

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Adenwalla, Belli, Buan, Fech, Hanrahan, Kolbe, Latta Konecky, Minter, Peterson, Vakilzadian, Woodman

Absent: Franco Cruz, Purcell

Date: Tuesday, July 2, 2019

Location: 201 Canfield Administration

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 Chancellor Green/Interim EVC Moberly

2.1 Update on Lecturer Salaries

Chancellor Green stated that the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee's letter of recommendation, along with concerns raised at the non-tenure track faculty forum made it apparent that the salaries for lecturers needed to be addressed. He noted that former EVC Plowman looked at the problem and initial proposals were put forward to set a base level salary for lecturers. However, it was determined that fixing the problem is more complex than originally considered and the administration felt that there needs to be a concerted effort with the College of Arts & Sciences (CAS), which has the largest number of lecturers, to properly address the problem.

Interim EVC Moberly pointed out that the problem is complicated and it also involves graduate students. He stated that Academic Affairs felt that Dean Button, the new Dean of CAS, and others need to be engaged in determining a more holistic approach to remedying the situation. He stated that just throwing money at the problem is not the solution and to that end he plans on creating a committee that would begin work this fall to review the issues identified by the Faculty Senate: salary, job security, promotability, and apportionment and to propose actions to rectify these problems. He reported that the plan is to have the committee's final report in the spring semester.

Woodman pointed out that some of the issues are related to policy. He noted that some lecturers have worked at the university for 25 years and still have no job security. He stated that he is concerned that the committee's recommendations will not be for campus-wide policies but will instead devolve into individual college policies which will allow chairs to continue to take advantage of lecturers. He noted that the qualifications needed to be a Professor of Practice eliminates most lecturers from applying for a PoP position. Interim EVC Moberly pointed out that CAS has this specific criteria for who can be a Professor Practice. He noted that there needs to be discussion with CAS about this, but

he cautioned that we do not want to dictate to the colleges what qualifications are needed for their PoP positions.

Adenwalla asked if there will be a well-defined track for lecturers for promotion. Interim EVC Moberly noted that currently there is no promotion track, but it has been suggested that lecturers be provided with a two or three year contract rather than a year-to-year contract. He pointed out that, in the past, much of the funds that were used to cover lecturer salaries had been one-time money that was only available from year-to-year and CAS did not feel comfortable giving a longer-term contract to lecturers due to the uncertainty of having available funds. He noted that the Regents Bylaws state that the lecturer position is a one-year contract and notification of non-renewal of the contract is not required. He stated that the lecturer position was not meant to be a long-term position and this is something the committee will need to look at carefully.

Chancellor Green pointed out that if you look at the number of these positions across the campus they are predominantly in English and Modern Languages and Literature in CAS. Adenwalla asked if this is not an argument for having more faculty lines in these units. Chancellor Green stated that this is part of the on-going discussion around the problem.

Woodman stated that he is concerned that other colleges with high enrollments will start using lecturers similar to what has occurred in CAS. He noted that former EVC Plowman hired a significant number of Professors of Practice and the College has a strong online presence which can help support some of these positions. He suggested that CAS could start self-funding the lecturer positions through its online presence. Chancellor Green stated that CAS has requested more funding for temporary instruction and they have received some additional funding to cover these positions.

Hanrahan stated that the problem in Fine Arts is with how the workload is calculated for lecturers. He stated that he would be interested in working with the committee to develop guidelines for what the workloads should be for lecturers. Kolbe pointed out that while it would be wise to have a campus policy it should provide for acceptable workloads rather than dictate specifically what workloads should be. Interim EVC Moberly noted that all of the consequences of the suggested actions need to be carefully considered. He stated that while there might be room for a campus-wide policy, it should not hinder a college's ability to cover its instructional needs.

Belli pointed out that many of the lecturers felt a considerable amount of optimism when former EVC Plowman stated that there would be improvements for lecturers and many of them are now distraught that no action has occurred. He stated that it needs to be conveyed that the process of resolving some of the problems is still ongoing.

