

ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
APPROVED MINUTES
November 19, 2003

Members Present

Lloyd Ambrosius
Richard Edwards
Matthew C Hansen
Jeffrey F Keown

Richard M Kettler
Marjorie J Kostelnik
Nancy Mitchell
William J Nunez

Prem Paul
Barry T Rosson
Wendy R Weiss

Members Absent

Sarah B Campbell
Ronald E Lee

Derrel L Martin
Cynthia H Milligan

John C Owens

Others Present

Alan Baquet, Associate Vice Chancellor of IANR (for John Owens)
Grenville K Yuill, Director of the Architectural Engineering Program
James D Goedert, Chair of the Department of Construction Systems
E Terence Foster, Professor of Construction Systems
Raymond Moore, Interim Associate Dean of the College of Engineering & Technology at Omaha
John L Ballard, Associate Dean of the College of Engineering & Technology at Lincoln

Rosson called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Minutes

The minutes for November 5 were corrected and approved. Rosson distributed a correction to the previously approved October 22 minutes.

School of Architectural Engineering and Construction

Kettler, Kostelnik and Campbell reviewed the proposal for a School of Architectural Engineering and Construction. The proposed school would merge the Construction Management and Construction Systems Departments and the Architectural Engineering Program. [The subcommittee's written report is attached to the permanent record.] Yuill, Goedert, Foster, Moore and Ballard were present to hear the report and answer questions.

The subcommittee met with faculty in Omaha on October 29, with faculty in Lincoln on November 14 and November 17, and with Associate Dean Moore on November 19. Kettler said the faculty broadly and cautiously supported the concept of the new school. The subcommittee recommended that the proposal address: (1) research and educational priorities for the proposed school; (2) the short- and long-term future of the programs and faculty in each of the units; (3) details of the new degree program in Construction Engineering; (4) an integration plan to unify the three components; and (5) an outline of the future planning process within the new school.

Kettler said the subcommittee recommended an addendum outlining the integration process. In particular there was a need to determine the specializations of new hires and in what order the hires would be made. There was consensus that the director would need to be hired first. Moore said Dean Allen opposed additions to the proposal, as it had gone through numerous revisions previously. Moore said changes would have to be reviewed by the faculty and would push approval of the school past the

target date of Fall, 2004. Edwards asked if the college would pledge to outline the planning process without an addendum to the proposal. Moore said it would. Recent votes by the faculty show they are comfortable with the proposal. The Architectural Engineering faculty voted seven to one in favor, with one abstention, the Construction Systems faculty was unanimously in favor, and the Construction Management faculty was in favor by a vote of four to two.

Keown asked how the school will function with three separate Promotion and Tenure Committees. Foster and Yuill said the overall promotion and tenure process will be supervised by the Director of the school, as it would be difficult to integrate the promotion and tenure of such different units. Kostelnik asked whether a unified process was anticipated at some future time. Ballard said there are broad criteria for promotion and tenure at the college level. Ambrosius asked how it was possible to use two sets of criteria, one at the program level and one at the college level. Goedert said research-oriented faculty need a promotion and tenure committee qualified to judge performance in that area. The promotion and tenure committee at the programmatic level will judge performance as it pertains to the program. Evaluation at the college level will have a wider scope. Kostelnik observed that the Director will be another layer of administration between the program heads and the dean.

Kettler said the three units are being kept separate at the beginning of the school because the faculty members are uncertain about their new roles. They want to hold onto familiar processes until they see what might happen with new ones. They expect that there will be faculty involvement but they would be grateful for formal assurances.

Kostelnik said the important question is whether the people involved see a promise for the future. Their votes are based on their expectations for the future, not on what exists at the present. Weiss said there appears to be a need in the community that this proposal could meet. Foster said all three units see it as a great opportunity. Ballard said the proposed school builds on a strength that already exists in eastern Nebraska.

Kostelnik asked whether the college had set aside money to overcome the distance between Lincoln and Omaha. Yuill said the college has historically been divided between the two campuses and has made the necessary adjustments. Ballard said he expects that people will overcome their anxiety about the future and will see it is in their interest to cooperate. There has been distrust between Lincoln and Omaha in the past and people overcame it.

Edwards said the proposal could try to spell out everything before the merger takes place, or provide a general framework to be filled in as people gain experience in the new unit. He thought it was better for the members of the unit to work together to develop their own processes than for a structure to be imposed on people who are not ready for it.

Rosson thanked the guests for their input. They left. The APC went into closed session.

Motion

Edwards moved to recommend that the Chancellor accept the proposal. Weiss seconded. Discussion followed. Points covered included the need for formal assurances to the faculty that they would be given input into the integration process, how such assurances might be made, the costs of delaying the school's initiation, funding for the school, and the reservations that each unit's faculty had expressed. Edwards noted that PoE grants could not be made until the school is approved by the Regents and the Coordinating Commission. While details have yet to be worked out, there is broad support and private

money already committed to the School. Ambrosius said he was in favor of taking a vote with the caveat that the Dean or the Vice Chancellor would write a letter assuring the commitment to faculty participation. Edwards said he would be glad to ask Dean Allen to write the letter concerning future faculty participation. With that understanding, the APC voted to recommend approval. The vote was eight in favor with one opposed and one abstention.

Recommendations for Programs of Excellence (PoE) funding

Institutional Research and Planning compiled the recommendations and comments received prior to the meeting. A working document was distributed to the members. Rosson said the favored proposals appeared to be the Center for Digital Research in the Humanities, the Visiting Scholar Program in Law and Psychology, and the Water Resources Initiative. Edwards invited discussion of the other three proposals.

Support for and objections to the School of Architectural Engineering and Construction proposal were expressed. Edwards said it was not necessary for APC to vote, but he valued the discussion and the written comments.

The J. D. Edwards Program proposal was discussed. Questions were raised about reimbursements for faculty time and about other sources of funding that might be available to the program.

The Visual Literacy proposal, the relationship between teaching and artistic endeavor, and the differences between research and artistic activities were discussed. Edwards explained the accountability process for PoE grantees. He invited the APC members to send him any further comments by email.

Issues from the Vice Chancellors

Baquet had no issues from IANR.

Paul said there is a serious lack of research facilities on campus. Plans are being made for a Virology Research Center and for a research park using the Textron property. The Division of Research proposed that 10 percent of indirect cost (IDC) recovery funds be reserved for capital projects. The proposal has the support of campus groups including the Research Advisory Board, the Research Council, and the Deans and Directors. If the Chancellor approves the proposal, the money will be used for matching funds and seed money. Nebraska does not have state money for new construction, although several years ago LB1100 allowed UNL to demolish and replace some buildings. Paul said Beadle (1995) was the last new building constructed with state funds.

Edwards reminded the APC that the subject of dual college and high school credit has not been addressed. Rosson said the issue will be on the December 10 agenda since Edwards was not available at the last meeting where it was scheduled to be discussed. Edwards congratulated Ambrosius on his book that appeared in a recent issue of the New York Review of Books. APC applauded his achievement.

Other Business

Mitchell volunteered to serve on Plant Pathology's APR team in May or June, since the APR to which she was assigned has been postponed. The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lona Kramer, APC Coordinator