

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

**Approved Minutes  
November 14, 2007**

Members Present

Mary K. Bolin  
William J. Nunez  
Jamie Radcliffe  
David H. Allen  
Steven S. Waller

Barbara A. Couture  
David Fowler  
Craig J. Eckhardt  
F. Edwin Harvey

Dwayne Ball  
David Solheim  
Sarah Morris  
Jeffrey F. Keown

Members Absent

John Bender

John C. Owens

Prem S. Paul

Others Attending

Charles W. Berryman, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences  
E. Terence Foster, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Research  
Grenville K. Yuill, Director, Charles W. Durham School of Architectural Engineering and Construction  
Raymond Moore, Associate Dean, Engineering Dean's Office

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 17, 2007 meeting was moved by Ball. Radcliffe seconded and the Minutes were approved without dissent.

Minutes of the Summer Meeting

Approval of the Minutes from the Summer, 2007 meeting was moved by Harvey. Fowler seconded and the Minutes were approved without dissent. Nunez mentioned he and Solheim would discuss the operating procedure of summer meeting(s) later on in this meeting.

Master of Science in Construction Graduate Degree Proposal [Copy of subcommittee report attached to permanent record]

Bolin acknowledged the guests, who then introduced themselves. [The guests were Charles Berryman, E. Terence Foster, Grenville Yuill, and Raymond Moore.] Bolin stated Bender and Keown were the subcommittee members reviewing the proposal and asked the guests to comment on the proposal. Yuill stated they would defer until after the subcommittee members presented their comments. Keown indicated that questions were raised regarding the proposal which had already been distributed to APC membership. Keown stated the questions had been answered adequately and he had nothing further to discuss.

Bolin asked members if there were any questions or further 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. [Berryman, Foster, Yuill, and Moore left.]

Subcommittee Appointment – Doctor of Plant Health Degree Program [Copy of full proposal attached to permanent record]

Bolin indicated to APC members that subcommittee members were needed for this proposal. Nunez stated this was a fairly complete packet and very thorough proposal. Keown suggested one of the volunteers should be student representation. Bolin indicated the purpose of this subcommittee is to review and discuss this proposal then report back to APC. Ball and Morris volunteered to serve on this review subcommittee. The appointments were supported by APC membership.

Summer Recess Operating Procedure [Handout of APC's operating procedures attached to permanent record]

Solheim conveyed to members his confusion on the summer meeting procedure and stated he had contacted Nunez for clarification. He said his interest in summer procedures began when the Project Initiation Request (PIR) for a Nanomaterials Technology Building came before APC during its summer recess. Solheim proceeded to tell of the timeline as he remembered. He indicated he sent an email, with questions, to APC members. This email was forwarded to Chancellor Perlman, who then replied to him answering his questions. Solheim said he did look over the operating procedures; however, he would like to determine the procedure if questions exist or further information is needed. Solheim expressed he does not have a problem with an email format but APC should make this procedure consistent.

Nunez stated that he and Solheim had talked and Solheim did have valid points regarding the following of APC's operating procedures during summer recess. Nunez said physical meetings during the summer are very problematic as members are generally out of town or traveling. He said we need to adhere strictly to guidelines but perhaps the current guidelines are outdated.

Solheim asked if we all can correspond via email. Nunez replied yes. Eckhardt stated that email shouldn't be a problem and is a time saver. Radcliffe said he agrees that while the process may not have been procedurally accurate, electronic communication during summer is the way to go.

Solheim pointed out that meetings are also open to the public. This should also be a criterion of summer meetings. Nunez agreed and informed APC members that he and Solheim would meet to discuss options on re-writing the summer operating procedure and would then come back to APC to further discuss these options.

APC membership voiced the following potential suggestions to make meetings more open: 1) Open a public discussion board; 2) Broadcast electronically the meeting date and time to the public; and 3) Possible use of Blackboard, however would have to know attendees in order to grant them "participants" rights.

