

## MINUTES

### University of Nebraska – Lincoln Academic Planning Committee

November 2, 2016

**Members Present:** Bloom, Busch, Correas, Delserone, Farrell, Franke-Schubert, Hartman, Hinchman, Kostelnik, Marron, Nunez, Simpson, Sollars, Wagner

**Members Absent:** Goddard, Trainin, White, Yoder

**Others Attending:** Dean Donde Plowman, Dean Archie Clutter

**Note:** These are not verbatim minutes. They are a summary of the discussions at the Academic Planning Committee meeting as corrected by those participating.

---

#### **1.0 Call**

Wagner called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

#### **2.0 Approval of October 19, 2016 Minutes**

Bloom moved for approval of the minutes as revised. Motion seconded by Delserone and approved by the APC.

#### **3.0 Proposal to Change the Name of the College of Business Administration**

Plowman reported that the request to change the name from the College of Business Administration to the College of Business is not a radical change and is common with our peers. She stated that the timing is due to the new building that will be coming online next year and the necessary signage. She pointed out that the idea has been vetted with the faculty of the College and with alumni boards and there is overwhelming support for the change.

Farrell asked if someone's name will be associated with the College. Plowman stated that she hopes that a name will be attached in the future. Hartman asked what the acronym would be for the College. Plowman stated that it would probably be COB.

Marron stated that she thinks the change makes sense and is more contemporary. Simpson moved to support the proposal to change the name from the College of Business Administration to the College of Business. Hartman seconded the motion. Motion approved.

#### **4.0 Revisions to APR Guidelines**

Wagner noted that at the last meeting there was discussion to make further revisions to the section in the Guidelines pertaining to administrators who are faculty members attending meetings with the external review team. He stated that because there are really two issues to be addressed he wanted to deal with the revisions formally and asked for a motion. Simpson moved to approve the updated revisions. Sollars seconded the motion. Wagner asked for discussion.

Wagner presented two revisions to Section VII.2. The first was to fix a problem created by a previous revision, which seemed to preclude meetings of the review teams with chairs, directors, and unit heads from affiliated programs. The second addressed whether administrators should be allowed under special circumstances to attend the meeting between faculty members and the external review team. Delserone asked if department heads and chairs are considered administrators. Wagner stated they are administrators, even though they also serve as faculty members.

Kostelnik pointed out that some programs within departments are very small and if the chair is one of the faculty members in the program she/he could contribute to the meeting with the external review team. In some cases the chair could provide institutional history of the program. Sollars noted that she just recently experienced this situation with the English APR and the faculty in one of the programs wanted to have the chair present at the meeting. Correas stated that there should be a mechanism for the faculty to bring in the chair or director of a program if the faculty are in agreement and there is a specific need for that person to attend.

Delserone asked if there is a way the faculty can notify the APR representative of their comfort in having the chair or director attend the meeting. Wagner stated that there was some previous discussion that faculty members might feel that there could be retaliation if the chair is not allowed to attend the meeting.

Kostelnik pointed out that the APR is a review of a program, not the chair. She noted that when the APR schedule is developed it is through the associate dean who should have some idea whether there are any conflicts in a department. Wagner stated that it is important that there be free flowing discussion and that faculty members feel they can speak freely during the meeting. Correas pointed out that some department heads have a 100% administrative positions, while chairs still actively teach and conduct research. He recommended that the chairs who still have faculty responsibilities be allowed to attend the meetings with the external review team.

Bloom pointed out that in most cases there will not be an issue with a chair or department head attending the meeting. However, protections need to be in the guidelines to protect faculty members. He stated that the APC representative should be proactive in reaching out to the faculty to see if they are comfortable with having the chair/head attend the meeting. Correas stated that if exceptions are to be allowed, there needs to be language in the Guidelines relating to how this should be done. Bloom suggested dropping the language “under special circumstances.” Sollars pointed out that the default should be that an administrator would not be in attendance except in cases where they are needed to enhance the external review team’s ability to get needed information.

Franke-Schubert noted that the Guidelines state that the external review team can meet individually with faculty members, but she asked if they meet with groups of non-tenure track faculty members. Wagner reported that in the recent APR that he was involved in the meetings were by programmatic areas, but not with non-tenure track faculty members. Franke-Schubert asked if the external review team could have meetings with non-tenure track faculty members. Wagner stated that the request might need to be made of the person in charge of the APR.

