EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: **Belli, Hanrahan, Kolbe, Latta Konecky, Minter, Peterson, Purcell, Vakilzadian, Woodman**

Absent: **Adenwalla, Buan, Fech, Franco Cruz**

Date: **September 17, 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 VC Nunez
2.1 RCM Update
VC Nunez reported that the steering committee continued to meet during the summer with a lot of work behind the scenes. Summer has been very busy with a Chancellor's retreat where he and co-chair Dean Farrell gave a presentation on the progress of our hybrid RCM budget model, and campus forums on June 25th and August 22nd. The second forum was held with a panel of qualified administrators from other institutions who discussed their experiences with having a hybrid RCM budget model. He pointed out that each of the administrators stated that the RCM model has been effective and that they would not go back to their former incremental budgeting system.

VC Nunez stated that last week the Deans' retreat was held and parameters outlining the RCM budget model based on the 2018 budget data were presented. This directional model was affirmed by the Deans. He noted that this information will be shared with the Steering Team, Chancellor and the campus soon.

VC Nunez reported that there has been significant discussion on the implementation of the model as we move forward including the issues of governance. He stated that a centralized budget oversight body is typical nationally at institutions with similar models. Peterson asked if the governance body would be in the colleges. VC Nunez stated that this is the purview of the deans, but what he is discussing is one for serving the university. He stated that there may need to be a mechanism where increases or decreases to resource pools could be vetted. Another committee generally needed in a hybrid RCM model is a strong university curriculum committee. UNL has such a committee and it seems this committee could be aligned with the budget model efforts to prevent duplication of courses by colleges seeking to bolster their student credit hour production.

VC Nunez stated that with our hybrid budget model all funds will go through the colleges, but the colleges will pay for university services via costs pools. For example he noted that colleges will be charged the cost of administrative operating expenses, space allocation by square footage in the college's buildings, and academic services. Peterson noted that colleges might promote conserving electricity and other utilities if they have to pay the costs for them. He stated that at some universities departments were giving space back once the RCM model started being used.

Vakilzadian asked who decides how much colleges will be taxed and who will make the decision to increase or decrease college budgets. Nunez stated that direct costs will be allocated to a cost pool and an algorithm will be used to determine the proportion of cost to colleges. He stated that a best practice is oversight committees to address these issues as they arise. Vakilzadian pointed out that salary increases are given with promotion and tenure, and noted that some colleges have more faculty members receiving promotion and tenure from year to year which could affect their budget. VC Nunez pointed out that the cost of covering promotion and tenure salary increases is covered through state appropriated funds from Central Administration and the Legislature. However, if no new resources are received colleges cover the costs.

Hanrahan asked where the transparency is with the RCM model. VC Nunez stated that it is in how the model is structured. He stated that faculty will be able to see the revenue funds and established cost pools. He noted that there are true costs that benefit the greater good that have to be covered, such as paying for the University Police and Admissions Office. He pointed out that administrative offices are now considered in cost pools. Hanrahan asked who determines what the costs are going to be. VC Nunez stated that the university has established costs already and new costs are either driven by inflation increases or new priorities.

VC Nunez stated that the figures for 2020 will become the genesis for the 2021 budget and the college figures for each year will be based on revenues minus direct expenditures and applied costs. These will be reviewed to ensure that the figures are accurately reported. He noted that many units have more expenses than the revenue they generate and so we are all subsidized in some way by state allocations. He stated that the purpose of the RCM model is to incentivize colleges and departments to seek revenue enhancement.

Hanrahan stated that the Executive Committee is planning on resurrecting the Budget Committee and suggested that this could be the governing body. VC Nunez stated that national best practices show the benefits of a more expansive group with representation from administration and staff. He indicated that the committee might be too insular and lack the necessary information and representation. He pointed out that the APC has some budget responsibilities and it has both faculty members and administrators on it. He suggested that a broader executive group seems appropriate, but there could be a subgroup that looks specifically at faculty issues. Peterson suggested looking at the other Big Ten schools that have RCM budgets to see what kind of governing body they have.

Woodman asked if a Dean could propose different salary increases for their college. He pointed out that some colleges have differential tuition and wondered if this would impact the college budget that would allow for higher salary increases. VC Nunez noted that the Board has to approve salary increases and the amount is typically the same for all of the campuses.

Hanrahan stated that at the forum there was discussion about colleges creating a committee to help oversee the budget. He reported that the Senate could assist with this by passing a resolution stating that colleges need to create a budget advisory group. He also stated that the forum pointed out that deans would have to be good at resource management or the RCM model could fail. He asked what help has been given to deans to help them adjust to the new budget. VC Nunez reported that the deans have met multiple times with the consultants, their staff, and the B&F team to help get them ready for the budget model. He stated that his office would not dictate that colleges must have an advisory committee. He noted that the college business officers will have an elevated role in assisting the Deans with budgets. He pointed out that the mission of the University is the most important thing that needs to be supported. He stated that it is important that the Deans and the colleges think of the future of both their colleges and the University when they are making budget decisions.

VC Nunez stated that the steering committee has technically satisfied its charge at this point, but there is much more work to be done. He indicated the Steering Team is working to define the ongoing role.

Purcell noted that IANR has its own budget and asked if the VC of IANR will have control over the Institute's budget. VC Nunez stated that IANR does have its own budget and this will remain, and IANR will be considered a primary unit in the RCM model.

Kolbe asked if the budget oversight committee will have a way for colleges to raise concerns if they felt that they were not receiving the correct allocation. VC Nunez stated that this needs to be outlined as the governance structure is determined.

2.2   Service Delivery Initiative Update
VC Nunez stated that the SDI Implementation Team includes faculty, staff, and administrators and they are looking at university-wide business processes individually to assess the value and seek methods for improvement. He reported that a process improvement person was hired in Business and Finance using existing positions to help focus us on the effort.

VC Nunez stated that there is a goal is to develop metrics and performance indicators to evaluate the effectiveness of services. Travel reimbursement is one example. Hanrahan asked what metrics are being reviewed. VC Nunez stated that it is the time between receipt of the travel form and processing, quantity and time in queue among others as determined by the Team. Hanrahan asked if this can be reviewed at the college level. VC Nunez stated that with the Concur system the travel reimbursement process can be tracked down to the college and person level.

Kolbe, who serves on the SDI Implementation Team, reported that the team is trying to create a system where there is shared resources across the campus. He pointed out that each college would retain their own business offices, but for more universal business transactions such as travel or PAF, the business people in a larger college could assist the smaller colleges with the processing of transactions. VC Nunez stated that the idea is to equalize the workload among the colleges. He pointed out that processing a PAF or travel reimbursement does not require the business person be in the same college. He noted that sharing resources would also cover incidents of maternity leave or extended leaves of absence because it would allow the necessary work to be done by others.

VC Nunez stated that the SDI is not meant to be controversial, but rather a chance for us to conduct business more efficiently and effectively and to hopefully find some savings in the process. Latta Konecky noted that the goal is not to reduce the workforce by a certain percentage, but to meet the capacity of needs more efficiently.

Hanrahan asked where the SDI is in the development stage. VC Nunez stated that it is moving into the operationalizing stage. Kolbe stated that in theory, the new standardized processes will start next summer when things are typically quieter on campus.

Woodman pointed out that the faculty and staff are going to ask where administrative efficiencies are going to be made. VC Nunez reported that the Chancellor is intent on looking into administrative efficiencies.

Woodman asked if there will be communication on what will be occurring in the colleges so faculty know what to expect. Kolbe stated that the departments will still have autonomy because departments and colleges still do things that are unique to them. He stated that the idea with the SDI is to create a shared pool of people that are experts at particular business processes. He noted that there was a concern that all of the finance people were going to be moved into a central location, but this is not going to happen. Woodman asked if there is going to be personnel movement. Kolbe stated that staff will have the opportunity to be promoted to an expert status, which could mean that their office location would be moved. He noted that his college sent a survey out to get a better idea of what the faculty and staff are feeling which will provide some guidance in how the college wants to structure its business operations. Latta Konecky pointed out that a position could stay within the college, but the person in that position might be moved to a different location within the college. Kolbe stated that this is one of the potential models, but it is now up to the colleges to decide how they want to do this. He reported that the SDI implementation team is not dictating to the colleges how they should structure their business operations.

3.0   Announcements
 3.1   Town Hall Meeting
Hanrahan reported that the Chancellor has called for a Town Hall meeting on Monday, September 23 and the 2025 Plan is scheduled to be rolled out during the meeting.

3.2   Meeting with Dean Carr

Hanrahan reported that he and Buan met with Dean Carr to talk about CollegeNET, the new graduate application software.   He noted that Dean Carr stated that there was faculty involvement in reviewing the software, and some of them were Senators, but Hanrahan pointed out that the Senators might not have known they were representing the Senate.

3.3   Meeting with Interim EVC Moberly, AVC Walker, and AVC Batman

Hanrahan reported that he met with Interim EVC Walker, AVC Walker and AVC Batman to discuss faculty appointments to deans search committees. He stated that they agreed that the EVC office will provide a list of names which the Executive Committee will review and provide input on and identify other faculty members they would like to see on the search committee. He reported that once the Committee submits the names, if the administration wants to make additional changes to the membership of the search committee they would negotiate it with the Senate President.

Woodman asked what would happen if the administrators refused the names submitted by the Executive Committee. Hanrahan reported that the suggested faculty members for a dean's search comes from the college, and typically the administration is looking for a particular number of faculty members to serve on the search committee. He stated that when the Senate President provides the list of names the administrators will review the list and could eliminate faculty members based on pragmatic decisions. He stated that if a significant number of faculty members are eliminated, but the administration has found other faculty members to appoint to the search committee, they will confirm approval of the new members with the Senate President. He pointed out that the process is similar to the one that the Chancellor and the Executive Committee agreed to.

Purcell asked if there has been a similar discussion with the IANR administrators. Hanrahan stated that he will push forward with having this discussion.

3.4   Title IX Collaborative Work Group

Minter asked for an update regarding the Work Group. Hanrahan stated that he has not been asked by the administration yet for recommendations of members to serve on the Group. He stated that he has collected names and additional recommendations can be sent to him.

Purcell reported that she and Latta Konecky were asked to review an online Title IX and Sexual Misconduct training demonstration for administration, faculty, staff, and students. She stated that she liked the proposed training and felt that it was very interactive and she conveyed this to Tami Strickman, Associate to the Chancellor. Hanrahan stated that the training focuses on how people can be more respectful and how to make the campus a great place to be. Woodman asked if the training will keep a record of peoples' responses. Latta Konecky stated that the only record that is kept is whether a person completed the training.

3.5   Ad Hoc Committee on Lecturers
Belli reported that the Committee met and he and Woodman were made co-chairs. He stated that he would like to share the results of the non-tenure track faculty survey that the Senate conducted with the Ad Hoc Committee. Hanrahan noted that the Executive Committee agreed in a previous meeting that the aggregate results could be shared. Belli stated that he will share the summary data with Woodman and Minter to get their opinion to ensure that the information does not violate the anonymity of the respondents.

4.0   Approval of September 10, 2019 Minutes
The Executive Committee approved the revised minutes. There was one abstention.

5.0   Unfinished Business
5.1   Executive Committee Goals
The Executive Committee worked on further revisions to the 2019-2020 goals.

5.2   Goal Timelines
Agenda item postponed.

6.0   New Business
6.1   Academic Freedom Statements
Hanrahan asked the Executive Committee members to review the academic freedom statements that were previously developed by a task force created by former EVC Plowman. He noted that the Executive Committee reviewed the statements earlier in the year and provided feedback, but these are now the updated versions.

6.2   Agenda Items for Interim EVC Moberly
The Executive Committee identified the following agenda items the meeting with Interim EVC Moberly:
- How does the practice of the EVC Office of approving new hires work under the RCM model?
- Is strategic investment of faculty driven by the college or outside forces?
- Updates:
  VC for Student Affairs Search
  Gender Equity Pay Initiative Recommended by FCAC
  Update on the Proposed Changes to Student Code of Conduct

6.3   Executive Committee Summer Report
Agenda item postponed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:34 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, September 24, 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.