

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

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

Absent: Adenwalla, Purcell, Vakilzadian

Date: Tuesday, February 26, 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 2:33 p.m.

2.0 Vice Chancellor Boehm

2.1 IANR Promotion and Tenure Committee

VC Boehm stated that the promotion and tenure process at most universities consists of a department promotion and tenure committee review followed by a recommendation to the unit leader. After that a college promotion and tenure committee would review the file and make a recommendation to the dean who would then consider the file and send it to the appropriate Vice Chancellor. He pointed out that the process in IANR has been different because a file is not only reviewed by the lead dean, it then goes to a Council of Deans before being submitted to the Vice Chancellor.

VC Boehm stated that the current process in IANR overemphasizes administrative recommendations for tenure and/or promotion, and the lead dean's recommendation is represented in two levels of review and this needs to be corrected. He noted that the current process underrepresents faculty recommendations because the faculty voice in tenure and promotion is represented at only the academic unit P&T committee level. After the file leaves the unit P&T committee it is only acted on by those with administrative appointments. He pointed out that the current process is not consistent with how P&T files are evaluated at UNL or among our peer/aspirant universities. Having an IANR-wide P&T Committee comprised of faculty would align IANR practices with the University's Guidelines for the Evaluation of Faculty that clearly identifies review by a committee of faculty at the 'college' level.

VC Boehm reported that the Institute-wide P&T Committee will make recommendations on tenure and/or promotion for faculty with IANR appointments who are on the following lines: tenure-track, Professor of Practice, Research Professor, and Extension Professor. Materials for faculty on the following lines will follow separate processes: Extension Educator, Forester, and Geoscientist. The reason for these exclusions is that a) these faculty have unique job responsibilities and expected outcomes and impact, and b) these faculty positions do not require terminal degrees.

VC Boehm stated that the process became more complex when departments in the former College of Home Economics were merged into the College of Education and Human Sciences (CEHS). He noted that creating the IANR Promotion and Tenure Committee requires a change to the IANR Bylaws. He pointed out that the IANR Bylaws require that any change to the bylaws be approved by the vote of the entire IANR faculty (those who are designated as voting faculty members), and noted that voting is currently taking place to revise the Bylaws and this voting will end on March 1. He reported that the voting members of the faculty include Extension Educators, tenure/tenure-track faculty, Professors of Practice, Research Professors, Foresters, and Geoscientists.

Peterson asked if faculty housed in CEHS, but who are considered IANR faculty, would still go through the CEHS process. VC Boehm stated they would. He noted that the dean of CEHS informally engages the dean of IANR that would hold the appointment and the dean of CEHS would meet with the IANR Council of Deans. He pointed out that the current process is very complicated. He stated that the proposed model would have these faculty members go through the CEHS process and the IANR promotion and tenure committee at the same time. VC Boehm reported that Associate VC Bischoff, who was a chair in CEHS, met with the promotion and tenure committee chairs from all 12 CASNR units and the 3 CEHS units as well as the IANR Advisory Council to get input about an IANR promotion and tenure committee.

Belli stated that IANR has a very complex structure. He noted that Extension Educators are considered IANR faculty, yet they do not belong to a college. VC Boehm pointed out that there are Extension Educators embedded in departments and some are tightly aligned with CEHS. He noted that the IANR promotion and tenure committee is only for the tenure track faculty. He reported that Extension Educators have an entirely separate promotion process. Belli asked if all tenure track faculty members belong to a college. VC Boehm stated that they do belong to a college.

Hanrahan stated that the IANR Bylaws states that there are three deans: CASNR, Extension, and Ag Research, but the dean of CEHS is not listed. He suggested that this might need to be changed in the IANR Bylaws. VC Boehm reported that the Institute supports the three colleges. He pointed out that the CEHS Bylaws are clear about promotion and tenure, but IANR's need to be updated. He stated that the spirit of the change to create an IANR promotion and tenure committee is to make it more of a faculty process rather than an administrative process. Belli asked if every tenure-track faculty member would go through a department promotion and tenure committee and the IANR promotion and tenure committee. VC Boehm stated that if the faculty is paid by IANR they would go through the process, but if they are 100% paid by CEHS they would only go through the CEHS process.

Hanrahan asked about faculty members in Biological Systems Engineering (BSE) and whether they go through both Engineering and IANR promotion and tenure processes. VC Boehm pointed out that BSE is a department in CASNR, not the Engineering

College. He noted that BSE is only considered for a specialized College of Engineering accreditation, but none of the faculty are members of the College of Engineering.

2.2 Update on CEHS Dean Search

VC Boehm stated that Professor Sherri Jones has accepted our offer to become the new dean of CEHS and she will begin her appointment on July 1, 2019.

2.3 Update on Ombudspersons Search

VC Boehm reported that the search/selection committee comprised of Kevin Hanrahan, Judy Walker, and Rich Bischoff have interviewed four applicants and will bring a recommendation to him and EVC Plowman soon. The goal is to have these appointments made so that our new ombudspersons can attend a national training for Ombudspersons in April. Hanrahan stated that the interviews have been completed and hopefully an announcement would be made soon.

