

MINUTES

February 27, 2019 University of Nebraska – Lincoln Academic Planning Committee

Members Present: Bender, Bloom, Boehm, Clarke, Geisinger, Hibberd, Hinchman, O'Connor, Purcell, Smith, Sollars, Traynor, Tschetter, Zeleny

Members Absent: Gay, Plowman, Purdum, Reilly, Wilhelm

Others Attending:

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

Bender called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. Bender welcomed Professor Geisinger to the Committee noting that Geisinger was elected in January to replace Professor Dombrowski who resigned from the APC due to taking on an administrative position.

2.0 Approval of January 16, 2019 Minutes

Bender asked if there were any revisions to the minutes. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Zeleny moved to approve the minutes, motion seconded by Traynor. Motion approved.

3.0 APC Representative Needed for School of Biological Sciences APR (October 6-8, 2019)

Bender noted that an APC representative is needed to serve on the APR of the School of Biological Sciences. Tschetter volunteered to serve.

4.0 APC Representative Needed for Jeffrey R. Raikes School of Computer Science and Management APR (October 27-29, 2019)

Bender reported that an APC representative is needed to serve on the APR for the Jeffrey R. Raikes School of Computer Science and Management APR. Smith volunteered to serve.

Bloom pointed out that there does not seem to be consideration for religious holidays when the APR schedule is set. He noted that he has discussed this with Associate Vice Chancellor Walker. Smith reported that he spoke with Associate VC Walker recently and she is pointing this out to the departments.

5.0 Proposal for Renaming Psychological Studies in Education - Ph.D.

Bender stated that a proposal has been made to rename the “Psychological Studies in Education” Ph.D. offered in the department of Educational Psychology to “Educational Psychology”. He asked if there were any questions or concerns. Geisinger moved to approve the proposal. Motion seconded by Traynor.

6.0 Proposal to Rename Department of “Civil Engineering” to “Civil and Environmental Engineering”

Bender reported that a proposal has been made to rename “Civil Engineering” to “Civil and Environmental Engineering”. Bloom stated that he was surprised that the justification for changing the name did not include information that the department was teaching in the area of environmental engineering. Instead the reason cited was that other universities are using the name for their departments. He reported that he verified that environmental engineering is being taught here and noted that it should have been stated in the proposal. Zeleny moved to approve the request. Motion seconded by Geisinger.

7.0 Suggested Revisions from the Faculty senate Executive Committee to the Proposed Revisions to the Procedures to be invoked for Significant Budget Reallocations and Reductions

Bloom reported that he met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on January 29th to discuss the proposed changes to the Procedures. He noted that the Executive Committee recommended that the example indicating when the procedures should be invoked be removed. Bloom stated that he did not see a problem with removing the language. Boehm agreed. Bloom pointed out that that document will need to go to the Faculty Senate and ASUN for approval.

Traynor noted that ASUN elections would be taking place soon and the document would be considered by the next term of senators. He stated that the ASUN Executive Committee could consider the document and he did not think there would be any primary objection to it. He stated that if the Executive Committee agreed the President could send a formal notice of the approval to the chair of APC.

Geisinger stated that he questioned whether administrators are the only people responsible for continually monitoring external factors that can affect the university’s revenue, and suggested including faculty leaders in the language. Bloom pointed out that this is a fair question. He noted that in the first instance of the document it is not just administrators identified as continuing to evaluate the revenue. Boehm noted that continual policing of the revenue and budget occurs regularly and is part of the shared governance process. He stated that the Procedures are for invoking a budget reallocation or significant budget reduction. Geisinger suggested adding language that says that the process will be handled in a true shared governance environment to ensure that there will be more consultation with the faculty than in the past. Boehm pointed out that the entire process is shared governance once the procedures are invoked. He stated that the question is who invokes the procedures. He noted that faculty members cannot invoke the process.

Purcell pointed out that during her time as Faculty Senate President in 2017 she was very much involved with the Chancellor regarding the budget concerns. She stated that the question is more about the timing of when the Procedures would be invoked.

Geisinger noted that his position had major changes due to budget cuts, yet he was never consulted. He pointed out that he wants to make sure that there is reasonable consultation when faculty members’ positions will be affected due to budget cuts.

The APC recommended including the language “in the spirit of shared governance” to the fourth paragraph in the preface and deleting the language recommended by the Senate Executive Committee. Zeleny stated that the reference to the Chancellor’s cabinet should be changed to language that would more broadly explain the leadership since the members of the leadership team can vary depending upon the standing Chancellor. Boehm suggested inserting the language Chancellor’s senior leadership team. Bender noted that footnote two, which defines the actual administrators of the leadership team, should be removed. The APC agreed with the changes. Purcell stated that she believes the Senate Executive Committee would be fine with the changes.

Purcell moved to accept the revisions to the Procedures. Tschetter seconded the motion. Motion approved by the APC.

