

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

**Approved Minutes  
October 20, 2010**

Members Present

Jennifer I. Brand, Chair	William J. Nunez	Shelley T. Fuller
David Manderscheid	John Bender	David C. Solheim
Rita Kean	Miles Taft Bryant	Justin Solomon
Curtis L. Weller	Dwayne Ball	
Deborah W. Minter	Jeffrey F. Keown	

Members Absent

Ellen Weissinger	Ronnie Green	Prem S. Paul
------------------	--------------	--------------

Others Attending

Nancy Myers, President, UAAD (University Association for Administrative Development)

Brand stated a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 3:04 P.M.

Approval of October 6, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Approval of the Minutes from the October 6, 2010 meeting was moved by Ball and seconded by Bryant.

Brand asked if there were any comments, questions or discussion. Ball asked that his remark, second paragraph on page four, be stricken as this is a pleasantry, not official business. The Minutes were approved as corrected without dissent. [Minter arrived]

Business of the Expansion of the Academic Planning Committee

Brand stated in each member handout packets were documents, including a motion, all from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, [attached to permanent record] regarding the expansion of the APC. Since Bender and Minter had met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee last Wednesday, Brand asked Bender to discuss this item further.

Bender explained that this motion came from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and that they would like to take to the full Faculty Senate at their next meeting. The motion is similar to the request for expansion that the APC drafted and sent to the Senate (*Rationale for Expansion of the Academic Planning Committee from Six to Eight Elected Faculty Members* document [attached to permanent record]). The documents agree in supporting the expansion to eight faculty members elected by the faculty and serving full terms, but differ in that the Senate document requires the designee of the President of the Faculty Senate be the immediate past chair of the APC if the incumbent is willing to serve in that capacity and that person's term is complete. (This was recommended by the APC but not required.)

Kean asked Bender if the Faculty Senate passes this motion, would the APC have new members this year. Bender said if this motion is approved at the Faculty Senate meeting in November, this conceivably would not change the composition of the APC until next academic year. Minter commented the Faculty Senate Executive Committee did discuss possible ways to shorten the timeline to change the composition sooner but could not think of any viable options in that moment.

Discussion continued on the timeline, staggered terms, and if the Faculty Senate could hold a special election to fill the two new terms as soon as possible after approval by the Board of Regents. Discussion concluded with the following motion:

Ball moved to make a friendly amendment to the motion to change the structure of the Academic Planning Committee (APC) from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee that the APC would like to request that within a reasonable amount of the time after the change in structure is approved following the proper procedures that the Committee on Committees appoint, or recommend to the President of the Faculty Senate, new members to fill the vacancies until the next election. Bender seconded.

Brand asked if there was further discussion, questions, or comments on the amendment to the motion and there were none. She called for a vote on amending the motion. The amendment carried with one abstention.

Discussion continued on the amended motion.

Solomon inquired about the current composition of the APC and who were voting members. Nunez replied currently there are sixteen members and all are voting members except for the Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development. He said membership is as follows: eight faculty members - six are elected by the full faculty as provided by the Faculty Senate, one is the Graduate Council representative, and one is the Faculty Senate President's designee; and eight other individuals - two academic Dean representatives appointed by the Chancellor, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Vice Chancellor of the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources, the Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development as an ex officio non-voting member, one undergraduate student and one graduate/professional student as selected by the President of the ASUN, and the Director of Institutional Research and Planning, who serves as the APC Secretary. Ball noted if the expansion of the APC is approved, there would be ten voting faculty members and eight "others". He also mentioned a document pending approval that would expand the APC to include the Presidents of UNOPA and UAAD and that these additional two representatives would be voting members on budget matters only during Phases One, Two, and Three of the budget reduction process.

Brand asked if there were further questions or discussion.

Weller clarified that in the new version, the faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate would represent four disciplines with no more than three from a single college, (instead of the current two from a single college), so that theoretically there could be five faculty members from a single

college if the Graduate Council Representative and the Faculty Senate President's designee are from the same college as three others. It was noted by several members that the Faculty Senate's Committee on Committees works very hard at making sure there is a good distribution of APC members among the colleges, and that this has not been a concern in the past.

Solheim inquired about the relationship between the two issues: the expansion of the Academic Planning Committee from six to eight elected faculty members and the approval of the pending revised *Procedures to be Invoked for Significant Budget Reallocations and Reductions* document. Solomon shared his concern that a chief goal of this expansion is to ensure a larger faculty representation on the APC and that the published rationale does not reflect this. Brand replied the APC should and would like to make changes in a logical order; one item at a time and conveyed this "Expansion" document was to mainly help the overworked faculty, and was a separate issue than the budget reallocation procedures. This was the general consensus of the members in attendance.

