

MINUTES

October 30, 2019 University of Nebraska – Lincoln Academic Planning Committee

Members Present: Bloom, Clarke, Hebets, Johnson, Moberly, O'Connor, Purdum, Ratcliff, Smith, Tschetter, Wilhelm, Zeleny

Members Absent: Bender, Boehm, Gay, Geisinger, Hachtmann, Hibberd, Purcell

Others Attending: Professor Hurwitz

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

Clarke called the meeting to order at 3:07 p.m.

2.0 Proposal to Change the name of the Bachelor of Science “Grazing Livestock Systems” to “Grassland Systems”

Clarke noted that there is a proposal to change the name of the Bachelor of Science to “Grassland Systems.” Wilhelm moved for approval of the name change. The APC approved the proposal.

3.0 Proposal to Establish the NU Governance and Technology Center (Clarke)

Clarke reported that she and Bender reviewed the proposal, and had numerous discussions about it including input from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. She noted that the proposal calls for establishing a center in the Law College, but will have initial partnerships with the Colleges of Business and Engineering. She stated that the primary goal of the center is to examine the changes impacting law and policy which are being generated by science and technology. She reported that funding for the center would come from three donors totaling \$5.5 million and will be used to hire one or two faculty members and an Executive Assistant to manage the center. She stated that the proposal calls for the center to host workshops, hold discussions on the topic, start a seminar for graduate students who might want to pursue a career in this area, and to build engagement and student awareness. Moberly stated that the plan is to have robust conferences and develop white papers with the goal of having an impact on policy makers and businesses.

Clarke stated that there was concern whether the proposed center would be a viable unit, and there was concern over the primary donor, the Koch Foundation, which has had a complex relationship with academic institutions in the past. She noted that she and Bender looked at the history and agreements for other centers that the Koch Foundation has supported at other universities, and felt that the agreements were quite reasonable and could be used as a template for our agreement. She pointed out that the proposal calls for establishing an external advisory board for the center.

Clarke stated that a major concern is in regards to academic freedom and whether there could be a violation of it. She pointed out that there is the question of whether the center would impact the incentive based budget model, but there is not enough information on the new budget model to know if open lines would be given to the center. Moberly reported that with the incentive based model the colleges will retain their lines, and if people retire in the Law College a line would go to the center. He noted that the faculty of the college are aware of this. He pointed out that funding from other colleges will not be taken to support any lines for this center.

Clarke stated that she and Bender are comfortable with approving the proposal.

O'Connor stated that he noted in the proposal that there is funding for five years, but asked what would happen after that. Moberly stated that if Hurwitz is unsuccessful in raising funds the faculty associated with the center would be retained in the Law College because they will have tenure, but the College would not provide any funding to support the center. Hurwitz noted that the donors made it clear that they want good ideas to emerge from the center, but they have no plans of supporting it after five years. He stated that he believes that he will be able to generate funding for the center three or four years after it begins. Moberly pointed out that the Koch Foundation name will not be on the center. Bloom pointed out that there will more than likely be reaction to the center once it becomes known that the Koch Foundation is providing funding, and the university needs to be prepared for this. Moberly stated that he believes there are guardrails in place to address issues that may have occurred in the past with the Foundation. Clarke noted that it is important the university be proactive in communicating information about the center.

Ratcliff asked for clarification on the graduate assistant position that would be associated with the center for only the first year. Hurwitz noted that the graduate assistant would provide assistance which would free up time for the faculty to work on the launch of the center. He reported that there is already a graduate assistant in the Law College who could move into the position.

Ratcliff noted that there have been some universities that have had issues with the Koch Foundation, and asked if these cases were reviewed. Hurwitz stated that he believes those incidents were under a different generation of agreements. Ratcliff pointed out that some of the incidents were fairly recent, 2016-2018. Ratcliff agreed to share information about these incidents with Hurwitz.

Bloom moved that the APC accept the proposal. Smith seconded the motion and the APC approved the motion.

4.0 Initiate PIR Review: Revised PIR for Barkley Center Project, Architecture Library/Studies + Link Project

Zeleny reported that the PIR subcommittee will be reviewing project initiation requests for the Barkley Center project and the Architecture Library/Studies + Link project. He stated that the plan is to present the findings of the subcommittee to the APC at the November 20 meeting.

5.0 Approval of October 9, 2019 Minutes

Ratcliff moved for approval of the minutes. Johnson seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by the APC.

6.0 Reports from the Interim Executive Vice Chancellor, and Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development

Wilhelm reported that ORED has been working on adding more detail on how the incremental budget will be handled by the unit, and what the university is doing with university-wide centers. He stated that a different modeling scenarios are being considered for the centers. He reported that recently a group, led by Dean Tim Carr, was convened to look at research, graduate education, and tuition. He pointed out that we need to be more organized in this area, and noted that he will have more to report on this issue in the coming months.

Wilhelm noted that the University is a member of EPSCoR, Nebraska's Established Program to Stimulate Competitive Research which is seeking additional federal funding through a track one proposal which could bring in \$20 million over the next five years. He stated that the topic of the proposal has to deal with quantum materials. He noted that Professor Binek is leading the charge, and if the proposal is approved, the research efforts would include faculty from UNL, UNO, UNK, and Creighton.

Wilhelm stated that a public event was held last week to give congratulations to Professor Sinitskii, Chemistry, on receiving a \$4.5 million grant from the Department of Defense. He noted that Sinitskii will be the leader of an interdisciplinary, multi-institutional team, although most of the work will be done here.

Wilhelm reported that next week is the Fall Research Days event (formerly known as the Research Fair). He stated that the Research Slam will be reinstated, and suggested people look at the ORED website for additional information about research efforts on campus.

Moberly stated that the EVC office is carefully reviewing remission and tuition waiver programs, and how to use Foundation funding for some remission programs. He noted that there has been some miscommunication on how those Foundation funds are being used, and departments are thinking about their Foundation funds and whether some of them can be used for tuition remission. He suggested faculty members could either contact him, or their Dean, for further information.

Purdum pointed out that there is considerable discussion occurring at the department level regarding the use of Foundation funds to recover remission. She asked if funds are taken out of Foundation accounts to recover tuition, how departments would maintain who the students are that are admitted to a program. Moberly stated that we need to rethink how our scholarships can be used and how we award them. He pointed out that recruiting the top students is becoming more competitive, and reported that several years ago only half of the students who were not awarded scholarships came to UNL, and last year the number dropped to only a quarter. He stated that we need to be more thoughtful in how the funds are provided, and we need to see how we can use the scholarships more

strategically. Smith pointed out, that as the chair of a department, he found the information on the use of Foundation funds was not communicated well. He stated that it is concerning to the department because some Foundation accounts were set aside for graduate recruiting, and the faculty feel that they don't have control over the department's Foundation accounts. Moberly stated that he would be happy to discuss the issue with the chairs. He stated that if departments have plans for the Foundation accounts, they should let the Dean and EVC know by June 30th. He pointed out that never would a foundation fund from one department be used to fund another department. Smith noted that getting real dollars behind the scholarships is important. Moberly stated that the Law College has been matching scholarship requirements with the students in the College, but the rest of the campus is using a stacked method. He stated that the EVC office will work with each college and unit to develop processes and procedures to help them start utilizing Foundation funds to provide scholarships.

Moberly reported that there has been discussion about online programs and how we could increase our efforts in this area. He stated that some market research is being conducted, and he is speaking to units to talk about their interest for creating online courses.

Moberly stated that the co-chairs of the 2025 Plan have been exhaustive in their efforts to reach out to the campus to talk about the plan. He noted that the co-chairs have stated that they have been receiving tremendous feedback.

Moberly reported that an effort coming out of the EVC's office is in regards to peace and civility, and having respectful disagreements which can advance conversations rather than making people retreat from discussions.

Moberly noted that the voluntary separation incentive program, VSIP, has been released, and at this time it is unknown how many faculty members will take advantage of the program. He stated that the deadline for applying for the program is in December. He noted that faculty members who are interested in obtaining more information should contact Professor Kostelnik who is a knowledgeable, confidential resource person who is knowledgeable about VSIP.

7.0 Other Business

7.1 Update on the Incentive Based Budget Model (VC Nunez)

Nunez reported that the incentive based budget model is moving forward and there was a tremendous amount of work done to vet the model. He stated that the goal has been to create a very transparent model and to listen to the concerns of the campus. He pointed out that the budget model is a tool and he is convinced that it is going to be successful.

Nunez stated that the algorithms and coding for the colleges are being built using the 2018 data. He pointed out that the 2018 data were being used because it was the most recent financial data that have been audited and ready to use. He noted that the 2019 data has just been received and will be applied to the next fiscal cycle of the model.

VC Nunez stated that best practices show that the next step is to formulate governance structures to manage strategic investment funds and the investment pools. He noted that the idea is to create a team which will serve as the Executive Budget Committee at UNL which would be responsible for submitting a final budget recommendation to the Chancellor for approval. He reported that other committees would include: 1) a support unit allocation committee that would meet with unit leadership to review unit budget proposals, and support service effectiveness and efficiency; 2) a space management committee which would refine and develop policies and procedures for space management as it relates to the budget model and act as a broker for space across campus; 3) the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee would be expanded to oversee undergraduate curriculum issues including the addition or elimination of courses or programs and ensuring coherent interdepartmental curriculum changes; 4) the Data Quality Committee would ensure that the quality of the data needed for the incentive-based model to operate is accurate. He suggested that a modified version of the APC, plus additional members, could serve as the Executive Budget Committee. He pointed out that we need to think carefully of how the governance structure will work. He noted that the Regents have oversight of the university's budget, and the Chancellor has oversight of the overall campus budget.

Nunez noted that we are looking at annualizing our budgeting process, which is typically done at other institutions that use the RCM budget model. He stated that the primary units will need to know what the cost pools are. He pointed out that how we form our budget is based a lot on assumptions, such as how much tuition will increase, what the salary increase will be, and how much the Legislature will give to the university, but the budget will be built on a base budget and we do know what that will be.

Nunez reported that a Data Quality Committee has already been established and it will be led by Dean Tiffany Heng-Moss and Assistant Vice Chancellor James Volkmer. He stated that this Committee is important because they will need to look at credit hour production and ensure that the credit hours go to the department whose faculty member is teaching the course. He stated that the quality of the data is important for the budget model to run well.

Smith asked if the Deans are at the point that they can let their departments know how much funding they will receive. Nunez stated that the Deans already have their initial budget model which is based on the 2018 data. Smith asked if there is a timeline for when the department chairs will be informed of their budget. Moberly stated that the Deans are responsible for rolling out their budgets to the departments. He pointed out that departments need to consider that the amount that they were allocated in 2018 is not what they will receive. He stated that the 2018 budget is just being used to run the pilot model. He pointed out that 2021 will not impact a department's budget, but 2022 is when adjustments would be made.

Nunez reminded the APC that the university is not going to be defunded. He stated that when the budget is loaded it is positional based, but over time it will be calibrated to make the budget more operational. He stated that the intent is to look to see how we can

build incentives and make adjustments with the budget. He pointed out that the issue is how we can use the budget model as a tool to make the university better. He noted that we are not flush with funds and we need to be strategic with them.

Smith stated that at a meeting with the Huron Consultants it was suggested that departments will need to take a harder look at what courses are being taught, and when and where. He asked when the chairs need to start looking at the teaching schedules. Nunez stated that there is really a three-year period before changes are likely to be made. Moberly pointed out that what this means is that departments may want to reconsider whether it is wise to cap some courses. He noted that removing caps on some courses would help increase credit hour production.

Purdum stated that she hopes that the incentive-based budget model does not pit department against department. She noted that there is also concern with cross-listing courses if credit hour production will only go to the instructor's department. Bloom pointed out that if the departments are in the same college this should not be a problem. Nunez noted that combining some courses could increase enrollment. He stated that the budget model is only a tool and should not dictate how we operate. He pointed out that having a strong curriculum committee and APC should help alleviate problems.

O'Connor noted that a lot of the colleges will be subsidized through the subvention fund. Nunez reported that 55% of our funding is from the State which means that we are all subsidized in some way.

7.2 Cancellation of November 6, 2019 Meeting

Clarke asked if the APC feels that we need to meet next week at its regularly scheduled time. The Committee agreed that a meeting next week was not necessary.

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m. The next meeting of the APC will be on Wednesday, November 20, 2019 at 3:00 in the City Campus Union, Platte River Room, North. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator.