

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

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

Absent: Belli, Franco Cruz

Date: September 24, 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 Announcements

2.1 Potential Faculty Members for Title IX Committee

Hanrahan reported that he received a potential list of faculty members to serve on the Title IX Committee. The Executive Committee then discussed the list and made additional recommendations.

2.2 Clarification being sought for approval of ARRC Procedure Changes

Hanrahan reported that he has sent an email message to Corporation Secretary Carmen Maurer asking for clarification on whether the Board of Regents must approve the changes to the ARRC procedures. He noted that the Board of Regents' Bylaws indicates that the Board approves the rules and procedures, although this is not entirely clear.

2.3 RCM Steering Committee Update

Peterson reported that the steering committee has fulfilled its obligation in developing the budget model. He stated that the decision was made to continue the steering committee to help address the governance issues of the budget model. He stated that the question is who will oversee the budget model. He noted that Professor Bloom of the APC has suggested that the APC might take a role, but there needs to be discussion on what the governance committee would look like. He pointed out that the steering committee was not discussing governance at the college level, but Dean Farrell, co-chair of the steering committee, thinks it would be a good idea to have governance at the college level as well as the campus level.

2.4 Service Delivery Initiative Update

Kolbe reported that the SDI Implementation Team has completed its work, but there was agreement that there needs to be an advisory committee at either the campus or college level to examine how things are working with the changes to the service delivery. He stated that each college has developed their own set of rules for transactions over the

years and there is a concerted effort to now have a standard set of rules for the entire campus.

2.5 2020-2025 Strategic Plan

Hanrahan reported that the draft of 2020-2025 Strategic Plan will be rolled out to the campus next week and is now available online <https://www.unl.edu/chancellor/n2025-draft-report>.

3.0 Approval of September 17, 2019 Minutes

Agenda item postponed until next week's meeting.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Goal Timelines

Agenda item postponed.

4.2 Academic Freedom Statements

Hanrahan stated that the effort to create statements on academic freedom were started by former EVC Plowman. He noted that one statement aims to define what academic freedom is, and the other is more of an internal document that provides more detailed information about academic freedom in teaching and learning. He stated that the EVC Office is asking for the Executive Committee to vet the statements with the goal of eventually presenting the statements to the Faculty Senate along with a resolution to support them.

Vakilzadian pointed out that there are areas in the statements that are in conflict with federal regulations. After reviewing the statements further the Executive Committee felt that there needs to be some clarification before it can be presented to the Senate. Agenda item tabled until a response providing clarification is received from AVC Walker.

4.3 Executive Committee Summer Report

The Executive Committee approved the Committee's summer report which will be presented to the Faculty Senate next week.

5.0 Interim EVC Moberly

5.1 How does the practice of the EVC Office of approving new hires work under the RCM Model?

Interim EVC Moberly reported that discussion about this issue began with the deans last week and is continuing. He stated that at this point the thinking is that there will be a light review by the EVC's office of college hiring plans to make sure that the college strategic plans are in step with the campus strategic plans. Kolbe asked if there would be a review of hiring needs at the beginning of the fiscal year. Interim EVC Moberly stated that with the RCM budget model the budgeting process will occur throughout the year.

Woodman asked if the EVC office will get all of the funds from unfilled positions as previously occurred with former EVC Plowman. Interim EVC Moberly stated that there is a difference in opinions with the deans in what they think should happen with open

faculty lines, but currently the thinking is that starting with the new fiscal year, July 1, 2020, the lines generally will remain in the colleges. Buan asked if lines could carry over if a search takes longer than anticipated. Interim EVC Moberly stated that the funds could be used for temporary hiring needs, but would more than likely be returned to the college the following year to hire someone for the vacant faculty line.

Interim EVC Moberly noted that the college budgets will fluctuate with people leaving, increased enrollment, and increased research funding. He pointed out that a baseline budget has been set by a formula which has assumptions built into it. He noted that some colleges may have extra funds in their budget some years while other colleges are in need, but even though a college may show a deficit, an investment in the college could be made because the opportunities for it to grow are great.

Adenwalla questioned whether colleges will have a little less power in some ways with the new budget model. Interim EVC Moberly stated that the colleges will actually have more power because they have greater control of what to do with the funds. He reported that the discussions occurring now focus on how colleges negotiate to get additional funding. He pointed out that with our current budget model funds get moved around, but very few people know where the funds go. With the RCM model transfer of funds would be much more visible. He noted that there needs to be trust that the leadership will move the funds to get colleges to move slowly in the direction they want to grow.

Hanrahan asked how the subvention funds are covered if a college runs in the deficit. Interim EVC Moberly stated that a college could be permitted to run in a deficit under the formula as part of the strategic investment of the university. He pointed out that assumptions should not be made if a college is “profitable” under the model that the college is running efficiently.

Hanrahan stated that the Executive Committee thinks there needs to be a faculty committee to provide oversight. He noted that such a committee should have conversations regarding the decision to shift funds. He pointed out that the faculty might be in a better position to identify the consequences if funds are shifted and it would not be seen as such a top-down decision.

Hanrahan expressed concern that the RCM model will put such a focus on obtaining funds at all costs that the value of programs will not be considered and this is another reason why there needs to be some sort of governing body that could serve as a check to the power of a dean. Interim EVC Moberly stated that Dean Farrell pointed out that the RCM model is just a tool, and it does not drive the values of the campus. He stated that the values are determined at both the unit level and the greater campus level.

Minter reported that the College of Arts & Sciences has sent a notice out to faculty members about a faculty committee that would be looking at the RCM. She pointed out that sometimes there is talk about having a college level oversight committee, but at other times there is talk about having a campus-wide oversight committee. Hanrahan stated that there needs to be both: a college committee that determines what is important for the

college, and a campus oversight committee so the administration cannot prioritize one field at the expense of another.

Minter asked who is tasked with messaging the campus about the change with the budget model. She noted that right now we are sub-venting each other and she worries that we don't have enough people creating the right kinds of conditions for people to trust the RCM model.

Kolbe questioned what the benefits of RCM are beyond the transparency. Interim EVC Moberly stated that currently all of the tuition goes into one central pool, but with the RCM model much of the tuition will go back to the college that generates the course. He pointed out that currently people may not be thinking about increasing enrollment, but the RCM model will help people become more creative in growing enrollment and recruiting students. Kolbe noted that growing enrollment is only one facet. Interim EVC Moberly stated that another way to improve the budget is for us to find scholarships that provide real dollars would be very helpful.

Woodman asked if the evaluation of Deans by the EVC would be as transparent as the budgeting process. Interim EVC Moberly stated that the new EVC will need to help make those kinds of decision. He reported that he imagines that there will be a meeting with the deans about strategic plans and to see how they are managing the budget.

Adenwalla noted that many faculty members are nervous because recently the College of Engineering has been given a significant number of faculty lines at the expense of other colleges and departments. Interim EVC Moberly pointed out that the transferring of faculty lines has always occurred, but with the RCM model these transfer will be more transparent.

5.2 Is strategic investment of the faculty driven by the college or outside forces?

Hanrahan asked how we make sure that we invest in some areas while we protect other needed areas that may not bring in as much money. Interim EVC Moberly stated that if a program is weak we should not want to invest in it, but the question is how do we determine what is considered a weak program. He noted that we have a limited amount of funds and we need to figure out how to use those funds as wisely as possible.

Peterson pointed out that reallocation of funds goes on now, it is just that we will be using a different budget model. He noted that the budget model doesn't solve issues, but it will hopefully give people the incentives to make improvements. Interim EVC Moberly pointed out that due to the transparency of the RCM model transfer of funds or lines is much more visible and administrators should be able to defend their decision and be able to justify the need for it.

