

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

**Approved Minutes  
January 26, 2011**

Members Present

Jennifer I. Brand, Chair	William J. Nunez	Shelley T. Fuller
David Manderscheid	John Bender	Jeffrey F. Keown
Deborah W. Minter	Miles Taft Bryant	Ronnie Green
Curtis L. Weller	Dwayne Ball	

Members Absent

Ellen Weissinger	Prem S. Paul	David C. Solheim
Justin Solomon	Rita Kean	

Others Attending

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

Brand stated a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 3:06 P.M.

[Note the order of the agenda was changed]

Academic Program Review Monitor Appointment – Department of Agronomy and Horticulture  
Brand drew attention to the 2011-2012 Academic Program Review (APR) Schedule in each members handout packet. [attached to permanent record] [Fuller arrived] She indicated that a member was needed as an APR monitor to the Department of Agronomy and Horticulture in October 2011 and asked for a volunteer.

Weller volunteered to serve as the APR monitor. The appointment was supported by APC membership.

Academic Program Review Monitor Appointment – Department of Philosophy

Brand indicated to the APC that a member was needed as an APR monitor to the Department of Philosophy in November 2011.

Minter volunteered to serve as the APR monitor. The appointment was supported by APC membership.

Approval of December 1, 2010 General Meeting Minutes

Approval of the Minutes from the December 1, 2010 general meeting was moved by Bryant and seconded by Ball.

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

Clarification on the Operating Procedures of the Academic Planning Committee

Brand asked Bryant to discuss this agenda item.

Bryant stated the Long-Range Planning subcommittee (Minter, Keown, Fuller, Ball, Bryant) wanted to introduce a language change in the Operating Procedures of the APC. He circulated the document “Rationale for Motion to Require APC Chair to Vote” to membership. [attached to permanent record]

Bryant explained the APC is a committee created in the UNL Bylaws. He said faculty members are selected from specified academic areas to serve as representatives and that the chair must come from these faculty members. He stated the current Operating Procedures of the APC do not specify that the chair may vote on matters before the APC. He said the motion from this subcommittee is to make a specific addition to the APC’s Operating Procedures that requires that the chair shall vote. In this way, the APC would maintain faculty representation. It was noted as the “membership of the APC is in continual change from year to year and thus it is prudent to have a written statement about the chair’s voting authority.” [Ball left to retrieve a document needed to complete this motion]

Minter commented the matter of the chair voting was discussed at length and validated against Robert’s Rules of Order. She stated the rules permit the chair to vote and that this addition provides clarification on this matter. Bryant added that proportional faculty representation also supports the rationale.

Brand suggested if there were no further discussion the APC move onto the next agenda item and resume conversation when Ball returned. Membership agreed.

Subcommittee Appointment – Proposal on Undergraduate Microbiology Program [copy of proposal attached to permanent record]

Brand indicated to APC membership that subcommittee members were needed to review the proposal on the Undergraduate Microbiology Program and asked for at least two volunteers for this subcommittee. She said a copy of the proposal was in each member handout packet.

Keown [subcommittee chair] and Bryant volunteered to serve on this subcommittee.

APC Representative Academic Program Review Report for University Libraries [Copy of report attached to permanent record]

Brand introduced the next agenda item and asked Keown to present his report.

Keown indicated a copy of his report was in the members handout packets and expressed this was a very good review. He noted two of the individuals on the review team were from Big Ten schools and he felt this input to the committee was important. He said the review team was impressed with the efforts that the Libraries have made in the Center for Research in Digital

Humanities (CRDH) and “the progress made since the initial Center of Excellence Funding has been significant and the research has pushed UNL Libraries to the front of all university libraries in the country.” He stated the CRDH is at a point where they can begin to move outward from the humanities to the science areas.

Keown informed membership that no student representation or involvement was involved in this process. He said he was not sure if the emphasis had changed on student involvement in the program review process; however, expressed he believes student involvement is important. He noted the review team did speak to students, however, during the review. He stated this was not in his report but he wished to relay this to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Vice Chancellor of the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

Keown remarked the libraries have renovated research and study areas and commented, in talking to students, the changes in the new stack areas and study areas have been significant and in their best interests. He expressed Dean Joan Geisecke has done an excellent job.

Keown, in conclusion, said the review process went smoothly and the review team was extremely knowledgeable. He stated there is no need for any additional response from the APC to this review and that a formal APC hearing was not needed.

Manderscheid commented the Center for Research in Digital Humanities is a joint effort between the Libraries and the College of Arts and Sciences and that the CRDH is receiving national attention. He noted other schools, including Big 10 schools, are visiting and looking to UNL on how to build a center for research in digital humanities. He thinks this is one of the great success stories of the Center of Excellence funding.

Minter said, regarding student representation on the APR of Libraries, it may not have been clear that this review was an academic program review. [Ball returned] Brand noted on the last two APR's she was involved in, only one had student involvement. She thanked Keown for bringing this matter to attention.

Brand asked if there were further comments, questions, or discussion and there were none. She thanked Keown for his report.

*Continuation - Clarification on the Operating Procedures of the Academic Planning Committee*

Brand observed that Ball had returned. Ball passed around to membership a revised Operating Procedures of the APC handout. This handout only listed the Preamble, Article 1, and Section 1, 2, and 3 of Article 2 and only showed the addition of “The chair shall vote on all motions.” as the last sentence in Section 1 of Article 2.

Brand asked if there were any questions or comments and there were none.

Brand reminded membership the language change in the Operation Procedures comes to the APC as a seconded motion with the understanding that the APC will vote on this motion at its next scheduled meeting. She thanked the Long-Range Planning subcommittee for their work.

### Update on Parking Concerns on Campus

Brand said the next agenda item was on parking concerns on campus and asked Bender to update membership.

Bender conveyed that late last semester he had been invited to a Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) meeting as the APC is broadly involved in parking issues due to APC's role in the process of reviewing and approving building plans on campus. He said the issue of availability of parking, as well as the increasing costs of parking, is of a particular concern right now as a result of the plan to build a Residence Hall at 18<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> & R Streets, which will displace surface parking places. He said new construction will continue to diminish surface parking in area lots and the quantity of parking spots in garages may not be enough to offset the displaced parking places. He said one of the FSEC members expressed concern over the cost of parking for staff – that the increases fall disproportionately. He said there was not any action taken at this FSEC meeting, just concerns voiced and the thought that the APC should also be aware of this conversation due to APC's role in the approval process.

Bender reminded membership when the Project Initiation Request (PIR) to build the Residence Halls at 18<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> & R Streets came before the APC there was the discussion on parking and about the likelihood of there being some sort of coordinating effort for building parking as the building of the residence hall occurred. He said is unsure of the status of this and asked Nunez.

Nunez noted the matter for another parking garage has been discussed administratively. He said the university is investigating a number of plans and at the forefront is a new parking garage. However, there is obviously a cost issue and construction of this could run \$10-12M.

Ball approximated that \$10M pays for approximately 800 to 900 parking spaces and that equates to approximately \$12k per space. Ball asked Nunez if the 800 to 900 parking spaces will replace the lost parking. Nunez recalled that the garage capacity would surpass that of the surface lot, but he would investigate. Membership suggested that Chris Jackson or Kim Phelps could address the APC at a future meeting to discuss the future plans for parking and costs in more detail.

Bryant asked Bender and Nunez if there were any other projects in the near future impacting parking. Weller noted the new Outdoor Adventures Center and climbing wall at 14<sup>th</sup> & W Streets. Nunez agreed but noted that the Reunion Building on the east side of that block was recently demolished and should offset parking on the west side for the outdoor recreation facility. Nunez also mentioned parking might be somewhat affected with the new East Rec Center on East Campus, depending on the ultimate footprint.

Brand asked about possible faculty and staff parking in Innovation Campus. Nunez said the master plan for NIC includes a parking plan and the area could be perimeter parking for the general campus depending on build-out.

Brand asked if there was further discussion or questions. Brief discussion ensued as to invite Chris Jackson or a parking representative to a future APC meeting to discuss parking matters. Discussion concluded not to proceed unless questions arise again. It was noted the Parking

Advisory Committee is aware of this topic and that this topic could also be part of an APC Master Plan discussion.

#### Update on Academic Planning Engagement

Brand indicated she would update membership this agenda item. She noted she and Ball, along with Faculty Senate members, John Lindquist, Tom Franti, and Ken Nickerson, have been working very hard on ways to engage faculty in academic planning. She said a plan has been established and that they are working on the details. She shared at this point the themes center on our move to the Big 10 and what this means to faculty. She stated there are three faculty forums conceived: 1) Nunez, Director of Institutional Research and Planning, speak on data and where the UNL is at in relation to other Big 10 schools; 2) Graham Spanier on his perspective of transitioning to the Big 10, and 3) to have the new Senior Vice Chancellor moderate a discussion with experts on different models on the future of the University. She stated the thought is that these forums would be a way to begin faculty conversations and that details are being worked out now. She asked that any comments or suggestions from the APC on these proposed forums be directed towards her or Ball.

Discussion ensued. Manderscheid commented he has asked the department chairs and program directors in the College of Arts and Science in their strategic plans this year to answer questions such what does it mean to join the Big Ten? What does it really mean for the faculty and the staff? How does it impact our operations? He said he is aware of other colleges asking the same questions and having the same discussions.

Ball said some very legitimate questions can be raised by looking at the University as a whole. Keown commented UNL needs to show how unique we are and how our uniqueness really helps people in our state.

Nunez thanked Brand and Faculty Senate representatives for thinking of him and shared his willingness to participate. Nunez suggested it might be more beneficial to include the Chancellor, Senior Vice Chancellor, and the Vice Chancellor of the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources in order to have a discussion at a high, strategic level about this issue. Nunez could provide information to support this discussion. Brand was in agreement.

Brand asked if there were further discussions or questions and there were none. [Nunez left]

[Note the order of the agenda was changed as Green had not yet arrived]

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

None

#### Other Business

Minter inquired to membership if the APC knew any information on the search for the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Several members replied the only information they were aware of was from the newspaper and public announcements.

Brand indicated Green had not arrived yet to report on the last agenda item. She adjourned the meeting for a break at 4:00 P.M.

The APC reconvened at 4:10 P.M. when Green arrived. Brand called the meeting to order.

#### Report on Innovating Agriculture and Natural Resources to 2025

Brand asked Green to report. Green noted the *Innovating Agriculture and Natural Resources to 2025* document that was in each member handout packets. [attached to permanent record]

Green stated this document is provided as a context and proceeded to tell membership the background. He said in early November 2010, a retreat that involved all IANR department heads, district directors, dean, associate and assistant deans, and vice chancellors was held - approximately 35 individuals were involved in this retreat. He informed membership the purpose of the retreat was just to take a step back within the strategic plan that the Institute already has. He said this strategic plan and framework for 2008-2016 is well articulated. He said while he believes the strategic plan is in very good shape in what it needs to be doing in programs in the Institute, he was concerned on how well IANR was positioned to be able to really deliver that strategic plan with the processes currently in place with the way that we do business in the Institute. Thus the retreat was staged, in context, to determine where we are at and where we are going by empowering and engaging faculty and staff in discussion to ensure major impact on our strategic plan goals.

Green indicated to initiate this process, eleven groups or teams were created to develop recommendations and implementation plans. He stated these teams are being led by members of the IANR administrative team and they are charged with engaging the community of faculty and staff in their discussions and planning during spring semester 2011, beginning immediately after an IANR "All Hands" meeting on January 13, 2010. He shared 340 people attended the January 13 meeting and that 230 participated on-line. He said he has received a large amount of feedback – electronically and personally – with ideas.

Green said the "team leads" will report to the Deans Council on a monthly basis beginning on February 16 to allow tracking of progress. He said then the same individuals involved in the November 2010 retreat, along with potentially another smaller group, will be recalled for another retreat in July 2011 to discuss adoption and implementation. He stated the resulting implementation plan will then be presented to the IANR community in September 2011 for additional feedback.

Brand noted the APC had previously asked IANR for an APC representative to be included in the *Innovating Agriculture and Natural Resources to 2025* discussions as an observer for the APC and that Green had agreed. She said Keown had volunteered to be this representative and his APC duties would be to observe the proceedings and communicate appropriate information to the APC.

Brand asked Keown if he wished to communicate any information to the APC. Keown told that the faculty is very pleased and are very upbeat that they are involved in this process.

Brand asked if there were any comments, questions, or discussion for Green.

Discussion ensued. Bryant inquired is there likely to be engagement from City Campus in this process? Green replied one of the goals that he has stated is that there is one university campus here in the way that we operate. He communicated it is the full expectation of the IANR administration that the “team leads” engage colleagues across the campus, where appropriate, in these discussions. He conveyed he has shared this with his colleagues administratively on City campus as well. Green noted there is a lot of interest from them as well as where the discussion(s) will lead. [Manderscheid and Bryant left]

Brand asked if there were further questions or discussion. There was none. Green communicated he will report back to the APC on this topic regularly.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:41 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle (Shelly) Green  
APC Coordinator