Kostelnik suggested language should be included in the Guidelines that clarifies that a chair can attend the meeting if she/he has information to contribute about the program. She pointed out that this could be done in a separate meeting if faculty members in the program feel they want to meet with the external review team without the chair.

Farrell noted that this is a gray issue which could be difficult to regulate. He asked who would make the decision to allow the chair to attend the meeting with the external review team. Wagner stated that he believes the revisions address this problem. Farrell pointed out that the revisions do not clearly state who makes the decision and whether it is in consultation with anyone. Sollars suggested that the APC representative consult with the external review team, not with the faculty or the administrator. She pointed out that the external review team knows what information they are seeking. Wagner stated that he would accept this as a friendly amendment.

Wagner asked the APC members to vote on the motion to approve the revisions to Section VII.2. of the APR Guidelines. Motion was approved.

#### **5.0 Appointment of Subcommittee to Review the Proposed Sports Media and Communication Program**

Franke-Schubert and Farrell agreed to serve on the subcommittee to review the proposal for a sports media and communication program in the College of Journalism and Mass Communications.

#### **6.0 Long Range Planning Subcommittee**

Wagner stated that the APC usually generates some ideas for the Long Range Planning Subcommittee to work on during the academic year, although the Subcommittee can also identify issues to address. He noted that the Long Range Planning Subcommittee would determine which issues fall within the remit of the APC, refine and prioritize the issues, and place them on future APC agendas.

Correas suggested looking into having more compact Ph.D. programs. He pointed out that there can be great differences in how many credit hours are required for graduate programs, even among very similar disciplines.

Bloom stated that there needs to be discussion about the planned significant growth of the university and how our academic programs, and the infrastructure of the university, are going to deal with this growth.

Delserone noted that Chancellor Green promised to come and speak to the APC regarding proposed budget models and suggested that this be an agenda item. Nunez reported that a memo was just sent out announcing the task forces being formed to help gather information for strategic planning. He pointed out that one of the task forces will look at financing and the budget. In March the process will begin to look at the budget models and best practices. He pointed out that changing the budget model will be a complicated process.

Simpson noted that the Chancellor has appointed four task forces to gather information on several issues. She suggested that the chairs of the task forces should meet with the APC to provide a report of their work.

Kostelnik pointed out that growth has been mentioned in all of its dimensions, but she asked if there may be some things around the curriculum that need to be considered such as how standardized it should be and possible programs for the future. She stated that the biggest challenge for UNL will be how we evolve from a smaller, more personal campus to a larger, personal campus. She asked if there are policies and strategies that need to be more formalized. She noted that one of the things that she would definitely like to see retained is the promotion and tenure process for faculty members.

Clutter stated that IANR has talked about this being a personal and accessible institution whether you're a faculty member or student. He stated that this is a very collaborative university and there is easy access to colleagues in other departments and to colleges across the campus. However, there is still a lot of opportunity for us to do better. Discussions are needed about our strengths and how we are going to reach the research goals. Wagner noted that undergraduates have tremendous opportunities to be involved in research here.

Bloom suggested that another issue that should be considered is internationalism and what policies do we need in place to facilitate international work. Kostelnik stated that another issue is long term retention, how do we retain students and faculty and help them along in their career.

#### **7.0 Other Business - Reports from the Interim VC of Academic Affairs, Interim VC of IANR, Interim VC of Research and Economic Development**

Kostelnik pointed out that an announcement was made that there was not a good fit with any of the four candidates for Executive Vice Chancellor. She noted that this is not a bad thing because it is important to have a good fit. She reported that the search committee has been asked to continue looking for suitable candidates.

Clutter reported that in 17 days two APR site visits were completed. He stated that all indications from conversations with the external review committees is that they will be excellent reviews. He stated that the administration really appreciates the effort to make the APR process better. He reported that Associate Dean/Director of ARD Deb Hamernik will serve as Interim Associate VC in Research to help out with the transition of the office. He stated that Department Head Gary Brewer will serve half-time as Interim Associate Dean in ARD during the time that Hamernik will be assisting the Office of Research.

The meeting adjourned at 3:59 p.m. The next meeting of the APC is scheduled for Wednesday, November 16, 2016 at 3:00 in the Gaughan Cultural Center, Ubuntu Room. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator.