before we could apply for these contracts. He reported that there will be classified research and unclassified research and a secure facility will be required to conduct some of the research and we need people with the proper security level. Chancellor Perlman stated that the potential is extraordinary if we produce well.

Chancellor Perlman reported that implications from the contract will soon be seen as the Board of Regents is going to review a proposal to renovate Brace Hall. He noted that Brace is now a teaching facility and it will have life science laboratories and a testing center in it. He stated that the plan is to put in a 160 seat classroom and Information Technology personnel will assist with the computing side of teaching. He noted that Behlen Laboratories will become the classified secured facility for research and already has some secure areas.

Woodman noted that a colleague asked how the grants can be accessed. Chancellor Perlman stated that it is his understanding that governmental agencies wanting to work through USStratComm can publish openings for contracts. He noted that retired Lt. General Bob Hinson, a former deputy commander at StratCom will be director of NU's National Strategic Research Institute and his responsibility will be to expand and get us as much of this research money as we can get. He noted that Lt. General Hinson will be working with VC Paul. He pointed out that research will be done in conjunction with the Medical Center and if a faculty member from another university has security clearance they can participate in the research.

Nickerson asked if Senator Nelson's office was involved with helping us to get the contract. Chancellor Perlman stated that there was substantial involvement and support from Senator Nelson and his office. He noted that Senator Nelson was instrumental in getting Strategic Air Command a new building and it is a major employer in the Omaha area.

Nickerson asked if UNL faculty members participating in research associated with USStratCom will need to get security clearance. Chancellor Perlman stated that it will depend on the research. He stated that classified research will require security clearance. He stated that the question is how far up the security clearances have to go, will he have to get security as Chancellor? He pointed out that the research has been moved out of the Board of Regents hands so they do not have to get clearance.

Nickerson asked if contract possibility will be posted through UARC. Chancellor Perlman stated that Lt. General Hinson may receive notification of possible contracts and knowing the capabilities and interests of various departments, he might notify departments directly. Woodman asked how individual faculty members will become aware of the contracts. Chancellor Perlman reported that VC Paul will probably put together a team to help with this. He noted that there has already been a half-day retreat for faculty who may want to participate in the contracts.

Guevara pointed out that security clearance can be costly and asked who would incur this cost. SVCAA Weissinger stated that she does not believe that the clearance will cost much. Chancellor Perlman noted that students at PKI have already received security clearances and he did not think there was much cost to

getting these clearances. He pointed out that the real cost will be with making the facilities secure.

2.5 Upcoming Issues

Chancellor Perlman noted that SVCAA Weissinger had mentioned that Education Abroad will eventually be housed in the student union. He stated that after seeing the campus unions of some of the Big Ten schools he is not pleased with our student unions, in part because environmentally they do not identify what campus you are on and the unions are not a high energy place. As a result a consultant has been hired to come in and take a look at the unions. He pointed out that the older part of city campus union definitely needs to be updated and there is significant space being consumed by a kitchen that is no longer used.

Chancellor Perlman noted that this leads to the most interesting part of his visit to Ohio State University. He reported that the libraries there were opened up to a student space and it was jammed packed with students on a Friday afternoon. He stated that the Campus Master Plan suggests that we look at the library as a student center and he is pleased with this idea. He noted that one of the main avenues for walking on campus at Ohio State goes right through the library.

Chancellor Perlman reported that there are three themes for the Campus Master Plan to be considered and he is intrigued with two of them. He pointed out that the plans dramatically remake the campus in terms of how you think about space and it will change the culture of the campus in some ways. He stated that anyone interested should participate with the planning process as much as possible.

Chancellor Perlman noted that the elections are coming and there could be at least three, perhaps four, new members of the Board of Regents. He stated this will inevitably make changes with the Board and the administration on each campus are preparing for this change. He noted that in three of the races no incumbent is running so there will be opportunities for the new Regents to see a deeper side of the campus. He stated that the State Legislature will have some major change in leadership as most of the leaders have reached their term limits. He stated that a great deal of effort will need to be put in by the administration and faculty members to orient the new people in regards to the University. He pointed out that the work on the next biennium budget will begin in January.

Schubert stated that faculty members will probably have to work with VC Paul to become involved in the USStratCom contracts. He noted that the process is not like going for a NRI grant. Woodman wondered whether it would be beneficial for interested faculty members to publicize what their capabilities are if they are interested in being involved with this kind of research.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 ACE Recertification

Guevara reported that he received an email message from Director Mitchell, and copied to his chair, explaining how her office deals with the ACE recertification process in each department. He pointed out that it was clear from her email that she took the observations he reported as criticism when that was not the intent. He stated that he finds it bothersome that she feels that she is being targeted rather than the process. Nickerson pointed out other Executive Committee members related difficulties that they or their colleagues have had with the recertification process.

Guevara stated that there were some inconsistencies with what Director Mitchell said about the evidence that is needed and what the form says. He noted that Director Mitchell stated that once every five years the evidence needs to be provided, yet the form states that every semester the evidence must be collected from the course. He stated that some faculty members feel this is an intrusion into their classes and how they teach and he is just communicating the concerns of these people. Reisbig stated that she raised the issue at a departmental meeting. She noted that her chair discussed that collecting the samples of work is mostly problematic when there are temporary instructors teaching courses. Each time there is a new temporary instructor teaching an ACE course they need to be informed that they need to retain three samples of the coursework so the course can be recertified.

Guevara asked the Executive Committee how the issue should be handled. Reisbig suggested that the ACE Governance Documents be read and then the issue should be re-discussed to see if the Committee still has concerns over the process. She suggested that the Executive Committee can propose potential changes to the recertification process. Guevara stated that he thinks the process can be simplified. He reported that several people have told him that instructors are doing all of the work to retain samples from each course yet no one will actually see it.

Woodman pointed out that there are four levels involved with the recertification process: instructor, department, college, and then the University Curriculum Committee. He asked if all of this oversight is necessary. He noted that the further you get the evidence away from the department, the more likely people will not understand it. Reisbig stated that the department should handle assessment of the course. Woodman agreed and stated that the department should make sure that students are achieving the outcomes stated for the course.

Schubert asked if there is just a small group of faculty members who feel that the recertification process is a problem or do many faculty members feel this way? He wondered whether part of the problem is that people do not know what the policy and process is for recertification. Guevara stated that no one is saying that the ACE courses are a problem, it's the recertification process. Nickerson reported that he has collected a lot of emails from faculty members in Biological Sciences who have made significant

complaints about the process. Schubert stated that before any recommendations for revisions to the policy are made we need to get evidence that it is a widespread problem. He suggested that a committee should look into how to improve the process, not rewrite it. He reminded the Executive Committee that many faculty members were involved in setting up the ACE program and recertification process.

Woodman pointed out that difficulties with the recertification process are just starting to come out since the second group of courses is now going through the process of recertification. Griffin suggested having a discussion at the November 6 Senate meeting to hear what the experiences have been of faculty members with the process. Another idea would be to send an email message out to the faculty members who have gone through the recertification process to get their opinion on it.

Reisbig stated that it seems like the largest concern is for courses with multiple sections, particularly when temporary instructors are used to teach the course. Woodman pointed out that Arts & Sciences has courses with huge enrollments and large multiple sections and this is where there is an issue. He stated that he does not know how many large courses with multiple sections have been through the recertification process.

Schubert asked if the committee that came up with the ACE procedures should be asked to look at the policies again. Nickerson pointed out that a number of the people on the committee have probably retired. He noted that the Executive Committee doesn't seem inclined to revamp ACE, just to change the requirement for recertification. Reisbig asked if the Senate can do this. Griffin stated that the University Curriculum Committee syllabus states "Any changes to the Subcommittee's duties, powers, or procedures subsequent to the Faculty Senate's approval of the ACE Proposals must be approved by the Faculty Senate."

Guevara stated that the concern is that faculty members feel that someone is looking over their shoulder. He noted that it is a violation of academic freedom to tell your colleague that we want to look at how you teach your class. He suggested that the recertification process should be less intrusive. He pointed out that a committee cannot tell him whether students met the outcome of his course unless it is someone within his own discipline. Schubert stated that he can still see the need for depositing a sample of the work from an ACE course.

Purdum pointed out that there seems to be a philosophy versus process argument taking place. She stated that evaluating a course to see if it is valuable and working well is a valuable exercise, but it seems like the process is being taken to the nth degree some departments. She suggested that a committee be formed to make recommendations to changes to the recertification process if Senators voice the same concerns.

Anaya stated that it should be determined whether one department or field is having more difficulty with the recertification process. She stated that currently it is difficult to gauge whether there is really a problem, and if there is a problem, what is the magnitude of it.

Reisbig suggested that there be a series of steps beginning with reading the Governance document, followed by discussion of the document and then getting informed responses to the process. She noted that if there is no central person in a department reminding faculty members to collect the data the process can be much more cumbersome.

The Executive Committee decided to have a discussion on the ACE recertification process at the November 6 meeting.

4.0 Approval of October 17, 2012 Minutes

Reisbig moved to approve the minutes as revised. The motion was seconded by Wysocki. The motion was approved.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Faculty Salary Data

LaCost reported that she spoke with Associate to the Chancellor Nunez about the data and he preferred the data not be released in printed format. She stated that she would be willing to meet with the ADVANCE group, or any other group, to discuss the aggregate data.

Reisbig noted that she changed her position on not wanting to share the data because individuals can be identified. She pointed out that she went to the Board of Regents website and found that faculty members are individually listed by name along with salary so the same information that is in the data can, with some work, be obtained by looking at the Regents' webpage. She noted that the usefulness of the data as presented on the Board of Regents' website is limited and that the compiled faculty salary data has much more utility for identifying hiring trends and differences in salary based on factors such as gender.

LaCost moved to table the release of the cumulative faculty salary data indefinitely. Anaya seconded the motion. The motion was approved, six in favor, three against.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Agenda Items for SVCAA Weissinger and VC Green

The Executive Committee identified the following agenda items:

- Activity Insight
- Rural Futures Institute
- New developments with East Campus
- General Enrollment Issues

6.2 Agenda Items for Associate VC Goodburn

The Executive Committee identified the following agenda items:

- MyPlan Update
- Retention Initiatives
- Overruling Academic Standards Committee's decisions

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Wednesday, October 31, 2012 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.