

MINUTES

University of Nebraska – Lincoln Academic Planning Committee

March 9, 2016

Members Present:

Leslie Delserone	Thien Chau	Curtis Walker
William Wagner	William Nunez	Nancy Busch
Mike Hoffman	Patrick Shea	Melanie Simpson
Michael Farrell	Guy Trainin	Eva Franke-Schubert
Tyler White	Gerry Harbison	Ronnie Green

Members Absent:

Maria Marron	Prem Paul	Ron Yoder
--------------	-----------	-----------

Others Attending:

Lance Perez, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

1.0 Call

Delserone called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

2.0 Approval of January 13, 2016 Minutes

Shea recommended several changes to the minutes. Harbison moved that the minutes be approved with the amended changes. Wagner seconded the motion. The motion was approved/

3.0 Revising the APR Guidelines – Issues and Direction (Hoffman, Wagner, Simpson)

Hoffman stated that the subcommittee working on revising the APR Guidelines wanted to get a sense of direction and agreement from the APC on basic issues and proposed changes. He noted that there are basic housekeeping changes that need to be made, but there also should be clarification on the composition of the external review team. The subcommittee proposes that the review team shall have no administrative presence. Discussion ensued with Perez advocating that department chairs and unit heads should be allowed to serve as an internal member because they have provided valuable information to the external review team members in the past and have been recommended by the department(s) under review. Hoffman noted that the majority of the internal representation on the review team have been dominated by department chairs and suggested that the proposed change to not have an internal administrator on the team be

approved. However, the restriction could be changed later if it is determined that it would be more helpful to have chairs serve on the team.

Shea stated that the APR guidelines should be followed. He noted that from his experience in serving as the APC representative on APRs, faculty members have stated that they did not feel they could freely discuss their concerns with an administrator present in the meeting. Perez pointed out that the guidelines specifically state that faculty members can request a meeting with the external review team without administrators being present. Shea clarified the difference between private meetings with faculty to discuss specific concerns and subject- or issue-based meetings (such as teaching, research and extension) with the review team. He said faculty want to have these discussions without any administrators present.

Green noted that there is a difference between the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources (IANR) and the rest of campus in the practice of APRs. He stated that the issue has been discussed in previous meetings and is one of the reasons why the guidelines are being reviewed. He pointed out that Academic Affairs has been conducting APRs the same way for some time and units identify internal members they would like to see on the review team. He noted the practice has been to have a sitting chair serve as the internal representative, although this is not written anywhere. Farrell asked who then selects the person from the list of identified people. Perez stated that the Dean vets the list and the appropriate Vice Chancellor finalizes the selection. Harbison noted that there has been a disproportionate number of administrators chosen. Delserson pointed out that the subcommittee can make its suggested changes which will be discussed again when the revised guidelines are considered for approval.

Hoffman reported that other proposed revisions being considered are: providing an explicit statement that faculty, staff, and student meetings with the review team shall be conducted with no administrative presence; defining a process for requesting a meeting with the external review team; and addressing the Professor of Practice and Research Professor roles within the guidelines and whether they should meet separately with the External Review Team or with the rest of the faculty. Farrell pointed out that some departments have very few Professors of Practice or Research Professors and suggested they meet with the other faculty members. Shea suggested that the units decide whether to have separate meetings.

Delserson stated that there is a request from Ron Yoder to consider the timeline for reports to be submitted and she suggested that Hoffman contact Yoder for further information. Hoffman pointed out that the timeline is well defined in the guidelines, but not well followed. Shea noted that not following the timeline can drag out the process and can be difficult on the APC representative. He stated that recently the APC representative has given the report to the APC even though all of the reports have not been received and there is some uncertainty as to who the reports should be submitted to. He suggested that this be clarified. Green pointed out that the responsibility of the APC representative is to observe whether the APR has been done properly. Perez noted that former APC member Steve Lahey put together a document on the role of the APC

representative which could be helpful. Hoffman noted that a checklist for the APC representative is planned and the revisions will be formalized and presented to the APC.

4.0 UNL Bylaw – Proposed Revisions, Sections 1 and 1.1 (Shea, Wagner, Simpson, Chau)

Delserone reported that the initial proposed changes from the Chancellor's office included removal of the majority of the information on the APC and to include them in the operating guidelines. However, this was not acceptable to the APC. Other revisions include: adding a specific seat for a non-tenure track faculty member; making the Secretary a non-voting member, and giving the APC authority to approve or disapprove academic program requests.

Nunez stated that the idea to remove the specifics of the APC from the Bylaws was to make it an internal process to make changes. Currently any changes require approval from the APC, Faculty Senate, ASUN, the Chancellor, the President, and the Board of Regents. However, the APC felt it was important to keep the information on the APC in the UNL Bylaws so it will remain. Shea added that it is important to keep in mind the difference between bylaws (binding) and guidelines or operating procedures (non-binding). He noted that this is the basis for including critical details concerning roles and procedures in bylaws.

Shea noted that one revision is to add a seat for a non-tenure track faculty member at the level of Research Professor or Professor of Practice, which has previously been discussed by the APC. He pointed out that the current Bylaws do not exclude these faculty members, but it was felt that they should be specifically and consistently represented on the APC. The Committee discussed whether the number of members should increase to 19, but there were concerns that it could be difficult to find a Research Professor or Professor of Practice to serve since there are a limited number of them. The precedent of non-tenured faculty and professors of practice serving on the committee already exists.

Shea reported that another suggested revision concerns the role of the Secretary. Currently it is the Associate to the Chancellor who is very helpful, but there is a question whether the Secretary should be a voting member because there could be a potential conflict of interest. Wagner stated that the Chancellor ultimately makes the decision on most APC issues. Nunez stated that in looking at the history and construct of the Committee there is value in having a Secretary. Shea suggested that the Secretary could come from the membership of the Committee. Nunez pointed out that the issue of having a Secretary with continuity needs to be considered by the Committee. Harbison pointed out that it would be tedious for a member to sit through two hours of meeting without even having the ability to vote on issues. Shea clarified that the recommendation for the Associate to the Chancellor as a non-voting APC member is to recognize and appropriately accommodate the unique role of that individual in the university.

Shea stated that there should be a clear and concise statement in the Bylaws on the primary function of the APC and its authority. He noted that a recommendation is being made to include language giving the APC responsibility for approving or disapproving

academic programs. Currently, the APC only has an advisory role and can just make recommendations. He suggested that there needs to be a discussion about what the appropriate role is of the APC in University governance with respect to academic governance. Chau noted that shared governance is spoken of frequently on campus and when he received the APC responsibilities he thought it would give students a formal means of shared governance. However, the APC vote is not binding and he believes the APC needs more formal responsibilities to provide that shared governance with the students.

Green pointed out that the Regents Bylaws state that recommendations must come from the Chancellor. Decisions come through the APC and go to the Chancellor, but before anything goes to the Board, whether it is approval of academic programs or budget decisions, the Chancellor must approve it. Wagner asked what happens if the APC denies a request. Nunez stated that he cannot remember a time when the Chancellor went against the decision of the APC, with the exception perhaps being specific budgetary items during times of budget reductions. Shea pointed out that the Chancellor is not required to have the approval of the APC and can act without it and consideration should be given to changing this on academic matters. He believes that the process has worked well, but it should be codified more specifically so the APC has a specific purpose, function, and role.

Delserone stated that the proposed revisions need to be considered. She noted that the APC is a highly selective representative body whereas the Senate has the broadest faculty representation. Green pointed out that there really is a very elaborate process for approval of many things already in place. He noted that program approvals are disciplined related, go through department and college approval processes before it even goes to the APC. Harbison said that the only relevant point is whether the APC's disapproval will stop the process of approval by the Chancellor.

Delserone asked that the APC consider the proposed changes and be prepared to vote on the complete set of revisions at the next meeting. Walker asked that the language on the student membership be changed to reflect current practice which is that the ASUN President and the President of the Graduate Student Assembly serve as the student representatives.

5.0 Other Business

5.1 Report from IANR VC/Interim SVCAA Green

Green reported that the campus is moving forward on the diversity mapping efforts and the process should begin in the fall semester. He stated that the mapping will be conducted over the course of a year and it will help us evaluate where we really are in respects to diversity. He noted that part of the effort will be led by a diversity council that will be chaired by Perez.

Green stated that the current enrollment figures for the fall semester indicate that we are up 300-400 first-time freshmen this fall, although there are still about six weeks before we have hard figures.

Green reported that the Legislature has considered the University's appropriation request and capital funding. Although it is not yet finalized, it appears that we will get half of what we requested. This amounts to \$11 million per year from the state to be matched with \$11 million per year from the University, up through 2030. For UNL this means that the Walter Scott link and Nebraska Hall will remain as the top priority, but Mabel Lee Hall cannot be completed as planned unless additional funds are raised.

Green reported that the searches are going well and that interviews of candidates for the Dean of Architecture will begin shortly, as will interviews for Associate Vice Chancellor for International Engagement and Global Strategies. He stated that it is hoped to have these searches concluded by the end of this academic year.

Green noted that Georgian Suite A of the City Campus Union is finally going to be renovated. He said that the funds will be provided through the Pepsi endowment funds.

5.2 Determine if a quorum will be available for the March 23 meeting (spring break)

Delserone queried the APC members to see if they will be available to meet on March 23. Due to the lack of a quorum the meeting will be cancelled.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:49 p.m. The next meeting of the APC will be on Wednesday, April 13, 2016 at 3:00 in the City Campus Union, Colonial Room A. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator.