

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Adenwalla, Belli, Buan, Franco Cruz, Dawes, Fech, Hanrahan, Peterson, Purcell, Renaud, Vakilzadian

Absent: Leiter

Date: Tuesday, October 23, 2018

Location: 203 Alexander 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 (*Hanrahan*)

2.0 Chancellor Green/EVC Plowman/VC Boehm

2.1 Office of Executive Vice Chancellor Reviewing Student Credit Hour by Each Professor? Why?

Hanrahan reported that he heard from administrators that the Executive Vice Chancellor's office was looking at each individual faculty member's teaching record: the number of classes, number of students in each class, and credit hours produced. EVC Plowman stated that this is not happening, nor are there plans to obtain this information. She pointed out that what is being considered are college and department guidelines pertaining to workload for faculty members. She noted that the number of courses being taught by faculty members is being compared amongst the colleges to see if there is a variance in the workload for faculty members. Hanrahan stated that he was informed that the drilling down to faculty production levels was in conjunction with the RCM model. EVC Plowman noted that as the RCM budget model is considered, there will be formulas developed by which decisions will be made on how to allocate some of the state resources, but the campus is far away from determining these formulas. She pointed out that a consultant, who has experience in helping universities transition to a RCM budget model, is first going to be engaged to help us. She said that many other universities with a RCM budget model have made credit hour production and number of majors a part of their formula, but research and creativity projects have to be factored into any formula we might develop.

Renaud stated that some of the smaller colleges, especially those where creative projects are an essential part of a faculty member's responsibilities, are worried that they will be negatively impacted because the projects do not necessarily bring in a lot of revenue. EVC Plowman stated that faculty will have input into developing a formula, but we are at least a year away from beginning this. Adenwalla asked how faculty will provide input. EVC Plowman stated that there will probably be a taskforce that will work on developing the formula and the taskforce will include faculty members. She pointed out that the decision will not go to the faculty for a vote. She noted that we are at least three years away from the budget model being implemented, and the plan is to run a pilot model for a

year before the new model would be used. She reported that there will be a working group that will examine the budget model as it is piloted.

Renaud asked what the ultimate goal is of the change in the budget model. EVC Plowman pointed out that colleges need to have an incentive for growth, and there are colleges, such as Journalism and Mass Communications, which is growing in enrollment and faculty, but the budget has not been adjusted for that growth. She noted that the colleges would maintain a strategic portion of their current budget, but the colleges would have responsibility for their own budget.

Renaud stated that in the past, credit hour production was reviewed, but no additional resources were given to teach larger classes or more sections. EVC Plowman pointed out that every college and department is being asked to grow, but we need to find a better way to allocate our resources. Renaud asked if some colleges will lose funds while others get more. EVC Plowman stated that her hope is that whenever we are ready to implement a new method it will be done without reducing budgets from where they are currently.

Hanrahan noted that interdisciplinary research groups were created which have tenured faculty members. He cautioned that there is a concern amongst these groups that a member's department might be so negatively impacted that one of the faculty members might decide to leave the university putting the whole group in jeopardy of losing their grant funding. EVC Plowman pointed out that we want more interdisciplinary research groups and she appreciates hearing this kind of concern because this is an important factor that will need to be considered as the budget model is developed.

Purcell asked if there are rogue people in administration who might be getting this drilled-down information on faculty members. EVC Plowman stated that she did not know of anyone. She pointed out that the whole process of looking into revising the budget model was slowed down considerably while the university dealt with budget cuts. She reported that the campus will not fully change to an RCM budget model, rather it will be a hybrid model. Adenwalla asked if the budget model shift is only for UNL. EVC Plowman said yes.

Adenwalla asked if the RCM budget model is related to the university shifting money away from UNL and giving it to UNK and UNO. Chancellor Green noted that we did receive a smaller portion of state dollars which began with this fiscal year, but the proposed RCM model is not a result of the reallocation of university funding.

2.2 Update on Ombudspersons

EVC Plowman noted that she and VC Boehm are waiting to hear that the Faculty Senate endorses the plan to hire ombudspersons. She reported that she and VC Boehm are each contributing funds to create two new part-time faculty ombudspersons, one from IANR, and one from outside IANR. She stated that ideally they would like to have one female and one male and faculty members could go to either ombudsman to help faculty navigate issues with someone who is not an administrator. She reported that Associate

VC Walker and Associate VC Bischoff are working together on developing the ombudspersons positions and the idea is to have people in place by the end of the year.

Peterson asked if these positions will be half-time. EVC Plowman stated that they will be one-quarter time. She noted that the people could even be emeriti faculty members, and the plan is for the ombudspersons to meet once a month with the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor, Vice Chancellor of IANR, and the President of the Faculty Senate.

VC Boehm noted that the deans were asked to provide comments regarding the faculty ombudspersons. The deans support this initiative and neither Associate VC Walker nor Associate VC Bischoff received any feedback, but they would like to have the position approved through the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. He reported that the training the ombudspersons would need and their salaries would be augmented in a fair and equitable way.

Peterson pointed out that having the ombudspersons could help alleviate pressure on the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee and Panel. He noted that serving on a special committee is a huge burden for faculty members and it would help if problems could be handled before they reached the stage of needing to go to the ARRC. VC Boehm stated that it would be a great question to ask if universities that have had an ombudsperson have seen a decrease in formal grievance cases.

2.3 Clarification on proposed changes to Regents Bylaw 4.4.5. Why is it being changed and not being removed, and what is the status of the resolution giving Extension Educators longer notice of termination?

Chancellor Green reported that at the recent Board of Regents meeting that language was reported to revise the Bylaws to clean up the language in regards to Extension personnel for inclusion on the December 2018 Board of Regents agenda, but there has been confusion concerning the way it is written. He noted that Central Administration proposed replacing the language of Bylaw 4.4.5 by explaining the Extension personnel correctly, and this included information regarding the support staff who are paid through the county.

Purcell pointed out that the Faculty Senate's resolution to eliminate Bylaw 4.4.5 did not even refer to the support staff because they are employed by the county, not the University. The resolution related to Extension Educators who are University of Nebraska-Lincoln faculty. She noted also that the recent proposed revisions lead people to believe that County Extension Boards have decision-making authority which is incorrect. She pointed out that the new proposed language does not indicate that Extension Educators are faculty. VC Boehm agreed that the new proposed language does not go far enough in defining Extension Educators as faculty.

Chancellor Green noted that the Executive Committee is asking that language needs to be included in the Regents' Bylaws that Extension Educators are faculty members. Hanrahan asked if this will be proposed as a resolution to Central Administration.

Chancellor Green stated that he will further discuss the clarification with NU Provost Susan Fritz.

Belli asked for clarification on the Extension Assistant positions. VC Boehm noted that Extension is funded by the state, federal government, and county. He noted that there are 182 Extension Educators working in seven focus areas and the Extension Assistants provide support for the Extension Educators. Belli asked if the Extension Assistants are considered University staff. VC Boehm said yes, they are university staff. Belli asked if the Extension Assistants have a special appointment. Purcell stated that they are considered managerial/professional and have different responsibilities than Extension Educators. Fech pointed out that there are three different types of Extension Assistants and they can be funded from three different sources which causes problems because they have different benefits creating inconsistency issues.

Hanrahan asked what happened to the Faculty Senate's resolution to change the length of termination notice for Extension Educators. He pointed out that currently Extension Educators can be terminated with a 90-day notice and the Senate proposed that fully promoted Extension Educators be given a year notice of termination, the same as Professors of Practice, a 6-month notice for Associate Extension Educators, and 90-day notice for Assistant Extension Educators. Chancellor Green reported that this language was not added into the proposed revisions. He noted that he approved the recommendation in 2016, but it was not advanced at that time. Purcell reported that the Senate Executive Committee has asked the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee to resurrect this concern and wants efforts to begin again. Chancellor Green suggested that restarting the process would be the appropriate thing to do.

2.4 Clarification on proposed revisions to Regents Policies 4.3.2 regarding tenure and continuous appointment reports.

Hanrahan asked for clarification regarding the proposed change of language in the Regents Bylaws on tenure recommendations. Chancellor Green stated that the revisions are basically housekeeping changes that reflect the current process of reporting tenure decisions. He noted that the Board of Regents receives an annual report from the campuses listing faculty members who have been granted continuous appointments during the previous academic year. He stated that the substantive change is the removal of language that states that the UNL Bylaws require the UNL Chancellor to inform the Board of Regents if the recommendations for continuous appointment differ from the recommendations of a dean or director in tenure cases.

2.5 Plans to improve faculty development leave?

Vakilzadian pointed out that the university's faculty development leave only provides full salary for six months, but if a faculty member chooses to take a year's development leave that salary has to be spread out over 12 months. He noted that costs of living and travel are not included and many faculty members choose to stay in Lincoln rather than continuing their development leave elsewhere because these costs are not supported. He asked if there were plans to improve the development leave.

EVC Plowman stated that she would like to be able to improve development leaves, but the needed resources are not available. In regards to the request for the university to cover travel expenses during a faculty development leave, she noted that some colleges might be able to provide additional financial assistance for a development leave.

Vakilzadian asked why faculty members cannot get paid by another institution if they are on a faculty development leave. Peterson pointed out that the Board of Regents policy is to not allow the faculty member to have a net gain in salary if they are getting paid by another institution while on leave. He stated that it would be interesting to see how many faculty members who are on faculty development leave choose to stay in Lincoln rather than travel to another university.

Buan pointed out that mini sabbaticals would be helpful for faculty members with young children, and beneficial for faculty members who have recently been promoted to associate professor. EVC Plowman asked how a mini sabbatical would affect the individual's teaching load. Buan stated that this would need to be worked out in the department. EVC Plowman suggested that a taskforce could be created with input from Associate VC Walker and Associate VC Bischoff to explore the possibility of providing more flexibility to allow for a mini sabbatical while being expense neutral. Franco Cruz suggested that guidelines be developed, particularly in respects to funding travel for development leaves so the faculty member does not incur the cost of travelling. EVC Plowman wondered if compensation for mini sabbaticals could fall under the outside consulting policies.

EVC Plowman stated that she is open to revisiting the issue of development leaves and suggested that a taskforce could look at other university's to compare their development leave policies. Hanrahan agreed that a task force was needed and would follow up with EVC Plowman on this issue.

2.6 Revenue projections for the state and budget implications.

Chancellor Green noted that the revenue trends continue to look good and the State is up 5 ½ % in revenue above previously forecasted levels, but the Forecasting Board is meeting later this week and we will have to wait to see if the trend is continuing. He stated that if the trend continues through the end of this year the university will go into the Legislative session with a different starting point than the last two sessions and will not have to immediately be addressing a negative current year budget situation. He pointed out that two unknowns that could impact the State's budget are the future impacts from the trade tariffs and the proposed Medicaid expansion. He stated that the University was requesting a 3% budget increase for the first year of the next biennium (FY 20), and 3.7% increase for FY 2021. He pointed out that these increases only fund some base costs for increasing salaries.

Renaud asked if out-of-state student enrollment was affecting our budget. Chancellor Green reported that we are actually down 1 percent in our total enrollment, but we have the smallest decrease in enrollment in the University system. EVC Plowman pointed out that our out-of-state freshmen student enrollment is up. Chancellor Green stated that

where we saw the biggest decrease in enrollment is with international students, and in graduate enrollment.

Chancellor Green reported that when the budget was implemented this year by the Board of Regents the Board gave President Bounds the authority to increase tuition mid-year if it is needed to address mid-year rescissions. He noted that for the last two years the University had to deal with mid-term rescissions. He stated that a mid-year tuition increase has not been done before and we hope that it will not be needed. He pointed out that changing the tuition level mid-year creates difficulties not only for the students, it is a huge process for the University and encompasses many changes involving many different offices.

Chancellor Green reported that conversations with the Governor and the Appropriations Committee Chair are more positive than last year with respect to the budget.

Belli asked if the international student drop is in undergraduate students or graduate students and is this a national trend. Chancellor Green stated that the majority of our enrollment decline was in graduate students (69%) and that 82% of that drop was in international students. He noted that we graduated an unusually large number of masters' and doctoral students last year and we have not been able to replace all of those students. He reported that nationally international student enrollment is down. Adenwalla stated that the number of visas being denied has increased. VC Boehm confirmed that this is correct.

2.7 Is enrollment of lower income students down?

Chancellor Green reported that EVC Plowman checked and the number of Pell eligible students is flat. He stated that we lost about \$1.5 of our previous \$6.5 million in revenue from the College Bound Nebraska program this year and it has impacted how much funding we can offer to new College Bound Students. He noted that some of the funding has been replaced with the Husker's Scholars fund.

Renaud asked if the number of high school students is decreasing. Chancellor Green stated that the number of graduating high school students remains fairly flat, but he does not know how many students have chosen to attend the community colleges or the influence of the very low unemployment rate in Nebraska and nationally. He pointed out that the State is in need of skilled trades and some students may be opting to go to trade schools rather than to the University. Renaud asked if there are areas where we are more successful in recruiting students. Chancellor Green stated that this is variable. He noted that we are up in out-of-state students in all of the colleges and IANR enrollment had an increase in international and domestic students. VC Boehm reported that our strategic enrollment plans are at the unit level where we are targeting our distinctive programs that students cannot find elsewhere. He noted that attention is being given to grow these programs.

Renaud asked if we are changing our recruiting plan since our enrollment numbers are down. Chancellor Green stated that our resident Nebraska enrollment did slightly decline

and there will be heavier recruitment efforts in Lincoln and Omaha. He reported that ground work is being laid to have discussions with Legislators regarding how much tuition the University remits. He pointed out that scholarship programs such as Regents' Scholars, are remissions, i.e., we receive no tuition from those students. He noted that most states have programs that provide state aid for students, but Nebraska does not have this. Purcell asked if the August 25th incident involving academic freedom may have impacted enrollment. Chancellor Green pointed out that there is really no way of knowing the impacts if this isolated incident had any impact on enrollment.

2.8 Issues on the Horizon

Chancellor Green stated that the first Town Hall meeting for this academic year will be held on October 29th. He reported that he will be discussing the N150 Commission report, and noted that the final report is scheduled to be completed by December 1. He stated that he will also provide a follow-up about the Gallup report as well as other campus level updates.

Chancellor Green stated that the interviews for the four candidates for Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Inclusion are now complete and feedback on the candidates is being sought. He stated that the administration is pleased with the candidates and hopefully a decision will be made soon.

Chancellor Green reported that the search for the Dean of Arts & Sciences is on track and he is pleased with the level of applicants that applied for the Dean of CASNR.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Big Ten Academic Alliance Conference (BTAA)

Hanrahan reported that he and Belli would be attending the BTAA Conference in Iowa City this weekend.

3.2 National Council of Faculty Senates

Purcell reported that she along with Buan, Vakilzadian, and Past President Woodman would be attending the National Council of Faculty Senates in Texas on October 27th.

4.0 Approval of October 16, 2018 Minutes

Hanrahan asked if there were any further revisions to the October 16th meeting. Hearing none he asked for unanimous consent to approve the minutes. The Executive Committee agreed to approve the minutes.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Resolution to Support NU Budget Request

Hanrahan reported that he is still waiting to receive information relating to the resolution to support the NU budget request and requested that the resolution be tabled until the needed information is provided. Motion approved by the Executive Committee.

5.2 Update on Ad Hoc Committee Addressing the AAUP Censure

Hanrahan reported that he met with EVC Plowman and Associate VC Walker and presented the charge for the Ad Hoc Committee that the Executive Committee developed. He noted that they were fine with the membership, although they felt that it would be stacked with Senate representatives. He stated that they also had some issues they thought should be addressed, one was to create a taskforce to develop a timeline for the Ad Hoc Committee and to define the charge. He suggested that the taskforce could consist of himself, Associate VC Walker, and Professor Schleck.

Purcell moved that the Ad Hoc Committee should follow the charge that was put forth by the Senate Executive Committee. Belli stated that he thinks the charge should be limited to addressing the AAUP censure because some of the recommendations are beyond the scope of what this Ad Hoc Committee should do. Hanrahan stated that he would entertain a motion to amend the Ad Hoc Committee charge and to have a three person task force to define more clearly the criteria of the charges and to create a timeline. He asked for unanimous consent to withdraw the motion initially moved by Purcell, and requested a new motion be made to create the three-person task force. Purcell objected. Belli moved to amend the initial motion moved by Purcell to strike the two recommendations that he indicated. Motion seconded by Renaud and approved by the Committee.

Buan suggested that a timeline be created. Adenwalla moved for Hanrahan to work with Professor Schleck to develop a timeline that would take into consideration the AAUP's schedule. Purcell seconded the motion. Motion was approved.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Resolution on Faculty Apportionment

The Executive Committee agreed to move the agenda item to next week due to lack of time.

6.2 Response to ACLU Concerns about Lactation Spaces at UNL

Buan reported that the Chancellor received a letter from the ACLU regarding the lack of lactation rooms in buildings on campus. She noted that the Chancellor's Commission on the Status of Women (CCSW) has been working on improving friendly family practices on campus which includes the issue of the lack of lactation rooms. She stated that another problem is that supervisors have not been trained about the rights of staff members which allows them to take necessary lactation breaks.

Buan reported that the University has agreed to improve websites by providing an online map of lactation spaces on campus. She noted that in the past when buildings were renovated or built a lactation space was not considered. She stated that the family friendly practices would require that lactation spaces must be provided in any new or renovated building.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:39 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, October 30, 2018 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 203 Alexander Building.

The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Lorna Dawes, Secretary.