

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

**Approved Minutes
December 7, 2011**

Members Present

Zoya Avramova	Gerard Harbison	Martha McCollough
Dwayne Ball	Sylvia Jons	Jack Morris
Miles Taft Bryant, Chair	Gary Kebbel	Patricia Sollars
Jennifer Brand	Stephen Lahey	Ellen Weissinger
Lane Carr	Christopher Marks	

Members Absent

Ronnie Green	Prem S. Paul
William J. Nunez	Donde Plowman

Others Attending

Michael Ruhrdanz, Director, Communications and Operations, Information Services

Bryant stated a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.

Consent Agenda

Bryant inquired if there were any changes to be made to the agenda and there were none. He mentioned it had been brought to his attention by coordinator Green that APC members were needed as monitors for three upcoming Academic Program Reviews (APRs) and he would be asking for volunteers if there was time at the end of the meeting.

Approval of the Agenda (Minutes from the October 19, 2011 general meeting included) was moved by Carr and seconded by Jons. The Agenda was approved without dissent.

Bryant informed APC membership that Ball had submitted to the APC the following two representative reports [both in each member handout packet and also attached to permanent record] on the Academic Program Review of: 1) the Department of Plant Pathology and, 2) the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication. Both reports were accepted by APC membership. Bryant thanked Ball for his reports.

Informational Item

Bryant indicated in each member handout packet was a copy of APC's annual report to the UNL Faculty Senate [attached to permanent record] and reported he presented this report to the Faculty Senate yesterday. He commented he may ask Marks, who is also a member of the Faculty Senate and was in attendance at yesterdays Senate meeting, to share his impression of the meeting. He informed membership there was some conversation on the role of the Academic Planning Committee in the degree to which we as a Committee are involved in proactive academic planning. He said not too much more to report and this was not a tumultuous meeting.

Carr wondered if this body would consider presenting this same report to the ASUN (Association of Students of the University of Nebraska) as there is student representation on the APC and it might be helpful to the ASUN to receive this annual report and know what this body does. Bryant inquired the opinion of APC membership and expressed personally he believes this is a good idea and did not see a problem with this. Membership agreed.

Brief discussion ensued. Carr said a copy of this report, with the name changed to ASUN, would be appropriate. He said as a student representative on the APC, he would just present this report to ASUN and highlight a few items to inform. Bryant suggested this happen in December or January to coincide around the time when the APC normally presents its annual report to the Faculty Senate, which is generally in December. Carr noted the ASUN meets every Wednesday at 6:30 p.m. Discussion concluded, if there were no objections, that Carr would convey this conversation to Marlene Beyke, Director of Administration-Student Government, who would then contact coordinator Green. There were no objections. Bryant commended Carr on his good idea.

Sollars shared with membership the question she heard after yesterday's Faculty Senate meeting was a two-fold discussion. (Sollars is the Faculty Senate President's designee.) One was if the Academic Planning Committee should be renamed to suggest what it actually does, which is perhaps more like a planning oversight committee. The other was a reflection of the change in the charge of the APC to reflect what the committee actually does rather than what the charge currently states. She does not know what is moving forward. Bryant said he did not know to what degree the current membership can change things. He commented the APC and the Long-range Planning subcommittee has for some time now looked at ways this Committee could be more involved in university governance - where shared governance could be strengthened. This is an on-going target and movement. He mentioned he told the Faculty Senate at yesterday's meeting the APC was encouraged as there will be an opportunity for the APC to converse with Chancellor Perlman in May regarding his goals before he formulates them over the summer. He felt he accurately conveyed to the Faculty Senate that the APC considers this a very positive step. He thanked Sollars for mentioning this.

Presentation Item

Bryant welcomed guest Michael Ruhrdanz, who was present to discuss the email migration of the new Microsoft Office 365, and expressed appreciation for him attending this meeting. He indicated the APC was interested in learning how this may impact the academic side of the house.

Ruhrdanz expressed he was happy to attend and thanked membership for the invitation. He shared that Mark Askren, Chief Information Officer of Information Services, was not able to attend as he was out of town on university business. He told members he is a Director in Information Services responsible generally for computer security, networking, and telephones - and, for the next months, email. He stated he had prepared a brief overview and had allowed time for questions. He pointed out that coordinator Green had a stack of his business cards and if a question goes unanswered to feel free to contact him.

Ruhrdanz then began his presentation. He told that migration and implementation is now down to 6 months. He said the University selected a Microsoft Office 365 cloud-based e-mail system. He remarked Office 365 is really just Microsoft Exchange. He pointed out already some colleagues have been using it for years. He noted that as part of the review process he learned that most of our peer institutions were using this system. He expressed that we are pretty excited about this possibility. He said the new e-mail system has a tremendous increase of capacity. He said Office 365 supports 25 GB of mail space per user which is a tremendous increase of capacity than what is available now. He stated regarding an implementation timeline beginning around December 14 for the official migration day; however, most likely it will be after the first of the year for a very streamline process that will end by June 30, 2012. He shared the vision is to have a web page with instructions for one to migrate themselves but noted that is not quite ready yet.

Ruhrdanz commented he believes another positive benefit of the new e-mail system is that e-mail addresses will not change. He said existing @unl.edu where the email address format is the person's first initial, then last name and some kind of number, such as mruhrdanz1@unl.edu, will not change. He pointed out though when you migrate to the new system you will have the option of selecting another "name"@unl.edu – within reason and on a first come first serve basis. Bryant inquired if one can keep the current address. Ruhrdanz replied certainly and noted if a new e-mail address is created, any e-mails sent to your old e-mail address will be forwarded to the new e-mail address.

Ruhrdanz indicated there are a few aspects related to the new Office 365 that are not quite ready to be supported yet and are as follows: 1) voicemail message sent to an individual as an e-mail – this should be resolved within a few weeks according to the vendor supporting this; 2) the mobile device Blackberry – support is planned for first quarter of next year and told information will be sent out when those capabilities exist; and, 3) attachments over 25 MB stored in the current e-mail system – currently working on a process to store those in a different manner. He noted there are only 100 people on campus with attachments larger than 25 MB and those individuals will be contacted.

Ruhrdanz conveyed the two primary methods to access Office 365 e-mail, calendar, and contacts are through the Microsoft Outlook client or through a web browser. He also mentioned POP (Post Office Protocol) and IMAP (Internet Message Access Protocol). He stated if you plan to access Office 365 through the Outlook client the office client requirement is Office 2007 or 2010 so an update may be needed. He communicated more information on operating systems, office, and browser versions, as well as frequently asked questions, is located at the following URL: <http://is.unl.edu/emailhome/faqs>.

Ruhrdanz then asked if there were any questions.

Ball inquired if he would still receive e-mail sent to his unlnotes.unl.edu address once he migrated. Ruhrdanz replied yes, e-mail sent to the unlnotes.unl.edu address would be received at the Outlook client indefinitely.

Harbison inquired if the alias resolution would be here at UNL or at Microsoft? Ruhrdanz replied the alias resolution would be occurring here at UNL then back out to Microsoft. Harbison commented he has previously had difficulty with Microsoft as unknown to him he was placed on a "spam list". He said as a result of this he determined he had not been receiving a number of e-mails that were sent to him. He said Microsoft did resolve this issue when contacted; however, Microsoft should inform individuals when they are placed on a Microsoft "spam list". Ruhrdanz thanked Harbison for mentioning this and communicated there has been some thought and discussion already regarding the issue if an individual is placed on this sort of list. He stated he will add this issue to the list for further discussion.

McCullough inquired if the file folder system set up in Lotus Notes would still be maintained once migrated to the new system. Ruhrdanz replied yes, each folder in Lotus Notes will become a folder in the new system with the messages contained and with the same folder name.

Bryant asked to what degree this e-mail system has been piloted with faculty and students. Ruhrdanz replied he cannot answer on the students. He stated over the last few months there have been meetings with departmental representatives and groups such as the Academic Senate and Facilities. He said approximately 25 individuals are currently testing and assessing the e-mail system and responses have been favorable. [Brand arrived] He noted a team is built to address questions as they arise on a case by case basis.

Bryant inquired what plans were in place to help faculty with the migration. Ruhrdanz replied once the migration is in place the plan is if an individual is self-sufficient then the individual can migrate themselves or you can contact your building system administrator.

Bryant asked membership if there were any concerns and there were none. He inquired if there were any comments.

Weissinger commented Mark Askren met with the deans last Tuesday and a number of the deans then connected with him and it appears there can be routine presentations such as this in the colleges or in the departments if needed. She believes that now the deans and the IT representatives are now fully involved and the colleges have what is needed for a smooth transition.

Jons informed she is also involved in the Graduate Student Association (GSA) and voiced a presentation such as this would be helpful and informative to the GSA. Ruhrdanz asked Jons to contact him to schedule.

Bryant asked if there were any further questions, comments, or discussion and there was none. He and membership thanked Ruhrdanz for his informative presentation. [Ruhrdanz left]

Committee/Subcommittee Reports

Bryant indicated committee/subcommittee reports were next on the agenda.

1. Project Initiation Request (PIR) Subcommittee

Bryant noted that Nunez, subcommittee chair, was absent as he was out of the country. There was no report.

2. University Curriculum Committee (UCC)

Morris reported he has reviewed and approved another 60 plus course changes online. He commented this seems to be the nature of the business. Bryant communicated he has attempted, unsuccessfully, to contact UCC Chair Brian Moore to determine his availability to attend an APC meeting to have a conversation on the role of the APC representative to this Committee and should this role continue. Bryant said he would continue trying to contact Moore. Marks communicated he should see Moore tomorrow at another meeting. Bryant asked Marks if he did see Moore to please pass along a message to contact him. Marks said he would.

Morris voiced he would like to have knowledge of the nature of the review that those proposals receive prior to when he reviews and approves. He expressed he considers himself a “rubber stamp”. He wondered what the purpose is of the review at the level of this Committee.

Brief discussion ensued. Brand wondered at what point during the review it is realized that, for example, three colleges are attempting to create the same course with just a different title. Morris expressed this is a good point and commented there is no background to know the rationale or purpose for making a change as there is no discussion as this is online. Bryant remarked concerning duplication presumably this is the responsibility of the undergraduate curriculum committee to evaluate and, within the colleges; it is the college committee that decides the course. Weissinger observed there is a curriculum structure built that begins in the programs and departments, then to the colleges, then to the UCC. Bryant also pointed out the UCC should have two face-to-face meetings a year, once each semester. Lahey pointed out, in his thinking, if a proposal comes before the APC for consideration and it is very clear that a particular program will change radically, and the college dean is not aware of this, it is at this time that having an APC member on this Committee is beneficial as this individual could then put up a red flag and table the proposal. [During discussion Carr and Ball briefly left and returned]

Discussion concluded with 1) Bryant reading the below charge from the UCC Handbook and, 2) to continue further discussion on the role of the APC with UCC Chair Moore when he can attend an APC meeting.

The role of the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) is not to duplicate the review process of the college curriculum committees, but to provide a campus-wide perspective on curricular issues, to address curricular policies and make recommendations regarding the present status and future improvement of the undergraduate curriculum, and to evaluate curricular proposals that have implications beyond the individual colleges.

Bryant thanked Morris.

3. Aesthetic Review Committee (ARC)

Avramova informed she did not have anything to report as this committee has not met since the APC last met. She informed this committee will meet again on December 15.

Bryant inquired to Weissinger if she was aware of the status of locating a new Campus Architect as this individual had retired. He explained according to the ARC bylaws the Campus Architect is assigned to Facilities and is the Committee Chair. Weissinger stated she was not aware of the progress of this search or if a Chair had been named yet.

Bryant thanked Avramova.

4. Long-range Planning Subcommittee

Lahey stated this APC subcommittee has not met again since the APC last met and has no report.

Bryant thanked Lahey.

Discussion Items

1. Employee Plus One

Bryant indicated Lahey would discuss this discussion item.

