

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

**Approved Minutes
October 19, 2011**

Members Present

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Zoya Avramova | Sylvia Jons | William J. Nunez |
| Dwayne Ball | Stephen Lahey | Donde Plowman |
| Miles Taft Bryant, Chair | Christopher Marks | Patricia Sollars |
| Jennifer Brand | Martha McCollough | Ellen Weissinger |
| Gerard Harbison | Jack Morris | |

Members Absent

| | |
|--------------|--------------|
| Lane Carr | Gary Kebbel |
| Ronnie Green | Prem S. Paul |

Others Attending

Patrick Dussault, Dean, Graduate Studies
Libby Jones, Associate Professor and Graduate Chair, Department of Civil Engineering-Omaha
Timothy Wei, Dean, College of Engineering

Bryant stated a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

Consent Agenda

Bryant inquired if there were any changes to be made to the agenda and there were none.

Approval of the Agenda (Minutes from the October 5, 2011 general meeting included) was moved by Harbison and seconded by Jons. The Agenda was approved without dissent.

Bryant stated Announcements were next and is as follows:

Welcome to Christopher Marks, an Associate Professor in the School of Music. He was elected and represents Arts and Humanities. [revised membership list attached to permanent record]

Professor Lahey, who was appointed as the APC Vice Chair and Chair-Elect, will be on sabbatical next fall 2012. Bryant said he and Lahey will further discuss. One option is to find a replacement for one year or even one semester and Bryant noted Lahey's term expires July 31, 2014. A proposed resolution from Bryant will be brought back at APC's next meeting in November.

Bryant indicated a member was needed as an APC monitor representative to the Academic Program Review of the School of Biological Sciences from March 11-14, 2012 [schedule attached to permanent record]. Sollars volunteered to serve as the monitor and this was supported by APC membership.

Bryant and Lahey attended a Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting last Wednesday to discuss two items: 1) guidance on Faculty Senate's expectation on the description and the charge of the APC and, 2) ask for their input on how the APC can foster the goal of attaining 160 more faculty members. [Weissinger arrived] Lahey said this committee had several good suggestions on how the APC's Long-range Planning (LRP) subcommittee might consider refining what the APC does. The LRP subcommittee meets on Monday and this will be a topic of discussion. Bryant added the Minutes of Executive Committee meeting should be publically posted soon. [Wei arrived]

Action Items

1. Ph.D. Degree Program Proposals (College of Engineering)

Bryant introduced the proposal and welcomed guests Dean Wei and Dr. Jones who were present to answer questions, if needed. He then asked McCollough, subcommittee chair, to further discuss this item.

McCollough informed the Committee Brand and Jons were the other members on this subcommittee who reviewed this proposal. She stated currently the College of Engineering supports an interdisciplinary Ph.D. program with Fields of Specialization in thirteen subject areas. She said the College proposes seven stand-alone Ph.D. programs rather than specializations. She communicated they had prepared a report [attached to permanent record] and noted one method they used to formulate a recommendation on the proposal was to refer to the revised guidelines established by the Nebraska Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education (CCPE). According to the CCPE's revised guidelines, Ph.D. programs must have a mean of three Ph.D. students each year during the prior five years. Of the seven proposals, five met this goal. She said after meeting with Dean Wei, it became clear to the subcommittee, that though two programs do not currently meet the goal, this will be remedied once the programs are able to grant their own Ph.D.'s. Additionally a stand-alone Ph.D. in these two programs will permit them to recruit more students and research dollars.

As a result, McCollough stated the subcommittee recommends APC approval for the College of Engineering to develop seven stand-alone Ph.D. degree programs in the following areas: Architectural Engineering (Durham School); Biological Engineering (Department of Biological Systems Engineering); Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering (Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering); Civil Engineering (Department of Civil Engineering); Computer Engineering (Department of Computer Science and Engineering); Electrical Engineering (Department of Electrical Engineering); and, Mechanical Engineering and Applied Mechanics (the previous departments of Mechanical Engineering and Engineering Mechanics have merged in the new Department of Mechanical and Materials Engineering) and introduced a motion to do so. As a motion from a subcommittee, no second was required.

Bryant asked if there were any questions, comments, or discussion.

Plowman asked for clarification on the CCPE's guidelines in regards to the mean of the students

each year during the past five years. McCollough explained and brief discussion ensued.

Bryant asked if there were any further questions, comments, or discussion from membership and there were none.

With no further discussion, Bryant reminded endorsement of the subcommittee served as a motion and second and called for a vote. The APC voted to approve the proposed development of seven stand-alone Doctor of Philosophy degree programs. Bryant thanked the subcommittee for their work and the guests for attending the meeting and the guests thanked the APC. [Wei and Jones left]

2. Graduate Certificate Proposal (Response to Intervention)

Bryant stated the next action item was a proposal from the College of Education and Human Sciences, to be administered within the Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education (TLTE), to create a graduate certificate called Response to Intervention. He said at the last APC meeting the only concern of the Committee was the title did not specify the area in which this was to take place so we asked if the proposal could be re-titled to “Response to Intervention: Reading” as the intent of this graduate certificate is to increase the understanding of effective reading interventions by K-12 literacy teachers. He communicated he had discussed the concern with Guy Trainin, Associate Professor and Advisory Committee Chair in the department of TLTE, and he supports the re-title. [document attached to permanent record] He commented this was not a controversial proposal and the re-title satisfied APC’s concern.

Bryant stated he would entertain a motion to approve.

Harbison moved approval of the proposal from the Colleges of Education and Human Sciences to create a graduate certificate called Response to Intervention: Reading. Plowman seconded.

Bryant inquired if there were any questions, comments, or discussion. There was none.

Bryant called for a vote. The APC voted unanimously to approve this proposal.

Committee/Subcommittee Reports

Bryant remarked, in discussion with Nunez and Coordinator Green, he would like to begin having committee/subcommittee reports on the agenda at each meeting so membership is kept informed. This report does not have to be lengthy – just an update of what has happened over the past month or last meeting date.

1. Project Initiation Request (PIR) Subcommittee

Nunez, subcommittee chair, reported the APC’s PIR subcommittee currently does not have a project before them for review. He brought up the PIR Outline and Facilities Planning Policy Statements and communicated he would like this subcommittee to review the guidelines and

requirements of the PIR as they are dated and possibly language could be updated. [Dussault left]

Bryant asked who the other subcommittee members were. Nunez replied Aramova, Carr, and Ball.

2. University Curriculum Committee (UCC)

Morris reported he had met with Brooke Glenn, the program coordinator, in September to become more oriented on the process. He said the process of course approval in an online activity that initially requires considerable time to assess proposed changes in courses. He stated, since the beginning of the semester, he has reviewed and approved 127 course changes online. A majority involved minor edits to the course descriptions. He shared several involved requests for ACE (Achievement-Centered Education) certification and commented those requests require more involvement and, while he approved them, would need to have greater familiarity with the process in order to be more effective. He said there are only two face-to-face meetings each year.

Bryant commented in past APC meetings there has been discussion on this Committee and a suggestion from the APC representative on this committee is that attendance at each semester's face-to-face meeting might be sufficient for purposes of APC oversight. He asked Morris to convey to him any suggestions on ways to possibly streamline on how courses are approved. He also mentioned suggestions were appreciated on ways to streamline the Academic Program Review process. He inquired if the UCC was a Faculty Senate Committee. Nunez responded yes, a Faculty Senate Committee.

Bryant thanked Morris for his report.

3. Aesthetic Review Committee (ARC)

Avramova reported she has only attended one meeting since her appointment to this committee - a meeting on September 15, in which two items were on the agenda. These items were NE Union branding and improvement of one entryway to a building on East Campus. She informed membership both proposed improvements were approved. [report attached to permanent record] She stated she could not attend the next meeting on October 6 as she was out of the county for an invited talk at a conference meeting. She expressed this is a fast paced committee.

Bryant thanked Avramova and commented this Committee is not a large committee, and as there must be a quorum, if a member is absent a project could be stopped in its tracks.

4. Long-range Planning Subcommittee

Lahey stated this APC subcommittee has not met yet after he and Bryant meet with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. He said this subcommittee is thinking about systematizing the APC's engagement with the Chancellor's goals as announced in September. He stated he is currently working on a proposal. He said he will bring before APC at the next meeting.

Bryant thanked Lahey.

Discussion Items

1. 160 New Faculty Initiative

Bryant stated he recalled at APC's last meeting that membership agreed this initiative was one of the goals the APC could help the administration achieve.

Lahey commented this item was discussed at last week's Executive Committee meeting and they also feel that the APC should be paying some attention to this issue. At this meeting Lahey said perhaps a way to pay attention to this issue is to go to the individual colleges and see how they are going to make their hiring decisions. He told as a test case, after this meeting ended, he went to the Arts and Sciences building to inquire how they make decisions regarding hiring and found out - much to his pleasure - that they already have a system in place. He shared this college believes the other colleges also either have systems in place or if not, are currently working on a system as how to make decisions with regard to hiring.

Lahey said what will be discussed at the next LRP meeting is precisely this – that is identifying this issue as an action issue to the APC and how to go about approaching this action issue. He suggested a direction is that the APC invite Deans to an APC meeting once they have made decisions as to how they have determined what the priorities will be in the individual colleges to share with us before any plans move ahead.

Weissinger commented this makes good sense to her. She said we are at a very early stage of imagining how we are going to even approach the process of identifying the ways that we might allocate these 160 lines. This is a good time to be in the conversation. She said we are eight weeks into this initiative. She said she believes there is going to have to be broad campus conversation and the APC should be in the midst of these conversations. This should include imagining things such as what principles ought to guide us as we think about how to populate the campus with new faculty. She shared when she has conversations with persons, for example, department heads; they say they are going to have to think about whether these new tenure track faculty are more shaded toward our curriculum needs or more shaded toward our research priorities or some place in the middle and how are we to balance those imperatives in the context of the department or the college. [Avaramova left] She said the APC, the faculty broadly, the Chairs and the Deans all need to be engaged in conversations.

Lahey remarked another issue is joint hires – faculty spouses' issues. The question is in that number of 160, are faculty spouses included in that number? Weissinger said there are layers of things to consider. This is now a part of the market. Morris added this cannot be ignored and must be taken into consideration – in the 160, there will be spouses.

Bryant remarked to Weissinger he thought most colleges have mandated strategic plans that includes assessing departments on what they may need for faculty resources in the future. Weissinger replied yes, every college has to produce a hiring plan and the hiring plan is highly

integrated into the priority setting or strategic planning process of the college. She said that a hiring plan is often funded by a combination of funding from the base budget of the college and sometimes there are campus level resources that can also be brought to bear, historically from the Office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in what is called reversion. She shared this year for the first time the hiring plans were shared among the deans so all had a sense of what was going on. She said she thinks this served a good purpose.

Plowman commented the deans, after engagement with Weissinger, have discussed as we achieve the resources to make new hires, we wrestle with thoughts such as how do we use these hires to make us more competitive in the Big Ten? How can we best use these hires to become a better university? She said this might mean some preference for areas we would like to build on. She remarked these are rather vague statements but hopes will engage conversations in colleges.

Weissinger added this is a lagging goal and her assumption is the first hires will enter the campus fall 2013 or 2014 and thereafter so we have a thoughtful chance to think and discuss.

McCollough expressed she likes the fact the deans are now sharing their plans; however, for her it is the principles that are critical and this should be part of the conversations. She said it seems to her that the APC would be an excellent committee as it is a joint committee of administrators and faculty.

Weissinger mentioned a past event where the Faculty Senate invited Chancellor Perlman to a forum where discussion was on what it means to be in the Big Ten. She conveyed she has been thinking lately a public forum to communicate broadly and learn from one another is needed. She wondered if the APC could possibly be the sponsoring group on this forum and invite her and perhaps the Chancellor to talk and to listen. Brand informed membership the past event Weissinger mentioned was two faculty forums hosted jointly by the Faculty Senate and the APC on how joining the Big Ten and the Committee on Institutional Cooperation will affect the University of Nebraska. One forum was held in March and the other in April of 2011.

Bryant asked if there was further discussion on this topic and there was none.

Bryant stated he had a question for Weissinger regarding an upcoming Academic Program Review (APR) that he was involved in. He mentioned this was his first time as an APC monitor and he was provided with a list of 13 questions that came from the Office for Academic Affairs for the external team that will review the department. He read off a couple questions and wondered if it would be constructive as an academic planning committee to look at these questions and possibly add to the list. Weissinger said that would be welcome. She explained the list contains a broad set of questions that are somewhat unique across the departments. She said the list originates from Academic Affairs then goes to the department, the dean's office and the graduate dean's office where they are invited to offer questions and when the list is returned to Academic Affairs, it is distilled down to a working number. She stated the APC has a broader knowledge of how the APR process works and what types of questions will encompass the department and expressed she welcomes input and perspectives.

Bryant inquired if the Long-range Planning subcommittee should be charged with looking into this. Membership stated no. Weissinger suggested compiling a list of questions individually as time allows. Harbison suggested, after completion of an APR, the APC monitor note what questions should have been asked and what questions were good or helpful. Weissinger added or what procedures could have been refined or what groups could have been added to the schedule.

Jons inquired who sees and utilizes the reports that are written. Brief discussion then ensued on the APR and report process and who sees the reports and utilizes them. [Morris left] Discussion concluded with Nunez noting the APR Guidelines are located both on the APC and Academic Affairs web pages and Weissinger noting that the IANR (Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources) process is slightly different as research and extension programs and centers are involved.

[For reference the Academic Planning Committee is located at the following URL: <http://www.unl.edu/apc/> and the Office of Academic Affairs is located at the following URL: <http://www.unl.edu/svcaa/>]

2. Charge of the APC

There was no further discussion.

3. Matters from Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Weissinger did not have any other matters to discuss.

4. Matters from Vice Chancellor of Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources

Green was not present.

5. Matters from Vice Chancellor of Research and Economic Development

Paul was not present.

Other Business

Bryant announced concerning the proposed name change of the Department of Textiles, Clothing and Design to the Department of Textiles, Merchandising and Fashion Design that Deans Kostelnik and Plowman have not had the opportunity to meet to discuss this proposal and the concern with merchandising infringing on marketing. He recalled the APC considered this proposal at its last meeting. Plowman stated she spoke with Kostelnik yesterday; however, has not had the opportunity yet to meet with her colleges marketing department.

Bryant inquired to membership in order to expedite the process, once a resolution has been received from both Deans, if an email vote on this proposal was acceptable. Membership concurred.

Bryant thanked Weissinger for her participation and thinking on these matters.

There being no further business, Ball moved and McCollough seconded to adjourn the meeting.
The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle (Shelly) Green
APC Coordinator