Hanrahan requested that Interim EVC Moberly's letter regarding the formation of the committee be included in the minutes. Interim EVC Moberly agreed (see Appendix A).

2.2 What is the status of the proposed BOR Bylaw Changes on Extension Educators?

Chancellor Green stated that he plans to submit the change to Interim NU President Fritz to be put into the process for the Board of Regents approval this fall.

2.3 What is the status of the proposed revisions to the ARRC procedures?

Chancellor Green stated that the proposed revisions to the ARRC procedures have not gone forward because it was his understanding that there will be more proposed revisions from the AAUP Censure Committee and did not want to send multiple revisions at various times. Peterson pointed out that the Executive Committee thought that the current proposed revisions should go forward because it is uncertain when additional changes will be proposed. Hanrahan stated that there will be additional revisions based on the proposed Bylaws changes being suggested by the AAUP Censure Committee, but he does not think they will be substantive. Chancellor Green stated that he will need to know in advance whether the current proposed revisions should go forward.

2.4 Demands on Changes to Title IX Procedures

Chancellor Green reported that he has now met twice with the group that presented a set of demands concerning the Title IX process and procedures. Adenwalla asked if the students had personal experience in dealing with the Title IX office. Chancellor Green noted that most of the students had filed a Title IX complaint, but not all. He reported that the incidents occurred over a period of time from 2014-2019 and there were varying kinds of cases and circumstances.

Chancellor Green noted that the group presented a multi-page document stating what they want to see changed, and in his meetings with them each item was reviewed in detail. He reported that he informed the group that he would carefully consider and respond to each of the suggestions by the end of the summer and that he is committed to making some improvements. He pointed out that some of the suggestions are ones being considered even before the demands were made. He stated that some of the demands we see as a good opportunity for change. However, there are some demands that we cannot do because of federal requirements (such as FERPA). He stated that he plans on meeting with the group again and noted that it is impressive to listen to the students and he admires the courage that it took for these students to come forward with their concerns.

Chancellor Green pointed out that Title IX is an investigatory process, and part of the difficulty is that the group wants to blur the lines between advocacy and the investigatory process. Woodman asked if the issue is that they don't feel there is enough advocacy. Chancellor Green stated that he thinks some of the students feel this way. He noted that we formerly had a part-time contract with Voices of Hope (20 hours per week), but the contract was discontinued and we now have two full-time FTE employed advocates, however, Voices of Hope does not agree with this because they feel that the university advocates are conflicted as employees of the institution. He pointed out that the advocates are professionally trained and are there to provide advocacy.

Hanrahan asked the Chancellor if he has concerns of reactions over a bill that is coming to the Legislature negatively impacting campus safety and Title IX in Nebraska. Chancellor Green stated that he would be more concerned if he wasn't actively engaged

in talking with the group. He stated that positive dialogue has been occurring. Hanrahan stated that he has concerns that there are national forces that may start to weigh in should the legislative bill pass. Chancellor Green stated that he felt meeting with the group was absolutely the right thing to do, and noted that universities across the country are grappling with the same concerns.

Buan pointed out that when there are Campus Police and City Police on campus to investigate an incident it becomes confusing and causes people to distrust the lines of responsibility. She noted that it is good that there is a difference between Title IX and the criminal response. Chancellor Green reported that in all of the cases that were brought forward almost all of them were complimentary of the police and adjudication. He noted that the issue that is being raised is over the university policies. He stated that he is encouraged by the conversations he has been having with the group.

Hanrahan stated that if there is anything the Senate can assist with, whether it is to get word out about the policy or training, the Executive Committee would be more than happy to help out. Buan pointed out that one thing that needs to be considered is what mechanism do we have to provide accommodations for a student involved with a Title IX complaint and who is not comfortable with going to a class. She noted that some instructor's require documentation such as a doctor's note if a student is absent from class and questioned what we could do to help students who are involved with a Title IX complaint.

2.5 Graduate Student Health Insurance

Chancellor Green reported that temporary progress has been made with the graduate student health insurance, and the high increase in stop-loss costs for students has been fixed for this year. He stated that he has been meeting with GSA President Shawn Ratcliff and GSA Vice President Anthony Juristch to discuss the situation and he believes they are generally pleased with the progress that is being made. He noted that significant references have been made at how important it is to get the cost of the health insurance addressed as well as possible so we don't have huge increases next year.

Chancellor Green noted that while the faculty/staff health plan is self-insured, the student health plan is through United HealthCare and United absorbs the costs if there are not enough funds to cover all of the claims of the participants in the plan. He pointed out that this is a significant reason why there was such significant increases in the rates.

Adenwalla asked how the high rates were determined. Chancellor Green stated that Central Administration formed a committee, mostly of business people, who worked on the issue for six months, looking at what the best possible options would be, but there were no students on the committee. Adenwalla pointed out that the increases were high. Chancellor Green noted that the cost of the health care plan went up. Hanrahan reported that since there are so few students in the health care program not enough money comes in from the premiums to support the high number of claims that are being made, mostly by dependents of the graduate students.

Hanrahan noted that some schools have a contract for three years for their student health plan, but ours is only for one year. Chancellor Green reported that the other big difference with some of the Big Ten schools is that they require the health insurance for all of their students, but we have never done this. He suggested that our policy might need to be revisited. Hanrahan suggested that another option could be to enter into a cooperative Big Ten student health insurance program.

2.6 Search for UNL CIO - Why an internal search and who will make the hiring decision?

Chancellor Green reported that the search is now underway to find a CIO for our campus. He stated that the search is internal because when former VC Askren became head of One IT his position was basically swapped with Central Administration. He noted that we have good internal people who can fill the position and the decision to hire will be made by him and VP Blackman. He stated that the CIO position will report both to him and to Blackman since all of information technology is through OneIT. He pointed out that when Askren was hired there was no system-wide IT. He stated that our CIO will be the lead IT person at UNL.

Hanrahan pointed out that Askren was an outside hire who brought in so many improvements to university computing. He stated that the collective opinion of the Executive Committee is that there should be an outside search.

2.7 Enrollment Projections

Chancellor Green reported that projections indicate that we are expecting to be down 2% in enrollment. He stated that we are further down on international enrollment than anticipated. He stated that last year we thought we would have an increase, but there was more of a melt in the summer even though students had already placed deposits and gone through new student enrollment. Kolbe asked if there are any theories as to why students go through the initial process only to not enroll. Chancellor Green pointed out that this is happening at other universities too. He stated that the big worry is the loss of international students. Adenwalla asked where the biggest loss of international students is from. Chancellor Green stated that the number of Chinese students is down significantly.

Hanrahan asked if there will be anticipated budget cuts due to enrollments. Chancellor Green stated that there would not be any cuts because his administrative team has been as conservative as possible with anticipating our budget.

Minter stated that she is concerned that the flooding in the state would impact instate students returning. Chancellor Green stated that we have not seen this yet, but will not know fully until the start of the academic year.

2.8 Issues on the Horizon

Chancellor Green noted that two new deans, Dean Button of CAS and Dean Jones of EHS, started yesterday and Dean Stewart of the University Libraries will start August 1.

Chancellor Green stated that the School of Computing has now moved forward with the faculty of the department of Computer Sciences & Engineering voting 29-2 in favor of the school. He noted that a considerable amount of work needs to be done before the proposal can go to the Academic Planning Committee, but Academic Affairs is working with the faculty to develop the proposal.

Chancellor Green reported that he met with the 2025 Strategy Team co-chairs and the team is in the drafting mode and plans to present its report to the administrative leadership team in early August.

Chancellor Green stated that the EVC search is underway and nominations are now being accepted. He stated that the hope is to be able to conduct airport interviews in early September.

Chancellor Green reported that Westbrook Music facility is now in the feasibility study stage and the Foundation will look at what kind of fundraising can be done to support the construction of a new building. He noted that the timing is important because the campus will be getting ready to develop a capital campaign. He stated that the top floor of Andrews Hall has significant issues that need to be dealt with and that will cost approximately \$5 million. He reported that Neihardt will be taken offline with the Honors program moving into the Knoll Residence Center. He stated that he will appoint a task force to study the future use of the Neihardt complex to start work this fall. Fech asked what people are considering for Neihardt. Chancellor Green stated that there needs to be good discussion because there are some strong sentiments about the facility and the adjoining buildings need to be considered as well.

Chancellor Green stated that another sector of the campus that needs consideration is the area housing the former student health center, Selleck, Benton, and Fairfield Hall. He stated that the demolition of Mabel Lee Hall is on schedule once the Carson Center and the new gymnastics facilities are completed. He noted the dance program will move into the Carson Center and gymnastics will move into the new gymnastics facilities. He reported that the Johnny Carson Center for Emerging Media Arts is slightly behind schedule for completion but should be ready for the fall semester. He noted that the East Campus Union dining facility is a little behind schedule and the CYT abatement work has begun. He reported that the Scott Engineering renovation will begin later this fall.

Vakilzadian asked if the Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering will be joining the School of Computing. Chancellor Green stated that would need to be worked out. He noted that discussion to create a School of Computing took considerable time, but in the end there was strong consensus that it was the right thing to do. He stated that this is a big move forward for the CSE department. Adenwalla asked if the department will be located in a different place. Chancellor Green stated that there is a commitment to have all of the faculty located in the same building.

Woodman stated that with the RCM budget model CSE moving out of CAS could significantly impact the college's budget. Chancellor Green stated that all of the

expenses and the revenue from a unit will move with it if it should move to another college. Adenwalla stated that the point is whether the unit is making money or not. Chancellor Green stated that we will need to address this issue if we see a big decline in CAS' budget. Vakilzadian noted that the faculty of CSE were concerned with moving into one college. He asked if the department will have the same freedom as before. Chancellor Green stated that the unit will and it will also be getting an increase in its budget.

3.0 VC Nunez

3.1 Problems with Travel Reimbursement

Hanrahan reported that a faculty member raised concerns over the delay of receiving travel reimbursements and reimbursement requests being returned for trivial reasons. VC Nunez stated that there are currently over 930 reimbursements in the travel reimbursement queue. He noted that there have been some transition challenges as the campus adopts the new system and there is also an issue of whether people have received the necessary training. Regarding travel processing he pointed out that in the past the AP/Travel staff used to be able to make minimal changes to the reimbursement request if they detected an error, but this is no longer possible. He stated that over 35% of the travel forms have errors on them which need to be corrected. He reported that in the short term AP/Travel will look at things where they can process quickly and get them out of the queue, but there needs to be a concerted effort to work with stakeholders across the campus to get the number of submitted errors down.

Adenwalla pointed out that Concur is a cumbersome system to use and the help with it is terrible. VC Nunez stated that if there are designated people who are experts at dealing with travel forms within colleges; they can help reduce the amount of time in getting the forms processed. There are also significant resources online including FAQs and tutorials. He noted that Concur is widely used nationally and is our system for the foreseeable future. So, we need to adopt best practices to use the tool.

Hanrahan reported that faculty members often try to maximize their trips to save money and time and in the past this was handled by the business manager for his department who would work out the details. He stated that now the faculty members have to do it and the business manager is no longer accessible to the faculty. VC Nunez stated that quality service delivery is a critical aspect to travel reimbursement as well as error reduction. The goal should be to have a number of identified people in colleges that are experts and can assist with the travel forms.