Ball commended Solheim for bringing this issue to APC's attention and noted the public does have a right to an open meeting. Eckhardt also commended Solheim for asking questions.

Bolin said APC operating procedures were created before we had the technology that we have now, and that e-mail allows virtual meetings in the summer. The operating procedures should reflect this fact. [Morris arrived]

Bolin asked if there were further comments or questions. There were none.

Center Review(s) [Handout attached to permanent record]

Bolin provided the APC with a brief background on this agenda item. She stated the agenda item originated when Keown informed that a review was to be conducted on the Agricultural Research and Development Center (ARDC). Keown thought that an APC member representative should be involved in this review as a monitor. Bolin stated she inquired to Owens and Gary Cunningham, who informed her that this review was not an Academic Program Review (APR) so an APC monitor was not needed. Bolin then drew attention to the handout of approved Centers. She then asked Keown for further information on the review charge as he was

already involved in this review. Keown stated this review is now over; however, he would like to share the below excerpts with APC membership.

1. Evaluate the current ARDC management structure to determine:
  - Is the current structure working and efficient?
  - Should the ARDC Director have more direct input in to the management of department controlled areas?
  - Should animal units at the ARDC be organized under one overall manager? If so, to whom should the manager report?
  - Should all bulk and research crop areas at the ARDC be organized under one overall manager? If so, how should the bulk and research interface work? Should there be one or two managers?
  - Suggest a management structure for the ARDC that provides the greatest opportunity to facilitate research and increase efficiency and aesthetics.
  - Assess the effectiveness of the ARDC Faculty Advisory Committee and recommend changes in structure and function. If a new management system is developed, should committee membership be department heads or faculty?
  - Determine the effectiveness of utilizing significant faculty time in managing the research land and facilities.
  - Review how research equipment is “owned” and utilized. Is there a better model?

Keown moved a committee be created to give an objective evaluation if all Centers should be reviewed as in an APR. Eckhardt seconded. Bolin stated that it is moved and seconded that a committee be charged with giving an objective evaluation if all Centers should be reviewed as in an APR.

Keown said there should also be representation from the Faculty Senate on this committee.

Eckhardt stated, if viable, this committee should also address which Centers are academic.

Couture stated she wishes to talk to Provost Linda Pratt first to have questions answered about the system approach to center reviews before the proposed committee begins its discussion, as this committee might be making recommendations to establish a process that is already in place. The following questions Couture would like answered first are as follows: 1) What is the current BOR procedure for Centers reviews; 2) What is the campus response to Provost Pratt's request for a schedule for review of Centers; and 3) What is the current review procedure for Colleges that house centers? Couture said she would have the answers to these questions for discussion at a future APC meeting.

Bolin stated any part of a review is information seeking. Couture agreed and stated we would want to be sure this committee is really looking at Academic Centers. Harvey noted that Centers are already reviewed under APR guidelines and agreed with Couture's early statement that this committee needs to make sure they are not reviewing what has already been reviewed.

Bolin asked if there were any further comments. There were none. The APC voted unanimously on the motion to create a committee to look at the review process that Centers go through.

#### Matters from Vice Chancellors

Couture conveyed she would discuss two topics, NASULGC and the Special Emphasis report on the Strategic Planning Process. Couture informed APC membership that NASULGC (National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges) has been working closely with other universities the last few months regarding the *Spellings* Report and the implied threat of accountability. Couture told that NASULGC had created a voluntary system of accountability and that the NU system, as well as other universities, had pledged to participate in this system by showing accountability data on the respective university website. Couture noted that the display format, called the College Portrait: Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA), had been

devised to report college data so that anyone, particularly prospective students and their families, who views a campus website can find our information about the university or college displayed the same way. She gave a few examples of data points displayed, such as indicators of student demographics, student performance, and student learning. Couture said the decision was made to voluntarily display such information, rather than wait for a mandated directive from the Department of Education.

