

MINUTES

March 14, 2018 University of Nebraska – Lincoln Academic Planning Committee

Members Present: Aune, Bender, Bloom, Boehm, Clarke, DaSilva, Farrell, Moberly, Sollars, Trainin, Tschetter, Zeleny

Members Absent: Franke-Schubert, Goddard, Minter, O'Connor, Plowman, Purdum, Woodman

Others Attending: Professor Will Thomas, Co-chair 150 Strategic Planning Initiative

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 3:01 p.m.

2.0 Nebraska 150 Strategic Planning Initiative (Professor Will Thomas)

Bloom reported that the Chancellor has announced the strategic planning initiative which will have a steering committee co-chaired by EVC Plowman and Professor Thomas.

Thomas noted that the idea of the 150 strategic planning initiative is to figure out UNL's future from all aspects of the campus. He reported that the Chancellor is encouraging the senior leadership to think of the initiative as long-term planning, and noted that we have the opportunity to develop a plan that is much broader in scope. He pointed out that departments have strategic plans, but they do not consider what the university will be like in 25 years and this is a tremendous opportunity for UNL to identify where it wants to be in the future.

Thomas reported that the initiative is building on the work that was done by the four task forces the Chancellor created last year which considered student success, retention and enrollment; budget models; scholarship and creative activity; and achieving distinction in the Big Ten and beyond. He stated that the steering committee has met once with two consultants from Academic Leadership Associates who are contracted to work with us on developing our strategic plan. He noted that the steering committee will meet again with the consultants before they come back to campus again for a broader set of meetings. He urged the APC to meet with the consultants and Bloom pointed out that the APC is scheduled to meet with the consultants on April 4.

Thomas stated that there will be a two-day session in May for the steering committee and the plan is to receive the reports from the consultants as well as to bring into consideration the discussions which were raised by various groups when the consultants were on campus in April.

Bloom questioned whether a university as broad as Nebraska can have a single mission. Thomas noted that the university is very broad and is not only a land grant university, but UNL is the flagship campus. In comparison to universities in other states with multiple universities, Nebraska is very broad and we need to be clear about our identity as we envision moving forward. He reported that when we entered the Big Ten there were many questions about our identity, and although we are last in some respects in the conference, this is not an accurate reflection of who we are. He pointed out that it is crucial for us to determine our identity, and we need people external to Nebraska to see and understand our identity.

Farrell asked if only UNL is a member of the Big Ten, as opposed to the NU system. Zeleny stated that this is correct. Farrell encouraged the steering committee to incorporate non-tenure track faculty members. Zeleny noted that two members of the steering committee are non-tenure track and Boehm noted that Extension Educators are non-tenure track faculty members. Thomas pointed out that the broader commission is still in the process of being formulated and there will be subcommittees that will include many people from across the campus. Zeleny reported that there will be at least a total of 150 people serving on the various subcommittees. Thomas suggested that it would be good to have the consultants meet with assistant professors or non-tenure track faculty members when they come to campus in April. He reported that the consultants will do some survey work and will collect the responses and take notes of discussions at the open meetings in April.

Boehm stated that he felt very comfortable with the two consultants and noted that their approach to life fits with UNL. He pointed out that the strategic planning in no way pushes aside all of the unit planning that occurs on campus and the members of the 150 commission should have an understanding of what is happening at their local level. He stated that at a very high level, a strategic plan drives programs and ultimately influences how we allocate resources.

Da Silva noted that the President-Elect from the Graduate Student Assembly has been invited to participate in the Commission. Zeleny reported that the President-Elect is appointed to the steering committee and will help appoint graduate students to serve on the subcommittees. Boehm pointed out that numerous graduate students will be asked to serve on the subcommittees.

Bloom asked how the work is being distributed to the various subcommittees. Thomas stated that the expectation is that the consultants will facilitate our discussions and they will set up meetings and lead discussions from a non-local perspective. They will then report their results to the steering committee with the expectation that the results will be shared with the full commission. He pointed out that the consultants will also provide us with comparative knowledge that they have from working with many other universities who developed strategic plans. Bloom asked what the procedure is for filling out the rest of the commission. Thomas stated that he does not fully know the procedure, but his understanding is that it is a Chancellor's commission and the Chancellor will be appointing people. He noted that Plowman is co-chair and will probably have a hand in reviewing and helping to shape the membership of the commission to make sure it fully represents the university. Moberly noted that the deans were given a list of the different subcommittees and asked for recommendations of people to serve on them. Bloom stated that he would like to see a number of the APC members involved on the commission since the APC is the natural body to interact with planning for the campus. He

stated that he hopes to have reports on the work of the commission as a regular agenda item for the APC. He asked if the campus will be kept informed of how the work is progressing with the planning initiative. Zeleny stated that next month the consultants will meet with everyone and over the summer a draft document will be created. He noted that documents will be shared. Thomas stated that he would like to see the steering committee develop reports that can be shared with the campus. He stated that he would be happy to come back anytime to share information about the strategic planning process.

Bloom noted that the APC is scheduled to meet with the consultants on April 4.

3.0 Approval of February 14, 2018 Minutes

Trainin moved for approval of the February 14, 2018 minutes. Motion seconded by De Silva and approved by the APC.

4.0 APC Report on Agronomy & Horticulture APR (Professor Sollars)

Sollars reported that, in general, this was a very well run review, with one minor glitch in that a room was initially not identified where an individual could meet privately with the external review team, but this was quickly resolved once the problem was brought to the attention of the department.

Sollars stated that the self-study was well organized, easy to read, included photos, and an in-depth presentation of the areas the department wanted the external team to focus on. She noted that the self-study provided an extensive list of questions which the external review team was asked to consider. She noted that there were also focus questions for the team to consider and they asked for advice, given the large size of the department, on collegiality and how to focus on common goals.

Sollars reported that the external review was well conducted and the members all had expertise in the field and took the review very seriously. She noted that the team tried actively to address all of the questions raised by the department.

Sollars stated that included in her written report were the recommendations made by the team. She noted that the team did have some overarching recommendations regarding the development of a strategic plan and the development of a vision for the department. She pointed out that one significant recommendation was for the department to hire a permanent chair who would have the capacity to bring a vision to the unit. Bloom asked what the status is of the current chair. Boehm stated that there is an interim chair in place now, but a national search for a new chair has been launched. Sollars stated that other recommendations were to provide mentoring for new faculty members, and to clarify staff evaluations and how they factor into the salary exercise. She reported that the team also suggested that there be informal interaction between faculty members and graduate students.

Sollars stated that the external review team had recommendations for the undergraduate curriculum including suggestions that would help develop the identity of the program and how the department should work on developing recruiting and retention plans. She stated that it was also recommended that the department focus on job placement for undergraduate students.

Sollars noted that the review team was concerned with the proliferation of centers and institutes at UNL. She stated that the team had recommendations on the extension work and how the department should provide clarity for the role and expectations of Extension members. She noted that the team also felt that there needs to be on-going assessment of their interplay with Extension.

Sollars stated that the department agreed with the team's recommendations. Overall, she stated that the APR went well, and she stated that she has no recommendations for any hearings on the review.

Bloom noted that the department is very large which presents challenges for unity. He asked if the department is considered too large. Sollars stated that the team did not seem to think the unit was too large. She noted that the review team did suggest that there be more shared focus across the department, and the department's solution was to try and pay attention to finding common areas of focus.

5.0 Possible Revisions to APR Guidelines (Professor Bloom and Professor Sollars)

Bloom reported that he, Sollars, Associate VC Walker, and Assistant Dean Santiago met to consider possible revisions to the APR Guidelines to provide greater clarification. Sollars noted that one of the issues that was addressed was in regards to someone with an administrative appointment serving as the internal member on the review team. She pointed out that it can be helpful to have someone with administrative experience because that person can provide insight into how the university operates. However, a problem occurs if the internal member is involved in the reporting chain of the program being reviewed. She noted that one of the proposed revisions is that the internal review member cannot be an administrator from the same college as the program being reviewed.

Bloom stated that other revisions include providing further clarification on the role of the internal review team member, clarification about an individual having a private meeting with the review team, and clarification that the Chancellor receives a copy of the review team report. He noted that the revisions will be voted on at the next APC meeting.

6.0 Budget Update

Bloom reported that since the last APC meeting he spoke with the Chancellor regarding the budget, sent a letter out to the campus ensuring them that any further budget cuts will need to be considered by the APC, and spoke at the Faculty Senate meeting about the budget cuts. He noted that Chancellor Green continues to be prompt with providing information on how things are progressing with the budget, but he needs to officially close out the recommendations from the first budget cuts approved by the APC in January by making a formal announcement.

