

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

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

Absent: Leiter, Vakilzadian

Guest: Professor Ken Bloom

Date: Tuesday, January 29, 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 2:31 p.m.

2.0 Proposed Revisions to the Procedures to be invoked for Significant Budget Reallocations and Reductions

Bloom reported that during the budget reduction deliberations last year the Academic Planning Committee felt that that the Procedures needed to be updated to more accurately coincide with how the campus operates. He noted that the existing Procedures have many steps and it was thought that these could be refined and redundancies removed to make the process more efficient.

Buan pointed out that the administration continually collects data that is used for comparisons, but she questioned whether there was transparency about the comparisons that are gathered and whether the APC received justification when requested. Bloom noted that the proposed change to the RCM budget model will hopefully help to provide greater transparency, and the proposed revisions to the budget reduction procedures will allow the faculty and the university community as a whole to pressure the administration for further information. The revisions also simplifies the steps of the process.

Bloom reported that the APC formed a subcommittee comprised of himself, Purcell, and Boehm in the fall and quickly began work on revising the Procedures. Bloom pointed out that in the existing document there is a considerable amount of time between when the Chancellor first announces he is invoking the Procedures and when he actually begins talking to the APC about the proposed cuts. He noted that the proposed revisions streamline the process so that when the Chancellor invokes the Procedures he has to be ready to address the APC with a description of the campus budget situation and soon thereafter provide specific recommendations for reductions.

Hanrahan pointed out that there is a proposed revision in the preface regarding an example of what is considered a significant permanent reduction, in this case a 1%

reduction in the direct appropriation for the University system. He asked if the 1% would be based on the university's budget or UNL's. Bloom stated that the proposed revision is just to provide an example of what could require the Procedures to be invoked. Buan pointed out that the Procedures are UNL's procedures only, and a cut to the NU System budget should have to impact the UNL budget before the APC process could be invoked. Purcell stated that the instances listed are just to provide examples, there are various possibilities when these procedures could be invoked. Dawes suggested removing the sentence containing the example. Buan noted that there could be other reasons, such as a decrease in enrollment that could impact our budget. Bloom pointed out that it is the Chancellor who gets to decide when to invoke the process, not the APC.

Adenwalla asked if there is a timeline for the process. Bloom pointed out that it is difficult to have set timelines, but language has been proposed to make the process as timely as possible. He noted that sufficient time is required for all parties involved to review any proposed changes to the budget. Purcell stated that it is important that the APC allows sufficient time to review and follow the established procedures when dealing with budget cuts. Bloom pointed out that the APC did have a lot of control over the timeline with the budget cuts last year.

Buan stated that budget allocations could be manipulated more slowly over time by moving or merging programs and under these guidelines, the APC would not be consulted. Bloom stated that it is not totally clear that the APC would be involved with departments being moved from one college or another, but he thinks it should.

Hanrahan stated that he is concerned that one of the proposed revisions implies that the APC will automatically agree with budget cuts put forward by the Chancellor when the APC makes its announcement. Bloom pointed out that there are two different stages to the process: first, the scope of the budget problem has to be framed; secondly, the APC will review the proposals and can tell the Chancellor that some of the suggested cuts are problematic before the proposed cuts are made public. He noted that the APC has opportunities to provide feedback to the Chancellor, and while it is true that the Chancellor does not have to accept the APC's recommendation, the APC can publicly announce the reasons why it is against the Chancellor's recommendations.

Bloom verified that the Executive Committee wants the sentence that provides examples of when the Procedures would be invoked, to be removed. Hanrahan agreed. Bloom stated that he will notify the APC and they will act on the suggested change at the next meeting.

Belli noted that there have been numerous discussions of emphasizing vertical over horizontal cuts and asked if this is represented in the document in anyway. Bloom pointed out that the document has a great deal of information regarding programs, including the criteria that would be applied in determining whether a program should be recommended for elimination. Peterson noted that budget cuts are usually a combination of horizontal and vertical cuts, and the administration should not be restricted to make either a horizontal or vertical cut.

3.0 Announcements

3.1 Special Edition of President's Newsletter

Hanrahan reported that he sent out a special edition of the newsletter to provide information about the health insurance carrier and who people should contact if they are having problems. He noted that he received numerous emails from faculty with concerns, and some employees at the sister campuses are experiencing the same problems. He stated that the Faculty Senate Presidents from each of the campuses will continue to gather feedback and will work with President Bounds on the issue.

3.3 Request for University Police to be its Own Jurisdiction

Hanrahan stated that the university has requested that the NU Police be made its own separate jurisdiction. He noted that currently the NU Police are chartered under the State Police. He reported that the NU Police must submit a formal requisition each time University Police are needed at UNL to assist on football game days. Kolbe asked if the change would impact our budget. Hanrahan stated that his understanding is the change would only be jurisdictional and would not involve budgets.

Adenwalla stated that she is concerned that the NU Police would not have to follow the strict rules outlined for State Police and that abuses could occur and Buan expressed the same concern. Hanrahan stated that Chief Yardley of UNL and the other campuses Chief of Police are in favor of the request.

3.4 Testifying Before the State Legislature

Hanrahan reported that he was asked to remind faculty members that if they are contacted by a legislator to testify in front of the legislature that they contact Associate to the Chancellor Michelle Waite to inform her. He pointed out that university employees can testify as a private citizen, but need to identify that they are testifying on their own accord, they are not representing the university, and their statements do not represent the university.

Belli asked what employees should do if they want to raise an issue with the legislature. Hanrahan noted that this is fine, but again, they need to make sure that they identify themselves as a private citizen and it would be a good idea to let Waite know.

3.5 Board of Regents Chair

Hanrahan reported that Regent Claire is now the Chair of the Board of Regents and Regent Pillen is the new Vice Chair.

3.6 Information Technology Changes

Hanrahan reported that at the Board of Regents meeting a presentation on the Duo two-factor authorization program was given. He noted that there was no mention of VP Mark Askren stepping down. Buan stated that Duo is being piloted on the campuses and so far the feedback has been positive. She noted that consideration is being given to keeping logins to salary and benefits information separate from Concur and other services related to job function that are all accessed through Firefly. She stated that in order to manage

logging into different programs and classrooms or workstations, a system is being considered by ITS that would require log in once a week rather than having to sign-in each time you want to open different programs.

Franco Cruz asked if using Duo requires a cell phone. Buan stated that people can get a fob instead, but they must request it. Kolbe questioned whether having the system in place would prevent the need of having to change passwords every few months.

3.7 University Budget Information

Hanrahan reported that the Faculty Senate Presidents met with President Bounds to hear a slightly more detailed presentation on the budget. He stated that the university will have a deficit with our increased expenses, but the university is requesting a total of \$39 million over the biennium and the Governor recommended \$34.2 million. The Governor is recommending the same amounts for Salaries & Benefits, Health Insurance, Workers Compensation, and General operations. He reported that the President and Board are feeling good about the budget request. He pointed out that the Forecasting Board will be meeting towards the end of February and the report could have an impact on our budget. He stated that he has asked Interim VC Nunez to speak to the Senate regarding the university's budget at the February Senate meeting. Belli pointed out that what is not being considered in the budget request are the costs for utilities and general operations.

4.0 Approval of January 8, 2019 Minutes

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

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Faculty Survey

Hanrahan noted that the Ad Hoc Committee Addressing AAUP Censure contacted him to ask about including some questions regarding academic freedom. The Executive Committee felt that the questions are out of its purview and suggested that the Ad Hoc Committee should conduct its own survey. The Executive Committee then reviewed and suggested revisions for the survey that will be sent to the faculty.

5.2 Non-tenure Track Faculty Survey

The Executive Committee reviewed and suggested revisions to the survey that will be sent to non-tenure track faculty members.

5.3 How to Engage Faculty Senators More

Agenda item postponed due to lack of time.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Conflict of Responsibilities between the Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee (ARRC) and Ombudspersons

Peterson stated that he does not believe that there is a conflict of responsibilities. He pointed out that faculty members would go to an ombudsperson first to see if the problem could be solved at that level. If not, the ombudsperson would recommend that the faculty

member go to the ARRC which would then decide whether a special hearing committee would need to be formed to look into the situation. He stated the same would be true if a faculty member came to the ARRC first, but the issue could be resolved through the ombudsperson. The consensus of the Executive Committee is that there would not be a conflict.

6.2 IANR Institution-Wide Promotion and Tenure Committee

Agenda item postposed due to lack of time.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:39 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, February 5, 2019 immediately following the Faculty Senate meeting. The meeting will be held in the City Campus Union, Colonial Rooms A & B. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Lorna Dawes, Secretary.