University Planning Committee Meeting Minutes
March 9, 2018

Attendance:

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

Introduction:

- Thank you for all of the hard work accomplished by the subcommittees and to ECOS for working on how the shared governance review process will be achieved.

Approval of Minutes:

- Minutes from 2/23/18 and 3/2/18 meetings approved

Data & Program Analysis Subgroup Report:

- The Data subgroup shared a memo with the full UPC describing their general understanding of their task and plan of analysis.
- Stage one Analysis:
  - Student Faculty Ratio (as given by CBA section 18.510)
    - The next step is for the unions to reach out to OCHE for agreement about interpreting that metric.
  - Productivity metrics (APASP)
  - APASp reviewers scores
- Stage two Analysis:
  - Quality, demand, opportunity. They will further review all “programs for further consideration” to illuminate the context and countervailing factors that will guide decision-making.
  - The group is working with Dawn and Rosi to generate a cost per credit hour. That's the ultimate goal, which will be linked to the course rubric. People with expertise, like the deans, should also be consulted.
  - We should be looking at net savings. If certain programs go away, certain students may not come here anymore and it would influence how we project revenue.
  - Although we are talking about cuts, this is primarily about quality. Every program is concerned about the cuts they've taken and our ability to offer the quality our students expect and that we should expect from ourselves. We may lose some students on one hand, but we will be gaining in other areas, hopefully.
    - Explain the cost being associated to rubric. Some people teach in a program with multiple units and rubrics don't belong to a program.
    - Tracking to the rubric is closer to softening the noise than tracking through programs and department because so many people teach across programs and departments.
There are programs that collaborate in intricate ways to deliver programs. Some of those could serve as test cases for Dawn use.

- The goal is to pull whatever was useful out of APASP, and then use additional data to help alleviate the errors.
- The qualitative metrics from APASP might also be helpful as you look for additional information. The programs already responded to that APASP data.

- How to incorporate more subjective measures of quality? Especially as we look at mission/identity subgroup information?
  - This seems a good place for the mission/identity pillars to be measured for alignment.
  - The committee had two basic approaches to tackle the APASP scores. One was to use the scores and create quintiles, and that wasn't a good choice. But the other choice is to use the APASP scores to check back on programs that seem to be in trouble.
  - What aspects about APASP are we not using?
    - We are not using minors or certificates. Paul also met with Dawn and there is discrepancy between the way data was compiled. One was by department and one was program and we couldn't combine those.
    - We included almost all the other centralized data--the scores were so variable they were the only ones not included.

- At what point and at what time in the process should potentially impacted programs have a chance to respond?
  - Some people think programs should have a chance to respond to UPC before those programs have a chance to respond? What does that entail and mean from a timeline point of view?
  - That would mean draft recommendations to Faculty Senate by April 12. So you can backtrack from there.
  - When we finish the ranking, we could go through different analyses to make sure we are not looking. Ex, did you notice these are all departments with large cuts recently, or all PhD programs, or all in the area of environment, etc.
  - To meet the April 12 deadline, it makes us go back a week to have the recommendations.
  - More time for review or more time for thorough recommendations and analysis.
  - A lot of the departments and programs impacted might not be surprised at this point. If we warn people in advance to tell us about the impacts we are missing--they are difficult to know unless you are the person scheduling out the person next year. If we give them more notice on the front end, it might give us more time later.

- There are some on the data committee that are afraid to start playing with the data. I would ask for permission/feedback on turning the data committee loose to start working with the data. The feeling is that if we don't include the right metrics, there will be an explosion.
  - exactly, the perfect is the enemy of the good.
  - the limiting factor is how quickly we can incorporate the budget information.
  - We don't know how many programs we are actually talking about. we need to get in there and start playing.
  - If we get it wrong, of course we will correct. but we want the entire committee to understand what we are starting to work on?
    - I'm still concerned that some programs that struggle with the data the previous round haven't had a chance to get corrections. Help those programs that need to correct their data. Everybody knows the limitations.
What do we do with new programs? We've heard there are maybe 50 or 60?

- How will final recommendations be made?
  - The President is not prepared to go into a room on his own and make these decisions. He is looking to the UPC to make clear recommendations.
  - Issues of realignment are probably about a year out to make those changes.
  - It's important for all of us to shape this message when we are talking about this process with colleagues.

- Thinking about options for timeline to provide recommendations
  - Maybe the co-convenors together with Matt, Tim to hash out the timeline for this. To get this all done, we may need intensive time schedule (a few day retreat).
  - Remember that ASUM and Staff Senate also need time to provide recommendations
  - The type of information ECOS requested is very detailed. How will UPC provide all of that?
  - Should we give the programs the rubrics used for analysis and let them start running their own numbers right away?