Brand asked if there was further discussion or questions and there were none. She called for a vote on the motion to expand the APC from six to eight elected faculty members as the APC has amended it to include filling the vacancies through the Committee on Committees upon approval of expansion through all appropriate channels. The motion passed unanimously.

Business of the Revised Procedures to be Invoked for Significant Budget Reallocations and Reductions [attached to permanent record] (and referred to as "Senate document"). Brand noted this item was tabled at APC's last meeting (October 6, 2010).

Solomon moved to take the motion from the table. Bryant seconded.

Brand called for a vote to take this from the table. The motion carried with two opposed.

Brand indicated the motion was open for discussion. Major differences noted in this document included: 1) the expansion to include, at least representation, from UNOPA and UAAD, either voting or non-voting - and in this version, they are voting members to serve only during Phases One, Two, and Three of the budget reduction process to represent staff; 2) the "Consultation" on page 3 was spelled out specifically what consultation means; and 3) the "Alternatives" section on page 4 states the deans and directors are allowed the opportunity to propose alternatives while considering reallocation and reduction strategies.

Brand mentioned that a related document from last year's Long-Range Planning subcommittee was approved by the APC. As a result, during the last round of budget reductions, deans and directors were invited, for the first time ever, to APC meetings to present background and relevant information in order to assist the APC in decision on proposed budget reductions. This procedure is not in the Senate document but is in the APC procedures and is helpful in understanding long-range planning implications of cuts and reallocations.

Keown noted that some of the changes in the Senate document were just word changes from the previous procedures, such as "Academic Senate" to "Faculty Senate" and "Cabinet" to "Senior

Administrative Team (SAT)” and making the processes clearer. Ball commented the “Consultation” section is a very important change and very important part of the procedure.

Bryant stated he supports this document. The addition of the Presidents of UNOPA and UAAD would enable the staff to have a voice during the budget reduction and reallocation procedure. Currently the faculty and student have a voice but not the staff members. Bender noted in the previous *Procedures to be Invoked for Significant Budget Reallocations and Reductions* document, the procedures were equitable as they included more faculty and UNOPA and UAAD. He believes with upcoming possible deep budget cuts, the APC should have as much representation as possible.

Fuller pointed out she believes this document is not an accurate document. She pointed out in the “Alternatives” section on page four that wording doesn’t make sense – it appears there might be lost wording. Membership agreed that this appears to be an inaccurate document and the accuracy should be confirmed with the Coordinator or President of the Faculty Senate.

Ball moved to table discussion of this item until the APC received clarification that the APC had the correct document. Keown seconded.

Brand called for a vote on the motion to table consideration pending clarification. The motion passed unanimously.

Brand noted Green or she will contact the Faculty Senate Coordinator or President to verify the correct document and would let membership know as soon as possible. Solomon and Solheim noted they will also check to see what document ASUN approved.

#### Discussion of Possible Options for Partnering with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to Hold Campus-Wide Discussion

Brand indicated this agenda item came from the October 13 meeting Bender and Minter had with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. She asked Bender or Minter to lead the discussion. Bender said the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is interested in partnering with the APC to hold campus-wide discussions on a faculty driven vision for the future of the University and they had asked Bender to bring this matter to the APC for further discussion. He pointed out the APC has discussed campus efficiency in past meetings, and taking on this task. He wondered if the APC was interested in collaborating with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Brand inquired to membership if the APC was interested in collaboration. Brief discussion ensued. Keown wondered if the APC should have John Lindquist, the President of the Faculty Senate attend an APC meeting to further discuss this partnering. Brand said that is an option. Weller pointed out this is one of the responsibilities of the APC and maybe as a group we can encourage conversations. Ball noted this committee is different than a lot of campus committees. The membership of the APC includes faculty, administration, and students. He believes the APC should meet with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to further discuss a possible partnering.

Discussion concluded with membership agreeing that the APC should have a joint meeting with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Brand will contact John Lindquist to arrange this meeting.

Matters from Vice Chancellor(s) of Academic Affairs, Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources, and Research and Economic Development

None

Other Business

None

There being no further business, Bender moved and Ball seconded to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle (Shelly) Green  
APC Coordinator