

## MINUTES

### University of Nebraska – Lincoln Academic Planning Committee

September 21, 2016

**Members Present:** Bloom, Busch, Correas, Delserone, Farrell, Goddard, Hartman, Hinchman, Kostelnik, Marron, Nunez, Simpson, Sollars, Trainin, Wagner, White, Yoder

**Members Absent:** Franke-Schubert,

**Others Attending:** Interim Associate VC Walker, Academic Affairs; Assistant Dean Santiago, Agricultural Research Division, IANR

**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 3:03 p.m.

#### 2.0 Approval of September 7, 2016 Minutes

Bloom stated that a change was needed in section 7.0 to correct Trainin's statement regarding graduate certificates. The minutes should read that a graduate certificate should not cost the university additional resources. Simpson moved that the minutes be approved as amended. Hinchman seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

#### 3.0 Role of APC Representative on Academic Program Reviews

Wagner reported that there seems to be some confusion regarding the extent of participation of the APC representative on academic program reviews and Assistant Dean Hector Santiago, and Interim Associate VC Judy Walker, have been invited to discuss the issue. He noted that there needs to be clear guidance as to what the expectations are for the APC representative; whether the APC rep should be involved in all of the meetings and the extent to which the APC rep should participate in writing the review.

Kostelnik suggested that it would be helpful if the role of the APC representative was clarified. She stated that her understanding is that the APC rep is to monitor the process. Wagner agreed that the primary function of the APC rep is to ensure the integrity of the process. Correas noted that in April the Committee discussed whether administrators should be allowed to serve on the review team as an internal member. He suggested that the APC representative should have a more important role on the review team to create a balance if an internal administrator is appointed to serve on the review team. Wagner stated that the APR guidelines now state that the internal representative cannot be an administrator.

Walker stated that an internal Associate Dean was appointed to the review team for the APR of English, but she does not know if the appointment was made prior to the change

in the APR guidelines or afterwards. Wagner pointed out that the review team was set up during a time of transition and he does not believe it is worthwhile to change the person now, but for future APRs the guidelines will apply.

Yoder noted that the guidelines do say that the APC representative is to monitor the process. Bloom pointed out that this is not clear throughout the document. Sometimes the guidelines say that the APC rep participates. Wagner stated that on page ten of the guidelines it says that the APC rep is an active participant. Yoder noted that historically the APC member was considered a full member of the team and, in some cases, was involved in the writing of the report. Correas noted that on page ten the language reads that the APC rep may be involved. He suggested that the word may be changed to shall.

Wagner stated that the main issue is the scheduling of the APC representative for all of the meetings. Walker stated that for the English APR a previous template from Academic Affairs was used and it showed that the APC monitor as separate from the external review team. She stated that the schedule, which was filled out by the English department, had specific meetings identified for the APC representative, and it has been her experience that the APC monitor only attends some meetings. She stated that the spirit behind this thinking is the acknowledgement that the APC monitor is a faculty member with teaching responsibilities. She noted that Academic Affairs is not trying to restrict the APC rep to the meetings and the rep is welcomed to attend all of the meetings. She pointed out that the APC needs to decide whether the APC rep should be at all of the meetings or is not required to attend every meeting.

Sollars stated that she believes it is better to fully incorporate the APC representative into the team with the qualification that the rep can leave a meeting to teach a class. She pointed out that listing the rep separately could send a message to the head of the external review team that the APC rep is not to be an active member. Trainin pointed out that the external review team also meets in the evening which could mean the APC rep is involved for four days total, with meetings going into the late evening. He noted that most faculty members do not have that kind of time available, and there should be some flexibility which allows the APC rep to decide how actively she/he wants to participate.

Kostelnik pointed out that the APC representative gets to write a separate report from the external review team. If the APC rep participates in writing the external review team report that person becomes a member of the team. Doing this might inadvertently cause the APC rep to give up a very valuable role at the end of the review. Sollars noted that she has served on two previous APRs and she feels that the School of Biological Sciences review serves as a perfect model. She was included in all of the meetings and was informed what the external review team was going to discuss. The external review team members wrote the report, but she was asked to review it which provided her with the opportunity to participate. She pointed out that it is important for the APC rep to see the dynamics of the review team.

