

University of Nebraska – Lincoln
Academic Planning Committee (APC)

Approved Minutes
January 16, 2013

Members Present

Archie Clutter	Jared Leighton	William Nunez
Gerard Harbison, Chair	Christopher Marks	Linda Shipley
Mike Hoffman	Martha McCollough	Ellen Weissinger
Stephen Lahey	Jack Morris	Curtis Weller

Members Absent

Miles Taft Bryant	Libby Jones	Prem S. Paul
Ronnie Green	Eric Kamler	Donde Plowman

Others Attending

Lance Perez, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Harbison stated a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.

Academic Program Review Guidelines, Procedure and Process Discussion

Harbison welcomed Lance Perez, Associate Vice Chancellor in Academic Affairs and stated Perez had kindly agreed to lead the discussion on the Academic Program Review Guidelines. [attached to permanent record] He commented hopefully this will lead to making the entire process more efficient.

Perez stated he has been responsible for the Academic Program Review's (APRs) since he came to the Senior Vice Chancellor's office two and a half years ago. He said these Reviews are mandated by the Board of Regents. He said broadly speaking it is a comprehensive review of a department and its programs by a team comprised of three external team members, an internal team member and a representative from the APC (other members may be added if appropriate). The review of a department and its programs occur on a seven-year cycle and noted that some programs have been exempted due to accreditation visits.

Perez indicated this is a long process that begins a year ahead of time in accordance with the guidelines. In this year's time the department is informed, a review date is set, a list of potential review team members is compiled and the department begins working on its self-study report. He said this year long process culminates with the visit by the review team and there is normally a period of 120 days which a series of responses are due – the review team has 30 days following the site visit to submit a written review and evaluation of the program, the department has 30 days to respond to the review team's report (addressed to the dean), the Dean has 30 days after receiving the department's response to submit a written report to the SVCAA/VCIANR, and the SVCAA/VCIANR has 60 days after receiving all responses to prepare a response that is provided to the dean whose college houses the department, with copies to the department

chair/head/director and others as appropriate. He said this is the process dictated by the current set of guidelines.

Perez shared that since he became responsible for the APRs, he has been working on making these reviews much more meaningful and much more collaborative between all parties involved. He stated we haven't altered the timeline at this point but the process is one that has long term engagement with faculty and staff. But, he shared that the entire visit has been reshaped. Specifically, it used to be fairly compartmentalized. He said now certain barriers are gone and all key stakeholders meet together where there are frank and open conversations – prior to the visit, during the visit and after the visit. As an outcome of this change, the reports, the analysis and the feedback from the external team have become much more useful and meaningful to all involved, regardless of the timeline dictated. He noted that, for example, APR reports have recently been used to successfully make a case for better chemistry labs or new hires.

Perez mentioned another important benefit of the changes is that we are making better and more strategic investments in the departments. This is happening in a very developmental way. He said with respect to the timeline, progress is always being made [Clutter arrived]

Morris remarked he was a member on a review team and the process and timeline stretched out for a long period of time. He stated this impacts how the APC reports.

Weissinger commented she personally is often less focused on the timeline but inclined to let the process play out. She shared that she believes in some ways that the 120 day timeline could be disadvantageous in certain circumstances and that 30 days is not enough time for a department to thoroughly consider and discuss. She would argue for a thoughtful response from all involved in the process. Perez pointed out some department responses are due, for example, on December 24 and that submission is not going to happen. He shared that some departments now are asking for additional time in order to submit a more authentic report.

Morris wondered if the department could file a response that simply outlines the intention of where they plan to go for no other reason than to inform the team that the report has been received and acknowledged.

Perez said ultimately he thinks as we look forward it is best not to disrupt the core items of the process as he believes it is providing too many opportunities for dialogue between various administrators and departments. He feels this is really starting to have significant impact on our campus. He said yes, the department could file a response simply stating the report had been received and we will do this but then what would the deans response be? Weissinger observed the report could easily then be forgotten about.

Lahey informed his department is once again constructing another strategic plan and wondered whether there could be integration of these two projects as it seems to him there is duplication in work with this strategic plan and the APR. He questioned is there some way to begin to look at this issue?

Perez replied in the APR Guidelines that it is supposed to be integrated into the strategic planning process. He said some departments integrate APR responses into their strategic plan.

Lahey remarked that a plan updated annually seems to produce unnecessary updates. He feels that in response to an APR analysis, an update with regard to his college strategic plan is certainly a good opportunity. Weissinger stated this is more a tactical plan. Harbison suggested maybe better coordination between the Deans Office and the SVCAA office. Weissinger stated we could readily raise this issue directly. She expressed she believes there is an increasing connection and articulation between what we all learn in an APR and what ends up in departments and colleges.

Morris observed the Guidelines say the APC representative will be responsible for giving the APC a report on the review process, noting any problems encountered, within 90 days of the programs response. He said often times that a response is so delayed that one can't remember what happened unless one writes their report right after the review team visit. He said he wrote his report after the review team visit when he was the representative on a previous APR so he wouldn't forget. He wondered if the APC representative could give the APC his or her report upon receipt of the review team's report rather than wait for the process to complete. Perez replied a timeline of maybe 30 days after the external team report could happen; this would be an easy change to make to the process.

Harbison indicated he has heard two issues so far in this discussion: 1) the timeline as in the Guideline is too short while the actual time in reality ends up being too long, and 2) the integration of the strategic plan at the college level could be improved. He asked if there were any other issues.

Hoffman suggested rather than the single report there could be two reports. Something along the lines of the initial report that the APC representative writes up that regards the process and then a secondary evaluation by the APC rep on what the administration's response was to that. Then there is not a timeline issue. He commented it would be nice to see what the response was to the issues that were raised in the review.

Marks pointed out the Template for Report of Academic Program Review used by the APC representative needs some revisions.

Harbison proposed referring the following matters to the Long-range Planning subcommittee: 1) the timeline, 2) integration of the strategic plan, and 3) revisions to the Template to come back to the full APC addressing these issues within the next 60 days. He added Bryant and VC Perez should also be included in the Long-range Planning subcommittee discussions. Membership agreed. Harbison thanked Perez.

Approval of November 28, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Approval of the Minutes from the November 28, 2012 general meeting was moved by Lahey and seconded by Marks.

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

Academic Program Review Monitor Appointment [attached to permanent record]

Harbison indicated that a member was needed as an Academic Program Review (APR) monitor to the Department of Statistics from October 27-30, 2013.

Harbison asked for a volunteer. McCollough volunteered to serve as the ARP monitor. The appointment was supported by APC membership.

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

Harbison asked Weissinger if she had any matters to share or discuss. She said she had a couple of matters she would like to inform members of.

Weissinger said at APC's last meeting she spoke of improvement and enhancements to the general purpose classrooms. She expressed she was pleased to announce that plans are moving forward on this. She informed the group that Nunez, Lance Perez, and Jennifer Dam are currently visiting every general purpose classroom. She informed there will be an update on this at a future date.

Weissinger indicated the Brace Hall project continues to move forward with a completion date of fall 2015.

Weissinger shared one of the ideas brought forward by Sasaki Associates to the Master Planning process is Love Library. She said the idea is that Love Library can become a great many more things and noted this is at a very early stage of imagining. She stated with the increasing availability of online materials and volumes and archiving creates square footage available in both Love and C.Y. Thompson. Sasaki brought us a new eye for imagining Love North and the area around it as a new center of campus. She conveyed the vision of the first floor of Love North opening up having indoor and outdoor space and, being free of its obligation to hold library materials, becoming one large informal learning space academic commons for the campus. Additionally, informed APC that individuals from Academic Affairs have already begun working with the library faculty to ask what else we all want in the library that would draw the students. She said we are increasingly envisioning as an academic hub that services the students inside the Love Library space. She indicated she would like to see this happen by fall 2013 and that Program Statements should be seen soon.

Leighton inquired if access to library materials would be affected during the time of renovation. Weissinger said no, it is extremely rare that any print material can't be accessed during renovation. Harbison reminded it is the intention of the APC to invite the Dean of Libraries to a future APC meeting to hear they can adjust to this change as well as lose that amount of space.

Weissinger mentioned the recent newspaper article referencing the tuition freeze recommended by Governor Dave Heineman. She said it is hard to know if the Legislature will agree to this.

Harbison inquired if this will apply also to differentiated tuition. Weissinger replied no, it affects the base tuition. What it will mean is that the colleges that have differential tuition will not get a raise on the differential tuition rate for resident students because any increases in the differential tuition are linked to whatever the raises in the base rate are.

Harbison asked if there were further discussion or comments. There was none. Harbison thanked Weissinger.

Harbison asked Clutter if he had any matters to share. Clutter said that he had matters to share.

Clutter said, as you are aware, we have been talking a lot about people the last few months in the hiring initiative. He announced the Institute plans to release 15-20 of those 36 positions by the end of this month. [Perez left]

Clutter then informed of some administrative searches that were still in progress but close to concluding. He stated we have two administrative searches underway. He said one search is Statistics. He said three candidates were interviewed for this position last fall and it was decided to continue the interview process with two of those candidates. The other search is in the School of Natural Resources and two candidates were interviewed and only one was asked to come back for additional interviews. He said it appears these important but long processes will come to conclusion soon.

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

Other Business

Harbison informed membership he had presented APC's Annual Report to the UNL Faculty Senate on December 11, 2012 [attached to permanent record] and asked if there was any other business.

Nunez indicated he would like to update membership on the Master Plan in Bryant's absence. (Bryant is the APC representative on the Steering Committee for the UNL Master Plan.) Nunez informed next week, Tuesday through Thursday, Sasaki Associates will be on campus to present updated versions of the UNL Campus and Landscape Master Plans to committees and various groups as well as hold two open house sessions. He stated the UNL Campus and Landscape Master Plans are in the final phase of development and that Sasaki Associates would return in March with the final Master Plan, which would then go before the Board of Regents in June. He communicated the open house sessions are January 22 in the Nebraska Union Heritage Room and January 23 in the East Union Great Plains Room, 3 to 5 p.m. both days. He encouraged all to attend and stated this is the last opportunity for feedback to Sasaki.

Harbison mentioned memberships concerns during discussion at its November meeting. Nunez said those concerns were forwarded directly to Sasaki Associates. He also informed there are several more detailed studies currently happening for matters such as Love Library, Manter Hall and Textron facility that are expanding on the core master plan ideas.

Nunez stated he would like to thank Weissinger for her support for, and comments on, improvement and enhancement of general purpose classrooms. Nunez said he would welcome comments or ideas from membership regarding classroom improvements that could be factored into this process. Morris commented we need better quality interactive classrooms. McCollough voiced the first floor of Hamilton is treacherous.

Harbison thanked Nunez and asked if there was any other business. There was none.

There being no other business, McCollough and Morris seconded to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 4:17 p.m. The next meeting of the Academic Planning Committee will be held on Wednesday, February 13, 2013 at 3:00 p.m. in the City Campus Union.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle (Shelly) Green
APC Coordinator