

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Present:** Baesu, Bearnese, Billesbach, Buan, Eklund, Gay, Kolbe, Krehbiel, Minter, Weissling, Woodman, Zuckerman

**Absent:** Herstein

**Date:** Tuesday, April 12, 2022

**Location:** Nebraska Union, Chimney Rock Room and by Zoom

**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 (*Kolbe*)

Kolbe called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.

### 2.0 Chancellor Green/VC Boehm

#### 2.1 Analysis of Service Apportionment for IANR Faculty Members

Kolbe noted that VC Boehm had mentioned at his last meeting with the Executive Committee that he would have an analysis conducted of IANR service apportionments. VC Boehm reported that a preliminary analysis has been looked at and pointed out that service can run the spectrum for IANR faculty with faculty in the Nebraska Forest Service and Veterinary Diagnostic Center having 100% service apportionments to faculty with little or no formal ‘service’ apportionment such as Extension Educators because it is embedded their job description.

VC Boehm stated that there needs to be consideration on what ‘service’ is and how it is defined by the faculty of individual units. He shared that he would be asking the IANR Faculty Liaison Committee to discuss the ‘service’ apportionments across IANR and to see if they have any recommendations. Zuckerman pointed out that service is not valued in the tenure process resulting in fewer people willing to participate in service activities. VC Boehm suggested that previously approved promotion and tenure files could be reviewed to determine if service was a factor in granting tenure and promotion.

Weissling stated that there is also an issue of alignment of apportionments. She pointed out that those faculty members serving as graduate chairs have a greater level of service and their apportionment should be adjusted accordingly. VC Boehm stated that there needs to be consideration of what is considered service at the unit level, and how it is valued. He stated that there needs to be formal acknowledgement of a person’s role in a unit, and he will have IANR do a comprehensive look to see if this in fact occurs within the units. Weissling asked if a faculty member is asked to be graduate chair would the chair then adjust that faculty member’s apportionment to allow the faculty member time to do the duties of being graduate chair. VC Boehm pointed out that it is easy to change apportionments when both the faculty member and the department chair/head are in agreement, but there is a more complicated process if there is disagreement.

Billesbach suggested that instead of reviewing promotion files that have been approved, whether it would be better to look at tenure cases that were not granted to see if promotion would have been successful had the person had more time for service work. VC Boehm reported that since he has been here there have only been two denials for promotion and tenure out of 138 promotion files. He stated that by and large the faculty take the success of their colleagues seriously and that service to the unit, discipline, IANR and UNL was valued.

Kolbe noted that the question regarding service work and being acknowledged for that service work in their annual evaluations has also been asked of EVC Ankerson.

Minter stated that the Executive Committee is more concerned about the principle of shared governance that is part of everyone's express role. She believes that there needs to be an institution-wide commitment to service but asked if we have consistency across the units in how service is valued. She stated that the Committee wants to ensure that there is equity in how the service responsibilities are allotted and awarded. VC Boehm noted that there are numerous separate departments that have different bylaws and each one is encouraged to have conversations about shared governance. He stated that he thinks the IANR Faculty Liaison Committee would be interested in the discussion about service and how it is defined and rewarded, and he would be happy to come back and report on the Committee's findings.

Gay pointed out that serving on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee takes a lot of time, especially for the officers, but there is not much recognition for the work. He stated that if faculty members are expected to do more than they need to they should get paid for it. He stated that the Faculty Senate is the voice of the faculty, and the Executive Committee members ought to be provided with a buyout from some of their responsibilities as a faculty member and officers should also receive financial incentives.

Zuckerman stated that when a department has primarily junior faculty members, they need to do service work that would normally be done by tenured faculty members. Weissling stated that she knows of junior faculty members who are interested in serving on the Faculty Senate but have been discouraged by other faculty members. She pointed out that this creates a lot of uneducated and unconnected faculty members because they are not encouraged to do service work which would broaden their connections and provide greater knowledge of the university.

Minter stated that a shared project would be to ensure that people are recognized for the service work that they do and that they understand why service work is valuable. VC Boehm suggested collectively finding ways to value service.

Buan reported that in serving as an IChange coordinator she learned from a focus group that there is a very strong motivation for doing service work but when the service is devalued it effects the retention of diverse faculty members.

## **2.2 Process for distributing this year's \$5 million competitive market salary increases for tenure track faculty members and how is it being made transparent.**

Chancellor Green stated that the process is similar to what was used last year in that the work is being done at the dean's level of each college and they have been charged with providing transparency and communication about the process. He noted that the same process of comparing market salaries for each individual tenure-line faculty members is being done in each of the colleges except for one where the faculty voted to forego the merit increases and instead want the funding added to the college merit pool so that non-tenure track faculty members could receive a salary increase as well.

Eklund asked if this is related to the pay raise that was provided last fall to some tenure line faculty members. Chancellor Green stated that it is the same, however this year the increases will be done as part of the annual review process. Eklund stated that he was made aware of the salary increases through a colleague in his department but pointed out that faculty members who have worked hard to build a strong portfolio and did not receive an increase felt neglected. Chancellor Green stated that he was not aware at the time last year that the guidelines were not made available to all faculty members. He noted that the guidelines stated that an analysis of each tenure-line faculty member's salary would be conducted to see if their salary was competitive with others in their field or were lagging their peers' salaries. Eklund asked if the Oklahoma State Metrics was used. Chancellor Green stated that it was used and pointed out that these increases are not an ongoing process.

Gay asked if the funding was an initiative from President Carter. Chancellor Green stated that was the President's strategic priority and the funding primarily went to UNL because tenure-line faculty salaries were significantly lagging our peers. He noted that \$5 million was set aside from the system budget for two years to address the salary inequities.

Buan reported that the Faculty Compensation Advisory Committee was concerned whether the first salary increases were distributed equitably. Chancellor Green once again pointed out that competitive market salaries were reviewed for individual tenure-line faculty members to see if their salaries were lagging, and the funds provided by President Carter were used to address this lag. He noted that he is hoping that at the end of the upcoming fiscal year we will have made improvements.

Chancellor Green stated that he shared with the university's leadership that there is serious concern on the staff side because there has been a lack of attention to being able to increase compensation for staff members and any salary increases over recent years have been low and marginal. He pointed out that the market both locally and nationally for staff is very competitive and recruiting and retaining staff members is becoming increasingly more difficult.

## **2.3 Tenure Density Report**

Minter reported that she saw the tenure density report in the Board of Regents minutes and noted that it looks like UNL is losing tenure faculty members on city campus. She asked if we should be concerned. Chancellor Green stated that he does not think it is an alarming trend and pointed out that UNL went through a period of time when faculty were not being hired. Also, we are in the second year of a three-year budget which is the largest budget cut in the history of the university. He also noted that there were three tenure-buyouts over recent years which resulted in a significant number of tenured-faculty members retiring. Gay stated that when looking at comparisons with other universities we are doing pretty good.

#### **2.4 N2025 Forums that address available resources that would assist in meeting the N2025 goals.**

Kolbe stated that the Executive Committee felt that more information needs to be provided on what resources could help faculty achieve the goals of the N2025 plan and suggested engaging more with faculty members rather than the deans in the N2025 videos. Zuckerman suggested having people to attend department meetings to engage faculty members and to inform them of available resources.

Buan noted that the videos seem to have more communication about where we could be doing better and suggested that there be a more inspirational tone to them. Gay stated that research suggesting administrative fixes to increase research is not needed, more funding needs to be given to the faculty. Kolbe suggested showcasing the work of faculty members or departments instead of the deans in the videos.

Chancellor Green pointed out that the intent of the videos was to draw attention to the N2025 plan and what progress has been made with it since there has been limited communication about the plan and our progress during the pandemic. He noted that the intent associated with the videos was to present positive information. Buan reported that Dean Button of the College of Arts and Sciences has been trying to scale up some of the smaller programs and suggested that this strategy could occur in the other colleges.

#### **2.5 Analysis of cost savings from having service centers**

Chancellor Green asked if the analysis being requested is for campus service centers or for the centralization of services across the university. Kolbe asked if any information was available for both. Chancellor Green noted that the centralization of Information Technologies, Human Resources, Facilities Management and Planning, and Purchasing occurred in 2017-18 and continues to date. He stated that the creation of business centers on UNL first occurred on East Campus and has now occurred on City Campus and an analysis of these savings could be obtained. Minter stated that it would be helpful to know what has worked with these combined services and what has not. Weissling pointed out that the burden of some of the work has now been placed on faculty members restricting their ability to conduct research or other work.

#### **2.6 Gallup survey information for UNL**

Chancellor Green reported that the Gallup survey will be distributed broadly across the university next Tuesday, and results specifically about each campus. He stated that every

unit administrator that had ten or more responses to the survey would have access to the results dashboard.

Chancellor Green stated that at the system level the responses were quite favorable but there are a few things he wished were better. He noted that UNL campus data is also good and does not differ much from the system data and pointed out that the student data indicates that students were overall more positive than employees, but not significantly. He reported that there were a couple of questions where we deviated with lower results from national data. He stated that the data is broken out demographically and the results for African American respondents were consistently lower than for other demographic groups. However, in comparison to the national data for African Americans we had more favorable results relative to other universities across the country.

Weissling asked how the data will be used. Chancellor Green stated that the data certainly points to things that we need to focus on and improve and data will be available locally to the units to make improvements. He stated that President Carter wants to have the survey conducted routinely for an assessment across the system.

## **2.7 Update on the media contract for Athletics**

Chancellor Green reported that the proposed multi-media contract on paper looked like a good deal, but it turned out that the final agreement would not be in the best interest of the university. He noted that Athletics is looking at potential multi-media contracts, but it is unclear whether a contract will be signed in the future or sooner. He pointed out that handling our media in-house does put us at a significant disadvantage with the name and image likeness policy because the university cannot be involved in the name and image of student-athletes. He stated that it also puts us at a disadvantage for national contracts.

## **3.0 Announcements**

### **3.1 Graduate Council Vote on Revisions to Graduate Faculty Handbook**

Kolbe reported that the other campuses approved the revisions to the Graduate Faculty Handbook, but the UNL Graduate Council did not. He noted that these changes pertained to giving Professors of Practice graduate faculty status. He stated that he will have a conversation with Dean Hope to ask why our Graduate Council did not approve the revisions and would report back to the Executive Committee.

## **4.0 Approval of April 5, 2022 Minutes**

Kolbe asked if there were any revisions to the minutes. Hearing none he asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Gay moved and Buan seconded approval of the minutes. The Executive Committee then approved the minutes.

## **5.0 Unfinished Business**

### **5.1 Professional Code of Conduct (Minter)**

The Executive Committee continued reviewing and revising the draft Code of Conduct discussing whether the code would also apply to administrators, especially those who

also have a faculty title. Kolbe noted that the Committee would continue working on refining the draft Code.

## **6.0 New Business**

### **6.1 Agenda Items for EVC Ankerson**

Kolbe asked the Executive Committee to submit agenda items by email.

### **6.2 Information Technologies Service Committee (ITSC) Survey**

Kolbe noted that the Executive Committee had charged the ITSC to develop a survey to identify problems faculty are encountering with IT and a draft of the survey was reviewed by the Committee. It was noted that the survey appears to be more of a communication tool rather than determining issues that the faculty are having with ITS. Minter stated that she would share the survey through OneDrive so the Executive Committee could more carefully review it.

### **6.3 Report on Big Ten Academic Alliance Faculty Senate Leadership Conference**

Minter reported that she virtually attended the annual BTAA conference, which was held at Rutgers University. She stated that the conference was very interesting and one of the major issues discussed were governing boards and outside political interests interfering with campus issues noting that it was concerning how widespread this was occurring. She stated that the plan is to move the conference back to the fall so it would not occur again until fall 2023.

### **6.4 National Council of Faculty Senates**

Buan reported that the National Council of Faculty Senates has a conference coming up this summer. She pointed out that it is different from the AAUP in that it is more concerned with shared governance issues and stated that a few members of the Executive Committee have attended the conference in the past.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:16 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, April 19, 2022, at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in the Nebraska Union, Platte River Room North. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Kelli Herstein, Secretary.