

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: **Bearnes, Eklund, Gorman, Gruverman, Leiter, Lewis, Pierobon, Reimer, Shrader, Tschetter, Vakilzadian, VanderPlas**

Absent: **Baesu**

Date: **Tuesday, January 20, 2027**

Location: **Nebraska Union, Big Ten Conference Room**

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 (*Shrader*)

Shrader called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 APC Reviewing Documents

Shrader reported that he received an email from APC Chair Kevin Hanrahan stating that the APC will be reviewing and probably suggesting revisions to several documents. Griffin stated that the APC is looking at UNL Bylaws Section 1. #7 which defines the APC. In addition, the APC will be looking at its operating procedures and the Procedures to be Invoked for Significant Budget Reallocation and Reductions. The APC has guidelines about merging units but there are no guidelines specifically addressing elimination of programs. As a result, the APC will be considering creating guidelines for the elimination of programs. Changes may also need to be made to the Faculty Senate's Syllabus on Campus-wide Committees. Griffin pointed out that any changes to the UNL Bylaws will need to be approved by APC, Faculty Senate, ASUN, Chancellor and the Board of Regents. She stated that revisions to the Procedures to be Invoked for Significant Budget Reallocation and Reductions will need APC, Faculty Senate, ASUN, and the Chancellor's approval. Shrader stated that there may need to be joint meetings of the Senate Exec and APC to review and consider any revisions.

2.2 Feedback on Listening Sessions and Letter from President Gold and Interim Chancellor Ankerson

Shrader reported that he has been receiving considerable negative feedback from faculty members about the letter that was sent from President Gold and Interim Chancellor Ankerson the day after the listening session. He noted that the majority of the comments were that the administrators backtracked on the comments that they made during the listening session and that the letter destroyed any trust building that may have begun from the listening session.

3.0 Approval of January 13, 2026 Minutes

Shrader asked if there were any further revisions to the minutes. Hearing none he asked for a motion to approve the minutes. VanderPlas moved and Tschetter seconded, approving the minutes. Motion approved by the Executive Committee.

4.0 Unfinished Business

4.1 Strategies Moving Forward

The Executive Committee explored options for addressing concerns about faculty departures and compensation, as well as the impact of recent leadership changes. The group considered strategies for advocating shared governance and addressing issues with the Board of Regents and administration.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Agenda Items for Interim Chancellor Ankerson and EVC Button

The Executive Committee identified the following agenda items for the administrators:

- How much money will be generated through the VSIP and where will this money be used? (Button)
- The budget reduction was \$27.5 million, approximately \$6 million of this was additional to UNL's budget deficit. What is being done with these funds? (Ankerson and Button)
- Some faculty members in eliminated departments will be retained. Who determined which faculty member(s) would be retained and which will be terminated? When will the letters of termination be sent out? (Button)
- Is the administration planning to use the same indicators in the future and will these indicators be used to determine reinvestment? (Ankerson and Button)
- Can department chairs get access to the Academic Analytics data, and can they share individual metrics with the faculty members when conducting evaluations? How much do we pay Academic Analytics? (Button)
- Have you been told how UNL and UNMC will be managed jointly after the HLC merger? (Ankerson)
- There is a disconnect between the listening session last week and the letter that came out the following day. Many faculty members have made negative comments about the letter, and it defeated the beginnings of building trust that may have started with the listening session. (Ankerson)
- What are your priorities and what priorities President Gold has asked for you to do? (Ankerson)

5.2 Definition of Apportionment Categories (AVC Marks)

AVC Marks reported that approximately three years ago discussion began about the need to update the document, particularly around the community engagement because we were aiming for the Carnegie Engagement Designation, and when the Board of Regents recently granted two new categories of apportionment, it was clear that the document had to be updated. He stated that he has been working closely with Associate Deans for faculty to more clearly define the categories and he is seeking feedback on the new document from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee as well as others on campus.

Leiter asked how prescriptive the list is and whether the faculty needs to implement it or is it up to the discretion of the department. AVC Marks pointed out that the categories are not prescriptive. He stated that the idea is to provide the colleges and departments with the framework to develop their own more detailed standards and to use the categories in a way that best represents their faculty's activities.

VanderPlas asked how much AVC Marks has worked with IANR and Extension because historically there has been trouble getting IANR to comply with processes and procedures that happen across the rest of the campus. She pointed out that she was told that IANR doesn't do service apportionments. AVC Marks reported that he worked closely with AVC Bischoff and relied heavily on him for the Extension category. He noted that every college does not have to use all of the categories and it is up to your local colleges and departments to decide which categories apply to the work their faculty do.

Gorman asked how IANR cannot have a service apportionment if they expect people to be involved in service work. AVC Marks noted that this would be a good question to ask IANR. Griffin pointed out that the change with IANR service apportionment goes back to a document created by former IANR VC Boehm in 2022 that basically said that IANR faculty were expected to participate in service. Bearnas stated that Boehm took the service apportionment away for IANR faculty, including Extension. Gorman questioned how one person could change people's job description to remove the service component. VanderPlas stated that her apportionment is 20% Extension, 40% ARD, and 40% CASNR and she was told that there is no budget for the service work she does with the Faculty Senate, so she does not receive credit for her service work. She stated that she was told to give up her work on the Faculty Senate because there is no extra room in the teaching or research apportionment to give the service apportionment. She noted that she was also told that she could not appeal this decision. AVC Marks pointed out that the Regents Bylaws say that a faculty member can initiate discussions of changes to their apportionment.

Gorman pointed out that CASNR has graduates that go through the commencement ceremonies and the Marshals, who are faculty and staff members who volunteer and are greatly needed to help run the ceremonies are doing service work for the university. He questioned if they should just drop out of doing this service if they are not going to receive credit for their service work. Bearnas stated that she always writes down the service work in her evaluation documentation and Extension has been very good and careful about thanking her for her service.

AVC Marks pointed out that the goal of the document is to list and describe the different categories that could be used for apportionments. He noted that he agrees if a faculty member is doing service work, they should be given an appropriate apportionment and the process allowing for a change in apportionment should be followed. VanderPlas stated that this option should be available for all faculty.

Gorman asked why there are not more examples of the kinds of work that characterize an apportionment category. AVC Marks noted that the current version is so specific that if you read it as a catalog of the work that falls into the apportionment, anything that might not be listed would almost implicitly be unvalued. He stated that the examples in the new version try to strike a balance between the general and specific kinds of work that would define the apportionment. Vakilzadian noted that more examples might be helpful to the chairs in defining the work of a faculty member.

Shrader asked if many faculty members are listing outreach in their apportionment. AVC Marks noted that this is one of the new categories, so it has not been implemented yet. He pointed out that outreach can also be done through teaching or research so it can cross categories. Shrader stated that he believes the categories look good.

VanderPlas asked where professional practice would fall under these categories. She noted that statisticians often provide service to people in the university and also outside the university. AVC Marks suggested that it could go into service or if it is related to research, it could be listed there. He stated that the difficulty of the document is that it cannot define everything that faculty members do and the idea is to allow each individual department to refine what fits under a specific apportionment based on the department's standards.

AVC Marks asked if there are any suggestions about the document to please contact him. He stated that they would like to get feedback by February 1.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, January 27, 2026, at 2:30 pm. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Ann Tschetter, Secretary.