Hanrahan asked what is being done to fix the problems. VC Nunez stated that solutions are being worked on to fix the problems and there are people who care about this operation being successful. He stated that one of the things being done is looking at travel forms that can be processed more quickly and accurately. He also noted the need for travel delegates to work more diligently with travelers to ensure reimbursements are accurate as well as for ongoing and better training. We also plan to work towards the AP/Travel staff getting edit rights so changes can be made without sending the requests back.

Jo Bialas, Director of Business Operations, Financial Services, pointed out that there are many help documents online and about 60 videos relating to travel. She noted that there are also people who are experts across the campus who can provide assistance with the travel forms. Minter stated that one of the challenges with the videos is that you need to correctly identify what you are looking for or you won't find it. She suggested creating a more targeted support document for colleges and departments.

Buan stated that one of the real problems with Concur is the difficulty of using multiple funding streams across colleges. VC Nunez agreed that multiple funding sources does add complexity. He encouraged faculty members to start charging as many expenses as they can directly to places with university agreements like T&T and using P-card rather than using their personal credit card because of the delay with some travel reimbursements.

Hanrahan asked if a travel authorization still needs to be submitted even if a faculty member is going up to Omaha to do work and is not receiving compensation from the university. VC Nunez stated that this still needs to be submitted as it still is a trip and mileage reimbursement would be required, for example.

Bialis noted that the legislative bill to allow per diem expenses failed in the Legislature. Hanrahan reported that it is his understanding that there is a Legislative bill that pertains to incidental travel costs. Bialas stated that the biggest problem with expenses are the meals. Hanrahan stated that another problem is that Concur will not allow you to register with international hotels. The Executive Committee supported the notion to allow AP/Travel staff the ability to gain full access to the system to make small changes to rectify errors or make minor necessary edits.

VC Nunez suggested that employees traveling should start their reimbursement forms as soon as they return and to try and get it processed in under a week. Sheila Stewart, Director of Payroll, stated that faculty members should not wait to process the travel reimbursement form until midway through the 60-day time period because the later it is submitted, the greater the chance the process could take longer thereby delaying reimbursement.

4.0 Update on Incentive-Based Budget Model

VC Nunez reported that last week there was a forum on the incentive-based budget model and there was great participation. He stated that it was fully recorded and will be available on the RCM website in the near future (<https://budget.unl.edu/responsibility-center-management>). He noted that there were approximately 100 in-person attendees and almost 300 attending online. Considerable positive feedback was received and he and co-chair Dean Farrell personally answered emails received after the forum. Further, the FAQ section on budget.unl.edu is being edited to reflect the new questions.

Hanrahan pointed out that he was not aware of the forum until shortly before it was held. VC Nunez reported that there were several points of contact including a campus-wide

email from the Chancellor and listings in Nebraska Today. Members of the Steering Committee also communicated the forum to their constituency groups. Peterson noted that the next forum is set for August 22, 1:30-3:30, in the College of Business, room 002 and that it will be announced in Nebraska Today. VC Nunez stated that a reminder notice can also be sent out several days before the next forum. He noted that there will be a panel of experts at the August 22nd forum.

VC Nunez stated that all of the data needs to be obtained so it can be applied to the incentive-based budget model. Adenwalla asked if the process will be transparent so that faculty members can see where the F & A funds go. VC Nunez stated that this is the plan.

Griffin asked when the Deans will be trained in working with the different budget model. VC Nunez stated that the Deans are already being trained in a series of sessions with the consultants and B&F. We are currently conducting the third meeting with Deans and their staff. He stated that the Deans will look at the college model and determine what it means to them and eventually we will have a shadow model functioning. He noted that the budget model for the shadow year is based on the 2018 fiscal year budget. He pointed out that dollars in future fiscals will use that methodology developed during this current process.

Belli asked if the different colleges will have different budget models. VC Nunez stated that the budget model will be consistent across the enterprise but driven by the model parameters including enrollment, credit hours, space, etc. The difference will be with the subvention pool, but there will be a strategy of how the college calibrates its budget over time. Belli noted that the tax rates would have to be high in order to allow for flexibility with the subvention pool. VC Nunez indicated that the committee is still modeling this, but all indications are that the tax will be very much in line with other RCM universities.