Santiago stated that in IANR the reps are part of the discussion and it is believed that in order for the APC rep to monitor the process they need to be participating as much as

possible. Wagner stated that the APC rep needs to at least be at the meetings that involve people in the program being reviewed. Walker stated that she thinks it would be ideal if the APC rep can participate in all of the meetings. She stated that it is probably reasonable to ask that the APC rep participates in all of the meetings during the day, if possible, but the evening meetings should not be mandated. She pointed out that requiring people to attend meetings at night might make people reluctant to serve. Santiago agreed that it can be a struggle to find a faculty member that has the time to participate in evening meetings in addition to the day meetings. He tells the internal faculty members of the review team to try to be at the meetings as much as possible.

Correas stated that he agrees with Kostelnik that the APC rep should not be able to be involved in the writing of both reports, but thinks the rep should try to attend all of the meetings. He asked how it would be handled if a grievance from someone in the reviewed program came up during the meeting, but the APC rep wasn't in attendance. Sollars noted that any of the members of the department being reviewed can ask for a private meeting with the review team. Walker pointed out that the APC rep does not attend the private meeting with an individual.

Wagner asked if the APC representative should participate as much as possible with the external review team, including the writing of the report. Correas stated that the rep should not help write the report. Wagner asked if people supported the idea of having the APC rep read over the report of the external review team before it is submitted. Many members of the APC agreed with this suggestion.

Bloom asked if members of the review team receive an honorarium from the university. Walker noted that only the external review team members get an honorarium.

Wagner stated that he will make revisions to the APR guidelines and will forward the suggested revisions to the APC and to Santiago and Walker. Walker stated that she is willing to work on the messaging template and would be willing to work with someone from the APC on it.

#### **4.0 Additional Bylaws Revisions**

Wagner stated that the first revisions change is about the VC for Research and Economic Development position which will be split into two positions: the VC for Research and the VC for Economic Development. He asked which of the VCs should serve on the APC. The other addition is to include language that the Graduate Council representative is eligible to serve as chair.

Wagner asked which of the VCs should be members of the APC. Nunez suggested that the VC of Research should be a member of the Committee because research is vital for all academic programs. Correas pointed out that the VC of Economic development will report to the Chancellor while the VC of Research will report to the Executive Vice Chancellor. Kostelnik stated that membership depends on how frequently topics arise that need to be addressed by either of the VC's.

Trainin moved that the VC of Research be kept as a member of the APC. Bloom seconded the motion which was unanimously approved by the Committee.

Wagner asked if language should be included in the Bylaws that the Graduate Council representative can serve as chair. Delserone noted that with the election of Simpson as Vice Chair it will be the third time in the history of the APC that the Graduate Council representative will serve as chair. Correas suggested a friendly amendment for the language to read “and Graduate Council representative.” Wagner accepted the friendly amendment which was seconded by Delserone. Motion approved unanimously.

Wagner stated that he will forward the revised Bylaws to President Woodman of the Faculty Senate.

**5.0 Report on Agricultural Leadership, Education & Communication APR (Trainin)**

Trainin reported that the department of Agricultural Leadership, Education & Communication is complicated and has some overlap. He noted that the external review team was very diverse and responded to any questions raised by members of the department. He stated that he saw no problems with the APR process and the external review team was impressed with what they observed. He noted that the suggestions made by the external review team were very practical.

**6.0 Report on Aesthetics Review Committee Summer Activities (Harbison)**

Wagner noted that Harbison was gone over the summer and could not attend any meetings, but was going to provide a summary. He stated that efforts will be made to reschedule Harbison’s visit to the APC or to get someone else from the Aesthetics Review Committee to provide a report.

**7.0 APC Representative Report on University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (Delserone)**

Delserone stated that the role of the APC representative is to review the monthly curriculum requests and bulletin changes. She stated that the procedures are very straight forward.

Sollars asked if only ACE programs were discussed. Delserone stated that the APC rep is not involved in the ACE issues. She noted that approximately 100 action requests are made every month. She stated that serving on the UUCC provides a unique opportunity to see the evolution of undergraduate programs and to be able to offer constructive criticism to colleagues working on new courses. She pointed out that for the past three years the APC rep has been the Chair of the APC, which creates an additional workload for the Chair, and she did not think this practice should continue. She stated that the real value is that the APC rep can make the APC members aware of new proposed programs.

Hartman asked what topic areas were being proposed for new courses/programs. Delserone stated that some Journalism classes were being proposed for the undergraduate level, but most of the work was clean up of courses due to changes in majors and minors and course numbers being changed.

Hartman asked if the proposals for new courses were evolutionary to reflect changes in disciplines. Delserrone stated that good proposals would point out that the times have changed and the subject matter is no longer taught in the same way, therefore requiring new courses.

## **8.0 Matters from Vice Chancellors – Academic Affairs, Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources, and Research and Economic Development**

Kostelnik noted that the Chancellor's state of the university address is on Thursday and encouraged people to attend. Bloom asked for an update regarding the upcoming accreditation. Kostelnik reported that meetings have been held on City and East campus and were attended by faculty and staff members. She stated that there is a real effort to have people participate in the review, but the accreditation team will create the schedule. She noted that there will be opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to meet with the team. She stated that the team says that our report was well written and shows good evidence. She pointed out that when the team comes to campus they will validate the evidence rather than trying to generate new information. She stated that the visit is a real opportunity for us to talk about the strengths of the campus. She stated that the team's schedule will be distributed as quickly as possible when it becomes available to her office. She wanted to compliment those that wrote the report and note that they did a good job in terms of linking the goals and the evidence.

Kostelnik noted that a total of eight candidates will be on campus interviewing for the VC of IANR and the Executive Vice Chancellor positions. She strongly encouraged everyone to visit with the candidates and to attend the faculty forums and town hall meetings.

Goddard reported that an announcement was made on Friday regarding the donation from the Raikes Foundation and the Gates Foundation to establish the Nebraska Food for Health Center at Innovation Campus. Professor Benson, Biotechnology, will lead the center which will focus on food and how it interacts with the trillions of microbes found in the human gut and how this affects health. Goddard stated that the Center will work with experts from the University of Nebraska Medical Center and the University of Nebraska-Omaha in addition to faculty from UNL. Wagner asked how much new hiring will be associated with the new center. Goddard stated that he does not know the actual figure at this time, but there are proposed hires which will need matching money to support them over time.

Marron asked what the role of the APC is in relation to the establishment of centers. Wagner stated that he was unaware that the APC provides any input into the decision to create a center. Marron pointed out that the APC is active in formulating the goals for UNL in the areas of education and wondered if a center is defined as a program. She asked how many centers exist. Goddard stated that he is not sure of the total number. He pointed out that the APC can play a role if a center is trying to reorganize academically, but he does not think everything that is called a center needs APC approval because some of the centers are a result of research efforts. Bloom noted that in Executive

Memorandum #24, Definition of a Program, center is defined as an academic program. Goddard stated that the centers do get reviewed and some are tightly coupled with a department, but he is not aware if the APC gets involved with the review. Bloom asked about centers that go beyond UNL. Goddard stated that NU system centers report to the President of the university. He pointed out that most of the centers created in the past decade are mostly interdisciplinary and driven by the research agenda. He noted that there are many offices that are called centers, although it is not clear if they really qualify as a center. Wagner asked if any centers have been dissolved. Goddard stated that there have been centers that have been discontinued.

#### Other Business

Correas reported that the Graduate Student Association (GSA) has a travel awards program for graduate students. He noted that proposals are peer and faculty reviewed and the GSA might contact some faculty members to act as reviewers.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m. The next meeting of the APC will be on Wednesday, October 19, 2016 at 3:00 in the Ubuntu Room (#202) of the Gaughan Multicultural Center. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator.