

MINUTES

ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE University of Nebraska – Lincoln

October 18, 2017

Members Present: Bender, Bloom, Clarke, DaSilva, Farrell, Franke-Schubert, Hinchman, Marron, O'Connor, Purdum, Trainin, Woodman

Members Absent: Boehm, Goddard, Nunez, Plowman, Purdum, Sollars

Others Attending: Interim Dean Tim Carr, Janae Aune

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

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

2.0 Approval of October 4, 2017 Minutes

Marron moved for approval of the minutes. Motion seconded by Trainin and approved by the Committee.

3.0 Budget Reduction Procedures: Budget Framework and FY18/19 Process Narrative Document

Bloom reported that some of the Committee members were able to attend the working session last week where the discussion focused on the size of the reduction and the timeline. He noted that he had three additional questions for VC Jackson regarding the history of previous budget cuts. He noted that the information provided shows some of these budget items over the past few years, and in every fiscal year there has been a deficit ranging anywhere from \$800,000 to \$2.8 million. He guessed that some of the deficits were covered by the Chancellor's office and some reallocations may have occurred in some years. He questioned if there is a structural deficit which needs to be addressed and which will be aggravated by budget cuts. He stated that he also asked about what expenditures there will be for next year. Another question Bloom asked was whether there were other sources of contingency funds similar to the one in the utilities budget, but VC Jackson stated that her office is not aware of any other contingency funds on campus. He questioned whether the Deans hold any emergency reserve funds. He noted that the campus reserve fund is now very limited and the proposed \$8.5 million in budget cuts will help to put some funding back into the reserve fund.

Bender asked if there was any discussion whether the timeline would provide enough time for individuals and units to prepare for their defense if they are included in the proposed cuts. Bloom pointed out that this is a major concern of the APC. He pointed out that there is uncertainty in how much time will be required because the Committee does not know what the proposed cuts will be. Bender asked if the administration admits that the public hearings and

review of the cuts by the APC may carry over into January. Bloom reported that the Chancellor has indicated that this is a possibility.

Woodman questioned whether the deans have been given any parameters to work with in deciding their proposed cuts because the amount of time left for them to identify their proposed cuts is limited. Marron reported that at a recent Deans Council meeting EVC Plowman stated that she would be meeting individually with the deans to discuss the amount of cuts they need to identify.

Farrell suggested that the Committee needs to consider the general framework, the timeline, and the general budget separately. He noted that the general framework and the general budget amount is probably acceptable to the Committee members.

Farrell moved that the APC accept the general budget framework as written in the Procedures to be invoked for Significant Budget Reallocations and Reductions. Da Silva seconded the motion. Motion approved by the Committee.

Marron moved that the APC accept the general budget reduction of \$8.5 million. Motion seconded by Bender. No discussion followed and the motion was approved with one abstention.

Farrell proposed that voting on the timeline be held off until the APC has received information on how many specific budget cut items it will have to review and to ensure that there is adequate time for departments to prepare for a hearing. Bloom pointed out that the APC will not become involved again until the end of Phase Two. In the meantime the administrators will be working to develop the proposals. O'Connor stated that it is the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors' responsibility to present the proposed cuts. Bloom reported that the Chancellor has indicated that the proposed recommendations will be presented to the APC on November 15.

Clarke stated that she is most concerned at this time with the Phase III timeline. She pointed out that this is the most critical period and where some flexibility is needed, particularly given the time of the semester and the upcoming holidays. The APC discussed various options regarding the timeline. Farrell moved that the APC hold off on accepting the timeline until the Committee has received further information on how many specific budget cuts there will be, and to ensure that there is significant time for departments to prepare for a hearing. Bender suggested a friendly amendment moving that Phase Three will begin on November 15 and the APC will complete its work as expeditiously as possible. Farrell accepted the friendly amendment. Da Silva seconded the motion. The motion was approved by the APC members. Bloom reported that he will send the Chancellor a letter informing him of the APC's acceptance of the general budget framework, the budget reduction of \$8.5 million, and for the APC to complete the work as expeditiously as possible.

Da Silva asked where the FY18/FY19 Process Narrative document for the budget reductions will be published. Bloom stated that the Chancellor's website should have information pertaining to the budget cutting process.

4.0 Reports from the EVC of Academic Affairs, VC of IANR, Interim VC of Research and Economic Development

Carr stated that he was reporting for EVC Plowman and would update the APC on Graduate Studies. He stated that soon after taking the position of Interim Dean he realized that the Office of Graduate Studies needed updating. He pointed out that the admission process is outdated and one database system needs to be created rather than piecing different systems together. He noted that the fact that our process is still paper-based once students are enrolled shows how much we need to make improvements. He stated that the challenges will be to find an online system for document management that will work for us.

Carr reported that he has been making appointments with deans, associate deans, and chairs to talk about the goal to double our graduate student enrollment. He stated that his first question to the deans, associate deans, and chairs is how we can make our graduate programs more attractive and competitive. He stated that he has initiated a regular meeting, twice each semester for all graduate chairs and department chairs to share best practices and to address issues that need to be resolved.

Carr stated that one of the philosophical changes with Graduate Studies is that it will no longer work as an isolated entity, but instead will partner with other departments and use other systems on campus. He pointed out that he meets regularly with Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management Amber Williams, and the marketing and recruiting people in Admissions will now be working to recruit graduate students. Bloom asked if there is room in the budget to update the admissions process. Carr pointed out that a newer admissions process would be more cost effective than what we have now.

Woodman noted that a big issue for increasing the number of graduate students in the STEM fields are limited stipends. He pointed out that graduate stipends at many other universities are much higher than ours. Carr stated that he is having conversations with EVC Plowman and VC Boehm to reconfigure how more funds could be provided for graduate stipends.

Tschetter noted that in the humanities doubling the graduate student enrollment is overwhelming right now. She asked where the funds will come from that will enable departments to handle the increased enrollment. Carr stated that the projected growth of graduate students would increase over a period of time.

Franke-Schubert asked if marketing efforts will target domestic or international students. Carr reported that Amber Williams, Senior International Officer Sonia Feigenbaum, and Associate Vice Chancellor Amy Goodburn, are meeting every two weeks to try and determine where the focus should be.

Carr stated that one of the things that should be considered for Graduate Studies is offering masters' degrees in new ways, perhaps to offer more professional type of masters' degree that could lead to professional training. He pointed out that a lot of students that inquire about masters' degrees are looking for education for very specific professional jobs. He stated that these students are typically not interested or need an extended research background. He stated that certificates are official academic achievements and need to be considered. He pointed out

that many of the potential graduate students already have their masters' degree, but want some further education that could enhance their career. He noted that these are students who would also pay full tuition. Trainin pointed out that the goal to increase graduate students does not necessarily mean that all departments must double the number of its graduate students.

Tschetter stated that one of the issues is for graduate students to be able to get jobs once their degree is completed. She asked if the university plans on helping the graduate students to get jobs. Carr pointed out that Graduate Studies is a real partnership with the departments and it is important for the departments to let Graduate Studies know what disciplines have high employment rates. He noted that this information can then be given to the recruiters.

Franke-Schubert stated that doubling the number of graduate students will take a significant increase in funding. Carr stated that he does not think we will be able to rely on state dollars to fund graduate assistantships. He pointed out that any state dollars will more than likely go towards graduate teaching assistantships because those students are providing service courses. He noted that we could, however, think about some incentive programs where there is central funding that could entice research students to come to campus where they could explore working with a couple of professors and then rotating to other professors. He suggested that eventually those professors with grants could help support the program.

5.0 Other Business

Bloom stated that he thinks the APC should get a report and hear more about the new budget model. He noted that the Chancellor has indicated that some of the models are being tested.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:57 p.m. The next meeting of the APC will be on Wednesday, November 1, 2017 at 3:00 in the Chancellor's Conference Room, 201 Canfield. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator.