

University of Nebraska – Lincoln  
Academic Planning Committee (APC)

Approved Minutes  
November 28, 2012

Members Present

Miles Taft Bryant	Eric Kamler	Jack Morris
Archie Clutter	Stephen Lahey	Prem S. Paul
Ronnie Green	Jared Leighton	Linda Shipley
Gerard Harbison, Chair	Christopher Marks	Ellen Weissinger
Mike Hoffman	Martha McCollough	Curtis Weller
Libby Jones		

Members Absent

William Nunez	Donde Plowman
---------------	---------------

Others Attending

Susan Poser, Dean, College of Law

Harbison stated a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

Approval of October 17, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Approval of the Minutes from the October 17, 2012 general meeting was moved by Bryant and seconded by Morris.

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

APC Representative Academic Program Review Report for Department of Communication Studies [attached to permanent record]

Harbison indicated that Bryant had submitted to the APC his representative report on the Academic Program Review (APR) of the Department of Communication Studies.

Bryant stated this report was in the posted handout packet and also posted on Blackboard. He further remarked that discussion of the APR process is an agenda item later this meeting.

Bryant expressed, in his opinion, this report is a “poster child” for what is wrong with our academic program review process. He commented the Review Team and the Department did a great job in preparing their written responses but it has taken a very long period of time for administration to evaluate documentation and responses and prepare its recommendations. He feels this is a real problem.

Bryant indicated the process itself was followed and this was a well-organized and effective APR. He said the members of the External Team were very well chosen and Communication Studies was well prepared for the visit.

Morris said that he has been the APC representative on previous APR's of Departments and agreed that the academic review process works well but, except for the Review Team, it does take a very long time for responses, reports, and recommendations to be submitted. He said he has learned to draft his report shortly after the review has concluded and hold onto it until it is time in the process to present his report to the APC. He indicated that he does this as it can take up to a year or more to reach this final step. Bryant agreed.

Harbison said we will discuss the academic review process later in this meeting and asked if there were further comments and there were none. This report was accepted by APC membership. Harbison thanked Bryant for his report.

#### Report on UNL Campus and Landscape Master Plan Update

Harbison asked Bryant, as the APC representative on the Steering Committee for the UNL Master Plan, to report.

Bryant informed that Sasaki Associates had met with the Steering Committee earlier today and this Committee was shown a PowerPoint presentation. He said in this presentation there were three concepts for City Campus and three concepts for East Campus – Precincts, Crossroads and Mall. He shared the collective favored response from the blogging tool MindMixer was the Crossroads concept for both the City and East Campuses.

Kamler commented he is a student representative on the Steering Committee and these concepts were online. Bryant encouraged membership, if they hadn't already done so, to enter their comments and suggestions at the following URL: <http://www.planbigideas.com/>. He said to do so by the end of December. Harbison also encouraged visiting the Plan Big web page located at: <http://planbig.unl.edu/>.

Bryant communicated that other concepts shown and discussed on City Campus were opening up the ground level of Love Library North to utilize the surrounding landscape as a learning commons, restoring Memorial Mall into an open green space, and 14<sup>th</sup> Street as a multi-modal corridor with the potential for combined transit. He said some concepts shown on East Campus were clarifying circulation and navigability such as extending Fair Street to the East, extending the historic East Campus mall to Holdrege Street, and changing the East Campus Loop. He shared another topic of discussion was Hardin Hall, which is somewhat isolated from the campus, in terms of access to the campus. He said he suspects this will lead to proposals on this from Sasaki. [Green arrived]

Bryant stated the concepts presented were just a general outline from Sasaki Associates with more details to come in late January. Kamler expressed overall he was impressed. Bryant agreed.

Harbison stated he would like to focus the APC's role in the specific impact of this on academic planning on campus. He said while he loves the concept, regarding the Love Library conversion, he would like this Committee to hear from the Dean of Libraries that they can accommodate this change as well as lose that amount of space.

Harbison voiced a concern he has after viewing the City Campus Precinct concept. He stated the concept, which is fine in theory, but in fact the precincts don't correspond that closely to the way the layout of academic buildings on campus, specifically the Science precinct. He stated there really isn't a science precinct per se; however, there are two science precincts on City Campus. He listed Manter Hall, Hamilton Hall, Brace Laboratory, Behlen Laboratory and Oldfather Hall on one hand and on the other Jorgensen Hall, Othmer Hall, Beadle Center and Nebraska Hall. He said an academic issue for a large number of students is to physically get from one building to another building in 10 minutes, for example from Beadle to Manter Hall, to the extent this affects class schedules. He voiced this plan concerns him as this is a major problem in undergraduate education and this plan does not address it. He remarked, in his opinion, there are two ways to solve this issue. One is to move the science departments from one cluster towards the other cluster and this would be costly or the other is to arrange a faster east west transit route across campus.

Weissinger responded in the presentation given to her yesterday she believes there were a couple of ideas that might help with this issue and told Harbison that his point is not trivial. She said there may be other clusters like this but this is a cluster of students who are likely to be taking a class in Beadle and a class in Manter in the same semester. She mentioned she was shown overlays of a few transportation system ideas. She said it was shown that Vine Street is not a pedestrian mall, it is still vehicular and that 14<sup>th</sup> Street becomes pedestrian and shuttle. She indicated under one of the shown scenarios there was a shuttle route that would go from Beadle Center down Vine Street with a stop at the end of the Stadium mall. She said if you recall, there used to be a bus stop there and students, faculty and staff have told Sasaki that this was one of the most heavily used bus stop on campus. If this was put back, there would be shuttles running up and down Vine Street and this may help.

Jones said they are also looking at better ways of integrating bicycles. Harbison said yes, the idea is to channel bicycles along certain paths. Jones said a plan is needed for pedestrians to be where they should be, a plan for bicyclist to be where they should be, etc. and this would help solve problems with students getting across campus. She commented maybe an idea is a rail system but this would be expensive so probably not a solution. Harbison said another solution would be to increase the break between classes. Several members agreed.

Morris stated he would like to add that there is one more science precinct cluster and that is East Campus. He noted he has students that commute to class on East Campus within a 15 minute time frame. He said it is pretty clear that the design that we have is not very student centered, it might be architect centered but not student centered. It is not really focused on where the students are, where they live, where they are coming from, and how they get to their classrooms. He does not see a solution in the Sasaki concepts.

Hoffman wondered if MyRED could be data mined to look at the registration so we would know where the sections are being taught, then do a flow analysis of who goes where. He said classes that get a lot of traffic could be moved into a smaller region. He remarked we could get some real statistics on how frequently students have long trips and what the major classes are that could go into the class schedules. Harbison said this is a reasonable question and suggestion that should be brought to the attention of Sasaki. Jones stated, in technical terms, Sasaki should do an origin-destination study of students based on data. Weissinger stated she thinks this is theoretically possible.

Marks commented it is not just a problem of students getting from classroom to classroom and expressed a major problem is in the Arts area. He said the Arts area is in the Southwest corner of campus and all of the dorms are on the opposite side of the campus. He remarked none of the plans address this or even a plan for expansion in the Arts area.

Weissinger indicated she would be happy to “pick this one up”. She believes the first piece of the idea involves getting data from PeopleSoft by enlisting assistance from the office of Registration and Records and the office of Institutional Research and Planning and sharing this data with Sasaki, who could then help optimize a solution.

Weissinger also indicated she had made a note that: 1) the APC would like to hear from Nancy Busch, Dean of the University Libraries, and 2) Marks comment regarding the Arts area.

Harbison expressed he likes the plan; however, there seems to be a bit of a disconnect between the available space and the precincts. He said there needs to be more space for Arts and for the core academics and there is not a lot of space in the plan. This needs to be confronted.

Weissinger reminded one of Sasaki’s core concepts is the topography of our building and they believe that as we build buildings they have to have a higher elevation. That is how we can create more density in the existing footprints that we have. She expressed it is interesting when you look at the concept that how many potential building footprints that there are.

Bryant stated that he would communicate this discussion and ideas to Nunez. Harbison thanked Bryant.

#### Report on Deans and Directors Meeting

Harbison informed membership that he had recently attended the Deans and Directors meeting as the APC representative. [Poser arrived] He said some of the discussion in this meeting is as follows: 1) a report from Athletic Director Tom Osborne on the East Stadium Research facility, which is essentially a complete melding of academics and athletics for research – an ideal collaboration, and, 2) an update from Dean Alan Cerveny, who gave Office of Admission news and statistics.

[Please note the order of the Agenda was changed by the APC Chair]

#### Proposal on Juridical Sciences Doctor in Space Law

Harbison introduced the proposal [attached to permanent record] and welcomed guest Susan Poser. He stated Bryant and Lahey were the subcommittee that reviewed this proposal and asked Bryant to further discuss this agenda item.

Bryant indicated this subcommittee recommends approval of this proposal; however, they would like to have further discussion with Poser and the full APC.

Bryant pointed out in the past there has been caution against having doctoral programs with one or two faculty in a small doctoral program and wondered about this. Poser stated the vast majority at the College of Law is JD (Juris Doctor) degrees. She noted the LL.M. Program in Space, Cyber and Telecommunications Law, which has been a successful program that has 7 to 10 students every year for the five years this program has been in existence and that the proposed new Juridical Sciences Doctor in Space Law (JSD-SL) would complement this program. She expressed this proposal, for lack of better words, is icing on the cake.

Poser said interest for this new JSD-SL has been evident over the last few years as several candidates have approached Professor Frans von der Dunk, who is an expert in Space Law at the Law College, regarding a JSD or similar program in Space Law. She conveyed Professor Dunk spends part of his time at the College of Law and part of his time at the University of Leiden and initially that he would mainly be the principal advising students on their doctoral dissertation. She stated it is anticipated that on average one student will be admitted to the program every year to two, maximum capacity for the program would be 2-3 students per year.

Hoffman asked what is the advantage of a having an LL.M. master's degree in Law. Poser indicated the LL.M. program gives a person expertise in a particular area and is an advantage to the students as a lot of the classes are not offered by other institutions except for UNL. She stated graduates have gone into the government, general counsel at NASA, Virgin Galactic among other companies so in the legal departments they do not need to learn space law as they already have the background.

Bryant questioned the structure of this degree. Weissinger said these degrees are not governed by the Graduate College, just by the faculty and Dean. She clarified this is a professional degree and therefore proposed as a proposal from the College.

Lahey remarked in thinking of USSTRATCOM interaction, he wondered on the possibility of perhaps attracting people to Innovation Campus using this program for a need in labs such as research labs? Poser replied that both the LL.M. program and that association with STRATCOM has been in place for five years. She believes this doctoric will not bring people to Innovation Campus. She shared the College of Law is beginning to now do proposals for the UARC (University Affiliated Research Center) through STRATCOM so who knows.

McCullough wondered if there would be any interconnections with the other Big 10 schools such as sharing resources and if this program was intriguing to them. Poser commented there has been some interest and there have been some very early conversations on an asymmetrical benefit to all.

Bryant thanked Poser for this conversation. He indicated the subcommittee recommends APC approval of the request from the College of Law for a new program in Juridical Sciences Doctor in Space Law (JSD-SL) to be administered by the College of Law and introduced a motion to do so. As a motion from a subcommittee, no second is required.

Harbison asked if there were any further comments or discussion and there was none. Harbison called for a vote. The APC voted unanimously to endorse the proposal. Harbison congratulated and thanked Poser for attending and she thanked the APC for its consideration. [Poser left]

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

Harbison asked Green if he had any matters to share. Green expressed it is nice to be here as he has had to miss the last few meeting. He said he had several items to share.

Green communicated they are in the process of releasing a large number of new positions in the Institute. He said they have already identified the positions and now are laying out the process to start hiring. He stated there are 36 positions so it is a very large number of positions all at one time and these positions are across the board. He indicated the Institute's Leadership Council met this morning and agreed to move those positions into action early in the spring semester. He expressed this is an exciting time for us.

Green explained the Institute attempted to design positions that uses expertise across campus, including opportunities on Innovation Campus, so there was a lot of planning to identify these as priority positions. He commented that the Institute changed the way of determining how to release faculty lines. He said this was done as a group, the planning was done collectively, all departments in the Institute were involved and the unit heads worked together and together they identified the priorities coming from the faculty and worked across lines to do that. Thus there are clusters of positions not identified due to departments.

Green said this process will consume time very heavily in the spring, summer and fall. He conveyed the hope is that there will be another 20 positions in about a year and a half. He said that is the growth plan that they are on and we hope it will come to fruition. He remarked we are the only Institution that we know of in our field that is doing this currently; there are a few that are making some hires but there are none that are doing it at the level that we are doing so it is creating a bit of national attention and has caught the attention of our national competitors.

Green stated he arrived during discussion of the Master Plan and communicated they also are having similar discussions regarding libraries on East Campus – first initiated by the Dean of the Libraries Joan Giesecke last spring, then recently Nancy Busch. He said the topics of the conversation were whether to continue to operate the C.Y. Thompson Library as a functioning library, is it effectively and efficiently used for or serving that purpose, and, if not, what to do with that building. He said this building is a 3-story high, 1960's building that is basically a box. He indicated what is emerging out of discussion with faculty is a learning center type of facility with potentially a collaborative learning center environment for students right in the center of

campus. He said is unsure of where further discussion will go and informed a task force of faculty and students is currently being assembled to think of ideas of what a collaborative learning center would look like in concert with a library.

Green stated there is also development occurring on the south side of East Campus as construction has begun for a new fraternity house. He expressed this is exciting to see. He said there will be two more buildings going up where Valentino's is located and construction is scheduled to begin this winter. He told these buildings will be 3-story buildings so the whole south face of East Campus will change over the course of the next year and a half to where there will be commercial development there. He said Sasaki Associates have taken this development into their thinking of the Master Plan.

Green mentioned Innovation Campus and the announcement just before Thanksgiving regarding partnership with ConAgra. He stated this was labeled as research on popcorn and tomatoes and, yes, we will be working with them in those areas; however for negotiation and competitive reasons they were unable to share what other areas we will be researching and working on together. He said it will take a year plus to build the facilities and informed that more information would be forthcoming. He commented this is exciting to see this happening. He indicated discussion with deans across campus started yesterday now that first partner has been made public. A discussion with faculty about what would make sense to have on Innovation Campus in its first space will take place in the spring term.

Hoffman remarked it would be helpful to make sure to include faculty from IMSE (Industrial and Management Systems Engineering) as he believes this unit does not have representation, there is not a department Chair. Green acknowledged this.

Hoffman inquired what the apportionments are – is it Extension, is it Research. Green said the apportionments are all over the board, some are split research teaching, some that are split research extension.

Green said the Rural Futures Institute was approved by the Board of Regents in October so now formalized. He indicated a search firm has been contracted and the search for the Director will start after the first of the year. He said he is appointing a committee this week.

Bryant asked how IANR searches were conducted. Green stated it is a fairly traditional search; there is a search advisory committee that is appointed. He conveyed the descriptions on these positions have already been somewhat developed by work groups in the departments. [Kamler left] [Paul arrived]

Harbison asked if there were further discussion or comments. There was none. Harbison thanked Green. [Green left]

Harbison asked Paul if he had any matters to share.

Paul announced the annual Research Fair earlier this month was a major success. He said there were a number of sessions on social and behavioral sciences research as well as speakers from Penn State University, the University of Michigan and the University of Iowa – very engaging discussions. He indicated the group will come back in the spring with recommendations on how we can better coordinate social and behavioral sciences research for bigger growth.

Paul shared the College of Engineering has been interested in further strengthening the relationship to medicine with the researchers at UNMC (University of Nebraska Medical Center). He stated Dean Wei held a session earlier in the semester which included the College of Engineering, the Office of Research, and UNMC and out of this session faculty from both sides showed interest. He told this past Monday they met again with UNMC for a very fruitful conversation. He said as a result there is a call for joint proposals by the end of January.

Paul mentioned the delegation from Xi'an Jiaotong University that visited UNL recently and communicated in the past there has been conversation to see if there is an interest in exploring research collaborations. He stated there was further discussion during their recent visit and subsequently invited UNL to visit Xi'an Jiaotong University in the spring – date to be determined – for discussion on several areas such energy, material science, agricultural engineering, and possibly food safety. He said once those areas are finalized, a UNL delegation will then visit Xi'an Jiaotong University.

Paul conveyed the UARC is successfully moving forward and there are frequent visitors and collaboration with USSTRATCOM. He said faculty members are working together and there is a lot of enthusiasm. He commented this is tremendous visibility. He remarked Kurt Preston, the new associate vice chancellor in research, has been a great hire and indicated he has helped faculty to connect in a number of areas.

Paul additionally remarked that Regina Werum, the other new associate vice chancellor in research, arrives January 15. He said she succeeds Deb Hamernik, who served as interim vice chancellor for research. He voiced that Deb had done a wonderful job.

Bryant commented that the IRB (Institutional Review Board) touches the lives of the academic community in many ways and wanted to commend Paul as he finds that this office has become really helpful with students, for example making it much easier for graduate students trying to develop their theses and get them approved. Paul thanked Bryant for his complement and expressed he was pleased to hear this. He remarked he is very proud of the staff and faculty in the Research offices.

Harbison asked if there were any other comments or discussion for Paul and there was none. He thanked Paul.

Harbison asked Weissinger if she had any matters to share or discuss.

Weissinger indicated she is mulling over declaring an initiative tentatively called Learning Environment Enhancement Initiative. She stated this initiative would declare, most likely over a



span of several years, that we improve or enhance every general purpose learning environment on the campus. She said most are classrooms but there are other learning environments. She stated the scope of this initiative would be that some classrooms would get just an aesthetic enhancement such as new paint, ceiling tiles, or chairs and others would get more elaborate enhancements. She told enhancements would be prioritized on use. She indicated funding could be put together from a variety of sources for this initiative.

Harbison inquired if this initiative would include electronic improvements. Weissinger replied yes, there would be thoughtful upgrades made.

Discussion then ensued on improving classrooms and instructional space to remain competitive, differential tuition, interactive classrooms, distance education classrooms, hybrid courses, and contemporary learning pods. Discussion concluded with Weissinger commenting she really likes how the declared goals fit together and said this was quite intentional. She remarked these goals were centered on the goal of increasing the size of our tenure track faculty and we will do that by becoming a larger student body. She stated the 6-year graduation rate goal needed to be next to the enrollment goal and by putting those two goals together, we will attract more students. She said she has not moved forward yet on this proposed initiative and noted if you spend money on “A”, then you may be diverting money away from “B”; however, this initiative could potentially touch every faculty member and every student. [Weller arrived during discussion]

Weissinger stated another discussion matter is apportionments. She said there is language on apportionment in the *Bylaws of the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska*. She said one component of this Bylaw is that the specific apportionment of the faculty member’s responsibilities will be reviewed periodically in a private conversation between the faculty member and the unit administrator, whether that is the department chair or the dean. She said the purpose of the review, in her opinion, is to assure that the interests, the passions, the apportionments, the accomplishments and the rewards fit together and that to her is a fair and effective system of allocating faculty time.

Weissinger indicated now there is a database that shows every faculty member’s apportionment. She stated this database can be searched by individual faculty member, by department, or even by college and it can be aggregated. She commented the terrains of the apportionment are fascinating. She said, for example, there are several departments where every faculty member has the same apportionment. She remarked more than likely that might represent a less than fully thoughtful engagement about what faculty members are good at, and what to do and how to drive forward. She informed membership that she has discussed this with the deans and that she plans to send a memo to them stating her expectation that this bylaw be enacted and conversation to be engaged.

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

Hoffman observed there is no connection between the apportionment and the reward structure in the evaluation process so if there was more of a connection one might get buy-in on the apportionment discussion.

Morris said there is no specific determination on what constitutes a 20% teaching load, for example, in each department or college so it is difficult to look at a database, there is no formula that equates.

Marks commented he echoes what Morris said. He stated he believes that even though this apportionment Bylaw has nothing to do with the teaching load as it relates to that part of the apportionment, it will open a can of worms. He said in his department, there is a rubric for deciding teaching load that is quite detailed. He shared that some faculty are very unhappy with this. He added it is also not legitimate to compare across departments or even across campus.

Jones said it is the matter of fairness and some faculty feel they are treated unfairly so there is a need for a more uniform basis. Some would say apportionment has been used in a way to punish. She commented some will look at this as any change is punitive; there is an imbalance that makes it look unfair.

Weissinger remarked there has been mention to create a standardized metric that equal the unit of teaching. Several members commented this has been done and this metric does not work.

Harbison asked if there were further comments or discussion and there were none. He thanked Weissinger.

Weissinger thanked the Committee for the comments and stated she would take this conversation back to the deans at the next Deans' Council meeting. She stated she is only asking that we actually have this conversation and the result of that conversation be linked in some fair way to accomplishments and rewards. [Paul left]

#### Academic Program Review Discussion

Harbison suggested tabling this discussion to the next APC meeting due to timing. He informed eventually he will delegate this task to the Long-Range Planning subcommittee but feels the APC should discuss first. Membership agreed.

Hoffman inquired if there was a relevant guideline or procedure on the APR procedures that could be distributed before the next meeting. Harbison said yes. Coordinator Green said she would distribute the *Academic Program Review Guidelines* to membership.

Weissinger inquired what the general focus of this conversation is. Bryant replied the question is does the APC want to take on the initiative to try to improve the process? Weissinger suggested inviting Lance Perez, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, to this meeting. She told membership that without changing the guidelines, he has been working with the Departments and Deans as well as made this a more meaningful process. Membership determined to invite Perez to give a presentation and interact with the APC in this APR conversation.

#### Other Business

Harbison asked if there was other business and there was none.

There being no other business, Lahey and Hoffman seconded to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 4:39 p.m. The next meeting of the Academic Planning Committee will be held on Wednesday, December 12, 2012, at 3:00 p.m. in the City Campus Union.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle (Shelly) Green  
APC Coordinator