Lahey began by briefly explaining the “employee plus one” benefit proposed by University of Nebraska President J.B. Milliken and Vice President for Business and Finance David Lechner. He told under this proposal the university would expand eligibility for participation in the University’s benefits program “that would allow an unmarried employee to elect coverage for a partner who shares the employee’s household and with whom the employee is financially interdependent. A new category of family coverage also would be added that would allow an employee’s partner and their dependent children to receive coverage.” Lahey communicated the reasons outlined in the proposal include the need for the University of Nebraska to be fair in providing benefits for employees, and to be competitive with Big 10 Universities. He noted in the past semester, ASUN has endorsed this proposal, as has the Executive Board of the Faculty Senate: in the later case, this is an affirmation of the full-Senate resolution of a similar proposal in December 2010. He said numerous other organizations on UNL campus has also endorsed this proposal, in every case citing the same two reasons just stated.

Lahey pointed out a draft statement [distributed to membership] he had prepared stating that the proposed “employee plus one” benefit program now under consideration by the University System Board of Regents is critically important to the success of the University of Nebraska and inquired to membership if the APC should formalize a statement saying such to Chancellor Perlman.

Brief discussion ensued [Bryant left] and concluded with APC membership determining not to make a statement to the Chancellor regarding this matter.

Lahey thanked membership.

2. Matters from Vice Chancellors - Academic Affairs, Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources (IANR), and Research and Economic Development

Lahey noted and informed membership that Bryant had to leave the meeting to teach a class therefore he would chair the remainder of the meeting. He indicated Green (IANR) and Paul (Research and Economic Development) were not present to report on matters and inquired to Weissinger if she had any matters she wished to discuss or share.

Weissinger said two of the four public presentations for dean of the Hixson-Lied College of Fine and Performing Arts have occurred and two more are upcoming. She informed both public presentations have been well attended and she believes both candidates are good and her understanding is the next two candidates are good as well. She said the college has been wonderfully engaged in the process from her observation in the process.

Weissinger told the dean search for the College of Architecture will be publically announced this week or next. She said the search committee is almost complete now. She said her prediction is the candidates will be on campus in late February or early March. Jons inquired if students were on these search committees. Weissinger replied yes, there are always an undergraduate student and a graduate student on each of these types of search committees.

Lahey thanked Weissinger for the updates. He asked if there were any questions for Weissinger.

Brand wondered if there has been any further thoughts about how one will actually allocate the replacements from the VSIP's (Voluntary Separation Incentive Program - a program previously implemented by UNL offered only to tenured faculty, age 62 and older, with 10 years of service). Weissinger replied she can only speak on the Academic Affairs colleges as the IANR colleges will be handled differently and she does not have detailed knowledge. She stated she cannot remember exact numbers; however she believes the amount netted from VSIP salary dollars was \$6M. She stated \$1.2M was removed from this amount during the budget reduction process last spring. She said half of the remaining money went back to the college that it came from. She remarked the colleges will allocate those funds to their highest priorities and will make decisions on what their greatest needs are. She noted searches are currently ongoing to fill in a number of designated lines. She stated the other half of the money the colleges decided to reserve. She then shared a competition in the form of an RFP (Request for Proposal) from Academic Affairs will be announced after the first of the year. She said that deans will manage the process within their colleges and faculty can respond to the RFP seeking individual or cluster hires.

Lahey thanked Weissinger.

Other Business

Lahey reiterated several APC members were needed as monitors for several upcoming Academic Program Reviews in late summer and early fall 2012. He indicated a handout was just passed around the table detailing the program and date of the review team visit. [attached to permanent record]

Lahey indicated to APC that a member was needed as an APR monitor to: 1) the Department of History, 2) the Department of Political Science, and, 3) the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures. He asked that volunteers let coordinator Green know of their interest. Otherwise this will be on the next APC meeting agenda.

There being no further business, Brand moved and McCollough seconded to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 4:54 p.m. The next meeting of the Academic Planning Committee will be held on Wednesday, January 25, 2012, at 3:00 p.m. in the City Campus Union.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle (Shelly) Green
APC Coordinator