

UNL FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
City Campus Union, Auditorium
April 3, 2012
President LaCost, Presiding

1.0 Call to Order

President LaCost called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Faculty Senate Executive Committee Elections

President LaCost stated that elections to the Senate Executive Committee will occur during the April 24 Senate meeting. She stated that nominations are needed for President Elect, Secretary, and for two Executive Committee members. She noted that only one member from CASNR will remain on the Executive Committee and anyone interested in running for election should contact Coordinator Griffin.

2.2 Recognition of Outgoing Senators

President LaCost wanted to thank the outgoing senators for their extended service. She noted that Senators provided valuable input and she urged faculty members to consider returning to serve on the Faculty Senate whenever the time is appropriate for the faculty members. She pointed out that faculty input is critical as we move through times of change at the university. She once again thanked the outgoing Senators for their service. The outgoing Senators are: Aemal Khattak, Civil Engineering; Bruce Fischer, Construction Management; Kamlakar Rajurkar, Industrial/Management Systems Engineering; Keith Pederson, Construction Systems; Christopher Marks, School of Music; Scott Anderson, School of Music; Deana Namuth Covert, Agronomy & Horticulture; Carroll Welte, Northeast Research & Extension Center; David Varner, Southeast Research & Extension Center; Matthew Stockton, West Central Extension & Research Center; Ken Hubbard, School of Natural Resources; Amy Struthers, College of Journalism & Mass Communications; Leo Chouinard, Mathematics; Diane Farrand, Special Education & Communication Disorders; Al Steckelberg, Teaching, Learning, & Teacher Education; Richard Leiter, College of Law; Josephine Potuto, College of Law.

3.0 Chancellor Perlman

Chancellor Perlman noted that this will be the only time that he can meet with the Faculty Senate this semester as he will be in China on April 24 for the opening of the American Culture Center in Xi'an, China. He stated that he wished he could attend all of the Senate meetings but at times his position requires him to be in other places. He wanted to thank those Senators leaving the Senate for their work and effort and stated that he appreciates their input. He pointed out that this is an occasion to think about shared governance and in his role he needs to step back occasionally and ask the question whether faculty members are being invited and are participating in the activities that are going on to move the university forward. He noted that he wants to tie this into questions he is frequently asked about the growth of the campus and what kinds of planning exercises are taking place to ensure that we are successful. He stated that this year has been a preparatory year for trying to get people on board with the goals he laid out in his State of the University address. He reported that a number of actual planning efforts are taking place with faculty members being actively engaged.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the draft Campus Blueprint from the Enrollment Management Council is available on the web at http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/documents/Campus_Blueprint-March_2012.pdf. He noted that Associate Deans and some faculty members were involved in developing the plan and there is enthusiasm from the administration to have faculty members review the Blueprint and suggest ways to make it better. He noted that the Blueprint is an elaborate description on how we can grow enrollment. He stated that with other major things around the university, if faculty members are not engaged in the process, it won't happen. He noted that we need to implement some kind of plan to increase enrollment.

Chancellor Perlman stated that another growth initiative is to increase research expenditures to \$300 million. He stated that the growth initiative document is on the web. He stated that there was significant input from research faculty and the Research Advisory Committee in creating the initiative and he hopes that all faculty members will take a look at this document.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the campus will be involved in the development of a new campus master plan. He noted that the master plan looks at the physical location of the campus and examines how we can

find space to accommodate the growth of the campus. He stated that an RFP was recently made so we could get a professional planner to work on the master plan. He reported that there was a list of planners who responded to the RFP and this has been refined down to three, all of whom have significant experience in campus planning. He pointed out that there will be very elaborate plans over the course of the next year to engage the faculty and the students in the development of the master plan. He stated that there will be a number of iterations on where to construct buildings to accommodate 30,000 students, development of a transportation plan, landscaping for the campus, how we should build, and sustainability issues. He pointed out that the campus master plan will be a meaningful document and there will be a lot of meetings and opportunities for faculty to participate in the creation of the campus master plan.

Chancellor Perlman reported that Nebraska Innovation Campus (NIC) is moving forward. He stated that the faculty advisory Committee for NIC has been very active and proposals from faculty teams are being submitted. He noted that these proposals show how the work of the faculty member(s) might attract private businesses. He stated that faculty members are playing a real role in the development of NIC. He reported that a Design Review Committee has been created and will assist in reviewing design concepts for NIC buildings and providing input on the final plans for each building. He noted that Senator Peter Hind from Architecture and Professor Kim Todd from Agronomy & Horticulture are on this committee.

Chancellor Perlman noted that we are currently in a quiet phase of the life sciences initiative, but Dr. Brian Larkins is coming back to UNL to provide leadership in bringing the life sciences of city and east campus together. He noted that Dr. Larkins will help provide leadership to move the life sciences initiative forward.

Chancellor Perlman pointed out that there are a number of issues that are critical for us to move things forward and he believes the administration has reached out to the faculty and tried to engage the faculty as the administration thinks is helpful. However, if the Senate has a different view or other views that they would like to express, he is certainly open to hearing these views.

Chancellor Perlman reported that the Healthy Nebraska Initiative was signed by the Governor yesterday and this means that we will get a new veterinary diagnostic center on campus. He noted that this is an extremely important facility for us and a very expensive building to construct but the State will now help pay for it.

Chancellor Perlman reported that we are the lead campus in the American Culture Center at Xi'an Jiaotong University and the Center is partly being funded by the State Department. He pointed out that this opens up an opportunity for us to bring American culture, business, law, the arts and everything else American to the center of China. He stated that faculty members wishing to participate in activities at the Center can submit proposals. He reported that for the opening there will be a photography exhibit by a UNL faculty member, a UNL student jazz group will be performing, and during the summer a group of students will be going there led by Professor Patrice McMahon. He noted that lecturers are being sought to go to Xi'an Jiaotong University for a short time period and he encourages anyone curious or interested in China should go.

Chancellor Perlman reported that two conferences will be taking place in May: the Rural Futures Conference and the Annual Water for Food Conference. He stated that the Rural Futures Conference is an idea to see if we can figure out a way to look at the future of rural life and to enhance it and to see where the university can make contributions. He noted that the goals and metrics of this effort are ambitious. He reported that the conference is free and open to all faculty members and numerous colleges will be participating.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the Fourth Annual Water for Food Conference will focus on how to increase food production with limited water sources. He noted that 300-400 international people will be attending the conference and this is the first Water for Food Conference that Director Roberto Lenton will host. He invited the faculty to participate in the conference.

Professor Zlotnik, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, noted that the competition for having a university program in China is significant with many universities competing to establish programs there. He asked if we will be looking at establishing a campus or programs in China. Chancellor Perlman stated that up until now he has resisted the idea of doing a branch campus kind of activity in China, or anywhere for that matter, but he has been invited by China to think this through. He stated that at this point he does not see how this could be economically viable. He stated that Xi'an has a population of about 14 million. He reported that a variety of programs are being built in this city and we are building linkages with Xi'an Jiaotong University. He noted that they want to send 25 undergraduate students to UNL and establish a partnership program in research. He pointed out that since we now have a physical facility with the American Culture Center we want to set up an infrastructure. He reported that there is an American woman who lives in Xi'an who has become our associate

deputy director of the American Culture Center and can help develop needed infrastructure. He stated that he is not sure whether the Culture Center will eventually lead to us having a branch campus or a more formal program at Xi'an Jiaotong University. He pointed out that other universities have tried similar things but have failed.

Professor Archer, School of Natural Resources, asked if the University of Nebraska Press has been involved with the American Culture Center. Chancellor Perlman reported that a number of books have been sent over from NU Press as well as some art and films. He pointed out that this is a clear opportunity for NU Press to be involved.

Professor Eskridge, Statistics, stated that the Chancellor has suggested significant goals for the campus, but if we are going to achieve these goals we have to work better as a faculty. He suggested the need to consider changing our evaluation process for faculty members to reward faculty who are working with faculty members from different disciplines. Chancellor Perlman stated that he believes we have had some striking successes, particularly when a faculty member takes the lead and pulls a team together. He reported that several large successes will be reported soon and noted that the E. coli team research project received a \$25 million grant, the largest from the USDA. He stated that another team effort will involve four different colleges. He stated that he is not denying that we should look at evaluation and tenure policies. Professor Eskridge pointed out that the evaluation process has been talked about for years, but he does not see any changes to the process or policies. Chancellor Perlman stated that this has been discussed. He noted that a lot of people are embedded in their discipline but are willing to engage in other disciplines. He stated that he still thinks department tenure and promotion play a significant role in the evaluation process, but if faculty members are doing good work that is mixed with other disciplines they need to be given credit for this work. He stated that if success is shown, it needs to be rewarded. He stated that problems with evaluations may be culturally rather than policy driven. He reported that we are a lot further along with doing collaborative work than at our peer institutions. He noted that candidates for deanships have said that we have one of the most collaborative institutions that they have seen and that we have many more opportunities for collaboration.

Professor Neal, Art and Art History, stated that it is becoming more and more difficult for graduate students in the Arts to apply for jobs because of the infusion of digital and computerized work. She noted that we are one of the last universities to get money for digital technology and asked if there is any way to get large grant money to help get the needed equipment, or if we can collaborate with other colleges or one of the Big Ten schools that might have this equipment. Chancellor Perlman stated that he thinks there are opportunities to participate with the College of Journalism and Mass Communications and the College of Engineering. He reported that he recently met with the Director of the Census Bureau who is also one of the program directors from NSF and the Director wanted to convey, from a federal government perspective, that the hardest employees to find are those who can work with large data sets. From an art perspective, the question is how you can display a large data set in a way that people can understand it. He pointed out that the hardware is just a tool and unless you can explain how you can use this to help others, it won't get the funding. He noted that core facilities are needed that would allow professors from different departments or colleges to use equipment that is too large or expensive for one department or college to purchase.

4.0 Approval of 3/6/12 Minutes

Professor Wysocki, Computer & Electronics Engineering, moved for approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded by Professor Rinkevich, Classics & Religious Studies. The motion was approved.

5.0 Committee Reports

5.1 Parking Advisory Committee (Tausha Armbruster)

Armbruster reported that the Parking Advisory Committee (PAD) meets once a month during the academic year and is comprised of 3 faculty representatives, 3 staff, and four students. She stated that the PAD focused on several different issues this year, particularly on the intercampus bus routes and moving this service completely over to StarTran. She noted that economically this would be a good move because purchasing buses to replace existing equipment is very expensive and by sharing this expense with StarTran there will be less of a burden on faculty, staff, and students.

Armbruster reported that there will need to be an increase in the fees to accommodate a new parking structure and to support parking and general services. She pointed out that the fees have not been raised for three years on faculty/staff permits. She stated that the transit fees will be supported more by the student fees because they are the primary users of the transit system. She noted that the PAD reviewed one decision made by the Parking Appeals Committee and agreed with this Committee's decision on the appeal. She noted that the number of parking spaces on campus has taken a cut and this is the reason for building a new parking structure

at 18th and R Street.

Professor Rudy, Nutrition & Health Sciences, pointed out the loop parking area next to the stadium has taken considerable abuse from all of the construction vehicles and asked if it will be patched or resurfaced. Director of Parking & Transit Services Carpenter stated that the contractor will be patching the area of the lot that they are disrupting. He pointed out that this parking area was in disrepair before the construction began and a decision will need to be made as to what will be done with the lot. He noted that to completely resurface the loop will cost \$4 million. Professor Rudy asked if temporary patching could be done now because the loop is currently in very bad shape. Director Carpenter stated that some patching will take place over the summer.

Professor Ruchala, School of Accountancy, asked if the same level of service will be available when StarTran takes over the transit system. She noted that our transit system runs buses into the evening while StarTran does not. Director Carpenter stated that StarTran will operate the buses using our schedule. Armbruster pointed out that the University is encouraging StarTran to hire the bus drivers that will lose their job once we transfer the transit system to StarTran.

Professor Willis, Anthropology, noted that students are parking in the reserved parking area inside the loop parking. She asked why they were able to park there. She noted that at certain times of the day and evening it can be very difficult to find parking in this reserved lot. Director Carpenter reported that about five years ago part of that lot was made into a student reserved lot because there was a decline in demand from faculty and staff for reserved parking and many of the parking spaces in this area were left empty. Professor Willis pointed out that with the loss of parking due to the construction on the stadium she did not think it was a good idea for the students to have parking in the reserved lot. Director Carpenter stated that he has not received any complaints that the reserved lot is full.

Professor Stockton, West Central Research & Extension Center, asked who is going to pay for the students riding the bus. Armbruster reported that this will be paid through student fees and recently there has been an increase in the percentage of these fees for transit services. She pointed out that currently when someone buys a parking permit part of it goes for supporting the transit services and the PAD suggested moving more of these costs to the student fees since the students are the majority of the users of the buses.

Professor Carlson, Veterinary & Biomedical Sciences, asked what the fees will be for A lots versus garage parking. Armbruster stated that these parking permits will be separate in that A permits can only park in A lot. She noted that a report from outside consultants suggested that people be allowed to park in only one designated lot and not allowed to roam which would help to control over crowding of the lots. She noted that Parking & Transit Services wants to encourage people to use the buses more to travel between the campuses. Coordinator Griffin pointed out that this not feasible for some people, particularly those who have to work between the two campuses. For instance, she will have to bring even more equipment to the Senate meetings once the meetings are streamed and trying to travel by bus while carrying a lot of equipment is not feasible. Armbruster stated this is an issue that the PAD has discussed and they considered the need for loading zones.

Professor Carlson asked what off campus people, such as Extension Educators and faculty members from the Engineering department in Omaha, do for parking at UNL. Director Carpenter reported that Chance Management consultants were hired to look at how to better manage parking on campus and to look at our infrastructure. He stated that one of the recommendations is to manage parking lots directly by requiring permit holders to identify five lots that they want to park in and then the permit holder would be assigned a lot where he/she could park. He pointed out that not all of the lots will be assigned so visitors from the other campuses can park in these lots.

Professor Carlson stated that he has used the bus system this past year and had a good experience with it but noticed that a number of the bus stops are exposed to the elements. He suggested that having more bus shelters might encourage more people to use the buses. Director Carpenter agreed and stated that StarTran has a GPS system that he hopes Parking & Transit Services can get access to so that an application can be developed that will allow people to see where a bus is and how long it will be before the bus gets to their location.

Professor Woodman, School of Biological Sciences, asked if Director Carpenter sees an end to building more parking garages. Director Carpenter noted that this question is one of the reasons why the Chance Consulting team recommended people be assigned parking lots because it could help limit the need for more and more parking garages. He pointed out that parking is a piece of the master planning process. He stated that currently we are stuck relying on permit fees to finance the parking garages. He pointed out that one of the

critical elements in the future will be how the institution decides what to do with parking policies. He noted that everyone who uses parking on campus will need to contribute and this includes departments that have parking spaces and parking for state vehicles. He noted that the consultant's draft report will be submitted tomorrow and feedback on the recommendations made in the report will be gathered from the campus in the fall.

Armbruster asked if the parking structures will be assigned parking. Director Carpenter stated that it will be an assigned lot and the recommendation from the consultants is to gate large parking areas so enforcement can be confined to smaller lots. He stated that having a license plate recognition system is also being recommended.

Professor Eccarius, Special Education & Communication Disorders, stated that she assumes that the consultants are not using a business model for parking but rather an academic model because some people are required to be on the different campuses during the day. Director Carpenter reported that most of the consultants work is with academic institutions and this is one of the key reasons why they were selected to do the study. Professor Stockton pointed out that split campuses have unique problems that need to be considered. Armbruster pointed out that there are universities with a lot less land available for parking who encounter the same problems that we have with parking.

5.2 Graduate Council Report (Dean Dussault)

Dean Dussault was unable to attend the meeting.

5.3 Information Technologies & Services Committee (Professor Brooks)

Professor Brooks stated that the Information Technologies and Services Committee (ITSC) believes that the campus would be better off if we moved to wireless services to reduce the cost of hard wiring. He reported that the ITSC was informed by CIO Askren that this change would be official as of July 1, and faculty members were no longer charged for wireless connection. He pointed out that a problem with this is that the charge for wireless service provided income for Information Technologies and it is now unclear how the loss of income is being covered.

Professor Brooks reported that the Blackboard contract was up for renewal at a cost of approximately \$500,000 - \$600,000 a year, but the faculty has no control over whether the contract should be renewed because this decision was made at the Central Administration level and it decided that all of the campuses will use the same system. He stated that he believes the Blackboard contract will be renewed, but it may only be renewed for one or two years. Professor Brooks reported that the computer operations at the other Big Ten schools were reviewed and none of them had a consistently used course management system.

Professor Brooks stated that one of the more troubling issues that was discussed by the ITSC is the reorganization of the IS personnel. He pointed out that the plan to eliminate 13 positions was clearly being planned but the ITSC was not asked to provide any kind of input into this decision. He stated that the result of the firings was extraordinarily disruptive and the ITSC hopes to have greater input into these kinds of decisions. He stated that the lack of consultation with the ITSC in regards to funding and control is problematical.

Professor Eskridge asked how the ITSC can improve its communication with the administration. Professor Brooks stated that one fundamental problem is that we have 25 IS departments on campus and work is being done to consolidate these departments. He noted that there has been some success with this but the response from administration is that these are very delicate situations that need to be dealt with carefully. He noted that it is a complicated problem with history on both sides of the issue, but he thinks the faculty was not invited to participate until it was too late in some of the decisions that have been made about these consolidations.

Professor Chouinard, Mathematics, noted that he is retiring this summer and has become aware of an issue with old computers. He pointed out that some of these old computers could have social security numbers on them and he asked how the university is dealing with this issue and whether faculty members can turn these computers in. Professor Brooks stated that he does not know of any systematic approach to this problem. He noted that the IS person for his department takes care of discarding old computers. Coordinator Griffin pointed out that old equipment not wanted by a department or college anymore needs to go to inventory and she knows that there are computer programs that can erase all information on hard drives. Professor Brooks stated that he will bring the issue up with the ITSC and will let the Faculty Senate President know of the Committee's recommendation.

Professor Zlotnik asked if there will be a transition into a new course management system in two years. Professor Brooks stated that Blackboard will be in existence for as long as the contract is renewed, even if new course management systems are available. He pointed out that there was a course management system created at UNL but the university withdrew its support of this system. He noted that had this system been retained, changes and addition to it could have been done by our own personnel without the high costs associated with making programs to these kinds of systems. He pointed out that once again the ITSC was not able to provide input into this decision.

5.4 Committee on Committees (Professor Creighton)

Professor Creighton reported that the Committee on Committees (CoC) met last week to review the list of committees that needed to replace outgoing faculty members. She stated that there was an ample list of volunteers this year, but as the report shows, there are disturbing statistics that show a very steep drop in faculty members participating in campus committee service. She asked the Senators to help stress the importance of serving on committees and noted that it is a rewarding experience.

Professor Carlson noted that in 1999, 137 people volunteered to serve on committees but this year only 64 people volunteered. He asked what the percentage is of seats that were not filled on committees because of the decline in volunteers. Coordinator Griffin stated that she did not have this figure but knows that there were some committees that had open faculty positions. She noted that when there are not enough volunteers, the members of the CoC start suggesting people who they think would be good committee members. However, these people have to be contacted and many times they are not willing to serve. Professor Creighton noted that everyone is busy with their jobs but the committee work is important.

Secretary Shea pointed out that the lack of faculty willing to serve on committees is an ongoing problem and he thinks there are several main reasons for this problem. He stated that one of the problems was pointed out in a committee report presented today in that many of the committees have very little authority in what happens at the university. There is also not enough support from administration and recognition of the faculty for their participation on committees. He questioned what the incentive is for a faculty member to serve on committees. Professor Creighton suggested that this is a question that the Chancellor should have to answer.

Secretary Shea questioned how much shared governance there really is on campus and how much is the Senate involved in governance. Professor Neal agreed that there is little incentive in serving on committees and pointed out that it is difficult to tell a junior faculty member that they should get involved with serving on committees.

Professor Creighton asked if the Senators feel like they have any say in shared governance. She noted that service is required in order to get tenure. Professor Marks agreed with the sentiment that there is reluctance to serve on committees because they have little input into shared governance. He suggested that when the solicitation for volunteers is sent out that information be provided on what the committees have done in the past year. Coordinator Griffin asked how this information should be distributed. She pointed out that if she sends out an email message that is too long, most faculty members will not take the time to read through it.

Professor Creighton stated that she has found that serving on committees is rewarding and provides an opportunity to meet other people on campus that you would not otherwise meet. She stated that as a junior faculty member she found it rewarding to connect to others on campus.

Professor Carlson noted that his contract does not state that he has to serve on the Faculty Senate and his work on the Senate goes into a nebulous area under community service which some faculty members can be penalized for doing. He pointed out that the Senate has never really looked at the current operating system to see how significant decisions are made on campus. He noted that the Academic Planning Committee is supposed to have input into the formulation of the budget, but it cannot provide input because it receives the budget information after decisions have already been made. He stated that we need to understand the system that is being used to know how we can plug ourselves into the process of making decisions. Professor Neal stated that one way to get greater faculty input is to have Senators speak at department meetings to inform faculty members what is occurring on campus and with the administration. President LaCost agreed that the Senators are a conduit for providing and gathering information and Senators should be asked to be put on departmental meeting agendas on a regular basis. She stated that Senators need to bring issues to their departments that are being discussed in the Senate.

President LaCost noted that the Academic Planning Committee, and some other committees responsibilities are to advise administrators, but this is not possible if the committees are not invited to participate. She stated

that the main goal of the Executive Committee this year was to be pro active in efforts when joining the CIC, yet the Faculty Senate, and the faculty in general was not invited to discuss the change in the credit hour requirement. Secretary Shea noted that another example is the recent restructuring of Graduate Studies. He stated that the Executive Committee had absolutely no knowledge that this was even being considered until it was already done. He asked why there isn't any consultation with the Faculty Senate on issues such as this.

Professor Ruchala suggested that the Executive Committee should gather information from schools in the Big Ten that have a strong faculty governance structure. She believes that the University of Wisconsin is one of these schools and thought that the CIC could possibly help us get this information. She stated that the Senate should consider what can be done to make the committees stronger and how we can respond when we hear things late in the game. She pointed out that the more we can document incidences of being informed after the fact, the more we can articulate a response and have a dialogue with the administration on this issue. Secretary Shea pointed out that even at the CIC conference there was little time allocated to discussing faculty governance. President LaCost stated that those campuses that are unionized have a better place at the table when providing input on decisions. She noted that the Executive Committee meets once a week and whenever the Committee meets with the Chancellor or Vice Chancellors it asks what the upcoming issues are, but often little information is provided.

5.5 Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report (President LaCost)

LaCost reported that the Senate Executive Committee met with many people during the year and she suggested that the Senators review the report. She asked for any questions and suggested that anyone with additional comments should send an email message to either herself or Coordinator Griffin.

6.0 Unfinished Business

No unfinished business was discussed.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Student Bereavement Policy

LaCost reported that the motion to approve the Student Bereavement Policy comes from the Executive Committee. Coordinator Griffin noted that ASUN approached the Executive Committee with the request to approve a Student Bereavement Policy. Professor Peterson stated that debate on the motion will take place at the next meeting but he wanted to say that he is very troubled with having a stand-alone policy and does not like it. He stated that he wants to encourage the Senators to look at the Class Attendance policy because he believes the Bereavement Policy can be added to this existing policy. President LaCost state that this is a good suggestion and the motion will be discussed at the next Senate meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, April 24, 2:30 p.m. in the East Campus Union, Great Plains Room. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, and Patrick Shea, Secretary.