Eckhardt inquired if this emphasis on accountability will disappear after next November. Couture replied no, this is the reading from Capital Hill—both democrats and republicans are interested in accountability for higher education. Couture commented that Peter McPherson, president of NASULGC, along with assistance of David Shulenburg, vice president, academic affairs at NASULGC, was the person who spearheaded putting this project together. She stated that a large part of UNL's representation in the project would be handled by Institutional Research, and that each campus participating in the voluntary system of accountability has the opportunity to add additional links to the data that highlight the strengths of the campus. Couture stated the *College Cost Calculator*, a tool to estimate net costs for prospective students, would be displayed as a link on each campus's College Portrait website.

Radcliffe questioned the cost calculator on what. Nunez responded the subject that the cost calculator is intended to be is a tool for students and their families to estimate the total cost of attending the university. Institutions, including UNL, are still in the process of determining what tool is available for use.

Couture also explained accountability measures will be displays for each of the following three exams: Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAPP), Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), and Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP). She noted UNL is now testing the CAPP exam to determine whether this exam is a viability indicator of student performance on our campus.

Eckhardt inquired if the GRE [Graduate Record Exam] would also be displayed on the website. Couture replied "no."

Radcliffe, Eckhardt, and Ball all commented that normally exit exams do not give an accurate picture or information as the student does not give honest answers as they are on the "way out" and don't seem to care. Ball mentioned the College of Business Administration has a one hour required course and this might serve as a model. Ball further stated a requirement might be to say this course must be passed and offer incentives such as discounts.

Solheim said that he believes the best indicators are matters such as place of employment and salary once graduated. Couture agreed and stated, however, that once a student graduates, it is difficult to locate students to get the answers to those questions. Morris stated she agrees that exit exams are not useful and sometimes are confusing. In addition, how do you measuring the learning of a student in English versus Chemistry when they are vastly different majors? Couture pointed out that the current exams that measure college learning emphasize critical thinking and general abilities that theoretically do not favor one major over another.

Keown inquired if FTE [full-time equivalent] is a component of the Portrait instead of total enrollments. Nunez stated that he didn't think it was and would bring the working template to the next APC meeting.

Bolin asked if there were further questions on this topic and there were none.

Couture discussed the Special Emphasis report on Strategic Planning Process. Couture reminded APC members that the newly adopted university-wide strategic planning process was the focus of the "special emphasis" of the accreditation review. Couture added that the University of Nebraska-Lincoln has based its planning on three created white papers. These are: A 2020 Vision: the Future of Research and Graduate Education at UNL; The Report of the Blue Sky Committee: Intellectual Engagement and Achievement at UNL;

and Transition to the University Task Force: Everyone a Learner, Everyone a Teacher. She noted that these individual reports have helped guide individual colleges and units in their strategic planning, and that it is now important to articulate the overall planning direction of the university. To this end, the Chancellor and others have drafted a short summary UNL Strategic Plan, which was vetted by the Academic Deans, revised, and reviewed again by the deans at the Deans Retreat on September 20 and 21, 2007. Couture informed APC members that an email announcement would be forthcoming from the Chancellor along with the draft plan. Couture said two open forums are scheduled to allow for discussion and comment. The first forum is on November 27 from 3-5 p.m. in the Nebraska Union. The second is on January 24 in the East Union.

Bolin asked if there were any questions for Couture on this topic. There were none.

Other Business

Eckhardt drew attention to the fact that journals will be cut by 20 percent. He said the Library is the heart of the university and without the Library UNL can not achieve its goals. He mentioned that UNL needs to get its priorities in line and urged APC members to further explore this issue.

Bolin told APC members that Joan Giesecke, Dean of Libraries at UNL, had spoken to Faculty Senate Executive Committee the previous week regarding this issue. Bolin said that she believed Dean Giesecke would be happy to speak to the APC as well.

Ball commented when this was announced at a College of Business Administration faculty meeting, the announcement was met with gloom.

Bolin indicated that an invitation would be made to Dean Giesecke to present to APC at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle (Shelly) Green  
APC Coordinator