

**University of Nebraska – Lincoln
Academic Planning Committee**

**Approved Minutes
March 7, 2007**

Members Present

F. Edwin Harvey	Robert S. Haller	Dwayne Ball
Craig Eckhardt	M. Susan Hallbeck	Barbara Couture
David Solheim	David Fowler	
William J. Nunez	Steven S. Waller	

Members Absent

Mary K. Bolin	Giacomo M. Oliva	Curtis A. Wray
John C. Owens	Jeffrey K. Keown	Prem Paul

Harvey called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m.

Capital Planning Process at UNL

Nunez reviewed the recently adopted “University of Nebraska-Lincoln Capital Planning Decision Flowchart.” [handout attached to permanent record] He indicated that a 5-stage process is in place to 1) allow projects to surface and be vetted by a Dean or Director to a Vice Chancellor, 2) provide for a conversation and assessment with the Chancellor and Senior Administrative Team, 3) begin a process of early estimates on projects in excess of \$500,000, 4) initiate programming, and 5) ultimately be submitted to the Board of Regents for approval. This process was put in place to alleviate problems. [Hallbeck arrived]

Couture said it is good that there now is a formal process in place as prior to this it was unclear where a project ranked in terms of university priority. Couture stated that now any Faculty member, Chair, or Dean will now know what steps are required. Couture stated that the process of presenting the proposals to Chancellor Harvey Perlman and the SAT (Senior Administrative Team) members before forwarding to UNL Facilities is helpful as this helps to keep all stakeholders informed and Facilities from working on projects not viewed as institutional priorities. Couture indicated that it is not an “early estimate” unless done by UNL Facilities. There is always a danger in using outside vendors as they don’t understand UNL costs and costing procedures.

Nunez proceeded to discuss the 2006 Six-Year Capital Plan and submitted projects. Nunez stated the following projects: Undergraduate Academic Classroom Facility, Greater Nebraska Projects Hamilton Hall Phase II, Manter Hall, and Westbrook Music Building Renovation and Expansion are listed as the top state-funded projects for UNL. [handout attached to permanent record]

Eckhardt said that it is good to see this flowchart and that faculty should be able to see their projects as well as the feedback mechanisms. Eckhardt stated he is keenly aware of pricing

differences as he was involved in a remodel where UNL had an approximate 300% markup versus outside vendors.

Hallbeck said she likes where APC review falls on the flowchart. Hallbeck indicated the remodel of Johnny Carson is an example of a project where the PIR subcommittee and APC involvement allowed for substantial input. Nunez indicated that during the development of the flowchart, APC feedback was fully supported by the Chancellor and Senior Administrative Team as a required and necessary step in the process.

Fowler asked, "How do you know the amount will fall under \$500,000?" Nunez replied that this level was selected as it is the threshold required to go before the Board of Regents for approval. Generally, large projects will exceed this amount. However, it is very possible to have renovations that may or may not exceed this level and only by cost estimates will the level be determined. In cases where estimates come back over the \$500,000 threshold, the sequence of the flowchart must be followed.

Harvey asked if there were any additional questions. There were none. [Haller arrived]

Minutes

Approval of the Minutes from the February 7, 2007 meeting was moved by Eckhardt. Hallbeck seconded and the Minutes were approved without dissent.

Program Proposal for Professional LL.M. Degree in Space and Telecommunications Law[Report attached to permanent record]

Eckhardt indicated that the subcommittee consisting of Ball, Haller, and he met with Dean Steven Willborn. Dean Willborn answered questions regarding the program proposal. Eckhardt stated the main question concerned details on the size of competing programs and projected size of the student body. Dean Willborn indicated that a market assessment was difficult since we are dealing with program with very little precedent. Dean Willborn discussed a similar program at McGill University in Montreal, Canada. The size of the program at McGill University is quite large; however, significant competition isn't an issue for UNL. For example, McGill doesn't offer telecommunications emphasis and generally more incentive exists for students to matriculate to the states. [Ball arrived] Eckhardt mentioned there are two European universities that offer degrees in the area of space and telecommunications: Leiden University in Netherlands and the University of Cologne in Germany. Eckhardt said that there is not an answer on the number of people needed with this type of expertise because generally most cases are settled and do not go to court. Based on estimated industry growth, the potential market is \$1.2 trillion.

Ball stated that by year 2030, based on anticipated enrollment, there will be 240 graduates from this program. Therefore, the subcommittee believes there is sufficient room for growth.

Fowler asked if telecommunications are already "out there" in the form of satellites. Eckhardt replied that satellites are only a fraction of telecommunications and that only 10-15% of the volume is carried by satellites.

Harvey asked if there were any additional questions. There were none. Harvey called for a vote and APC members unanimously approved.

APC Representative APR Report for Computer Science and Engineering [Report attached to permanent record]

Waller reviewed the program review indicating he believed it to be a good APR process. Waller emphasized three items: First, he was very impressed with the process that Dr. Richard Sincovec, the Chair of CSE, followed. Waller informed that Dr. Sincovec met with the review team for the orientation, was available during the visit if needed, and then met with the review team at the exit. Unlike most APR processes, he did not attend faculty, staff, student or stakeholder meetings. Waller suggested to APC members that this process be adopted as a model for future reviews. Second, no students were on the review team but a one hour session with students did occur. Third, while some issues were elevated, all issues have been addressed by the department and university.

Waller informed APC members that he found this interesting, was very impressed with the review team, and felt that overall this was a good and beneficial review.

Eckhardt indicated that he was impressed that a Chair or Head would not be so involved as to prevent open communication between the faculty and review team. Eckhardt suggested that APC support this method of operation.

Eckhardt inquired if APC could adopt the process used by Dr. Sincovec. Couture said the issue is that more openness during the review might occur if the Chair or Head is not present and suggested that perhaps she and Dr. Owens could bring up this issue in a Deans meeting.

Haller said the APC monitor should have the right to remind participants of the procedures and be vocal when they see a misstep in the process. Couture and APC members agreed with Haller.

Hallbeck recommended a “cheat sheet” of duties for the APC monitor to inform current and future APC members the role and expectations of the monitor. APC supported this notion

Harvey asked if a subcommittee should be formed to discuss and produce such a document. Nunez suggested the Program Review Subcommittee could take on this task as time allows. Harvey agreed.

PoE Project Renewals

Couture conveyed that a new layer of PoE funding does not exist this year. The process this year is to renew PoE funding for current programs that have had funding for five years redeploying existing funds. Couture said that PoE recipients were asked to submit funding proposals. This renewal process was also used as an opportunity to focus on two funding issues with J.D. Edwards and Undergraduate Studies.

Couture stated that John Owens, Gary Cunningham, Prem Paul, and she all reviewed proposals. In addition, they asked the PoE recipients to anticipate a time when PoE funding would no

longer be required to sustain a currently funded program. Couture said the good news is that through this year's renewal process, priority programs were re-funded and additionally we were able to address the J.D. Edwards and Undergraduate Studies funding issues.

Couture invited APC members to comment within the next week so that final recommendations could be sent to Chancellor Harvey Perlman and Provost Linda Pratt. Couture stated that none of the principle investigators had been notified of their funding status to date. Couture said that PoE proposals would be posted on Blackboard for viewing. [handouts attached to permanent record]

Harvey asked if there were any questions. There were none.

Issues from Vice Chancellors

Couture stated to APC members that General Education Achievement-Centered Education (ACE) proposals 1 and 2 have been approved. The committee is now working and drafting proposals 3 and 4.

Couture invited APC members to stop by the Teaching and Learning Exposition for the Initiative for Teaching and Learning Excellence event March 29, 2007. She said that Chris Gallagher, Associate Professor and Coordinator of Composition, Department of English, will be the keynote speaker. Couture indicated there would be a number of events following the keynote address including a poster session and reception.

Couture said that she would soon be meeting with Dean Oliva and others regarding the University Academy proposal. Dean Oliva will be discussing this proposal at a future meeting.

Other Business

None

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shelly Green
APC Coordinator