University Planning Committee Meeting Minutes
February 23, 2018

Attendance:
Present: Alford, Atteberry, Barnes, Bodnar (remote), Chacon, Comer, DeLuca, Farnsworth, Fitzgerald, Humphrey, Kirgis, Manuel, Schwarze, Semanoff, Schafer, Stark, White (remote), Whittenburg.
Absent: Humphrey

Introduction:
- President Bodnar called the meeting to order and thanked the group for their work on the committee and as institutional citizens on behalf of the University.
- Part of this process will involve identifying areas we will no longer sustain. Let's proceed toward these decisions in accordance with the CBA and appropriate University policies. But let's not lose sight of the very clear need to articulate the University’s identity, the “north star”. We are here to articulate the way forward for the University. This will involve areas we can no longer sustain, but it cannot be the main focus.
- The President will meet with College of Business Professors with expertise in strategy; they will also attend the next meeting to discuss what a successful outcome will look like from a strategic planning perspective.
- Additional committee members will be added from the non-tenurable faculty and the Regents professors.

Approval of Minutes:
- February 16, 2018 minutes approved

Updates:

ECOS Meeting:
- UPC members went to the Feb 22 ECOS meeting to brief them on the UPC goals and how the process might unfold.
- ECOS asked that minutes of the subgroups be made public.
- UPC asked ECOS how they would like to handle the Faculty Senate’s right to review and recommend. They are going to discuss, create a plan, and bring a concrete proposal back to UPC so there are not questions down the road about the process.
- The process will also be shared with ASUM and Staff Senate.

Draft Schedule for UPC Work:
- The group reviewed and discussed the draft timeline and work plan.
Key dates: March 14 ASUM & Staff Senate meetings, March 15 Faculty Senate meeting. Plan to have materials ready March 13 for review ahead of time.

The plan is to have a work product at each of those meetings

Data subgroup updates/discussion:

- We want to have a set of data that will inform our prioritization in terms of quantitative measures that will show the budgetary consequences of decisions. The data we have doesn't capture all the information and some of it is at least misleading. Programs that are potentially going to be negatively impacted should have an opportunity to see that early, and to respond. They can help solve any problems with the data, or explain what is not appearing in the data.
  - APASP attempted to account for that. Each unit was asked to respond to the APASP data. Some did a good job responding and some did not. But departments will already know the issues and have had a chance to respond.
  - Any program that was concerned about the data had a chance to respond in the APASP report and then also to the ranking.
  - Some programs that struggled with data were not in a position to be able to redo the data, as other programs were.
  - This cannot be a data-driven process. It needs to be data-informed.
  - Program reviews and other sources could be used to triangulate the data.
  - What's the appropriate time and medium for programs to be able to respond?
    - Under the CBA, one trigger for curtailment/retrenchment is a decline in student:faculty ratio of at least 20% for any discipline, program, or department within the previous six years. Dawn might be able to pull this information as a first filter.
  - This is the critical question for us. How will we not start from scratch but use existing data or frameworks to triangulate the data? Those with experience on APASP can make sure we are not only building upon what's been done, but addressing the gaps and learning from those.

Mission & Identity subgroup updates/discussion:

- The subgroup is hoping to have a final draft for a mission statement in the next couple of weeks to help inform the work of the data subgroup.
- Are the areas of excellence more of a marketing/identity tool or do they lead to structural change?
- These clusters are going to be organizing principles for the University. They relate to marketing to some extent, but also provide direction for future curricular changes. It's where we want to focus our attention.
- The clusters could be across multiple programs and disciplines and cross the traditional areas of colleges/departments.
- Great universities are often able to collaborate across disciplines and create a niche that is of value.
- Some areas are horizontal connectors, not clusters (for example, creativity). Shouldn't every program involve creativity? If they are too broad, they don't help us. There must be some specificity.
- The areas of excellence should definitely be curricular. They've got to drive the bus. And then the marketing and structural changes flow from that.
- The message has to resonate with the audience. We need to get the enrollment numbers up.
- Does the UPC need to address general education?
The mission should really consider what our undergraduate academic experience is all about.

General education has to align with our focal areas. We need to think about the core competencies our students should come away with.

We need to keep in mind the distinction between general education and what it means to be a liberal arts university.

Discussion with Dawn Ressell, Data Office

- Questions for Dawn: How can we best use APASP Data? How can we ameliorate the issues with that data? How can we layer on budgetary consequences? How about the student:faculty ratio for discontinuance?

- The Data Office has all of the APASP data and has been working to create preliminary reports to take all the underlying APASP data and put it in Tableau. The UPC will have access to it and can slice it however you want.
  - Data Office is creating data reports for delivery next week:
    - Average scores for each unit of analysis
    - Number of completers
    - Faculty FTE (likely only those FTE truly paid out of that department); only instructional faculty (so if the index paying is not instructional, it’s not there) TT and NTT, GTAs
      - note: there are a number of programs that are partially research mission driven, and the money goes along with that
      - GTAs were not included in APASP metrics. This is potentially a significant cost driver.
  - For APASP average scores, will we have the standard deviation?
    - Yes, the Data Office can provide that.
  - Taking total cost (not just general funds) and total credit hours. Credit hours weren't a true metric of APASP, but it was behind the scenes?
    - Some programs will be high cost, no matter where they are taught. The data office is working on also providing some context related to that.
  - Are there metrics we can compare with peer institutions and assess where we stand on a national level?
    - Dawn can pull Delaware data.
  - Can we differentiate between in-state and out-of-state and if that’s useful?
    - The Data Office can do that but the UPC should think about strategically about what they really want due to the compressed timeline and resources available in Data Office.

- APASP spent a huge amount of time discussing these issues already, let’s not spend too much time rehashing those conversations.

- We have lost a lot of personnel since the APASP data.
  - Dawn would not recommend trying to update to FY18. Use supplemental information to show trends.

Meeting adjourned.