University Planning Committee Meeting Minutes
March 2, 2018

Attendance:

- Present: Alford, Atteberry, Barnes, Bodnar, Callaway, Chacon, Comer, DeLuca, Farnsworth, Fitzgerald, Humphrey, Kirgis, Lindsay, Manuel, Ratto-Parks, Schwarze, Semanoff, Schafer, Stark, White, Whittenburg.
- Absent: DeLuca

Introduction:

- Welcome to the new members, Amy Ratto-Parks and Ray Callaway.
- The timeline is compressed. The subgroups may need to ramp up their work to do most of the heavy lifting in the next three weeks in order to give time for shared governance review.

Presentation on strategic planning by College of Business Professors

- Professor Justin Angle shared the process the College of Business recently went through to create their new strategic plan. For this group, the strategy they came up with is not as important as the process used to create it.
- Strategy defined: The science and art of how an organization outperforms itself and its competitors.
  o How do we develop a model for performing?
  o Strategy is not budgets, enrollment, structures, or planning. These are all outcomes.
  o People start talking about taking action right away. Don't confuse strategy with tactics. Shift from “what are we doing” to “why are we doing it?”
- They established ground rules. For example: look for where you can contribute, rather than how you’re left out.
- President Bodnar clarified that the UPC’s work is not to create the strategic plan at this point. The UPC is charged to clarify UM’s identity and mission, and areas where we will focus and areas we will no longer sustain. Then another body of work will begin.
- Get the voice of your constituents and then continuously validate your ideas with those groups.
- They used a SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats).
- Value Proposition: a concise and compelling offer that will make someone walk past other options and choose you—and then keep choosing you.
  o Why are we doing what we are doing and for whom are we doing it?
  o What students will we have and who will we say "no" to?
  o Determine the fit between what students need and what we can offer.
- The College of Business identified four brand pillars that they describe as the four sides of the box. If it’s not in that box, they don’t do it. The idea of stopping something that’s not in the box is very difficult and it takes time. But if it isn't the right fit, they don't do it.
Discussion:

- The pillar of a liberal arts education is using content to teach people how to think.
- How do you know what students want?
  - You have to understand the demand side. Where are students going afterward? What graduate programs? What jobs? We have to try hard to listen to the students. And to employers--if our employers are telling us the students need to be better writers, then what does that mean?
- There’s a tension between the content and the “teaching to think.” It’s easier to focus on the content--we are trying to focus more on the “teaching to think” so we can build a student that can move ahead and be flexible in their changing career.
- For the 4-6 areas, can these exist outside of structural barriers?
  - Areas can cut across multiple colleges and that's fine for now. If in the coming years we think structurally change is needed to best achieve excellence in these areas, then we can address it.
  - For example: Health and Medicine, it organizes everything we do in that area across the whole University.
    - Sometimes only parts of programs focus on health, or a particular faculty member has expertise.
    - Facilitating curricular change becomes the next level of that.
    - There’s nothing original about a business model. Don’t be afraid to copy from other schools that are doing it well. There are so many great models out there already and we don’t need to waste time reinventing the wheel. We can also copy innovative internal programs.

Mission and Identity Subgroup report:

- They are working on parallel processes to identify both the mission and the 4-6 areas of identity.
- The goal by Monday is to have a draft mission statement with consensus from the group.
- Deans were also asked to think about where the strongest programs and opportunities exist.
- Creating a solid rationale for these areas is vitally important.
- The resulting report UPC creates needs to be written for an audience outside of UM and outside of academia. We often write for ourselves and it's not accessible to others across the state.

Data & Program Analysis Subgroup Report:

- The group is still working on collecting data and have not begun analysis in earnest. The way forward is to use the APASP data. There are issues with APASP scores (wide standard deviation) and those may not stand alone. However there is a huge amount of underlying data that is useful.
- There are three areas currently being looked at:
  - Which programs are struggling? Putting together a set of metrics from APASP data to identify the programs not doing as well Program cost. This is where APASP left off. We need to understand program costs and what savings would be gained by not continuing a program. This data is still being discussed.
  - Demand analysis. So we can decide what we really should be continuing.
    - What kind of data is available for this?
    - Consider that necessity is important for demand. We had this problem with APASP.
      - Ex: Chemistry teaches half their credit hours outside the major.
- Some programs may be loss leaders. Think about what might not make the cut but we'd be a worse institution if we lost it.
- We recognize we are not going to be able to know everything. Working with Faculty Senate on this is important.
  - UPC members have been working with ECOS.
  - We are trying to demonstrate what we have learned from APASP and how those opportunities can be used to do things better in UPC. There has to be a clear process and a clear output.
- When will the UPC see the deans’ implementation plans that grew out of the APASP process?
  - The deans aren't going to make implementation plans. The Provost is handing those off to the UPC.
- Will there be a recommendation for every program? What would those look like? ECOS wants to know in order to construct their review. They ask the recommendations contain a justification.
  - We may not respond to every program but are creating a future for the entire institution. As part of articulating that future, there will be a set of programs we cannot sustain. These programs will go through an appropriate Faculty Senate review.
- Will graduate and undergraduate programs be addressed separately?
  - We may differentiate undergraduate, graduate, and two-year programs.
  - Other data may be too complex to dig into for every program but once we identify programs that are struggling, we can dig more richly into it.
- How will UPC develop and get feedback on criteria for recommendations?
  - We want to give the Faculty Senate and the programs the most possible time for their review and response. If there are glaring errors with the criteria, we can correct them.
  - What's the Faculty Senate's role in this? How can they provide any useful feedback based on the huge amount of work accomplished by the subgroup?
    - We have to work to give them the most reasonable review period possible. They also want identified programs have a chance to respond before recommendations go to Faculty Senate.
    - ECOS thinks a two week period is the minimum. They are working on identifying the process and are soliciting the senate for feedback. They are thinking it shouldn't be the whole curriculum committees. Maybe prior chairs or members from those committees.
    - The only realistic way to do this process is to focus on degrees. It does raise a question of how do you factor in that a lot of teaching goes on outside a department. Just because you eliminate a degree or even a department doesn't mean that every faculty member or class goes away. It seems we need to identify that pool of departments or degrees we are not going to continue to offer. And that's all we do at this stage. We have to start with a programmatic approach and then we need information about cross-links and collaborations and requirements.
  - We have to be mindful of the cost of each program and aware of the cost savings we need. We will have to eliminate programs to get to a number that works for the University’s budget.
    - This is terribly hard. Nobody likes it. We have a structural deficit and we have to give clarity to people. It's not fair to have people feeling uncertain.
  - April 15 is an important deadline for graduate students to accept their scholarship and thereby decline other opportunities. We have to commit to those students. And there may be undergraduate students in similar situations. We don't want them to show up and have their program be discontinued.
    - They will have the opportunity to complete the degree they enrolled in.
- We could communicate better about the timeline and the associated urgency of this process.
- We are in a multi-year process because of our commitments to teach out programs and CBA requirements.
- We are far from working within a sustainable budget. In bringing our budget into balance, we will not continue to make incremental, across-the-board cuts that harm the quality of all academic programs and student support services. Instead, we will be deliberate, focusing on our areas of opportunity and excellence.

Meeting adjourned.