

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Belli, Buan, Franco Cruz, Fech, Hanrahan, Kolbe, Minter, Peterson, Purcell, Vakilzadian, Woodman

Absent: Adenwalla

Date: Tuesday, April 30, 2019

Location: 201 Canfield 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 (*Hanrahan*)

Hanrahan called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

2.0 Approval of April 23, 2019 Minutes

Hanrahan asked if there was any discussion or revisions to the minutes. Hearing none he asked for approval of the minutes. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Faculty Senate Rules & Bylaws Committee

Hanrahan reported that Senators Ibrayeva, Billesbach, and Vuran have agreed to serve on the Senate Rules & Bylaws Committee. He stated that one of the changes they may consider is the start date for new Senators.

4.0 Chancellor Green/VC Boehm

4.1 Leadership Transition Plans for Executive Vice Chancellor Position

Chancellor Green reported that he has met with the team of Academic Affairs who report to the Executive Chancellor, the senior leadership cabinet of the campus, and all of the deans to lay out the plan for the transition since EVC Plowman is leaving the university. He reported that EVC Plowman will complete her work here at UNL by the end of May and will assume her role as Chancellor of the University of Tennessee-Knoxville on July 1.

Chancellor Green stated that his plan is to move forward with a national search immediately. Hanrahan asked what the hiring date goal is. Chancellor Green stated that he would like to have someone in place by January 1. He reported that a search firm is being vetted now, and he has asked deans for nominees for the search committee and is asking for nominees from the Executive Committee. He anticipates that there will be approximately 25 members on the search committee. He stated that he thinks we will be able to attract an excellent pool of candidates and would like to find someone who is committed to the University and is interested in a long-term leadership position.

Chancellor Green stated that he will be appointing an interim EVC in the meantime and he expects to announce who that person will be by the end of the week. He pointed out that it is his intention that the interim will not be a candidate for the position.

4.2 President's Search

Hanrahan stated that he was surprised to read Central Administration's announcement in the press asking for feedback from the public about what qualifications they would like to see in the next President, but the faculty have not been directly asked to provide feedback. Chancellor Green noted that when the announcement went out it was his understanding that there would be listening sessions on each of the campuses, but he does not know if Central Administration has scheduled any of these meetings.

Hanrahan asked if faculty members from the campuses will be included on the search committee. Chancellor Green stated that he assumes so, and in the previous President search a two committee process was used and there were a significant number of faculty members involved. He pointed out that the new State regulation will allow the University to select a single candidate for consideration. He noted that he is continuing to push hard for the President search to be underway because the University needs to continue with the progress it has been making.

Belli asked if the Board of Regents is planning on naming an interim. Chancellor Green stated that he believes they will announce an interim. He pointed out that President Bounds' appointment does not end until mid-August.

4.3 Service Delivery Initiative

Chancellor Green noted that he has received a copy of the letter sent from the chairs of the College of Arts & Sciences (CAS) regarding their concern with the plan to create business centers. Hanrahan pointed out that there has been poor communication about what is happening with the initiative which is creating confusion and concern.

Chancellor Green reported that at the Town Hall meeting EVC Plowman laid out the timeline and the approach that is being taken for the proposed plan. He noted that it is clear that we are still working towards a model and what it will look like, and a meeting was planned which would involve business officers to begin the next stage of discussion. However, there was the perception that college chairs and administrators were being locked out of the meeting and would not be able to provide input. He pointed out chairs and administrators will be able to provide input, but we are not at that stage of the process yet.

Hanrahan noted that there is a lot of concern amongst the faculty, particularly what the plan will look like and what the final product will be. In particular, there is considerable concern about the management of grants, especially for CAS which has numerous departments and where there is a significant amount of interdisciplinary research. Minter pointed out that there is also concern about whether the staff lines will be pulled from the colleges and put into the business centers which raises questions regarding reporting lines

and how issues are resolved. Belli noted that the University of Kansas went to a similar model and the feedback of how well the model works has been consistently negative.

Buan noted that IANR went through the business centralization process and it has worked well. She noted that people in the business centers have been very helpful and the speed of getting work done has increased. She stated that there is a great deal of cross-discipline research occurring in IANR and the handling of the grants has been going well. She suggested that it might be helpful if there was an organizational flowchart that would show how the business activities would work.

VC Boehm reported that he was formerly at an institution that went to a service center model, and he emphasized that managing the dialogue about the change is crucial. He noted that while some people are open to the change, others will dig their heels in.

VC Boehm reported that Huron Consulting identified 125 different business processes here and currently 1,000 people are involved in the transactions, but it is estimated that only 350 people are needed to do the transactions. He stated that an idea is to have a third of the staff pivot into the business service centers which will be distributed across the campuses. He noted that these people would report to Human Resources or Business & Finance. He stated that strategic business and Human Resources functions will be retained in the colleges. He reported that the end result would be to have a concentrated focus group that processes transactions which would provide greater expertise. He noted that the SDI team is trying to formulate the plan alongside the RCM model.

Hanrahan asked who is on the SDI team. VC Boehm stated that this information has been publicized and can be found on the Office of Executive Vice Chancellor's website (<https://executivevc.unl.edu/service-delivery-initiative>). He noted that the Academic Planning Committee will be an excellent team to examine the proposed SDI and RCM plans.

Belli questioned whether the SDI plan would create positions that people would not be interested in doing because of the repetitive nature of the work. He stated that he thinks professional staff get a level of satisfaction from seeing the complete process unfold, rather than just bits and pieces. He noted that the professional staff are well appreciated within a unit and he questioned whether they would feel the same if they are moved into a centralized unit. VC Boehm stated that there are some people who like doing a variety of tasks, but others are feeling pulled in so many different directions with multiple tasks that they feel overwhelmed. He noted that having a core of individuals who are recognized for their expertise could help release some of the bureaucracy for the approval process. He pointed out that we are still very early in the process of determining what we need to do and it is unfortunate that there is so much pushback at this stage.

Hanrahan reported that there is concern that the process seems to be moving very quickly and that the faculty are finding out information after the fact. He pointed out that it is his understanding that someone is already being hired to lead the centers. VC Boehm stated that the only person who is being hired is someone to help coordinate the SDI effort. He

stated that the person being hired is to help coordinate the dialogues about the proposed plan. He pointed out that some of the same people working on the RCM model are working on the SDI and this is in addition to the work they normally do. He pointed out that it is the leaders of the SDI teams that requested that someone be hired to coordinate the effort. Belli suggested that better communication would clearly help the faculty to understand what is going on and it might help foster greater trust for the chairs and directors.

Buan pointed out that federal changes are occurring frequently that can have impacts with grants, and having centralized business centers would allow specific training for staff who would work consistently with these grants. She noted that this would help ensure that we are in compliance with the federal regulations.

Hanrahan stated that it looks like the faculty are not being brought in until the end of the process. VC Boehm stated that the Academic Planning Committee, which has eight elected faculty members, will receive updates regularly on both the RCM and SDI efforts. Hanrahan suggested that it would be good to have administrators speak to the Faculty Senate and to provide written information on the efforts. He noted that rumors are getting started because people are unsure of what is happening. Hanrahan stated that consistent and frequent messaging is needed so people are getting the same information from the same group of people. Minter stated that providing information on the timeline would be helpful, and Kolbe suggested that letting the chairs know that the position being hired is only to help with the planning process.

Belli suggested that there be communication regarding the number of business centers being planned and who these centers will serve. He pointed out that the moving from a smaller scale business operation to a larger scale operating could mean that some of the services faculty are used to getting now may not exist in the same manner. VC Boehm reported that no decisions have been made on what will be the appropriate number of business centers.

Minter pointed out that it is useful to have a staff member right down the hall to help out. She noted that CAS runs on a temporary instruction model, and frequently a lecturer may need to be hired quickly to accommodate the need for a new section of a course. She stated that to reconfigure how to deal with that kind of quick budget change is a significant task. VC Boehm noted that not a single head, center director, chair, or administrator is looking to interfere with the university's momentum, and the campus is closely examining our processes to see if efficiencies can be gained and unneeded bureaucracy removed to help us advance our goals.

4.4 Computer Science & Engineering - When will decision be made?

Hanrahan reported that faculty members are saying that a decision has been made about moving the CSE department to one college, and then another says a decision hasn't been made. He asked what is being planned.

Chancellor Green stated that dialogue has been occurring with the Executive Advisory Committee of CSE about changing the department into a School of Computing. He pointed out that additional investments would be needed and one of the goals is to increase the number of faculty in software engineering to meet workforce needs. He pointed out questions such as how the school would be developed and what it should look like would need to be considered. He stated that EVC Plowman has met with the CSE Executive Advisory Committee twice and has worked with the faculty. He noted that the question has been raised what the ideal model would be for CSE, and is more rational to be in a single college rather than being in two colleges (CAS and Engineering) such as it is now. He reported that we are investing in creating a school with a \$6 million initial investment and a \$2 ½ million increase to the department's permanent budget. He stated that the funds are to be used for hiring new faculty members and elevating the salaries of current faculty members. Purcell asked where the funds are coming from. Chancellor Green stated that the funds are coming out of the old distance education funds.

Vakilzadian asked if other departments would become part of the School of Computing. Chancellor Green noted that the School would take CSE as it exists today and elevate it into a school. Hanrahan asked if the department will remain in CAS if that is what the majority of the faculty members want. Chancellor Green stated that is unknown at this time. Hanrahan pointed out that there is concern that moving CSE out of CAS will impact other departments in the college, will make collaboration more difficult, and could impact NSF funding. Chancellor Green noted that these concerns are being considered, although there is no reason to believe that the location of the department would prevent collaborations from occurring or impact extramural funding.

Chancellor Green pointed out that any change will take some time. He noted that conversations about the idea to elevate the department have been occurring for over a year. Hanrahan asked if there is any consideration to having a separate standing program such as what Carnegie Mellon has. Chancellor Green noted this idea was actually proposed by the chair of CSE three years ago, but he is not in favor of it because it would add another level of college bureaucracy. He stated that a school could be within a college without the need to duplicate an administrative structure.

Belli asked why the best idea is to locate the department in a single college. Chancellor Green stated that the dynamics that have occurred over the years indicate that the department would be better served if it was in a single college. He pointed out that a good portion of the department's budget comes from the Engineering College.

Minter asked what the impacts would be for undergraduate enrollment. She stated that Engineering students seem to have to commit early in their college career because of all of the course requirements. Chancellor Green stated that he does not see this as an issue because this kind of situation already occurs (one example is Biochemistry where students can major through CAS or CASNR, yet the department is fully funded and administered in CASNR/IANR).

Hanrahan asked what moving CSE to one college will do to credit hour production with the RCM budget model. VC Boehm stated that whichever department provides the instructor for the course would receive credit hour production, but everyone wins if it is a vibrant course. He pointed out it has not been determined yet with the RCM model whether credit hour production will be considered. Hanrahan noted that there is concern from some in CAS that moving CSE to Engineering will drain resources from CAS. Minter stated that the college has made strategic decisions over the years to invest in CSE, investments that could not, then, be made in other departments. Those investments are lost to the college. VC Boehm pointed out that we are a comprehensive Research 1 university and decisions have to be made to allocate strategic resources. He noted that if we don't do this we could end up like MIT with a single-focused program.

Hanrahan asked if there is a timeline for implementing the School of Computer Science. Chancellor Green stated that CSE will be moved into one college, but when this will happen still needs to be determined. He noted that other factors, such as the new Engineering building and whether CSE wants to be housed in the building, will need to be part of the conversation.

Minter stated that it seems like the decision has already been made, and if faculty choose to stay in CAS they lose new space and big investments. So these meetings are just a way of making the change appear less controversial. Chancellor Green stated that he understands why CSE is in this situation given the history of what has occurred with the Engineering College. He pointed out that there should be one single computer science and engineering program at UNL, not multiple programs that are in different locations.

Purcell noted that when students are in CAS they are required to take four courses in languages, but the Engineering department does not have this requirement. Chancellor Green stated that there are curriculum issues that need to be considered. He stated that we have an opportunity to lead with the CSE department, but it will take a lot more investment to attain this goal.

4.5 Faculty Senate Executive Retreat

Hanrahan noted that EVC Plowman had suggested the idea that the Senate Executive Committee and the senior leadership team have a retreat during the summer to determine what the two groups could work on over the upcoming academic year. Chancellor Green stated that this is a good idea.

4.6 Proposed Changes to Teaching Evaluations

Hanrahan pointed out that another taskforce was formed and a pilot study using online teaching evaluations was conducted with about 5,000 students, yet the Faculty Senate was never contacted or asked to assist with the taskforce. He noted that while there were faculty members on the taskforce, none of them reported to the Faculty Senate about the proposed change and faculty on campus are hearing about this change after the fact and are not being as actively engaged as they should be. He stated that he is hearing a lot of concern from faculty members regarding the move to standardized questions and online teaching evaluations.

Chancellor Green stated that he is not intimately familiar with what has occurred, but he was shocked to learn that we do not have a consistent method of obtaining teaching evaluations. He noted that he has been at four different institutions and this is the only one that does not have a standard delivery mechanism for obtaining teaching evaluations. He pointed out that there should be some consistency with the instrument that will allow responses to questions tabulated in the same way. VC Boehm noted that there will be the same ten questions across the board, but departments will have the opportunity for customization and to add questions that would specifically apply to their courses.

Woodman reported that he has been a member of the taskforce and currently the taskforce is in the stage of development of the evaluation form. He noted that there will be a standard set of questions, but it would be a mistake to completely homogenize the evaluations for all university units. Latta Konecky pointed out that there appears to be two concerns. One has to do with the questions that will be used, and the other is the delivery method, paper versus online.

Belli stated that the faculty Senate has not even seen the common set of questions. He stated that faculty input is needed and the purpose for the change needs to be communicated to the faculty. He noted that it is important for departments to have the initial evaluation process and he has concerns that the process will become centralized. Zeleny pointed out that Regents Bylaws 4.6 states that teaching evaluations are part of a faculty member's evaluation and the evaluations are conducted in the departments, not at the central level.

Vakilzadian noted that it can be hard to get a consensus on evaluations. Chancellor Green noted that this is part of the consistency issue with our evaluation process. He reported that at some institutions students are required to complete a teaching evaluation on the last day of class.

Woodman pointed out that no policy decisions have been finalized yet. He stated that the goal is to end up with a tool for administering teaching evaluations and noted that 74% of the students responded in the pilot study. He stated that the taskforce feels that students should not be compelled or incentivized to complete the evaluation. Chancellor Green stated that additional pilots will be conducted before any decisions are made.

4.7 Reaction to Non-Tenure Track Faculty Forum

Chancellor Green stated that he thought the forum was very good and he was glad to be a part of it and that there was good administrative representation. He pointed out that there are obviously significant issues relative to lecturer appointments in particular, and he is committed to looking at these issues. He noted that there are just a few departments where the problem of compensation level is acute and needs to be addressed. He reported that these departments will be asked why more of the lecturer positions have not become Professors of Practice, and while he understands there is a complexity of issues, they need to be addressed.

4.8 N150 Call for a University Council - How would it operate?

Chancellor Green stated that this idea is very conceptual at this stage and there has not been much discussion on it. Hanrahan asked if such a Council would be a separate body from the Senate. Chancellor Green stated that this is unknown, and pointed out that there has been an ongoing conversation with the staff on the ability to have better representation. Purcell suggested that all parties, the Faculty Senate, UNOPA, and UAAD be included in the discussions. Franco Cruz asked what the need is for this idea, to incorporate representation from the staff. Chancellor Green stated that this is primarily the reason. He noted that having a Council that would represent the different people of the campus would certainly be different than the Faculty Senate.

VC Boehm reported that he has worked at an institution with a different model where there were separate councils for faculty, staff, students and administrators and members were elected from the councils to serve on a University Senate. However, he stated that he believes that we are doing a good job here, but suggested that there might be a need for some additional committees, particularly a finance committee consisting of faculty, staff, and administrators who understand the budget.

Chancellor Green pointed out that there are four Chancellor's Commissions which are structured differently in that they have three Councils: faculty, staff, and student councils. He suggested that a University Council could be similarly structured.

4.9 University Policy Dealing with FOIA Requests

Hanrahan asked what the university policy is for dealing with FOIA requests. He noted that there are several faculty members that have had FOIA requests made and even their personal pictures and other personal information on their computer were investigated.

Associate to the Chancellor Zeleny stated that information can be found at <https://registrar.unl.edu/academic-standards/policies/public-record-requests/>. He noted that public record requests are generally made by the news media and organizations. He stated that typically a specific word or name is used to filter the records to find discoverable records. He noted that the outcome of the requests are submitted to the general counsel. Chancellor Green stated that personal information in the public records is redacted.

Hanrahan stated that the issue is not that personal information is being released, but that it is being searched by someone at the University. Buan pointed out that many people think privacy and personnel laws protect them, but there is very little privacy if you use university computers. She stated that people need to be made aware of this. Associate to the Chancellor Zeleny noted that there is a memo of understanding that employees can use computers for some personal use. He stated that the University's General Counsel is very careful with any searches and would not release personal information. He pointed out that if there is university work on a person's personal computer, it could be subject to a FOIA request. Chancellor Green noted that as a public employee what you do on a computer relating to university business can be reviewed by a FOIA request.

5.0 New Business

5.1 RCM Committee Update (Peterson)

Peterson reported that the RCM committee will be meeting tomorrow, but at this time he has no further updates.

5.2 Faculty Names for EVC Search Committee

Hanrahan noted that about 15 faculty names will be nominated by the Executive Committee to serve on the search committee. He asked the Committee members to send them a list of names of faculty members who would be good to serve on the search committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:31 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, May 7, 2019 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in the City Campus Union, Heritage Room. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Joan Latta Konecky, Secretary.