University of Nebraska – Lincoln
Academic Planning Committee (APC)

Minutes
December 9, 2015

Members Present

Leslie Delserone	William Nunez	Nancy Busch
William Wagner	Mike Hoffman	Patrick Shea
Maria Marron	Guy Trainin	Eva Franke-Schubert
Michael Farrell	Tyler White	Melanie Simpson

Members Absent

Prem S. Paul	Curtis Walker	Gerard Harbison
Ronnie Green	Thien Chau	Ron Yoder

Others Attending
David Hyten, Associate Professor, Agronomy and Horticulture
Amy Goodburn, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, on behalf of Ronnie Green

Delserone called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. She stated a quorum was not present so approval of the November 18, 2015 meeting minutes would wait and the discussion on agenda item 2 would begin.

Discussion: Plagiarism and Risk to the University
Delserone stated an area of concern by both she and Dr. Hyten is the increasing incidence of plagiarism by students, researchers, graduate students, post-docs and others. She introduced Dr. David Hyten and displayed documents for the discussion.

Hyten thanked APC for the opportunity to speak to the Committee. He stated his concern came from his own personal experiences with this topic. He shared he was an associate editor for *Crop Science* for 3 years while with USDA-Agricultural Research Service and indicated the first time he found plagiarism was as a co-author. He read a paragraph that sounded familiar and it was indeed his own work. Hyten said his initial thought was the other author must have thought this practice was okay as Hyten was a co-author. This prompted him to check the remainder of the paper where he found 3/4 of the introduction plagiarized from many different papers. He said at that time he was the editor of two other papers and after checking discovered plagiarism on another one as well. He stated since that time he now uses Google to check sentences but admitted that only the most blatant plagiarism is found this way.

Hyten referenced an editorial from the *DNA and Cell Biology* journal (displayed for the Committee) where they are using a high-caliber plagiarism software to check submitted works. He said that when the journal began using this software they discovered 10-20% of the submissions had significant plagiarism. He expressed that researchers and universities should be concerned; at least for this particular journal, if plagiarism is found they inform the provost and

the dean of the university where the author resides. And, if any funding is listed in the acknowledgement, they will contact that funding agency. The author will then be blacklisted for a period of 3 years.

Hoffman asked about self-plagiarism. Delserone referenced the potential for copyright infringement if self-plagiarism occurs across several different publishers, depending upon the copyright transfer agreement signed by the researcher. Shea asked Hyten what his recommendation would be to the Committee in this regard. Hyten replied his recommendation is that the faculty need access to plagiarism software, not just to check students work, but peers' work as well. Shea commented he thought some of this software was free or were they all fee-based? Delserone indicated there is a cost for good software, but after looking online was not able to locate an actual cost unless you contact the vendor. Shea stated as there is a cost he wondered if the APC should ask administration to provide this software to all faculty.

Discussion ensued. Hoffman voiced the Vice Chancellor of Research should be included in any conversation. Delserone agreed and indicated there are some directorates within the National Science Foundation that are screening grant proposals for plagiarism. She referenced a table, prepared by Associate Professor Andrea Dinkelman (displayed for the Committee) detailing the use of the plagiarism software iThenticate by several research universities. [Farrell arrived] Delserone stated funding came from different sources and remarked perhaps funding could be subsidized between the Research office and the Senior Vice Chancellor's office. She conveyed that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee thought this might be a good open mic discussion item at a Faculty Senate meeting. She suggested the APC make a recommendation to the Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, the Vice Chancellor of IANR, the Vice Chancellor of Research, and the Vice Chancellor for Information Technology to consider investigating site licenses to make software available to researchers (or system-wide to all four campuses). [Busch arrived]

Delserone conveyed, for clarity purposes, the SafeAssign program in Blackboard is essentially an educational tool, designed for a faculty member to request a student in his/her class to run his/her paper against its database. She said if something would came back flagged the instructor would meet with the student to have a teachable moment. She said the database with this program is extremely limited; the iThenticate library is massive and continues to expand.

Trainin stated we need to consider how to educate the campus and how to find an effective way to communicate this issue. The tools won't do anything on their own. [White arrived]

Delserone asked if there were further questions or comments. There were none.

Hoffman moved to request that the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Vice Chancellor for IANR, the Vice Chancellor for Research and the Vice Chancellor for Information Technology consider this issue for the University of Nebraska–Lincoln and report back to the APC with thoughts on the matter along with an appropriate plan for awareness and training at UNL. Wagner seconded.

Delserone asked if there was further discussion. There was none. She called for a vote and the motion was approved unanimously. She stated she would share with APC membership how this topic goes with Faculty Senate. She thanked Hyten and he thanked the APC. [Hyten left]

Approval of November 18, 2015 Meeting Minutes
Delserone indicated a quorum was now present. She asked if there were any questions or comments on the November 18, 2015 meeting minutes.

Shea voiced his concern on edits made by Ronnie Green, some of which do not appear to be things that were actually said at the meeting. He wondered how much revision was acceptable in the minutes and commented the meetings are recorded by Coordinator Green. He asked for review of the recording for clarity. He indicated there were two items in particular: 1) Page 3 paragraph 4 under Discussion: Presence of IANR Administrators at Academic Program Reviews (APR) Meetings with Faculty where "voiced he [Green] agrees" was altered, and 2) Page 4 paragraph 2 where Shea had remarked "the unit heads in IANR are primarily administrators which is a little different than department chairs" was also altered.

Hoffman moved to table approval of the November 18, 2015 minutes to the January 13, 2016 meeting; in the meantime the APC Coordinator and APC Chair would review the recording. Shea seconded.

Delserone inquired if there was any additional discussion and there was none. Membership voted unanimously to table the minutes until the next meeting on January 13, 2016.

Action Item: Appointment of Subcommittee to Review and Revise *Academic Program Review Guidelines*
Delserone stated the next item was to appoint a subcommittee to review and revise the *Academic Program Review Guidelines*. She stated this appointment is a result of discussion in several recent APC meetings. She indicated she had already spoken to Hoffman and that he had agreed to serve on this subcommittee.

Delserone asked for two more volunteers. Simpson and Wagner volunteered. All three appointments were supported by membership.

Hoffman requested the location to the link to the *Academic Program Review Guidelines*. Wagner asked the timeline of this subcommittee for the review of the *Guidelines*. He indicated a review of the *Guidelines* should occur every 10 years and that the last review was spring 2006. Delserone asked if it would be realistic to have a recommendation for the full APC the week after spring break in March with the goal to finish by the end of the spring semester. This seemed realistic. Nunez suggested this item be placed in the APC "tickler file" for an early-semester check on the progress and asked Coordinator Green to do so.

[For reference the link to the Academic Program Review Guidelines is located at: http://www.unl.edu/apc/documents.shtml]

Action Item: Appointment of Subcommittee to Review Proposal to Add Graphic Design Majors within the B.A. and B.F.A. Programs
Delserone stated the next item was to appoint a subcommittee to review the proposal from the Hixson-Lied College of Fine and Performing Arts to add Graphic Design majors within the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Fine Arts programs. [attached to permanent record] She said this proposal was electronically distributed to membership and also posted on Box. She said the intent was for a two person subcommittee to review and bring its recommendation to the next APC meeting on January 13 for full APC consideration.

Delserone asked for volunteers. Marron and Farrell volunteered. Both appointments were supported by membership.

Discussion: Academic Planning Committee Operating Procedures (Voting) and Environment
Delserone recalled a couple of APC meetings ago (November 4) there was a motion initiated by Shea regarding changes to the APC voting procedure when there were sponsors or people involved with a proposal present during the meeting. The proposal was that these individuals would be asked to leave the room so the APC could have the opportunity to discuss, deliberate and vote. She continued that Nunez also had feedback regarding whether that was appropriate with regards to Robert's Rules of Order. She remarked this matter pointed out a concern of hers that the Committee may be devolving into a Committee that is very concerned about who hears what and what will be done with that information.

Delserone remarked to Shea, as he had initially voiced this motion that he had appeared to be surprised that the APC meetings were open. Shea replied yes, he was not aware the APC meetings were open meetings. He indicated that he had not found this information in any document where it was stated that the APC meetings were open meetings. He wondered if others, including APC members present, were aware of this and that anyone anytime could attend. Nunez pointed out the APC meetings are treated as open as they are scheduled and published to the university community, agendas are widely circulated and publicly posted before meetings, and the APC is a representative appointed and elected governing body. Given these factors it has always operated as open. So, the meetings have operated as open until closed by a vote to go into executive session. Shea wondered if every meeting, every committee, unless it is specifically stipulated that it was not, was an open meeting and where does one draw the line as to which committee meetings are open and which ones are not. Nunez indicated it is a good question and one Legal Counsel could address. Shea indicated he would begin advertising to faculty to attend APC meetings and perhaps there should be a provision that at the end of the meeting, within reason, to allow time for individuals to make comments or raise some issues.

Discussion ensued on what Shea had proposed at the recent previous APC meeting, specifically that proposers and/or administrators that are directly connected with or having an interest in the proposal leave the room during the APC discussion and vote. Shea said this might influence an APC member's vote as they may feel inhibited. Hoffman remarked this could be solved as, according to Robert's Rules of Order, a secret ballot could be requested. He said any APC member could request this and that this had been requested before by an APC member. Delserone and Nunez agreed. Shea stated he did not know that was an option and indicated he would be okay with a secret ballot. Nunez added that a motion for executive session would also

accomplish this objective. Wagner recalled this has been done before during budget reductions. He commented it sounds like the APC already has a mechanism already to accomplish this - the APC just needs to invoke this when requested. Discussion concluded with members agreeing mechanisms were already in place to handle sensitive business items. The earlier proposal, while originally approved by a majority of the APC membership, will not be implemented.

Matters from Vice Chancellors - Academic Affairs, Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources (IANR), and Research and Economic Development
Delserone asked Goodburn if she had any Academic Affairs matters to report on behalf of Green. Goodburn said that she did not but would be happy to answer any questions. There were no questions. Delserone thanked Goodburn.

Delserone indicated both Paul and Yoder were unable to attend today's meeting.

Other Business
Delserone asked if there was any other business. Shea mentioned proposed revisions to the UNL Bylaws.

Delserone communicated to membership, that regarding revisions to the UNL Bylaws, Dave Woodman, Chair-elect of the Faculty Senate, and Shea, Chair of the APC *ad-hoc* subcommittee, would work together to expedite revisions and keep communication going between the Senate and the APC. Shea indicated that he had contacted Woodman to schedule a time to get together to plan and coordinate what the Senate would like to address and what the APC would like to address as well as common interests and common issues.

Shea stated that Delserone had given the APC Annual Report to the Faculty Senate at its last meeting. He commended Delserone for a good report. He wondered if the procedure used before the report was given to the Faculty Senate should include sharing with the APC beforehand.

Delserone indicated due to a tight timeline/deadline this was not possible this time. She commended Coordinator Green for her help in preparing this report. She communicated this report was now posted both in Box and on the APC webpage and that basically this report is a tabulation of the APC activities since the last annual report to the Faculty Senate by the previous APC Chair. Hoffman agreed and commented there is a short time to prepare this report. Trainin remarked, to piggyback on Delserone's comment, that if this report is mostly a tabulation of APC's past year, he believed a level of trust could be established that the Chair creates the report. Hoffman conveyed this report is mostly a tabulation of the previous year but there are opportunities for recommendations to the Faculty Senate and for the APC to share with the Faculty Senate. Delserone suggested an agenda item, at an APC meeting prior to the submission of this report, giving the membership an opportunity to suggest recommendations for the Chair to incorporate into the report.

Delserone asked if there was any other "other business" and there was none.

Delserone welcomed Eva Franke-Schubert to the APC. She indicated Franke-Schubert would complete the remainder of Arthur's term.

There being no other business, Simpson moved and Wagner seconded to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m. The next meeting of the Academic Planning Committee will be held on Wednesday, January 13, 2015 at 3:00 p.m. in the Nebraska Union.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle (Shelly) Green, APC Coordinator

Z:\APC\Minutes\2015-16\DRAFT2015-12-09_min-final.docx