Bloom reported that if the Appropriations Committee's recommendation on the budget holds, the university will be facing a smaller budget reduction. Boehm stated that the Legislature will debate the budget and the worst case scenario is if we have a 4% reduction in our permanent reduction for 2018-19 FY. He noted that the Legislature has to decide on the budget by March 27, and the Governor has five days to accept or veto the budget. He stated that if the Governor

accepts the budget we will have an assigned budget. However, if the Governor vetoes the budget, it has to go back to the Unicameral and is open for debate. He reported that the last day of the Legislative session is April 18. He pointed out that Title X funding could cause complications with the budget and could potentially derail the entire budget session. If the session closes without a budget being finalized a special session could be needed.

Boehm reported that the University is preparing for the worst in the event it should happen. He noted that if the University has to cut 4% from its permanent budget it would mean that UNL would lose \$11.5 million from its budget. He pointed out that the University has to give 90 days' notice if a person's employment is going to be terminated so the timing of the Legislature's decision on the budget has significant impacts for the University. He stated that as soon as we know the assigned budget, he believes the Chancellor will meet with the APC to begin the budget cutting process. Bloom questioned whether RIF letters can be sent before the APC has gone through the budget reduction process. Boehm stated that any RIF letter would say that these are proposed cuts. Farrell pointed out that RIF letters can't be sent unless the University is ready to terminate employment for the individuals. Zeleny stated that language needs to be included that the cuts depend on the outcome of the budget.

Farrell asked if the Governor can line item the University's budget. Boehm stated that the Governor can only reject the University's appropriation as a whole and that it takes 30 Legislators to override a veto.

Bloom pointed out that he anticipates that the APC will be working on budget reductions, but the timing is still uncertain. He noted that the APC will need to deal with the budget framework once the Chancellor invokes the procedures for budget cuts.

Moberly reported that the Deans were asked to hold back 2% of their college's budget. He asked if 1% of this will be put back into the college budgets should the University not be cut as much as the Governor proposed. Boehm pointed out that the Governor's proposal is for a 2% rescission for the current fiscal year, and this is cash from our budget. He noted that in 2017 we didn't know we were going to have a mid-year rescission, and we weren't notified until the third fiscal quarter when the money had already been spent. Consequently, we are being more careful to try ad deal with another rescission.

7.0 Reports from Executive Vice Chancellor, Vice Chancellor of the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources (IANR), and Vice Chancellor of Research and Economic Development

Boehm noted that international trade is critical to Nebraska and President Trump's proposal on tariffs and the retribution and retaliation that could occur from any tariffs could have negative impacts for the state.

Boehm reported that he recently met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and he informed the Committee that he has thought how important it is to have a faculty ombudsperson. He wrote a white paper and started floating the idea around and learned that Associate VC Walker, Assistant to the Chancellor Strickman, Faculty Senate President Purcell, and President-Elect of the Senate Rudy have been working on this issue as well. He stated that there has been

good alignment between IANR and the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor on this issue and the idea is to possibly have two ombudspersons, one female and one male, although the proportion of FTEs for these people would need to be determined. He is hoping that someone could be in place by July 1.

Boehm reported that he has taken a look at the demographics of the IANR faculty and shared this information with IANR Faculty Senators and IANR colleagues. He pointed out that there has been some interesting good trends in that the Institute has seen a net increase of roughly 70 tenure-track faculty members. In regards to gender parity there has been some improvement, from 30% in 2007 to 40% now across the various ranks. He pointed out that there has also been improvement in regards to the ethnic makeup of the faculty. In 2007 the faculty was only 19% ethnically diversified, but it is now at 43%. He noted that these figures include our international colleagues. He stated that while there is a lot to celebrate with the recent new hires, as you look at the ranks of faculty members there is a melt from our lack of having a robust, inclusive hiring package and both he and Plowman are committed to improving our diversity. He reported that Plowman is moving ahead with creating the search for a Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Inclusion.

Farrell moved for adjournment. Motion seconded by Moberly and approved. Meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m. The next meeting of the APC will be on Wednesday, March 28, 2018 at 3:00 in the City Campus Union, Colonial Room B. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator.