

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** Belli, Buan, Franco Cruz, Hanrahan, Kolbe, Latta Konecky, Minter, Purcell, Vakilzadian, Woodman

**Absent:** Adenwalla, Fech, Peterson

**Date:** Tuesday, May 21, 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 2:32 p.m.

### 2.0 Vice Chancellor Boehm

#### 2.1 **With the proposed RCM budget model will transparency be enforced from the Chancellor's office all the way down to the department level? How much of the funds will be kept by the upper administration before the money moves down to the departments?**

VC Boehm pointed out that the first question needs to be addressed to Chancellor Green. He stated that his experience at Ohio State with the RCM model was that transparency was very clear at the highest level. He noted that once the budget has been given to a college, the culture of that college will determine how the funds will be dispersed. He stated that the chairs and directors will have to ask the question of whether they think resources will be distributed in a transparent manner. He noted that with the RCM model revenue generating units will help subsidize lesser revenue generating departments.

Buan asked if there are any thoughts on how the RCM model will work with interdisciplinary courses. VC Boehm reported that we are very early in understanding how our resources flow here, and we probably won't fully understand the flow until the third or fourth visit by Huron. He pointed out that there has been a great deal of discussion about interdisciplinary courses and how we will distribute the tuition from these courses. He suggested that one way to distribute the tuition from interdisciplinary courses is for the funds to go to the department that owns the prefix of the course, although there is discussion about the tuition going to the instructor's home department. He stated that further discussions are definitely needed to determine how everything will work. He stated that the model will be populated with data and the proposed model will run parallel to the current system which will allow us to observe if there are blind spots or gaps that will require revisions to our RCM model. He noted that there is a more collaborative shared governance approach with the RCM model, but every unit leader will need to make a decision regarding how transparent the model should be. He stated that he hopes there will be a group of faculty in IANR who will make inquiries about the budget and will raise any concerns they may have. Belli asked if the transparency will be

dependent with the college. VC Boehm stated that his experience has been that transparency is nuanced at the college level.

Woodman asked if the colleges will have more independence from the EVC office in how they use their resources. He questioned whether some of the responsibilities of the Academic Planning Committee will even be needed once the RCM model is in place because Deans could have the ability to control the programs and departments by the allocation of resources. Buan pointed out that college structure can vary, but there should be some protection for more vulnerable departments. VC Boehm agreed and stated that the model needs to be customizable at the college level. He noted that we have a buffering capacity built into the system and when it comes to the life, genesis and birth of an academic department there needs to be conversation about it with open debate. He stated that the RCM model is an ebb and flow of resources, and a Dean could decrease the number of faculty in a department through this ebb and flow, but he cautioned that if a faculty line is not replaced in a unit it becomes very personal for the unit. He noted that the APC process deals with catastrophic budget cuts.

Woodman stated that there is the concern that the Deans will be the primary decision maker for determining the department budgets. VC Boehm stated that he thinks the Deans need to be more actively engaged with the budgeting. He noted that EVC Plowman made a decision early in her role as EVC to pull any open faculty line back to her office. The challenge with this is that open lines generate cash when they are not filled and the Deans use that cash to fund things like temporary instructors. He stated that what he thinks will happen is that all of the college budgets will be rebased and that faculty lines will reside back with the Deans. He stated that if a Dean wants more faculty lines they will then need to go back to their VC to request the lines.

VC Boehm stated that with the RCM model 100% of the revenue will flow from the administration to the colleges. The colleges will then distribute funds to the departments, but there will not be set budgets like there is currently. However, before funds are distributed to the colleges it will need to be determined how facility costs and other expenses will be covered. He reported that at Ohio State there was a central tax of 24% that was taken off the top of the combined funding sources, and for the first time the colleges received bills for utilities. He noted that everything was monetized. He stated that he thinks all of the F & A from research grants will be returned to the college and from there the department will receive a portion of the F & A. He pointed out that currently ORED pays for about half of the start-up costs for new faculty members, but with the budget changes the departments and colleges will be solely responsible for the startup costs. He noted that currently F & A covers the costs of ORED, but with the change to the RCM model some kind of tax would be needed to help cover the costs of ORED operations.

Latta Konecky asked how the tax would be handled to cover the use of the libraries. VC Boehm stated that someone will determine how much it costs to run the library. He noted that if the Dean of Libraries makes a request for additional funding a shared governance process will be needed to validate the request. He stated that formulas will need to be

developed to determine what the tax will be to cover those units that do not generate their own revenue.

## **2.2 With the proposed changes to the teaching evaluation process, describe how teaching evaluations are used in IANR promotion and tenure.**

VC Boehm stated that teaching and learning is a critical mission area in IANR and each department promotion and tenure committee evaluates the output of a faculty member according to their apportionment. He reported that faculty member evaluations are based on peer evaluations, peer review, self-assessment, and evaluation of teaching and learning. He stated that the change with the teaching evaluation process will not impact how IANR uses course evaluations in reviewing faculty members.

VC Boehm pointed out that he considers the promotion and tenure process the most sacred elements of faculty governance. He stated that he wants to encourage faculty at the local level to have open dialogues about what effective teaching looks like and how it is valued in the promotion and tenure process. Woodman asked what would happen if a dean was to tell a department that they can't use teaching evaluations in the annual review process for faculty members. VC Boehm stated that there are bylaws in place that need to be followed, and faculty members need to hold administrators accountable for adhering to these bylaws. He stated that he is concerned with the radical differences in department promotion and tenure processes and stated that important conversations are needed about the process to address these disparities. Kolbe asked if VC Boehm sees any changes occurring in department promotion and tenure processes with faculty members retiring or leaving. VC Boehm pointed out that the P & T process starts and ends with the faculty and he does not think administrators should get involved with the department process.

Hanrahan noted that teaching evaluations play a heavy role in determining salary increases. VC Boehm stated that assessing effective teaching by a faculty colleague can be subjective, but when faculty members receive formal recognition of teaching awards this goes a long way in ensuring that the faculty member will be rewarded at the local level. He pointed out that there are faculty members that are doing amazing jobs of teaching that aren't in academic departments and this is something that he feels needs to be considered.

## **2.3 What bold steps are the IANR senior leadership team envisioning, to solve pay equity within the IANR tenured/tenure track faculty lines?**

VC Boehm reported that when the Extension Educator salaries were examined for inequities the decision was made to also look at the salaries of the 330 IANR tenure-track faculty members. He noted that the effort has taken 14 months due to the difficulty of understanding a faulty data system, but he stated that the IANR administration is getting close to making some bold adjustments. He pointed out that in regards to gender equity there is no egregious problems, but there a few salaries that need to be adjusted. He reported that approximately 50% of the inequities in IANR salaries are due to the calendar year contract versus the academic year contract. He stated that 30% of IANR

faculty members are on academic year contract and 70% are on calendar year contracts, but the problem is that these faculty members are hired at the same salary.

Belli asked why some faculty members are given an academic year contract while others are given a calendar year contract. VC Boehm stated that he has not been able to determine the reason for the difference. He noted that new faculty members want to be on a 9-month appointment which will give them time to work on developing high paying grants. He reported that his administration is working on developing a plan to look at salary inequities and the differences in contracts to boost salaries. He stated that he inherited \$150,000 in the IANR budget from when Chancellor Perlman held back .5% of permanent budget dollars, and he is using this money to deal with salary inequities. He reported that .4% of the 2.4% salary increase for the University approved by the Unicameral will be going to UNL to address salary inequities. He stated that he thinks IANR will default to hiring faculty members on 9-month contracts, and if a faculty member is hired for 12-months the additional needed funding will need to come from a supplemental fund. He pointed out that we need to be competitive with the other Big Ten salaries.

VC Boehm reported that in examining the 330 tenure track faculty salaries he requested seven years of annual evaluations which were examined to see where the faculty member fell in the evaluation scale. He noted that we want to make sure we can retain a faculty member who has been here for seven years and has a 3.5 evaluation rating. He stated that 133 faculty members have been identified who meet the 3.5 rating. He pointed out that he is not just interested in parity, but in looking at equity based on performance. He noted that City Campus has another 650 faculty members that need to be examined for salary equity.

VC Boehm stated that he hopes to be able to start addressing the salary inequities with the new fiscal year in July. He pointed out that making these salary adjustments will mean that filling open positions will slow down because additional permanent funding will be needed. He noted that we need to make sure we are taking care of the people here rather than adding more people only to lose those we already have. He stated that the plan is to come back every year to see how we are doing with making the needed salary adjustments.

#### **2.4 What are the plans for the Rural Futures Institute moving forward?**

VC Boehm reported that as Vice President of Agriculture and Natural Resources the Rural Futures Institute (RFI) falls under his management. He noted that the idea behind the RFI is to leverage the talents and research expertise from across the four campuses of the University to help identify the successes of the rural communities and to empower them. He reported that the budget of the RFI was reduced considerably in the 2017-18 budget cuts. He stated that Interim Executive Director Connie Reimers-Hild will be leaving and his plans are to appoint a director, preferably someone who is the head of a department, to handle the RFI. He stated that he also plans to appoint a taskforce to examine all of the university's assets for rural initiatives and to create a collaborative

structure that better deals with our rural efforts and allows the RFI to move forward. He pointed out that the RFI will be organized differently than it is today.

**2.5 What is the status of the resolution to change the BOR Bylaws about extending the termination notice time to 90 days for Assistant Extension Educators, 180 days for Associate Extension Educators, and 365 days for Extension Educators and explicitly stating that Extension Educators are faculty members?**

VC Boehm noted that this is a question that needs to be addressed to Chancellor Green. He pointed out that he approved the resolution and it was sent to the Chancellor but ultimately needs to be approved by the Board of Regents.

**2.6 Status of the IANR Promotion and Tenure Bylaw Changes - what is the timeline for moving forward?**

VC Boehm stated that although the proposal to change the IANR promotion and tenure process failed by only ten votes, a great deal was learned from the experience. He reported that Associate VC Bischoff will be having dialogues with the faculty when they return to campus for the start of the academic year and afterwards the question will be put forward again. He noted that the IANR Liaison Committee is part of the IANR governance structure and there are good conversations with the members of the committee and the IANR Faculty Senators. Purcell pointed out that the Senators and members of the Liaison Committee are not afraid to ask questions of the IANR administrators. VC Boehm pointed out that they also hold the administration accountable and he noted that he feels good about the relationship. He stated that he is confident that the process for moving the promotion and tenure change forward will be better and is hoping that it will be successful.

**3.0 Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity and Inclusion Report (Professor Lee and Director Tetreault)**

Lee reported that the Senate formed the Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity and Inclusion in September 2016 with the initial expectation of the Committee presenting a report in March 2017. However, he pointed out that the protocol could not be finalized in time and the focus groups took considerably more time than anticipated.

Lee stated that from the outset, the Ad Hoc Committee knew that the campus had hired Halualani & Associates to complete a diversity analysis during the 2016-17 academic year and that the University was going to conduct a Gallup survey about diversity and inclusion. As a result the Ad Hoc Committee decided that it wanted to run a series of focus groups with historically underrepresented groups. Lee then discussed the history and prejudice of universities in the country, including the history of discrimination at UNL with women and people of color.

Lee reported that the Committee ran 12 focus groups, four of these were with LGBTQA+ students, faculty, and staff. He stated that students generally thought UNL had a good climate for the LGBTQA+ community and they were fairly positive about the city of Lincoln, although some students indicated they are not as comfortable in the city and on

certain parts of city campus as well as east campus. He noted that there was overwhelming positive responses regarding the LGBTQA+ Resource Center and many participants pointed out how it was extremely helpful to them. He reported that the stickers on the doors of offices throughout the campus indicating that it was a safe place meant a lot to students. However, students commented that they did not see many of these stickers on East Campus and would conceal their sexual identity when they were there. Lee stated that an issue raised by transgender students was the lack of gender neutral bathrooms.

Tetreault noted that there has been progress over time for LGBTQA+ students, faculty, and staff, but further improvements are still needed. She reported that there are now five recognized LGBTQ+A groups on campus. She noted that some students feel UNL is the best environment that they have been in while others do not feel it is safe. She pointed out that the more people conceal their identity the greater their fear. She noted that the differing perceptions are based on past as well as current experiences. She reported that the LGBTQA+ Resource Center's 2017 campus climate and needs assessment survey indicated that students who concealed their identities reported significantly higher levels of anxiety, depression, and lower overall wellbeing.

Tetreault stated that the bathroom issue is significant, and she knows of students who plan their routes on campus so they can use a family friendly bathroom. Buan asked if the East Campus Union renovations will include adding a gender inclusive restroom. Tetreault reported that a gender inclusive restroom is to be added, and it is her understanding that any new building on campus is required to include a family friendly restroom, although this information does not seem to be available to the campus community since there is no restroom policy guidance. Woodman asked if there is any policy relating to renovations on older buildings. Tetreault stated that if it is feasible to install a gender inclusive bathroom it is supposed to be included when a building is renovated. She noted that in Nebraska there is a requirement that there be a certain number of bathrooms available in a building based on how many people will be using the building. She noted that usually a women's restroom is converted to be gender inclusive. She reported that there is a guide available listing the gender neutral restrooms on the LGBTQA+ Resource Center's website (<https://unl.app.box.com/file/440972956599>).

Lee stated that a focus group was conducted with Muslim students and there were largely encouraging stories from graduate students regarding their experiences at UNL. He noted that the international graduate students felt welcomed by their graduate advisor. He reported that one issue facing Muslim students was having a designated prayer room and there were also some struggles with their dietary restrictions. He noted that some students were afraid to leave the country due to Trump's travel restrictions and Omani students felt that they were treated much more unfairly at the border crossings.

Lee reported that international students who share a room with American students had positive reports and felt welcomed by their roommates. He stated that an issue for some international students is that not enough time is given for them to understand technical documents which impacts their academic standing. He noted that some universities give

international students an extra year to better develop their language skills. He stated that academic advising did not recognize that some international students need to go more slowly in order for them to comprehend English.

Franco Cruz asked if there were any guidelines that could assist the Muslim students in getting prayer space. Tetreault reported that it was her understanding that at one time space was being considered in the Union where the Pantry is now located, but the space needs to be large enough to accommodate separate prayer space for women and men. She stated that she is not aware of any plans at this point in time to create or provide a prayer space. Franco Cruz asked if a prayer space is being considered for both City and East Campus Unions. Tetreault stated that a prayer space would just be located in the City Campus Union. Lee pointed out that Muslim students have a prayer meeting every Friday in the Union, but they pray every day and take a break at lunch to do this. He noted that students stated that their academic advisors and instructors were supportive of their prayer break. Woodman asked if there is a mosque in Lincoln. Lee reported that there was a mosque in the city.

Lee stated that originally the Ad Hoc Committee did not plan on conducting a focus group with Jewish students, but the rise of anti-Semitism has frightened many of them. He reported that the Jewish students felt that they live on a Christian campus because of all the churches located in close proximity to the campus. He noted that the Jewish students were very encouraged by the respect students who took the History department's Holocaust course displayed. He reported that the Holocaust is a specific historical event that has significant meaning for the Jewish community, and they find the use of the word in other contexts to be very objectionable. He stated that the Jewish students have reached out and had good relationships with the Muslim student groups.

Lee stated that the largest focus group was with Asian Americans, many of whom are second generation. He noted they were asked how they interacted with the Asian international students and their response was that they occasionally reached out, but most of the international students tend to stay with students from their own country. He reported that some of the Asian American students felt there were some stereotypes, but overall felt comfortable with their lives. Woodman asked if East Asian students were included in the focus group. Lee stated that there were some. Woodman suggested that focus groups be held with south Asian students since there is a large number of them on campus.

Lee stated that it was difficult to have a focus group with students with disabilities because there was hesitancy from the prior leadership of the student group about the research that was being conducted. Tetreault noted that she is advisor to the University Disability Club and she knows that the leadership was hesitant to have students participate with the focus group because of concerns that it could trigger the trauma that many of the students experienced which resulted in their disability or because of the difficulties in living with disabilities. She noted that students with physical disabilities have been body shamed, but there are also students who have disabilities that are not visible.

Tetreault stated that one of the issues facing some disabled students is dealing with accommodations. She noted that they have to first prove that they need accommodations, then develop a plan which then has to be implemented. She pointed out that we are a compliance campus so oftentimes disabled students have to fight for their accommodations. She stated that most classrooms are not set up to accommodate a wheel chair and the disabled student is left sitting in the front of the classroom. She noted that disabled students often have to advocate for themselves, but are often viewed as being too aggressive when they do. Lee stated that another issue is the lack of qualified note takers for technical courses. He noted that they frequently do not understand the topic well enough to take adequate notes for those who have learning disabilities. Tetreault stated that these issues are not a criticism of the Services for Students with Disabilities office, but show the need for more staff, funding, and education. Hanrahan suggested that training for faculty and staff to help students with disabilities would be helpful. He asked whether ASUN should consider a resolution requiring all instructors' lectures be taped. Woodman pointed out that most large lecture classes are videotaped. Latta Konecky wondered what kind of connection there was between the Explore Center advisors and the Services for Students with Disabilities office. Tetreault pointed out that some students who have disabilities do not want to go to the SSD office. Kolbe noted that the students may be concerned that there is a stigma attached to being identified as having a learning disability.

Minter stated that students with disabilities may have a more difficult time when they get to the university because in the K-12 schools students receive more assistance in dealing with their disability, whereas at the University they have to handle getting any assistance on their own. She wondered if there is a designated person on campus who contacts these students to help them before they arrive.

Lee stated that more than any other group, the African American students experienced a number of uncomfortable situations, and oftentimes found themselves as being the only African American in the class. He stated that it is clear that the presence of African American faculty members makes a clear difference for the students. He noted that African American graduate students are typically more isolated, and while they may know that there are African American faculty members at the University, they do not have opportunities to talk to them. Buan pointed out that there used to be an African American group on campus.

Lee reported that the faculty African American focus group described the climate on campus as lukewarm, and they often feel that they are viewed as an affirmative action hire. He stated that these faculty members are rarely awarded for participating in diversity efforts. He noted that African American students felt the same way as the LBGTQ+A students about East Campus not being a welcoming place. He pointed out that he has mentioned this concern to VC Boehm.

Lee stated that the Ad Hoc Committee had planned to have a Latino focus group, but was unable to get it coordinated. Tetreault noted that our Native American population is so



small it makes it difficult to hold a focus group. Buan pointed out that we do not capture our state's Native American population of students. Lee noted that it is hard to get the students to move from the reservation because students often feel that they lose their culture if they move away.

Hanrahan asked if there is anything that the Faculty Senate should work on in regards of diversity efforts. Lee stated that there needs to be greater education for instructors regarding diversity. He noted that there are still instructors asking people to speak for their race in a course. Tetreault stated that this is a common occurrence for many students of color as well as LGBTQA+ students. Everyone in the class will look to them to answer anything that is brought up regarding race or the LGBTQA+ population. She suggested that the Senate should advocate for people thinking beyond the gender binary. She stated that the university forms should be changed to have a gender X option on the form for those people who do not identify as either male or female. She stated that language in regards to LGBTQA+ is constantly changing so people should be aware of the language being used. Lee stated that we need a more diverse people, but we need a climate that will foster diversity and considers intersectional identities.

#### **4.0 Announcements**

##### **4.1 Service Delivery Initiative**

Belli stated that it is his understanding that an implementation committee is going to be constituted for developing the business centers. Buan stated that she has heard from staff that they are worried that there is a lack of feedback from staff on the SDI.

##### **4.2 President Search Committee Recommendation**

Hanrahan stated that the Board of Regents has sent a letter seeking recommendations for nominating two faculty members to serve on the President's search committee. The Executive Committee agreed that Hanrahan and Belli should be nominated.

##### **4.3 Search for Director of Teaching and Learning Center**

Woodman reported that the two final candidates for the position rejected the offer. Minter stated that the plan is to re-advertise the position.

#### **5.0 Approval of April 30, 2019 and May 7, 2019 Minutes**

Purcell moved to approve the April 30, 2019 revised minutes. Motion seconded by Latta Konecky and approved by the Executive Committee.

Purcell moved to approve the May 7, 2019 revised minutes. Motion seconded by Latta Konecky and approved by the Executive Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, June 4, 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.