University Planning Committee Meeting Minutes
March 16, 2018

Attendance:


Absent: Humphrey, Stark

Approval of Minutes:

- March 9, 2018 meeting minutes approved

Mission/Identity Subgroup update:

- Review the draft areas of excellence. A draft was given to shared governance.
- Responses from the Faculty Senate presentation/discussion:
  - What was presented did not send a clear thinking on our sense of the importance of the humanities and sciences/liberal arts. We’ve talked about this as a group and know this is the foundational base of areas of excellence, but need to better communicate that. We need to show or demonstrate the arts and sciences core.
  - This is really important for connecting the two subcommittees and their relationship.
    - How will these areas be used for our immediate decision-making?
  - We need to catalogue of our strengths and highlight the opportunities we need to take advantage of.
  - The mission group is very high level while the data group is in the weeds. We need to be sure to connect the two.
  - Some of these things were raised in the strategic vision document—place based being very important, for example.
  - Phrases people thought were missing had been discussed during our process. That lets us know that we are near to an accurate representation of many different perspectives.
  - Perhaps too much emphasis on economic drivers, or the word "economy"
  - We really presented this in the spirit of a draft. In some cases it seemed they were responding as if it were a finished document. It was a true draft. We may still be building trust.
  - Law and public policy is too narrow.
  - Natural Sciences doesn't capture everything we do in the area of sciences and linking it with environment diminishes the linkage to sustainability that many people want to see.
  - This is compelling to external audiences, but to internal audiences, they see the pillars, look for themselves, and then may feel left out.
  - This group can provide the campus a vision that lays out the pillars and the characteristics of the foundation/core. This committee will not try to reform general education. But we could provide some design principles and guidance about the characteristics of that core, or foundation that the appropriate groups will then continue to work on.
We don't want this narrative about lack of commitment to liberal arts to perpetuate. It's not the spirit of this group.

The questions are not as strong as declarative statements. Take a stance that this is what we do, but also a sense of where we are headed.

What students identify as the most important reason for coming is the place (according to SPCC). And we need to sell them on the place. These pillars can be found in many places but the place is unique.

What we do really well is to get professional skills with the foundation of a liberal arts background that educates the whole person.

President Bodnar re-emphasized what he believes makes UM great.

- Our areas of excellence (discipline-specific)
- Our approach to educating the whole person (our differentiating approach to general education/liberal arts core)
  - We have to emphasize this more effectively than we are now. We need to demonstrate the importance of the foundation.
- Our commitment to student support/success
- Our location – place
- What should the mission subgroup produce regarding “the foundation”? Look at high-level attributes, competencies, literacies that a liberal arts degree should provide. What are the design principles that we would ask the faculty to consider for the general education curriculum? How can we make general education a differentiator for UM?

Are the pillars too narrow or too broad? They should not include everything.

- Yes, they are broad now, but it would be very hard to further narrow them. And everything isn't actually included.

These areas will help us to be declarative about our identity to prospective students, and also within the Montana University System.

- When you think about Environment, you should think about UM.

ASUM’s reaction was that the areas are not too broad. They agreed that this pretty closely captured UM’s identity.

- Yes, the student body found a place to see themselves in there.

Take programs in the top categories of APASP and see if these really are our strengths.

The Data analysis group needs to get as objective a ranking as possible and then take the identity and lay it across to see if it makes sense.

**Action items for Mission subgroup:**

- Rework the titles of the pillars to respond to feedback.
- Create declarative statements (rather than questions) about what each pillar explains about who we are and what we do.
- Explain the value of the liberal arts core and how it relates to the pillar. Get some graphics created to help explain that relationship.

**Data Analysis subgroup update:**

- Is there a realistic way to get to a net cost for each program? Instead of reviewing "Budget Impact," which is nearly impossible to determine, they suggest adding a criterion based on cost for Delaware: cost per credit hour, by major, and by degree.
  - They recommend looking at all three of those costs. Delaware also has national benchmarks--so you can see if a program is expensive to run anywhere.
They also recommend simplifying the qualitative measures for Stage 2 (programs for further consideration). In Stage 2 they will look at the APASP reviewers’ scores. This may provide additional context to programs being analyzed in Stage 2.

- When will the budget information come back in after it's used in Stage One?
  - We were trying to get that in early, in Stage One. Once programs are identified for further consideration, then look at the cost.
  - It does not make sense to get into the revenue side of it. There is no way to measure a student that would no longer come to UM if the program went away.

- Research dollars should not be in Stage One.
  - If you're generating a lot of research dollars, you won't likely be cut. But that will have to be analyzed in each situation.

- What do we do to get from the big list of programs to making decisions to cut one program and not another? Does UPC do this? Does the list go to the President? How is ECOS involved?

- No process is perfect. The methodology will never be agreed upon by all groups. Ultimately the President makes decisions in accordance with the CBA. The President does not want to go into a room alone and make those decisions. That's not good for the institution. He's looking for the best possible information from the UPC to advise his decisions. Faculty Senate will provide feedback to get to the same end result. Making no decisions is no longer an option for us. What is our best choice with the knowledge we have?

- It's very hard to get a clear understanding of cost saved if you eliminate the program—some faculty will be reassigned, etc. Maybe only the deans have this level of knowledge.
  - If the data cleanup is accomplished by the deans then they could get the data out sooner. This is where we had trouble with APASP. The data committee did not have time to go through every line and make the judgements we need to make.
  - Let’s narrow the number of metrics to those that we are very confident about—Dawn knows the strongest data. Then the metrics that remain, the deans go through to fill in holes.
  - The CBA calls for us to look at trend in student faculty ratio and cost per student credit hour.
  - If we don't have to use every metric from Criteria 3 and choose the ones that are solid.

- **Action items for Data Analysis subgroup:**
  - Dawn can do a data scrub and by next Friday provide an initial look.
  - Produce an updated timeline and plan of action

Meeting adjourned