2.4 Nebraska Extension Educators have the privilege of securing 400 letters from UNL and NU clientele across the state in support of NU to be delivered to the Nebraska Appropriations Committee. Why is this privilege not shared with campus faculty?

VC Boehm reported that Extension Educators were not invited to write letters to the Unicameral's Appropriations Committee. The members of the Nebraska Association of County Extension Board (NACEB), a private, membership-based corporation made up of external constituents, were invited to engage – and enlist local community and business leaders – in a letter writing, campaign to generate support for NU. He suggested that the Executive Committee might wish to clarify this further with Assistant to the Chancellor Michelle Waite. Fech stated that he and Senator Purcell look forward to the opportunity to discuss VC Boehm's suggestion with Assistant to the Chancellor Michelle Waite to expand the effort to other campus units and further bolster the advocacy potential to the unicameral.

2.5 Will all IANR faculty members be allowed to vote on the upcoming proposal regarding a Statewide Extension Educator Promotion Committee to parallel the Institute-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee, which because of their unique responsibilities excludes Extension Educators, Foresters, and Geoscientists? Please explain.

VC Boehm stated that any change to IANR's Bylaws requires a vote of IANR's faculty. Voting members of the faculty include Extension Educators, tenure/tenure-track faculty, Professors of Practice, Research Professors, Foresters, and Geoscientists. He noted that all of the IANR faculty need to vote, even if the Bylaw change does not apply to them. He stated that 66% of the IANR faculty will need to vote in favor of the change for it to be applied to the Bylaws.

VC Boehm stated that he would like the Institute to do more sharing of best practices and have cross-discipline discussions rather than having 15 vertical units that keep within themselves. Fech noted that the same thing occurs in Extension with the different

districts. VC Boehm agreed and noted that there are five different groups that evaluate Extension Educators and Extension Educators differently.

Peterson pointed out that these are good discussion to have. He noted that his department promotion and tenure committee has a faculty member from a different department on it and asked if there should be coordination between the units for the P & T committees. VC Boehm stated that there should be more coordination with the faculty. He pointed out that of all the shared governance processes, the promotion and tenure is the most sacred.

Hanrahan asked what VC Boehm sees as the role in the future of funded GTAs in IANR. VC Boehm stated that reports from the National Graduate Association shows that less than half of graduate students want to go into academia after graduating. He pointed out that our system for funding graduate students is archaic with most of the funding coming from federally funded grants, industry dollars and through remissions which negatively impacts our budget due to the loss of tuition dollars. He pointed out that graduate students should not be forced to teach if they are not interested. He stated that we should have mentored experiences for students and for those students who want to eventually teach we should provide graduate teaching assistantships. He stated that one idea would be to put a cap on the amount of teaching that a graduate student needs to do, such as having no more than three teaching experiences during a five-year career as a graduate student. Hanrahan asked if VC Boehm was committed to having graduate teaching assistants. VC Boehm stated that he is committed to this.

Buan noted that a lot of graduate students who come to the university are interested in basic research and want to put roots down in Lincoln to become entrepreneurs. However, due to the structure of our graduate system, we don't harvest their entrepreneurial spirit because they are often times pressured to be a TA. She pointed out that while VC Boehm's ideas seem radical, she thinks it is exactly what graduate students want. VC Boehm stated that there have been very meaningful discussions occurring about making every IANR unit a place that students want to come to and some of the systems currently in place may need to evolve to provide the students with what they want in a program and to attract new students.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Update about Proposed Business Centers

Hanrahan reported that he received an email message from Interim VC Nunez regarding the proposal to have campus business centers. He noted that Nunez said that the concept is for multiple centers to be developed over time, across the campuses to provide high-level service to faculty and staff. Hanrahan stated that he hopes that we can schedule Interim VC Nunez to meet with the Executive Committee later this semester to discuss the idea further.

4.0 Approval of February 19, 2019 Minutes

Hanrahan noted that he had an additional revision to the minutes which the Executive Committee approved. The Executive Committee then approved the minutes.

5.0 Assistant to the Chancellor Michelle Waite

Waite reported that she has worked at the university for 21 years and prior to that she served as a legislative aide in the Nebraska Legislature for 11 years. She stated that she serves as the principal advisor to the Chancellor regarding relations between the university and many of its external constituencies, including local, state and federal governmental agencies. She noted that she works closely with Associate Vice President for University Affairs and Director of State Relations Heath Mello. She reported that the majority of the university's lobbying efforts come out of the President's office and each campus has a position like hers.

Waite reported that Monday, March 4th is the university's hearing before the Appropriations Committee. She noted that the university's budget proposal was for a 3% increase in the first year of the biennium and a 3.7% increase for the second year of the biennium. However, the Governor is recommending a 2.6% increase in the first year of the biennium and a 3.4% increase in the second year. She pointed out that the budget situation looks better than it was two years ago, but the property tax issue is a big concern for the state. She reported that the Chancellors will be attending the hearing, although they may not necessarily be testifying. She stated that President Bounds, Regent Clare, and members of the agricultural business community are scheduled to speak along with the student body president from UNO. The other student body presidents will be speaking, although not as part of the University's organized testifiers. Hanrahan stated that he had heard that one of the Faculty Senate Presidents was going to speak. Waite stated that she did not see any of the President's name on the list. She reported that there are faculty members testifying, but not on behalf of the faculty as a whole. She stated that the Appropriations Committee's report to the full legislative body is required by May 2nd and the final day of the Legislature is June 6th.

Waite reported that the next big advocacy effort being organized on is the I Luv NU day. She stated that it was started last year and it is a day where anyone can come to the State Capitol to support the university. She noted that the event will take place on March 27th from 9:00 - noon and typically begins in one of the conference rooms in the State Capitol. She pointed out that all four campuses will be represented. She stated that the I Luv NU day is an effective advocacy event and she is happy to help anyone out who has questions and is interested in participating in the event.

Waite stated that there will also be a UCARE poster session, on April 16th, for Senators to meet with the students involved in the program. She noted that due to the construction occurring at the State Capitol this will be held in the Ferguson House. She reported that the N150 displays are currently in the first floor rotunda of the capitol building and will be traveling around the state.

Waite stated that she wants people to know that she is an advocate on behalf of the university and she wants faculty, staff, and students to know that she is a resource person that they can contact if they would like some advice about advocating or testifying before the Legislature.

Belli stated that the recent announcement regarding employees contacting Waite if they are asked to testify before the Legislature sounded like it was required. Waite stated that the intention was never a requirement, it was just asking faculty and staff to let her know if they will be testifying so she can provide advice, if requested. She noted that it is helpful for administrators to know if someone is testifying should an inquiry be made of the administrator. Members of the Unicameral do not often realize the size of the University and that they often think we are in contact with each other on a regular basis. She stated that when people testify they should state their position with the university, since it lends credibility to their testimony, although they should mention that they are not representing the university when they speak. She noted that people should also not use university resources, i.e., letterhead if they are contacting Senators as a citizen.

Belli stated that he knows there will be some employees who will disagree with contacting Waite. Waite pointed out that no one has to notify her. Fech noted that it would be helpful for the employee to contact Waite because of her experience and knowledge of working with the Legislature. Belli stated that some people feel that the administration would try to dissuade them from testifying. Waite stated that the administration would never do this. She noted that she works with students all of the time and just tries to prepare them so they can be a better testifier or knowledgeable in a certain area of public policy. She reported that the University is ramping up its advocacy efforts and is trying to be more proactive which is partly contributing to why the announcement was made. She stated that if anyone has further concerns they can contact her or Hanrahan.

Fech stated that the Executive Committee is trying to make the Faculty Senate more meaningful to the faculty. He noted that there is the Nebraska Association of County Extension Boards (NACEB) and wondered if each faculty department could set up a similar support group to provide liaisons with the community. Waite stated that this could be a powerful effort. Belli suggested that departments could start with the advisors who could contact graduates. Waite stated that she would be happy to help with the effort and that NACEB provides a good model from which to work.

Waite reminded the Executive Committee that anyone can contact her. She noted that she views herself as a liaison and is willing to assist any member of the faculty, staff or students with the Unicameral.

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Ad Hoc Committee to Develop Path for Promotion for Lecturers

Belli pointed out that the work of an Ad Hoc Committee to Develop a Path of Promotion for Lecturers integrates with the non-tenure track faculty forum that will be held in April. He suggested waiting until after the forum to create the committee.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Intercollegiate Athletics Committee Report on Wrestling Graduation Success Rate

Hanrahan noted that at the January 8th Faculty Senate meeting a motion was made for the IAC to investigate why the graduation success rate for the wrestling team was low in comparison with the other Big Ten schools and the Division I average for the sport. He reported that he received information from Profess Fuess, Chair of the IAC, and it shows while we are in the bottom group of schools, we are not the lowest. Buan pointed out that the intent of the motion was to try to determine why our GSR rate is lower and what can be done to help improve the rate. Hanrahan stated that he will contact Professor Fuess again to ask what plans Athletics has to increase the graduation success rates in wrestling and also in basketball which also has a lower GSR.

7.2 Survey of Faculty Members

Hanrahan reported that as of today, 741 faculty members responded to the faculty survey. He stated that the largest concern (89.3%) for those who responded is the state's funding support for the university followed by academic freedom and tenure (83.7%). He stated that the health insurance change (76.5%), faculty governance (76.1%), and UNL flagship status (75%) were of concern, but the vehicle mileage reimbursement (55.5%) and the Concur travel software (57%) were ranked lower.

Hanrahan stated that 83.9% of the faculty said that they know who their senators are. He stated that he will give a full report at the April 23rd Senate meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, March 5, 2019 immediately following the Senate meeting. The meeting will be held in the City Campus Union, Regency Suite. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Lorna Dawes, Secretary.