Bolin stated a quorum had been established and called the meeting to order at 3:00 P.M.

Bolin welcomed guests who were present in support and to answer any questions pertaining to the appropriate agenda item.

Minutes of the Previous Meeting
Approval of the Minutes from the October 3, 2007 meeting was moved by Ball. Fowler seconded and the Minutes were approved without dissent.

Center for Plant Science Innovation Proposal [Copy of full proposal attached to permanent record]
Bolin acknowledged and introduced guests, Michael Zeleny, David Manderscheid, Sally Mackenzie, Z.B. Mayo, and Mark Lagrimini. Zeleny distributed to APC members a revised proposal and drew attention to the highlighted addition to the second sentence on page 3, item number 4. Zeleny communicated the addition was for consistency purposes. (Initially the sentence read “The CPSI Director reports to the Deans of the Agricultural Research Division, College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, and the College of Arts and Sciences.” Presently the sentence reads “The CPSI Director reports to the Dean of the Agricultural Research Division, Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Research (Lifesciences).”) He then introduced Sally Mackenzie.
Mackenzie remarked she was in attendance to represent the Center. She informed APC members the Plant Science Initiative (PSI) had been in place for eight years and that five years after the program inception, an external review team recommended “that PSI evolve into a Center for Plant Science Innovation” (2006 PSI Review Team Report). Mackenzie said the CPSI Director would report to the Deans of the Agricultural Research Division, College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Office of Research and Graduate Studies.

Paul expressed his pleasure that Dean Manderscheid was also in attendance to speak in favor of this program. Paul mentioned that in the last year and a half PSI had been discussed with the Deans with full support. Paul noted he was impressed with the caliber of the external review team and indicated that PSI is clearly a center of excellence program. Paul then introduced Mark Lagrimini.

Lagrimini indicated there are many high quality scientists involved in this program which adds to its high quality. In addition, the program has been functioning like a “Center” for quite some time.

Keown remarked the Animal Science Department had been watching the development and progress of this program as in the future they would like follow a similar practice.

Manderscheid pointed out that although he is new to UNL, he indicated one of the areas that had excited him prior to moving to UNL was this cutting edge program. Manderscheid added there is no doubt this program should become a Center.

Mayo commented Nebraska is a strong agricultural state and that having an interdisciplinary center is a vehicle to fuel our existence.

Bolin asked if there were further comments or questions.

Eckhardt stated he was baffled as to why you would want all Center faculty to be located in one location. Mackenzie replied that having all faculty in one location is not problematic. They have maintained a healthy level of activity since inception and added they wished to keep the structure they have now in place.

Bolin asked if there any further questions or comments and there were none.

Bolin stated the subcommittee’s recommendation in favor of the proposal served as a motion and second. The APC voted unanimously to endorse the proposal. [Zeleny, Manderscheid, Mackenzie, and Mayo left.]

Project Initiation Request (PIR) Review of the Animal Research Facility Renovation Project

Nunez indicated the subcommittee members (Nunez, Ball, and Radcliffe) had meet with Donald Beermann, Scott Hunt, and Kim Espy to discuss this PIR and were also given a tour of the existing facility. Nunez stated Beermann was unable to attend this meeting however; Hunt and Espy were present to address APC membership. He then introduced Espy.

Espy pointed out the Animal Research Facility was built in the 1970’s, not in the late 1960’s as stated in the PIR. She explained this facility not only has outgrown the building but that renovations are necessary to better meet current building and life-safety codes and recognized standards of care for housing of research laboratory animals. In addition, to better accommodate scientists, researchers, staff, and students.
Hunt stated the building would undergo renovation on the existing west wing of the building. He cited spaces to be renovated include holding and procedure rooms, central office area, a new restroom, and shower and locker room facilities. Hunt added the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system would be replaced and the current utility systems would either be upgraded or replaced as these systems have or are near the end of their lives.

Paul conveyed to APC members that he would like to share the “bigger picture” on Animal Facilities. Paul stated that he has been at UNL for six years now and clearly we are not keeping up with the federal government requirements for animal care. Paul informed members that UNL has to go through reaccreditation every three years and each time we have been warned for not adhering to federal guidelines. He indicated that this is an urgent situation and that if progress is not made, UNL animal care programs can be shut down. Paul commented that UNL is under intense pressure to improve and by approving this PIR we can show the federal government we are making progress.

Keown and Radcliffe both remarked they supported this renovation; the renovation is needed; and renovation should begin as soon as possible.

Bolin asked if there were any further comments or questions. There were none. Bolin called for a vote and APC members unanimously approved without dissent. [Hunt and Espy left.]

Bachelor of Science in Turfgrass and Landscape Management [Report attached to permanent record]
Bolin asked Fowler and Bender to report on this degree program proposal. Fowler told APC members the proposal comes before the committee moved and seconded. Fowler indicated their comments were on the provided handout and added the proposal documentation was impressive.

Bolin introduced guests Robert Shearman and Kim Todd and inquired if they would like to comment. Todd reported that in the past decade major surveyors have added landscape personnel to their staffs and the need continues to grow. Todd explained the demand and ability to place students is great and currently industry requests for interns and graduates far exceed the number of students in the program. [Jones and Bishu arrived.]

Eckhardt commented about the problem with pollutants and toxic chemicals in landscaping and turfgrass and questioned if students required a bit more Chemistry in the program requirements. Shearman agreed and replied he believes flexibility exists in the program and for program advisors.

Bolin asked if there were any further questions or discussion. There were none. Bolin stated the subcommittee’s recommendation in favor of the proposal served as a motion and second. The APC voted unanimously to endorse the proposal. [Shearman, Todd, and Lagrimini left]

Proposal for Six Sigma Green Belt Certificate Program
Bolin asked Fowler and Eckhardt to report on the certificate program proposal. Again, Fowler told APC members the proposal is brought to the committee moved and seconded. Fowler read the following describing the background of the “Six Sigma” name:

"Six Sigma” is a registered service mark and trademark of Motorola, Inc. The term "six sigma process” comes from the notion that if one has six standard deviations between the mean of a process and the nearest specification limit, there will be no more than 3.4 defective parts per million. The management procedures
for assuring this level of quality have evolved from sources such as Total Quality Management and the W. Edwards Deming’s "Plan-Do-Check-Act Cycle."

Bolin introduced guests Erick Jones and Ramaratnam Ram Bishu. Jones informed members that a black belt certification program is offered at UNL but not a green belt certification program. Jones mentioned there is a 10 to 15% salary differential with Six Sigma training. Jones voiced this program is needed to facilitate the competitive nature of students. Jones stated there would be no need for additional programs and expressed this is a sound program.

Fowler asked if non-UNL students could enroll for this certificate program. Jones replied they could; however, as this course would be in the curriculum they would have to enroll in order to meet the admittance requirements and may also be required to pick up any needed prerequisites.

Radcliffe inquired if there were any consequences of approving this program as Six Sigma is a registered trademark of Motorola, Incorporated. Jones replied that he had communicated with Motorola and was informed there were no legal consequences as long as their logo was used and displayed.

Couture commented that she remembers this proposal as a topic item at a past NU system CAO meeting where it was noted that these courses were also available in the community colleges. Jones replied most colleges have this course but the colleges’ general consensus is that this program belongs here at UNL.

Jones stated he would like to clarify Green Belt and Black Belt certifications. He explained the level most known is the Black Belt, which among other responsibilities, oversees projects, teaches Green Belts, and serves as the technical expert in Six Sigma tools and statistical methods. Green Belt typically manages projects under the direction of the Black Belt and act as liaisons between the Black and Yellow Belts. (Yellow Belts are typically employees that are management support staff.)

Radcliffe questioned if there is an institution who decides what is Green Belt or Black Belt. Jones replied there is not a governing body at this point.

Eckhardt inquired if there was a qualifying exam for admittance into the Green Belt program. Jones responded there was not an exam although in order to be enrolled in this program the student must fill out an application, provide proof of high school graduation or its equivalent, and must follow the established undergraduate admissions expectations.

Bolin asked APC membership is there were any further questions or comments. Fowler stated he had a question but would ask at a later time as already approved.

Bolin stated the subcommittee’s recommendation in favor of the proposal served as a motion and second. The APC voted unanimously to endorse the proposal. [Jones and Bishu left.]

Matters from Vice Chancellors
Couture indicated she would discuss the two Achievement-Centered Education (ACE) proposals included in each member’s handout packet. Couture stated these are the final proposals and she would like to discuss the review process with APC members. Couture indicated these proposals have already been sent to the eight undergraduate colleges for review and approval. She explained each College votes in accordance with their bylaws and must report the results to the General Education Advisory Committee by December 21, 2007. Couture remarked the general response from the colleges is to expect the votes returned by the end of this semester. Couture explained the role of APC is to respond to these proposals in
an advisory capacity and commented she was in attendance to distribute the proposals and to seek endorsement of these proposals. (The final proposals are available to view online at [http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/gened/](http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/gened/).

Bolin asked Couture what the timeline was to respond to these proposals. Couture replied anytime, preferably before the end of the semester. Bolin asked APC members for input on whether these proposals should be discussed during this or at a future meeting. Solheim replied he would like additional time to review and would like to wait until at least the next meeting. Keown, Ball, and Nunez echoed Solheim’s response to Bolin and it was decided the APC response to these proposals would be discussed at either the November 14 or the November 28 APC meeting. Nunez asked APC members to email comments to the APC coordinator in order to ready for discussion on these proposals.

Bolin asked if there were any other comments on this subject and there were none. She asked Couture if she had any other matters to discuss. Couture said she would like to mention one more item regarding a project involving ASUN, our academic departments, and the Downtown Lincoln Association (DLA) working with the 2015 Vision. The DLA is asking for UNL’s help with expertise to stimulate retail development downtown. Couture said she would keep APC membership apprised and that she was excited about this collaboration.

Bolin thanked Couture and asked Owens if he wished to make any comments.

Owens stated he reinforced the remarks of Couture. Owens added that both he and Waller attended an Ag Builders of Nebraska meeting at East Campus earlier today.

**Other Business**

Fowler asked about the UNL website for application to certificate programs and indicated the page states applications should not be completed by degree-seeking UNL students. Fowler said he would like to discuss certification programs and the application processes a future APC meeting.

Bolin asked members if there were any questions or further comments and there were none.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle (Shelly) Green
APC Coordinator