

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

**Approved Minutes
December 1, 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	Ellen Weissinger
Deborah W. Minter	Jeffrey F. Keown	

Members Absent

Ronnie Green	Prem S. Paul
--------------	--------------

Others Attending

Nancy Myers, President, UAAD (University Association for Administrative Development)
Mari Greer, President, UNOPA (University of Nebraska Office Professionals Association)

Brand stated a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 3:03 P.M.

Approval of October 20, 2010 General Meeting Minutes

Approval of the Minutes from the October 20, 2010 general meeting was moved by Ball and seconded by Keown.

Brand asked if there were any comments, questions or discussion and there were none. The Minutes were approved without dissent.

Approval of November 3, 2010 General Meeting Minutes

Approval of the Minutes from the October 20, 2010 general meeting was moved by Kean and seconded by Bryant.

Brand asked if there were any comments, questions or discussion and there were none. The Minutes were approved without dissent.

Presentation on Campus Recreation Projects

Nunez stated the Project Initiation Request (PIR) subcommittee of the APC exists to review all capital projects in excess of \$500,000 that impact the academic mission of the university. He stated that projects such as the campus recreation projects, historically, do not come before the APC. He conveyed that the PIR subcommittee is currently looking at modifying the procedures for program statements for capital constructions projects, in particular how they impact academics. He said these two particular projects are very current and the thought was to share this with APC membership. He noted the students, with Solomon's leadership, have been fully engaged in the process and asked Solomon to begin the presentation. [Minter and Manderscheid arrived]

Solomon thanked Nunez, noted it was quite a campaign, and informed APC membership he would present a PowerPoint presentation. [attached to permanent record] He stated an outside consultant conducted a survey in spring 2009 that showed 87% of students use the Campus Rec Centers in some way or another. He then presented information on a new East Campus Rec Center, a better City Rec Center, and a new Outdoor Adventure Center.

Solomon conveyed the East Campus Activities Building is 84 years old and problems include significant structural problems, no air conditioning or heat regulators, asbestos, lacks ADA-accessibility, and no fire or weather alert system.

Solomon remarked problems at the City Rec Center are overcrowding, long wait lines, deficient number of equipment, and it is a landlocked building with no expansion possibilities.

Solomon stated the new Outdoor Adventure Center would be located at the corner of 14th & W Streets, directly north of Mable Lee Hall and noted the bike shop and gear rentals would be relocated to the new facility.

Solomon said the project would start fall 2011 and is expected to be completed by spring 2014. He mentioned the student fees and that the total project cost of \$20-22 million. He said the vote outcome was 72% of students voted yes and 28% voted no. He said a pretty impressive turnout and believes the numbers speak for themselves. He then opened the floor for any questions, if there were any.

A brief question and answer session ensued regarding financing, LEED certified, student fees, and parking spots and concluded with Brand thanking Solomon for the presentation.

Expansion of the Academic Planning Committee

Brand indicated in each member handout packets were documents from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) concerning the expansion of the APC. [attached to permanent record] She said the FSEC will further discuss some friendly amendments made to the motion, then will finalize and send to all Faculty Senate this Friday. She said the Faculty Senate will vote on the motion at its meeting on December 7. She noted two things: 1) the removal of the designee of the President of the Faculty Senate is recommended to be the immediate past chair of the APC and 2) the change in status of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development to a full voting member of the committee. She said if the APC has any comments on these documents, we need to let the FSEC know and asked the APC's sentiments on this matter.

Brief discussion ensued. Ball commented that the APC had not discussed the Vice Chancellor of Research and Economic Development as a voting APC member. Bryant commented we can all identify instances where this committee has not been involved in part of the planning of major initiatives that occur, so, logically, it makes good sense to him to have vice chancellors as voting members as voting members will attend meetings and convey information. He said, however, we need to address vice chancellors attending more APC meetings and sharing information.

Discussion concluded with Brand stating the APC can revisit this matter after the Faculty Senate meeting on December 7.

Procedures to be Invoked for Significant Budget Reallocations and Reductions Update

Brand asked Minter to discuss this item. Minter provided an update to the membership that the Long-range Planning subcommittee is very close to completing revisions on the Reallocations and Reductions procedures document and flowcharts. She said the Long-range Planning subcommittee could potentially bring the revised document and flowcharts for the review of membership at the next APC meeting on December 15. Keown complimented Green on her work and time reconciling different documents. The Long-range Planning subcommittee agreed. Keown noted Green has been compiling all revisions into one document in order to minimize any errors.

Engagement of Academic Planning Discussion

Brand asked Minter to discuss this item. Minter stated the Long-range Planning subcommittee has been tasked to review the charge of the APC, specifically the charge to engage in academic planning. She drew attention to the syllabus of the APC located in each member handout packets, in particular the “Responsibilities” section. [attached to permanent record] She conveyed the Long-range Planning subcommittee has been taking up and seeking advice and input on strategies for long range planning as the thought is to ensure the APC’s involvement earlier in long range academic planning.

Minter indicated the Long-range Planning subcommittee is now seeking advice and input from the APC on what structures could be put into place. She communicated the following suggestions were discussed in a Long-range Planning subcommittee meeting: 1) to invite the deans, as the APC did last year during the budget reduction procedure, to discuss their strategic plans and priorities each spring; 2) to receive a formalized release timeline so one or maybe two people, who would also be on the Long-range Planning subcommittee, could focus solely on being more involved in some of those earlier long range planning conversations, perhaps even Senior Administrative Team conversations; and 3) to indentify particular meetings, at particular junctures in the year, where it would be a standing part of the agenda that, for example, the Chancellor would come talk about “X” or the deans would come talk about “X” and that this regular reporting and information sharing could be a in closed session if there were concerns regarding confidentiality or proprietary and privileged information.

She noted the Long-range planning subcommittee will meet again in two weeks to keep moving ahead and to bring something back to the APC. (Keown asked if Minter if the Long-range Planning subcommittee could meet for a few minutes after this meeting and this subcommittee agreed.)

Bryant commented when one looks at the charge of the APC, the charge of this committee is somewhat proactive when it comes to planning and when you look at behavior in the past, the APC has been somewhat reactive. Ball agreed with Bryant and noted another charge of the APC is to formulate and recommend goals for UNL in areas of education, research, and service and he believes that we have failed in that charge and responsibility as we have not been doing this. Minter expressed she feels one reason why the APC sometimes ends up in more of a reactive position is the

sheer amount of data one has to read through and suggested the APC could establish a standing reporting function as the APC sometimes does not have or receive information in order to get a sense of vision in order to generate a collective response.

Discussion ensued.

Kean commented most plans from the colleges, as well as her own unit, starts from the bottom up and noted there is faculty involvement. She said this is part of the strategic planning process. Manderscheid noted there is a strategic compass for the university. He expressed the APC should maybe play a greater role in the university administration, not the college, strategic plan.

Weller stated, on Monday, he and Manderscheid participated in an announcement relative to Life Science. He said the Life Sciences Initiative is an initiative that is cutting across several colleges and wondered where does this fall in the realm of the charges and responsibilities of the APC? [Weissinger arrived] Manderscheid said that the Life Sciences Initiative executive committee held a retreat in September 2010 and then, as a result of this retreat, issued a report. He said this meeting was basically bringing the administrators up to speed as administrators have not been involved and pointed out that this is a faculty lead effort. He noted this is an example of long range planning that is taking place based in faculty cutting across colleges and one that the APC has not had much participation in at all.

Fuller inquired if the 2020 Vision was still a long range planning document that this university refers back to for decisions such as the Life Sciences Initiatives or Innovation Campus. Weissinger communicated the 2020 document is still a very much relevant description of the university aspirations. She noted, in regards to the Life Sciences, over the last decade or more, periodically the faculties in various Life Science departments have somewhat independently created white paper reports and recommendations. She expressed the current Initiative, while Chancellor Perlman formed it and charged it, in her sense, came from a general dissatisfaction with the pace of trajectory in Life Sciences, from the faculty. Fuller wondered when it is appropriate, or appropriate at all, for the APC to assert itself in these types of long range planning processes at an earlier date. She noted there always is faculty appointed to task forces; however, there does not ever seem to be an official faculty representative from the APC involved in these task forces and initiatives. Manderscheid the question of when the APC should become involved would be a question to pose to the Chancellor. He noted the Life Sciences report is just a document that is just evolving and this document is not in any way set in stone. Bryant commented he would not want APC's involvement to become an obstacle; but would like to see the APC's engagement. [Myers left] Brand said this could be an efficiency measure that could be further discussed with the vice chancellors.

Brand provided an update on academic planning engagement. She said, per discussion at the last APC meeting (November 3, 2010), she and Ball have meet once with FSEC members John Lindquist, Tom Franti and Ken Nickerson on what is the best mechanism for encouraging general faculty engagement. She said out of that meeting came two different possible foci: 1) should we be focusing on short terms things like how can we get upcoming budget cuts or 2) long term things like what do we see the university being like in 5 years or 25 years. She said there will be on-going

discussion on these topics, as well as discussion on the mechanism for engaging people in either of these topics. She stated we will meet again and she would report back to the APC after this meeting.

Brand inquired if there was further discussion or comments and there were none.

Academic Management Information System (AMIS) Ratio Report Discussion

Nunez conveyed he had received a letter from Minter and the Long-range Planning subcommittee asking for budgetary information and a consolidated data book for educational purposes in anticipation of budget cuts. He indicated he had acquired the FY2009-2010 departmental budget listings, which are publically available, and these listings were now posted on Blackboard. He noted that Green had pushed out information on this earlier today.

Nunez then drew attention to the binder notebooks, containing an AMIS Ratio Report, which each member received with their handout packets. [attached to permanent record] He said this data was published approximately one and a half years ago and is prepared by his office, Institutional Research and Planning. He stated this notebook is a trend book of academic information and proceeded to explain the variables contained within.

A brief question and answer session on the data and variables followed. Nunez said more data can be brought back to the APC, if needed.

Brand thanked Nunez for the data that will be helpful to the APC.

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

Brand asked Weissinger if she had anything to share. Weissinger updated APC membership on the four finalists selected to interview for the position of senior vice chancellor for Academic Affairs. She said two of the four finalists have been through the interview process and briefly told a portion of the biographies of each candidate. She expressed that she has noticed the participation of the members of this committee and other organizations, such as ASUN, and thinks this is wonderful. She said one of the keys to these searches is to continue to stay engaged. She said the turnouts at the presentations and other meetings have been great.

Brand asked if there were any questions or comments. Bryant commented this is a nice process. Manderscheid suggested this sends a great message to the candidates.

Other Business

Brand noted, in each member handout packet, was the APC's annual report to the UNL Faculty Senate. [attached to permanent record] She said this report will be presented to the Faculty Senate on December 7, 2010.

Green noted the Campus Planning presentation was posted on Blackboard.

There being no further business, Ball moved and Bryant seconded to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 4:23 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle (Shelly) Green
APC Coordinator