

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

**Approved Minutes
March 14, 2012**

Members Present

Miles Taft Bryant, Chair	Christopher Marks	Prem S. Paul
Dwayne Ball	Martha McCollough	Patricia Sollars
Gary Kebbel	Jack Morris	Ellen Weissinger
Stephen Lahey	William J. Nunez	

Members Absent

Zoya Avramova	Ronnie Green	Sylvia Jons
Jennifer Brand	Gerard Harbison	Donde Plowman

Others Attending

John Markwell, Associate Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources

Bryant stated a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. He acknowledged guest John Markwell who was present to answer questions, if needed, on an action item.

Consent Agenda

Bryant inquired if there were any changes to be made to the agenda and there were none.

Approval of the Agenda (Minutes from January 25, February 8 and February 22, 2012 included) was moved by Lahey and seconded by Paul. The Agenda was approved without dissent.

Bryant stated Announcements were next and is as follows:

Bryant informed membership that the ad-hoc subcommittee formed to review the role and course approval process of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee had not yet found a common date and time to meet - but will meet soon.

Bryant then referenced the timeline/checklist for program review activities document in each member packet [attached to permanent record]. He said in a previous APC meeting, discussion had included membership wondering when the APC representative to the program review team provides the APC a report on the review process. He noted the APC representative report is the last step in this process. He said the APC representative should still write his or her report after the department had prepared and submitted its written response to the review team's report as per previous meeting discussion; however he thought it would be helpful to then submit this report to coordinator Green, or Nunez, who would then hold this report until it was time in the process for the APC representative to report to the full APC. He said before this happened though the report could be amended if needed. Membership agreed.

Nunez commented many times faculty responsible for this report have rotated off the committee, retired, or left the university before the process was complete and s/he could report to the APC. He said it is a struggle to have them return to do this and by submitting their report earlier in the process it would alleviate this dilemma. Bryant added that SVC Weissinger has revision of the Academic Program Review process on her to-do list; however, there is awareness that this won't happen in the near future.

Action Items

1. Proposal – Merger of Horticulture Ph.D. Program into Agronomy Ph.D. Program Making a Single Ph.D. Program in Agronomy and Horticulture; Elimination of the Horticulture Ph.D. Program (College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources)

Bryant introduced the proposal and indicated in each member handout packet was a copy of this proposal [attached to permanent record]. He mentioned this agenda item was postponed at APC's last meeting as the subcommittee was not able to fully review the proposal. He welcomed guest John Markwell. He stated Morris and Keibel were the subcommittee that reviewed this proposal and asked Morris, the subcommittee chair, to further discuss this agenda item.

Morris noted this subcommittee had submitted a report on this proposal that was in each member handout packet [attached to permanent record]. He shared he was the APC representative on the Academic Program Review (APR) of the Department of Agronomy and Horticulture and one of the recommendations in the report that was filed by the review team was the elimination of the Horticulture Ph.D. program as it had not graduated a student in this program in the last five years. Markwell said this is also in response from a CCPE (Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education) review of two years ago when they then noticed there had not been a Ph.D. graduate student out of this program in the last seven years. He said at this time we told the CCPE we would negotiate with the department about combining the programs - so that preceded the five year department review. He commented the department was instructed to have this in the 5 year review document for committee feedback.

Morris conveyed the subcommittee recommends APC approval of the request from the Department of Agronomy and Horticulture to merge the Horticulture Ph.D. program into the Agronomy Ph.D. program making a single Ph.D. program in Agronomy and Horticulture as well as elimination of the Horticulture Ph.D. program and introduced a motion to do so. As a motion from a subcommittee, no second was required.

Bryant asked if there were any further comments or discussion and there was none. Bryant called for a vote. The APC voted unanimously to endorse the proposal.

2. Proposals – Creation of Graduate Certificate in: 1) Advanced Horticulture; 2) Floriculture and Nursery Production Management; and, 3) Ornamentals, Landscape and Turf (College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources)

Bryant introduced the next proposal and indicated in each member handout packet was a copy of this proposal [attached to permanent record]. He mentioned this agenda item was also postponed at APC's last meeting as the subcommittee was not able to fully review the proposal.

He stated Morris and Keibel were the subcommittee that reviewed this proposal and asked Morris, subcommittee chair, to further discuss this agenda item.

Morris noted this subcommittee had submitted a report on this proposal that was in each member handout packet [attached to permanent record]. He then conveyed the subcommittee recommends APC approval of the request from the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources to create three new distance education graduate certificates: 1) Advanced Horticulture; 2) Floriculture and Nursery Production Management; and, 3) Ornamentals, Landscape and Turf and introduced a motion to do so. As a motion from a subcommittee, no second was required.

Bryant asked if there were any questions, comments or discussion and there was none. Bryant called for a vote. The APC voted unanimously to endorse the three proposals. Bryant thanked Markwell and he thanked the APC. [Markwell left]

Bryant mentioned that Dean Pat Dussault would be attending the next APC meeting to discuss if the APC should or needs to be involved in reviewing and approving expedited graduate certificates. He said the hope is resolution at this meeting.

Committee/Subcommittee Reports

1. Project Initiation Request (PIR) Subcommittee

Bryant asked Nunez, subcommittee chair, if he had anything to report. Nunez stated this subcommittee had not received any new PIR's so no report.

2. University Curriculum Committee (UCC)

Bryant asked Morris if he had anything to report. Morris stated he had reviewed 120 proposals and did not have anything else to report.

3. Aesthetic Review Committee (ARC)

Bryant informed that Avramova was absent and there was no report.

4. Long-range Planning Subcommittee

Bryant informed that Harbison was absent and there was no report.

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

Bryant noted Green was absent due to a conflict and that Weissinger also had a conflict but should be in attendance soon. He inquired to Paul if he had matters to convey. Paul expressed that he was happy to be here today and commented he hoped his schedule will allow him to attend more often. He shared that he would like to update membership on two items.

Paul said the first update is related to the university goal to further strengthening the goals mentioned by Chancellor Perlman in his last State of the University address. He stated in the last six months, he and the Office of Research and Economic Development have spent quite a bit of time meeting with leadership such as deans, vice chancellors and Senior Administrative Team, to

develop what we have called Research and Economic Development Growth Initiative plan. He said a number of forums with different groups of faculty were held on campus and mentioned a presentation was also given to the Faculty Senate. He said the goal was to receive faculty input on the goal that was set and get their advice on how to overcome and address barriers. He shared two major goals that emerged from the faculty was to continue to enhance the quality of research scholarship and funding activity, which is consistent with the vision of the “2020 Vision” document, and to increase total research expenditures to \$300 million by fiscal year 2017. He told the Board of Regents, as part of the Strategic Framework, also has expectations and must be reported annually. He informed he reported progress to them at their March 2nd meeting.

Paul said another ambition is to increase and enhance public and private partnership, which is important in development such as with Nebraska Innovation Campus. He remarked societal problems are such that we need to engage all disciplines in addressing the challenges that we face as a society – energy, security, national security, or other common issues we face. He stated funding agencies are also expecting that not only that fundamental research is supported but that those research findings are translated into inventions and solutions. He said this is best accomplished by engagement of humanities, arts, social sciences, life sciences, physical sciences and engineering. He expressed that faculty open forums have been very helpful. He stated that suggestions would be compiled, plan revised and shared with the campus. He shared that faculty members are very complimentary of the research infrastructure that the university has built to support faculty and commented this is something that is very important.

He noted in the science and engineering areas that faculty recruitment has become very expensive and how we manage them need to be explored as an institution. He commented, regarding faculty workload, that he personally believes that there is not a competition between research and education; they help each other to reach excellence in all that we do in research, education, and outreach. Paul concluded by saying that personally this has been very energizing and that he appreciates all the support and interest that he has received across the campus.

Paul then asked if there were any questions.

Ball expressed he couldn't stress the idea and importance of interdisciplinary research more. He said he was curious as to what the Office of Research and Economic Development and Administration can possibly do to try to bring people together in ways from across campus that can support each other and still be rewarded with promotions, tenure and raises. Prem stated the university's policies are supportive of excellence in education, and research and commented the engagement of the private sector is very important. He noted the policies are variable and we need to address those. He said this is on everybody's agenda and through recent targeted topic forums and retreats; we have additional ideas on how to bring faculty together, especially when those who don't know each other, by using various tools and techniques.

Ball remarked finding ways to bring people together is wonderful but the reward structure problem is a bit knottier because interdisciplinary work is often published in journals that faculty will not be rewarded for publishing. He said he believes very established journals tend not to publish interdisciplinary work and it seems to him that is a problem that should be tackled by administration as an issue that could be inhibiting cross-interdisciplinary work. Paul shared last

week he spent most of the week attending an annual spring program review hosted by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research. He told this was the first time that the University of Nebraska–Lincoln attended this meeting as in the past this meeting was not open to the University. He said from a technical point of view this meeting was very educational and expressed an exciting part of this meeting for him was that four of our faculty were featured in presentations – Myra Cohen, Matt Dwyer, and Sebastian Elbaum were featured in a presentation on the first day and Don Umstadter was featured on the last day. He informed that Dr. Thomas Russell, Director of the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, will be here at UNL the entire day on May 11th to showcase our programs in an attempt to build relationships with other universities.

Bryant asked Paul to explain the benefits of reporting research expenditures as opposed to grants received. Paul briefly explained. Bryant then noted that the APC has a representative monitor on departmental APR's and remarked he suspects more and more of the external team reports will speak to the need for the departments to be more active in research and grant getting and while some departments can handle this easily as they are linked with the Office of Research and Economic Development, others will view that recommendation as difficult. He wondered what the Office of Research and Economic Development can do to help departments in that position link with this office. Paul replied Administration is aware of this and has had discussion. He mentioned the Research and Economic Development Growth Initiative, research development faculty fellowship program, and the creation a few years ago of the internal seed grants funding program are all designed to help faculty. He said he thinks the colleges will set their own goals based on what is feasibly possible and would then report to either SVC Weissinger in the Office of Academic Affairs or to VC Green in IANR, who would then contact him to work on any issues.

Paul said the second update he would like to mention is another one of the goals announced by Chancellor Perlman in his State of the University address. He said that item was faculty recognition and doubling the number of nationally recognized faculty awards. He said a very important part is nominating faculty and that no one should be excluded. He expressed we as an institution need to be more aggressive in nominating faculty and told that his office and the offices of Academic Affairs and IANR have teamed up and there will be a person to help departments with proposal development.

Paul then told of a fairly new company, Academic Analytics, which is basically aggregating national faculty research data to compare faculty productivity in different disciplines and departments. He said UNL subscribes to this and various offices here on campus are involved in reviewing and considering the potential use and benefits of the data. He said he would like to make this information available to the Colleges.

Bryant asked if there were any further comments, discussion, or questions for Paul and there were none. He thanked Paul.

Other Business

Bryant brought up a previous APC agenda item and subsequent discussion. He said this item was the new College of Business replacement building at 14th & Vine Streets and one of the matters discussed was the traffic and pedestrian congestion around this intersection once the building

was constructed. He proposed inviting HDR, the engineering planning firm that assisted with a sector study of this area, to a future APC meeting to discuss their proposed recommendations and solutions and asked Nunez if this could happen if membership agreed. Membership agreed. Nunez stated that this is still ongoing and could happen. He suggested that UNL Campus Planning and/or Ted Weidner from Facilities also be invited.

Lahey stated that he had two questions. The first had to do with the need to fund the retention efforts in the next few years. He said he believes this is an issue of increasing concern and wondered if and when we would hear more on expenditures and increased retention measures and felt this question should be directed to Weissinger as she has targeted this as an important issue. [Weissinger arrived] Lahey repeated his question.

Weissinger replied that retention, graduate rates, and student success is headed by Amy Goodburn in Academic Affairs. She conveyed Amy and Alan Cerveny have worked with an expanded version of the Enrollment Management Council to create a report titled Campus Blueprint. She said the report contains an initial description of the issues and opportunities related to recruitment and enrollment growth withstanding the quality of the university and size of the student body and the issues and opportunities related to student success and position of graduate rates. She communicated this document was just published and that she would email the link to this report to membership. She shared a retreat was held last Friday with about 130 faculty, department chairs, associate and assistant deans, and deans to kick off the retention components of this. She suggested inviting Alan Cerveny and Amy Goodburn to a future meeting. She said they are looking to meet with campus stakeholders to receive feedback. Bryant said if there were no objections from membership, an invitation would be sent inviting them to a future meeting to discuss this “Blueprint” report. There were no objections.

Lahey said his second question was on the topic of budget and wondered whether talk about budgets for next year was in the future. Weissinger said the Legislature’s Appropriations Committee has put forward a proposal but noted there are still weeks ahead of us yet. She remarked we will be beginning the second year of a two year biennial budget and commented she has not heard anything that changes the current plan.

There being no other business, Ball moved and Morris seconded to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 3:59 p.m. The next meeting of the Academic Planning Committee will be held on Wednesday, March 28, 2012, at 3:00 p.m. in the City Campus Union.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle (Shelly) Green
APC Coordinator