VC Nunez also pointed out that the model will directly fund IANR and Extension as a primary unit and strategic priority for the University. In this method it is funded directly as it has historically been and not through a subvention pool.

Adenwalla noted that F & A funds will be directly assigned to the colleges. She asked how the subvention pool will impact the F & A funds. VC Nunez stated that F&A funds are part of the revenue stream for colleges. Subvention is a mechanism for fully funding a unit to cover its costs. Hanrahan asked if those colleges generating funds and who are currently keeping their funds, will then have these funds transferred to the subvention pool. VC Nunez stated that he will be surprised if there isn't a college or more that will need some subvention funding. Hanrahan asked if all profits are going into a central pool which means that decisions will not be made at the department level. VC Nunez pointed out that the university is not profit making and, are subsidized by the state to provide our mission. He stated that the goal is to distribute the funds for core mission purposes and strategic initiatives, not create pools of money. But, we do need to fund certain things centrally and the model will account for that.

Peterson noted that there are the parameters that will be used for a shadow exercise starting with the new fiscal year. The shadow model will run parallel to the existing budget to see how the model works and whether there needs to be adjustments. Adenwalla asked if the incentive-based budget model is a done deal. VC Nunez stated that it is, and pointed out that he has not heard any support for retaining the current budget model.

Kolbe asked when the general faculty population will be allowed to see the budget models for their college. VC Nunez stated that this should occur in early September. He noted that we are already in the new budget year, but we do not know what the amount of our tuition dollars will be for this fiscal year.

Kolbe asked if the new budget model will help faculty to improve their enrollments and improve their ability to teach and conduct research. VC Nunez stated that absolutely it can help departments to be successful, depending on the decisions that the departments and deans make.

Latta Konecky asked where the University Libraries stands with the incentive-based budget model. VC Nunez pointed out that the Libraries is an essential mission centric operation and funds will come from the academic support cost pool. Latta Konecky asked if the new deans have been kept apprised of the upcoming budget changes. VC Nunez stated that both Dean Button and Dean Jones have been actively involved and informed and Dean Stewart has experience since she comes from a University that uses an incentive-based budget model. Dean Button is also on the RCM Steering Committee.

Hanrahan stated that he has not heard of any discussion with faculty at the college level. He asked when the rest of the faculty will be involved. VC Nunez reported that Dean Farrell, for example, has already met with all of her chairs. He noted that he has discussed this with Interim EVC Moberly and stated that discussions with the chairs and faculty needs to occur. He reported that Interim EVC Moberly is meeting with all of the deans as a collective group and discussion will ensue about how to engage chairs and faculty.

Woodman asked if the new model will generate FTE profitability statements on each faculty member and whether this information would be made public. VC Nunez pointed out that we are working on a tool to help distribute funds across the university in a transparent, strategic, and incentive-based method.

Kolbe suggested that the deans should be encouraged to share information about the incentive-based budget model with the college executive committee. VC Nunez also suggested that faculty should take the initiative to start talking to their dean about the budget model.

VC Nunez stated that a data quality committee is going to be formed. He noted that the Associate Deans have made the recommendation that tuition be distributed based on instructor of record rather than the course prefix. This alone brings up questions of data

integrity. There are many others. Belli asked about how the tuition funds would be distributed when there are joint appointments and multi-listed courses. VC Nunez stated that these are data quality questions that the committee will need to address. He reported that he has asked Dean Heng Moss and Assistant VC Volkmer to be co-chairs of the committee, and will ask the Executive Committee to identify faculty members to serve in the near future.

VC Nunez stated that the campus will need to monitor the incentive-based budget model once it is in place and there needs to be some mechanism for people to provide feedback on it. He suggested that some kind of governance committee will need to be installed.