8.0 Reports from the Executive Vice Chancellor, Vice Chancellor for IANR, Vice Chancellor for Research & Economic Development

Boehm stated that he would first like to thank Bloom for chairing the subcommittee that worked on revising the Procedures to be invoked for Significant Budget Reallocations and Reductions and for moving the subcommittee through the process quickly.

Boehm reported that the momentum of the university continues to move forward and Chancellor Green has been very busy since the State of the University address. He noted that the N150 Strategy Team has now been established and the goal is to have the Team report back to the Chancellor by mid-August.

Boehm stated that the Chancellor has sent out emails to possible members for the budget model committee. He noted that this committee will take the recommendations from the 2015 Strategic Compass Committee to create a hybrid RCM budgeting system. He stated that there will be an executive sponsor group and the idea is to present a plan sometime in August.

Boehm reported that another working group is looking at service centers for human resources and business operations and is considering if the campus could be organized differently to provide better service to faculty and staff. He stated that the colleges will be examined to see how they support faculty, staff, and students, and pointed out that this is all related to the N150 effort.

Boehm reported that the East Campus continues to be transformed with the renovation of the East Campus Union and the upcoming plans to renovate the CYT Library. He stated that the Union will continue to be open during construction. He noted that the dining hall will be moved to the second floor and the Great Plains room will be extended.

Boehm stated that CYT will start closing down in May, followed by the renovation process and the plans are to make CYT look like the Adele Hall Learning Commons area. He reported that the Dairy Store is being moved after 101 years in its current location. He noted that the Dairy Store will be on the north side of the building and will face the green space. He stated that the Dairy Store will be in its new location by June or July and a portion of the CYT Library will go into the space vacated by the Dairy Store. Geisinger asked how long the Library will be closed.

Boehm reported that the renovation will take two years. Bender asked if the plan is to include a testing center space. Boehm stated that there will be a testing center. He noted that the Library will decrease its volumes down to less than 20,000 and there will be compact shelving on the second floor. He stated that there will be a café and rooms for collaborative work and there will be two sets of doors for general use. Traynor asked if the Law College library expects to accommodate students who need a place to study since CYT will be closed down. Boehm stated that some students may go to the Law Library. He pointed out that the new dorms on East Campus have primary space that can be used and the first floor of the Union will be available too.

Boehm reported that he inherited a promotion and tenure process in IANR which is overly heavy on administration and under represented by the faculty. He noted that after consideration by a department, the promotion and tenure file is reviewed by the leading dean, and then to the dean's council, before going to the Vice Chancellor. He stated that Associate VC Bischoff has been working within IANR to develop and propose an IANR promotion and tenure committee, similar to what other colleges on campus have. He reported that the issue is up for a vote in IANR, and if approved the proposal would go to the Faculty Senate for approval since more than one college is involved.

Bloom stated that the APC is missing an opportunity to be involved in the strategic planning process even though the APC is designated in the UNL Bylaws as the committee that shall engage in university-wide planning. He stated that there should be significantly more overlap between the APC and the N150 Strategy Team. Zeleny noted that the N150 Team is a one-time committee. Bloom pointed out that the N150 report states that the campus should make good use of its existing committees. He noted that he is the only faculty member on the RCM committee and it is a committee that is heavily populated by administrators.

Boehm suggested that it might be a good idea to have the committee look into creating campus business centers to meet with the APC to provide updates and obtain feedback. Bloom stated that at least one of the co-chairs of the N150 Strategy Team should meet with the APC as well.

9.0 Other Business

Sollars noted that at the end of the last academic year the APC discussed the opportunity to look carefully at the APR Guidelines and procedures, but this has not occurred. She stated that a subcommittee should be formed immediately to look at this issue because a clear document is needed to define the role of the APC representative and the monitor, but also to clearly define the communication process. She stated that external team members need to be made clear what they are to do with the APR. She noted that she would be willing to work on the subcommittee.

Bender suggested that this is an issue the long-range planning subcommittee can take up. Clarke stated that she will call the long-range planning subcommittee together to begin work on the APR Guidelines.

Sollars stated that she is concerned that the APRs length has been reduced which is creating difficulties because meetings are being held at the same time and the external review team has to be split in order to cover the meetings. Tschetter stated that some external review team members

seem not to understand what they are supposed to do. She stated that while serving as the APC representative on an APR she was told to leave the meetings. Boehm asked if this was an isolated case. Tschetter stated that she believes so, but noted that the process needs to be made clearer to all those involved. Sollars noted that while this case may be isolated, there is an undertone of uncertainty in the departments about why the APC representative is present. She pointed out that there seems to be communication problems occurring and communications to external review team members and departments need to be made clearer. Boehm suggested there be a meeting with EVC Plowman and Associate VC Walker about the concerns.

Traynor moved for adjournment. Motion seconded by Boehm and approved. Meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m. The next meeting of the APC will be on Wednesday, March 13, 2019 at 3:00 in the City Campus Union, Georgian Suite. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator.