

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

**Approved Revised Minutes
March 28, 2012**

Members Present

Zoya Avramova	Sylvia Jons	Jack Morris
Miles Taft Bryant, Chair	Gary Kebbel	William J. Nunez
Dwayne Ball	Stephen Lahey	Patricia Sollars
Jennifer Brand	Christopher Marks	
Gerard Harbison	Martha McCollough	

Members Absent

Ronnie Green	Donde Plowman
Prem S. Paul	Ellen Weissinger

Others Attending

Jennifer Dam Shewchuk, Assistant Director, Campus Planning and Space Management, Institutional Research and Planning
Alan Cerveny, Associate Vice Chancellor, Online and Distance Education; Dean of Enrollment Management, Office of Admissions
Amy Goodburn, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
Patrick Dussault, Dean, Graduate Studies
Ron Yoder, Associate Vice Chancellor, Office of Vice President/Vice Chancellor, on behalf of Ronnie Green

Bryant stated a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. He acknowledged guests who were present for presentations and/or discussions as per our request.

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 March 14, 2012 included) was moved by Ball and seconded by Jons. The Agenda was approved without dissent.

Bryant stated he had an announcement to make and is as follows:

Bryant informed membership that he had good news to share. He said that Stephen Lahey will continue to serve on the APC during fall 2012. He noted Lahey will still be on sabbatical, however, he will not be out of town and can attend the meetings.

Committee/Subcommittee Reports

1. Project Initiation Request (PIR) Subcommittee

Bryant asked Nunez, subcommittee chair, if he had received any new PIR's. 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 no new items to report; however would like to bring to membership's attention that the ad-hoc subcommittee formed to review the role of the APC representative on this Committee, as well as the role and course approval process of this Committee, will meet next week to discuss planning strategies that were discussed and shared in a previous APC meeting. Bryant added that this ad-hoc subcommittee will report back to the full APC.

3. Aesthetic Review Committee (ARC)

Bryant informed that Avramova was not present and there was no report.

4. Long-range Planning Subcommittee

Bryant asked Harbison, subcommittee chair, if he had anything to report. Harbison stated he did not have a report as this subcommittee has not met yet. He informed membership a meeting is to be scheduled for some time next week. [Avramova arrived]

Discussion Items

1. 14th & Vine Street Planning

Nunez introduced this agenda item. He stated at an APC meeting earlier this year one of the agenda action items was a PIR for the College of Business Administration replacement building and that there had been conversation on parking and the already high level of vehicular and pedestrian traffic in this area that would increase once the building was constructed. [Brand arrived] He said he asked UNL's campus Planner, Jennifer Dam, to brief the Committee as well as address any questions. He then introduced guest Jennifer Dam.

Dam stated she would first give a brief background on the campus Master Plan and then discuss the 14th & Vine Street sector study that had been done in preparation for the new CBA to be located at that site. She then shared a PowerPoint presentation on the potential building site and potential expansion zone, a 14th & Vine Conceptual Plan, the loop parking lot and booster parking, and a rendering of the pedestrian corridor and bicycle circulation.

Dam informed that the current Master Plan was updated in 2006. She communicated three firms will be interviewed in a couple of weeks to update the 2012 Master Plan. She stated some items that will be looked at very closely will include 17th Street, which the last two Master Plans have shown a cul-da-sac but noted that was before Antelope Valley was completed. She commented if this was a cul-da-sac it makes it very difficult for trucks to enter and service the Engineering complexes as there is not a lot of room and shared it is her understanding that Facilities is working on a policy that focuses on straight, not semi-trucks, for service delivery routes. She said we need to consider if it makes sense to close 17th Street and if so, what would the configuration be. She said implicate with closing 17th Street, 16th Street would be a two-way street. She said we really need a consultant to take a more detailed look at current traffic counts now that Antelope

Valley is completed and give us a recommendation on whether or not those components of the Master Plan make sense.

Dam pointed out on the potential CBA site that the current Master Plan does show a new building there and then either an expansion or a possibility of a new building on the current Health Center site. She told there has been a determination that W Street will remain open so that is another issue that will have to be updated when the Master Plan is updated. She said this is a heavy pedestrian corridor with surrounding dorms, parking lots and garage, trails, academic core, and neighborhoods.

Dam said the 14th Street corridor is really one of the prime pedestrian and bicycle corridors on our campus. She stated it will remain a heavy pedestrian corridor as long as there is a parking lot in this area – there will be pedestrian and vehicular traffic using that area at the same time. She said there is not a traditional peak hour of traffic of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. so it is difficult to look at traffic counts as people come and go regularly throughout the day, plus there is a lot of student traffic particularly between 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Dam stated HDR was hired to look at the site layout for the CBA and Health Center site and that an in-depth traffic study was not done. She said this was really more a site analysis looking at how might we look at buildings on this site, how might they layout, and how might we incorporate pedestrian and bicycle circulation. She briefly described the conceptual plan for the new CBA and Health Center.

Dam stated another item that needs to be more closely looked at when updating the Master Plan is 14th Street. She commented we are suggesting that from 16th Street to 14th Street there is enough room on Vine Street to have one lane of traffic going each direction and a bicycle lane on either side. She pointed out in the 14th & Vine Street area the sidewalks are very narrow and buildings tend to be built up close to the sidewalk, which makes widening the sidewalks difficult. She remarked when you have pedestrian and bicycles trying to maneuver that corridor it would be helpful if there is a way to get the bicycles off the sidewalk and onto the street. She said there is not a lot of turning traffic movement; it is the through traffic movement that is more problematic so this will help the bikers feel more comfortable when riding on Vine Street, instead of the sidewalks. She said ways to approach minimizing bicycle - pedestrian conflicts will be studied.

Dam concluded that the topics she reviewed provide insight regarding the current thinking and direction that we are moving as a campus. She stated we intend to move this direction and then continue to get more information and refine as we move forward in our Master Plan update. She mentioned the scope of services that were listed in the RFP (Request for Proposal) does include evaluating pedestrian and bicycle traffic on campus and giving us recommendations on how best to handle that. She noted there are already areas of congestion already on campus, whether it be pedestrian, bicycle or vehicle.

Bryant asked if there were any questions, comments, or discussion.

Discussion ensued on the possibility of closing the parking lot in the Vine Street Mall area, east of the stadium. However there were comments this would be disruptive as it is a substantial lot with 376 spots and located in a “peak area”.

McCollough observed, at times, traffic backs up on 16th Street and also noted the crosswalk and inquired if building a bridge over 16th Street is a possibility. Nunez remarked studies show those bridges are not used. Dam added that there is not enough traffic demand to justify a bridge and noted with Antelope Valley open and almost completed that should take the bulk of through traffic off of 16th & 17th Streets.

Harbison voiced an issue that needs to be part of campus planning is that there is not enough time allowed between classes for students to cross the campus.

Marks commented it is encouraging to see bicycles on campus and bicycling should be more encouraged. Dam replied an increase in bicycle use has been noticed and added more bike racks have had to be installed.

Dam brought to attention that 14th, 16th, 17th and Vine Streets are city streets so approval from the City is needed to make any changes.

Bryant asked if there were further comments, discussion or questions and there were none. He thanked Dam. [Dam left]

[For reference the UNL Master Plan is located at the following URL: <http://irp.unl.edu/campus-planning-and-space-management>]

2. Campus Blueprint Report

Bryant indicated that in each member handout packets was the *Campus Blueprint* document [attached to permanent record]. He then introduced and welcomed guests Alan Cervený and Amy Goodburn.

Cervený stated they were in attendance today representing the Enrollment Management Council to share a little background information on this document and to answer any questions you may have. He said following Chancellor Perlman’s State of the University Address in September, Senior Vice Chancellor Weissinger charged the Enrollment Management Council with developing a strategic enrollment management plan for carrying out the Chancellors enrollment growth initiative – a highly coordinated set of action plans that would make sure all were in sync as we move forward and grow the University. He said we also wanted as part of this strategic enrollment management plan to make sure that not only was there a focus on undergraduate and graduate recruitment but also on student retention efforts. He said another component of this document is that as we grow there will various impacts on our programs and services and are we going to be in the position where we can effectively address that enrollment growth and the impact of that enrollment growth.

Cerveny conveyed the Enrollment Management Council held a retreat in October that included the deans and directors, the SVC and administrative team, and the Chancellor and from that retreat a series of strategic initiatives was developed. He told those initiatives were assigned to individual groups of faculty and staff, who worked in the fall to develop a set of game plans and all was then put together in a document that we began working on as a group in January. He stated we realized early on that no matter how detailed of the plans, the real key was to make sure that there was buy-in by the campus community thus leading to the development of this *Campus Blueprint*.

Cerveny stated he would like to briefly highlight a few items on what we are doing on the undergraduate recruitment front and then Goodburn would talk about student retention. He mentioned that while we are going to grow because of the demographics in Nebraska, we really need to be focusing out-of-state, but it is really important on the front end that we understand our first priority is Nebraskans. We really have to go “out there” with a renewed effort to make sure Nebraskans understand that the University of Nebraska–Lincoln is their University and will continue to be their University. He shared a focus will be developing key out-of-state markets and having on-site recruiters in Chicago, Twin Cities, Denver, and Kansas City. He said we really need to develop strong pipelines in some of these major Midwestern markets.

Cerveny said another focus is to develop our international student recruiting program. He indicated we have been trying to look at how we can gear up and really focus on some strategic countries and see where we can increase the number of out-of-state students.

Cerveny mentioned they are looking at improving the web site. He expressed before next fall he would like to have the best website available to students as it is the front door to the University in many ways -it is where people are going to form their first impression and we want to make a very strong first impression. He shared a virtual campus tour will be unveiled on August 1. He said we are always looking at how we can continue to utilize technology and conveyed we are looking at tying information into Facebook and using Twitter to get our message out.

Goodburn then discussed student retention efforts. She said in the spring the campus took a similar approach to enrollment growth by holding a retreat with department chairs, deans and directors, and vice chancellors. [Morris left] She said the focus of that retreat was retention and matters such as: 1) what are the high impact practices for retention that we know of nationally? 2) what are we already doing in terms of retaining students and what could we be doing better? and, 3) what could we developing that we aren't doing?

Goodburn then directed membership to page 11 where five recommended actions that institutions can implement to improve students' retention and graduation rates were listed. She briefly spoke on each of the following recommended actions:

1. Connecting and engaging first-year students through high impact practices.
2. Supporting quality undergraduate learning and teaching through faculty interaction.
3. Creating intentional and coordinated advising systems.

4. Aggressively promoting academic and advising support services.
5. Streamlining institutional processes and systems (such as course scheduling) that can impede students' success.

Goodburn concluded by expressing these are ways of thinking more strategically and asked if there were any questions. Bryant observed this Committee believes its role is to be involved in academic planning and in past instances have not been involved. He commented the need for better communication with Academic Affairs and noted SVC Weissinger is aware of this.

Kebbel agreed with Bryant. He also observed where a lot of colleges see a lot of their growth is in transfer students. He said he was curious of the plans of recruiting transfer students and then keeping data on them. Cerveny said the plans do include more of a focus on transfer student recruitment, hiring a full-time recruiter to work more closely with the community colleges – both in-state and out-state. He said we are also working with the colleges to look at ways to make our transfer credit process much more streamline. Goodburn commented transfer credit was identified by the Noel-Levitz consultant last year as a major issue. She told one of things we have done this year is to hire a temporary transfer credit evaluator to work on this.

Lahey inquired if there would be an opportunity for faculty to be more directly involved in new student orientation. Cerveny replied there are programs already in place where parents interact with faculty and that there is positive feedback on this. Goodburn commented programs such as “take a parent to lunch”.

Brand remarked that she did not see comparisons to other Big Ten institutions. [Lahey left] Nunez informed that national data is not available by college within a university so we benchmarked the Big Ten institutions at an institutional level. [Dussault arrived]

McCollough inquired if there was much data on why students leave or if students were interviewed when they leave. Goodburn responded we have demographics information and predictive features in students. She said interestingly if you look at retention nationally in best practices, survey data is ranked one of the least effective practices for addressing retention. Cerveny added the key to success is “connections” – whether it is academic, an intramural sport, or a club.

Jons asked for specifics on international students in regards to how support services can be customized to encourage retention. Goodburn said that international students have been a topic of a campus-wide focus group that is currently meeting. She said she is part of this group. She shared a student success initiative proposal that was approved in granted funding was a proposal to develop an on-line orientation for international students. She said this group has also been looking at what happens when students get here.

Bryant wondered if it would be appropriate to have an APC member on the Enrollment Management Council, if acceptable. Membership and Cerveny agreed. Ball volunteered. This was supported by membership.

Bryant asked if there were further questions, comments or discussion and there were none. Cervený emphasized the way this *Campus Blueprint* document was structured was to let the campus community know this is where we are at right now but that nothing has been finalized. He said this is an opportunity to broaden the conversation and get groups of folks involved in the process so that we can put our best foot forward as we move forward. Bryant thanked Cervený and Goodburn and they thanked membership for the conversation. [Cervený and Goodburn left]

3. Certificate Requirements

Bryant pointed out in each member handout packets was a *University of Nebraska Graduate College Guidelines for Certificates* document [attached to permanent record]. He then welcomed guest Pat Dussault and asked him to discuss this item.

Dussault stated, as dean of Graduate Studies, he would like to discuss with APC membership the approval of graduate certificates and the role of the APC in this process. He said there are two classes of certificates - non-expedited and expedited. He explained non-expedited certificates require a full review by groups such as the Graduate Council, the APC, the Chief Academic Officers, the Board of Regents, and most likely the CCPE (Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education). He said the other certificates are called expedited certificates and “in order to qualify for expedited review, only existing courses may be used as curriculum in the certificate program, and no new courses may be created.” He said these certificates follow the same review process of groups; however, the Graduate Council is the last body on campus to review the certificate before it is forwarded to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. He conveyed most of the certificates submitted for review qualify for expedited review. He said in recent years the APC had asked to be involved in the process in the review of expedited certificates and had done so. He then inquired to APC membership if they felt there was value in this group reviewing expedited certificates as these certificates already have had the review of a campus-wide committee.

Discussion then ensued. Brand asked if the Graduate Council was an elected body. Dussault said yes, an elected body with four-year terms. He said there are eight elected faculty members from the following eight areas: Agricultural and Biological Sciences; Arts; Business; Engineering; Humanities; Physical Sciences; Professional Education; and Social Sciences - as well as two graduate student representatives and the Dean for Graduate Studies.

Discussion continued. Brand noted a concern on the APC not reviewing expedited graduate certificate proposals was a recent example of a proposal that came before the APC for review and the APC requested a re-title on this proposal. Bryant suggested the APC could periodically receive a courtesy listing of expedited graduate certificates that the Graduate Council had reviewed. Marks observed if the APC continues to review these expedited graduate certificate that the APC needs to formalize this in its Bylaws/Operating Procedures. Ball suggested the possible creation of an APC subcommittee to review expedited graduate certificates or for the APC not to be involved in the review process of expedited graduate certificate at all.

Dussault remarked possible re-direct of the guidelines of the Graduate Council so if this Council believe the APC needs to review a proposal they would forward on, otherwise they wouldn't. APC members expressed support of this possible solution. [Marks left]

Discussion concluded with Bryant charging the Long-range Planning subcommittee to bring a proposal back to the next APC meeting concerning whether the APC should continue to unofficially be in the approval process in reviewing expedited graduate certificates. Bryant thanked Dussault. [Dussault left]

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

Bryant asked Yoder if he had any matters to convey or share with the APC. Yoder reminded the Committee of: 1) the upcoming Rural Futures Conference to be held on May 8-10, and, 2) that the fourth Water for Food Conference, May 30-June 1, will bring international experts together to explore key issues.

Other Business

None

There being no other business, Ball moved and Nunez seconded to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m. The next meeting of the Academic Planning Committee will be held on Wednesday, April 11, 2012, at 3:00 p.m. in the City Campus Union.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle (Shelly) Green
APC Coordinator