

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Belli, Buan, Franco Cruz, Dawes, Hanrahan, Kolbe, Leiter, Peterson, Renaud, Vakilzadian

Absent: Adenwalla, Fech, Purcell

Guest: Pascha Stevenson, English

Date: Tuesday, February 19, 2019

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*)

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

2.0 Lecturer Salary Concerns

Stevenson stated that she asked Hanrahan if she could address the Executive Committee regarding the poor salaries that many long-time Lecturers receive. She noted that she has a 100% teaching assignment, yet engages in service work (she is a current Senator for her department), continues to publish, and has received an evaluation of 4.9 out of 5 for the last three years. She stated that her current FTE is .75 and she teaches 3 classes each semester yet only earns \$31,000 a year from the university. She pointed out that there are many Lecturers on campus who are in similar circumstances and if they are the only breadwinner in their family, they would be eligible for public assistance. She stated that she considers the issue to be a human rights and living wage matter.

Stevenson pointed out that non-tenure track faculty members are not asking for tenure lines and she understands that conditions vary greatly between non-tenure and tenure track faculty members. She noted that many non-tenure track faculty members are dedicated to the university and provide valuable work and service and they should be recognized for this work.

Stevenson stated that she has begun compiling information from some of the other Big Ten schools regarding compensation of non-tenure track faculty members and the information she has obtained shows that we pay the lowest out of five schools. She noted that the University of Michigan, where the cost of living index is 127, is the highest of the group and pays \$9,571 per class, but we only pay \$4,808 and our living index is 95.6. She noted that these figures are for non-tenure track faculty members in English, but information could be obtained for other disciplines as well. Hanrahan asked if the information was based strictly on Lecturers. Stevenson stated that this is correct.

Hanrahan pointed out that the midpoint of the salaries for the universities surveyed is approximately \$8,350.

Stevenson reported that her department has tremendous will and has tried to provide increases in salaries for Lecturers, but the increase has been denied at the Dean level. Renaud asked if anyone brought this issue up to the new incoming Dean when he was being interviewed. Stevenson stated that she did not know the answer to this question.

Peterson asked how many Lecturers are in the English department. Stevenson stated that there are 20. She noted that some of the Lecturers have a 4-4 teaching load. Peterson asked if there have been any discussions about moving some of the Lecturers into a Professor of Practice position. Stevenson reported that there has been some discussion, but there is concern that creating these positions can remove funds from tenure-track lines.

Leiter asked if Lecturers are considered to be temporary positions and filled by people who are looking for temporary work. Stevenson stated that she has talked to people at some of our peer institutions who have been in the position for more than a decade. She noted that the non-tenure track faculty members at a number of schools have been unionized. She pointed out that what is needed is a path to promotion for non-tenure track faculty members. Belli asked if she receives benefits. Stevenson stated that she does receive benefits based on her FTE.

Buan stated that in the STEM fields there are post docs and the expectation is that the position is for only five years and those individuals move on to other positions, usually at a different university, but sometimes to a different job classification at UNL. She asked if there is a similar path in English. Stevenson stated that there are some post docs in the Humanities, but she is not aware of the stipulations on these positions. She noted that the AAUP's latest numbers show that 74% of teaching done at a university is done by those who are not on a tenure track line, and the Humanities is over represented in this pool. Hanrahan pointed out that most post docs are paid through grants while Lecturers are paid with state funds. Belli asked where the funds come from to pay the Lecturers. Stevenson stated that typically the funds are from temporary funds. Kolbe stated that this is a separate pool in his college. Buan noted that funds for short-term lecturers could help cover the cost of temporarily replacing an employee who may be out on family leave, but it seems like some units use these funds to meet recurring teaching need.

Hanrahan pointed out that the original intent of the Lecturer was to be a temporary position, but the university has abused this intent and kept faculty members as Lecturers for many years. He noted that at Penn State, after a certain number of years a non-tenure track faculty member who has completed a number of years of continual service is automatically made an Assistant Professor of Practice or is moved into a tenure-track line. Buan pointed out that UNL's peer institutions for salary comparisons are not the Big Ten, but the Regents list of peer institutions. Peterson noted that some of the Big Ten schools are included in the Regents' list of peer institutions. Buan asked how the English Lecturers compare in salary to the Regents' peer group. Stevenson pointed out

that when you are at the bottom it is not really necessary to compare your salary to those at the top because the salaries for English Lecturers is hovering around the need for public assistance level. She stated that the salaries need to be compared to what is considered a living wage and what is fair and decent. She noted that most of the other universities have a compromise and a path for the non-tenure track faculty members, especially in the Humanities. She stated that the university needs to find a compromise to adequately pay and support these people. She pointed out that models of what can be done exist with the University of Michigan, Penn State, and the University of Maryland.

Hanrahan stated that the issue of salary and promotion should be brought to the attention of the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee. He stated that the Senate could take up the matter of establishing a path to promotion and some kind of guarantee of a renewal process.

Kolbe asked why Stevenson is involved with service and publishing when she has a 100% teaching apportionment. Stevenson stated that she is a service oriented person and she believes in acting on changes you want to achieve. She noted that she loves to write and do research which is why she publishes.

Vakilzadian asked how raises are given. Stevenson pointed out that non-tenure track faculty members typically don't receive raises. Vakilzadian asked what the starting salary is for English Lecturers. Stevenson reported that it is \$4,808 per class. Vakilzadian asked how large the classes are. Stevenson stated that she typically teaches 75 students per semester and grades over 1,000 pages a semester. Hanrahan asked if the English department pays a Lecturer more if they teach a large class. Stevenson stated that at a certain point the department considers a large number of students as two classes.

Franco Cruz asked why the salary increase was denied. Stevenson stated that as she understands it, the college wants the Lecturers to be compensated at the same level. Vakilzadian asked if Stevenson's contract is renewed each year. Stevenson stated that her contract is renewed every two years, but she goes through a merit review each year.

Stevenson reported that there will be a meeting of non-tenure track faculty members on campus which will be held in the Gaughan Multi-Cultural Center. She stated that the idea is to try and establish a coalition that could provide a collective voice that would enable them to speak to the administration. Kolbe pointed out that the faculty are continually being told that the campus needs to increase its enrollment and much of this growth will be on the backs of the Lecturers.

Buan questioned whether it would make sense to compensate Lecturers on a per student basis. Hanrahan stated that it would probably be easier to compensate on the number of classes. Peterson pointed out that salary increases go into a pool of salaries and increasing the salaries for non-tenure track faculty members would decrease the size of the pool. He stated that if Lecturer salaries are increased, it should be done with increasing the amount of funds in the pool. Buan pointed out that an opposite side of the argument is to not offer so many classes.

Hanrahan stated that he would entertain a motion for the Senate to address the promotion problem for Lecturers. Kolbe suggested that this be postponed until the non-tenure track survey is conducted. Belli stated that he thinks the issue of compensation will rise at the non-tenure track forum.

Hanrahan noted that a path to promotion would have to be put into the Bylaws, but he does not think that all of the campuses would need to approve this change because not all of the campuses have Lecturers. He suggested an ad hoc committee be created to look at the issue. Peterson moved that an ad hoc committee be created to draft a policy or recommendation for a path of promotion for Lecturers. Motion seconded by Belli. Motion was approved by the Executive Committee. Belli suggested that the ad hoc committee review the Best Practices Recommendations made by a previous committee of the Faculty Senate.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Huron Consulting Group Recommendations

Belli reported that he has learned that there is a report from the Huron Consulting Group that was hired to look at the different business practices on campus to see if efficiencies can be made. He stated that one of the recommendations is to create a single campus-wide business center for the entire UNL campus to run the business operations. He noted that several business leaders from UNL went to a university in Kansas to see how a central business center for the campus functioned. He pointed out that the UNL people were not impressed with the operation and stated that there were unfilled needs of daily activities. He stated that if a centralized model would be implemented it would have significant impact on the daily work of faculty members and would adversely impact undergraduate and graduate students as well. He stated that the idea threatens the sense of community within units and is consistent with the BRT efforts to have the faculty do more administrative tasks which does not fall into their roles. Buan pointed out that over centralization leads to more abuses and less accountability. She noted that the more contact time with employees there is, the more accountable they are for doing a good job. Hanrahan stated that a centralized business center in his college was implemented. It is unclear if this is providing improved or compatible service.

3.2 IANR Promotion & Tenure Committee

Hanrahan reported that he met with Associate VC Bischoff and explained that the College of Education and Human Sciences is not listed as a unit within IANR, and since the dean of CEHS is considered an IANR Dean, this needs to be included along with the promotion and tenure process bylaw change. Hanrahan reported that Bischoff said for faculty members in CEHS who have a greater percentage of their FTE in IANR would follow the proposed tenure and promotion process. He stated that he plans on bringing this up to VC Boehm when the Executive Committee meets with him next week.

3.3 Update on Ombudspersons

Hanrahan reported that there have been four candidates and hopefully an announcement will be made next week about the hiring of two ombudspersons.

3.4 Faculty Senate Presidents' Meeting

Hanrahan reported that the Faculty Senate Presidents from each of the campuses will be participating in their first monthly meeting via Zoom later this month.

4.0 Approval of February 12, 2019 Minutes

Hanrahan asked if there were any additional revisions or discussion on the minutes. Hearing none he asked for unanimous consent. The Executive Committee agreed.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Statements on Academic Freedom

Hanrahan noted that last week the Executive Committee discussed whether the statements on Academic Freedom should be a policy rather than a statement.

Hanrahan asked if the Executive Committee agrees with the suggested revisions to the academic freedom statements. Belli stated that he would like to see some changes regarding academic freedom and research, but he would send his suggested changes to Hanrahan who would forward them to Professor Schleck.

Leiter moved that the proposed revisions be accepted and to inform Professor Schleck of the Executive Committee's approval. Peterson seconded the motion. Motion approved.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Agenda Items for EVC Plowman and VC Boehm

The Executive Committee identified the following agenda items for its meeting with EVC Plowman and VC Boehm next week:

- Huron Group Recommendations for Centralized Business Center.
- Why is EVC Plowman not attending the non-tenure track forum?
- Reason for having academic freedom statements rather than policy?
- Update on the Status of the Student Code of Conduct.
- Are there any issues that Academic Affairs can identify that the Senate can assist with?
- Recommendation for an administrator to serve on an ad hoc committee to look into developing a path of promotion for Lecturers.
- IANR Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- Non-tenure track faculty forum.
- Is there a policy of when renewal contracts are to be issued?

6.2 Athletic Department Recent Events

Hanrahan stated that concerns have been raised regarding Athletic Director Bill Moos' statements and John Bruning's involvement regarding the recent incident involving student-athlete Maurice Washington. He noted that he emailed Scott Fuess, chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, to ask for clarification. He stated that he would like to know if the Athletics department has a policy on what to do when a law enforcement agency contacts the University concerning a student athlete. Peterson moved that the

IAC should inquire as to what the Athletic Department's practice is when a law enforcement agency or officer contacts the university concerning a student athlete, and if it is determined that Athletics has no policy, they should create one. Leiter seconded the motion. Motion approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:21 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, February 26, 2019 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 201 Canfield Administration. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Lorna Dawes, Secretary.