4.0 Announcements

4.1 Executive Committee/Administrator Retreat

Hanrahan reported that Professor Blankley, Law College, will serve as the facilitator at the retreat and will come and visit with the Executive Committee to get thoughts about shared governance and how the Committee feels it is and isn't working. He noted that the retreat may be held at the East Campus Quilt Center.

5.0 Approval of June 18, 2019 Minutes

Hanrahan asked if there were any further revisions to the minutes. Hearing none he asked for approval. The minutes were approved.

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Update on Proposed Resolutions

Hanrahan reported that the Committee on the AAUP Censure is continuing work on proposing revisions to the Regents Bylaws that will enable UNL to be removed from the AAUP censure list. He suggested revisions to Regents Bylaw 4.10 Special Appointments to include the rights of filing a grievance be the same for Special Appointments as it is for all other faculty, but there has been resistance from the Censure Committee. Peterson moved to accept the changes recommended by Hanrahan and to push these changes back to the Committee on AAUP Censure. Fech seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Hanrahan stated that the resolution to provide lecturers notice of termination may not go forward as a Bylaw change, but he suggested that a campus policy that identifies when lecturers are notified of termination should be developed.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Report on Board of Regents Meeting

Hanrahan reported that a per diem Legislative bill being endorsed by the University will be coming in January and there will eventually be discussion with Associate VP Heath Mello about the bill.

Hanrahan reported that the Board approved an agreement with the State Department of Education and the state colleges to share information which essentially tracks students' lives from pre-kindergarten until graduation, including where students come from, where they go to live, their employment occupations, and how they are performing in school.

He stated that the goal is to improve the quality of education through the data that is provided.

Hanrahan stated that Interim President Fritz reported that she has plans to keep the university moving forward. He noted that she has agreed not to be a candidate for the President's position. He stated that she wants to resurrect the 4 in 4 campaign where students get their degree in four years. He reported that the Board hopes to name the finalist by November and have a vote at the December meeting so the new President can start quickly.

Hanrahan reported that a person from the Dear UNL group spoke at the Board meeting. He noted that there is concern that things could get worse before they get better with the situation and he told our student Regent Emily Johnson that the Senate would help in any way we could.

Hanrahan stated that AAUP local chapter President Woodman made a statement on behalf of the UNL chapter about its concern with the Presidential search committee and the lack of representation of faculty members from the campuses on it. He thanked Woodman for making the statement. He noted that after the Board meeting the four Senate Presidents met with Regents Clare and Pillen and he shared the statement the Executive Committee crafted explaining the concern of lack of representation by faculty members on the search committee. He pointed out that the UNO Senate President shared the same concern and noted that UNO had no faculty representative on the committee. Hanrahan reported that UNO will be sending their own letter voicing their concern.

Hanrahan stated that the Board voted on a resolution describing the seven key traits that a new President must have. He noted that the Board did state that the required traits could be changed based on feedback received from the listening sessions (see Appendix B).

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, July 16, 2019 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 203 Alexander Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Joan Latta Konecky, Secretary.

APPENDIX A

Nebraska

Lincoln

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR
AND CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER

June 28, 2019

Dr. Kevin Hanrahan
Faculty Senate President
215 Westbrook Music Building City Campus 0100

Dear Dr. Hanrahan,

I am writing to update you on the efforts by the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor to resolve the issues surrounding Lecturers on our campus that you and others have raised over the past few months. Thank you for your patience in waiting to hear from me as I have gotten up to speed on the matter since assuming the interim role this month. As I understand it, the Faculty Senate has identified four primary issues:

1. Salary

- The Faculty Senate would like a campus-wide (as opposed to college- or department-based) mandatory minimum salary for lecturers. The suggestion is that such a minimum should apply to all faculty, including PoPs and Tenure- Track, and should be higher for those with PhDs.
- In addition, many lecturers have been at the same salary for many years. The Faculty Senate would like to see an opportunity for annual merit increases if performance warrants.

2. Job Security

- Lecturers can be appointed for 1-2 years, or up to 3 years with permission. That said, most are on year-to-year contracts and at times they don't know if the contract is being renewed until shortly before

the new semester starts. There is also no requirement for notification of non-reappointment.

3. Promotability

- The Faculty Senate would like the recognition of longevity and accomplishment that a promotion would signal but see this issue as secondary to the previous two. In particular, the Senate is most interested in promotability if promotions come with salary increases, longer contract lengths, and notification of non-reappointment.

4. Apportionment

- Lecturers are required to have 100% teaching apportionments. Many assert that this does not accurately reflect the work they do. In particular, some are engaged in faculty governance activities, and would like to get credit for this work.

As you know, former EVC Plowman had hoped to provide solutions for at least some of these problems before her departure from the university, but the issues proved to be too complex and with many implications that needed to be worked through. Indeed, the issues have come about over a significant period of time and, as a result, careful thought is required before determining and implementing solutions.

I want to be clear that the EVC office is committed to addressing these issues and to working with you, the colleges, and other stakeholders to identify solutions. As the issues are especially acute in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), it is crucial that CAS be integrally involved in developing solutions.

Towards this end, incoming CAS Dean Mark Button and I will jointly charge an Ad Hoc Committee on Lecturers to study the situation and propose actions. I expect that this committee will include two lecturers, two professors of practice (one assistant and one associate or full), two tenure-track faculty members (one associate and one full), one department chair, one representative from the CAS Dean's office, and one representative from the EVC Office. Additionally, I anticipate that at least one of the faculty members on the committee will be an active member of the Faculty Senate. I would welcome your input on appropriate membership for the committee. Please let me know by Monday, July 15 regarding your suggestions for the ad-hoc committee membership. We anticipate charging this committee by the end of the summer, and we expect to receive

its report by March 1, 2020.

I look forward to meeting you and other members of the Executive Committee next week and I would appreciate any feedback you and your colleagues would like to provide on this approach.

Kind regards,

Richard Moberly
Interim Executive Vice Chancellor

Cc: Ronnie Green, Chancellor
Elizabeth Theiss-Morse, Interim Dean, College
of Arts and Sciences Mark Button, Incoming
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Karen Griffin, Coordinator

APPENDIX B

Board of Regents Resolution - Presidential Search Advisory Committee

WHEREAS, the selection of our next president is a critically important decision for the University of Nebraska, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents wishes to articulate our current thinking on seven “Core Leadership Pillars” based on our interviews with AGB Search, which should serve as the foundation on which the Leadership Profile is build;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Presidential Search Advisory Committee consider the following Core Leadership Pillars for inclusion in the Leadership Profile:

1. **Proven Leader** – demonstrated ability to lead and manage a large, complex organization, work effectively with the elected Board of Regents as an integrated management team, build a strong leadership team, and display a commitment to integrity and ethics.
2. **Prioritizes Higher Education, Academic, and Research Excellence** – understands, appreciates, and prioritizes excellence in higher education, academics, and research; and its importance to faculty, students, and their families, and the state.
3. **Committed to “One Nebraska”** – ability to develop and implement more collaboration and cooperation among the four campuses that leads to the whole being greater than the sum of its parts. Maximizes the economic impact to the state. Connects with Nebraskans – rural and urban.
4. **Strategic Thinker** – ability to articulate a vision for the future of the University of Nebraska that can be developed into a strategic plan.
5. **Political Acumen** – ability to develop and maintain effective working relationships with the Governor, members of the Legislature, and other elected officials across the state.
6. **Capable of Fundraising** – ability to develop and cultivate relationships with potential donors and work with the University of Nebraska Foundation to design major capital campaigns.

7. **Values Intercollegiate Athletics** – understands and appreciates intercollegiate athletics, especially Husker Athletics; and views it as an important door to the University of Nebraska.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to members of the Presidential Search Advisory Committee and AGB Search.