Woodman stated that he is skeptical that the major decisions will continue to be made behind closed doors. Peterson stated that the governance discussion will be complex, but suggested that the governance committee could mimic the Academic Planning Committee where there is both representation from the faculty and administration. He

stated that the governance committee should be at the campus level. Interim EVC Moberly stated that there has been so much focus on determining the budget model, and it has been viewed as the most difficult part of the process when in reality creating a governance structure will probably be harder.

Vakilzadian asked if the strategic plan will be decided at the college or campus level. Interim EVC Moberly pointed out that strategic plans will be needed at both levels. He noted that colleges will need to decide where and how they want to grow and it would be wise for the colleges to dovetail their strategic plan with the campus plan. Vakilzadian asked if departments wanted to create a program would it have to get the funding from the college. Interim EVC Moberly stated that the college would have to approve supporting the program, although the Chancellor could be asked by the dean to provide some seed money to start the program.

Vakilzadian inquired about the structure of the proposed School of Computing and whether departments within the College of Engineering will be merged into the school. Interim EVC Moberly reported that at this time the proposal calls for the department of Computer Science and Engineering to be changed to a school and it will be moved solely into the College of Engineering. He noted that currently CSE is a department that reports to both Engineering and Arts & Sciences. He stated that he knows of no other new plans to merge other departments into the School at this time.

5.3 Updates:

Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Search

Interim EVC Moberly reported that the Chancellor has asked the EVC Office to run the search for the VC for Student Affairs. He stated that the search will be organized soon and the search process should begin in the next month or so.

Gender Equity Pay Initiative Recommended by Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee

Interim EVC Moberly noted that former EVC Plowman asked the deans for a list of faculty members who may be in need of equity raises and the deans independently submitted a list of names along with proposed salaries. He stated that 33 people were identified, but he had to inquire how the list was determined. Additionally, further benchmarking raises will be provided to some faculty. He reported that he asked the deans to look at their top performers over the past five years and compare their salaries to see if adjustments need to be made to provide internal consistency. He stated that the deans will develop proposals for these people and any remaining funds will be used for either equity increases or for benchmarking increases. He stated that the goal is to hear back from the deans on the equity raises beginning October 1, and on the benchmarking raise by December 1.

Purcell asked if this means the additional .4% salary increase for UNL has not been allocated yet. Interim EVC Moberly stated that this is correct. Minter asked if the salary increases will be part of the permanent budget. Interim EVC Moberly stated that they

would be in the permanent budget. Purcell asked if once the Chancellor approves the salary increases they would go into effect immediately. Interim EVC Moberly said yes.

Status of Proposed Changes to Student Code of Conduct

Interim EVC Moberly reported that Central Administration said that each of the campuses would have to approve the changes with the goal of having the same Student Code of Conduct for each campus. He noted that Assistant VC Jake Johnson informed him that his office is working with the other campuses and with General Counsel to come to mutual agreement on the proposed changes. He stated that the target is to have the campus responses back by November and for the Code to go to the Board of Regents in April for approval.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Resolution to Support Proposed Revisions to Board of Regents Bylaws

The Executive Committee discussed and revised a proposed resolution supporting suggested revisions to the BOR Bylaws. The Executive Committee approved presenting the resolution to the Senate at the October 1 meeting.

6.2 Request to Send Survey to Faculty

Hanrahan reported that he received a request to send out a survey to faculty that would provide information for a NSF research grant. He noted that the principal investigators were encouraged to reach out to Human Resources to see if they would send out the survey, but Human Resources stated that their policy is not to send out surveys to gather data for research grants. He asked whether the Senate's faculty email list should be used to send out the survey. Kolbe pointed out that if individual departments want to conduct the survey that is fine, but the Faculty Senate needs to use its email list for faculty governance issues.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, October 1, 2019 immediately following the Faculty Senate meeting. The meeting will be held in the City Campus Union, Platte River Rooms. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Joan Latta Konecky, Secretary.