The President emphasized that feedback is really important. Programs will be identified for disinvestment where tremendous work is going on by talented people. We are not asking people to testify about the quality of their program. We have quality programs. However, some of those programs might not fit with the future of the University. We need to communicate that. This is a strategic alignment of our programs.

Mission and Identity Subgroup report:

- These are not final proposals. Let's have a conversation about what exactly we are trying to accomplish and what will these areas of excellence mean.
- The President reiterated--these are not marketing slogans. These are lenses through which to view the strategic areas of focus for the university. They are areas of excellence in education and research.
- We did not identify specific academic units. It's more of an "academic scaffolding". We know there are programs of excellence in every college and school. Hopefully these can stimulate an interdisciplinary approach across campus to leverage these strengths against our opportunities.
- They also don't identify the core attributes we believe are also fundamentally important in all of those areas (like critical thinking, etc)
- The committee likes numbers one and two. The other four are not as strongly supported.
- How can we weigh in? Some of the descriptions of these
- If your program is represented across many of these? How do you describe that? These are not program specific but if you are diffused across the tabs?
- The names are not quite right. It's hard to find a name without having the programs attached.
- It's also very hard to separate out our actual programs and schools and colleges. For example, Journalism might show up in a few of these categories. But this might not change the school of Journalism.
- We are trying to identify 6 areas that describe what UM does really well. That the President and others can talk about.
- It may inform structure down the road.
- We all agree that the first two are obvious strengths of UM. Environment, Health Leadership and Justice--we do well the study of human interaction & governance.
- Entrepreneurship. Could be business & Entrepreneurship. we do that really well.
• Human expression and communication (Creative Arts)
• I would like to see maybe 6 inspirational statements, rather than boxes that prove how good we are. Yes, this really addresses what we do. We can later provide the data. The statement needs to be succinct.
• Looking at the MT Tech WIRE Recommendations from BOR meeting can help us with this designation.
• Recommendation I: Montana Tech embraces the special focus BOR designation as a premiere Science and Engineering institution dedicated to meeting the changing needs of society.
• MT Tech has one pillar; we will have more but need to clearly articulate them.
• There are also cross-cutting factors that go across all of the pillars. They are important but they are not pillars. They help us knit them together. We are going to come up with both.
• These pillars are not unique. And they are not going to inform the data subgroup because they are too broad.
• We may need to ask the units themselves. They know best.
• How could anyone put them into buckets?
• We are not putting programs into buckets to be clear. We are defining our broad areas of study. Don't think from our existing structure out, think from where we are trying to maintain excellence.
• We should be able to say how they are distinctive to UM. These may be a bit too encompassing.
• It's really hard to find anything that would be truly distinctive. The point is when you actually talk about the environment, you are actually good at it. And those specific points might be unique.
• Perhaps the two subcommittees are not inextricably linked. The charge of the mission/identity group is to identify where we will plant our flag.
• The areas of excellence by themselves will not distinguish the University of Montana. It does not only live in this list. It also lives in our mission statement and the identity. The heart of the institution might not be described here.
• This list is just areas of excellence. The committee is going to have a hard time going around about these areas of excellence.
• Please do try to think of them as academic communities. Over the course of two years, Health has identified a community of advisors, of stakeholders, of potential students who buy into this idea as they did not before this community was organized.
• This is valuable for students who are choosing fields with an end goal in mind. It could be a valuable recruitment tactic.
• It's important for the MUS to know what UM does best.
• Charge to the mission group, take Tech's example and ask--what are our 4-6 areas and do the same thing. Try to write out what we mean by that.
• When I read this, it reads like a catalog of what we do really well. I am not sure it reads about what we should be really focusing on. I'm not convinced that all six speak to our constituency--we need to draw in students. And I'm also a little disappointed because it looks hard to come up with a strategic view of the data.
• Maybe we should consider what we do not want to do? That can feel riskier but if we are trying to be bolder in some of these decisions.

Next Steps:
• The Mission subgroup is charged to take the MT Tech presentation as a sample and create power point slides (or another form) to describe each of the proposed areas of excellence.
  o Other UPC members should send feedback to Reed if you have an alternative title.
• The Data subgroup will work on laying out a timeline to consider feedback from programs and shared governance. And then they will get started working on the data.
  o They are waiting on the budget piece. Rosi can provide cost impacts early next week. And include Hillary.

Public Comment:
• Professor Kalachev, Mathematical Sciences. In terms of identifying our strengths, there must be funding, capacity, and available jobs. I don't see science on the list of areas of excellence, which we are very good at. A program’s sources of funding include student tuition, grants, and state funding. For every student, a portion of their tuition goes to general education and also to their program so you can see how much funding goes to each program. If donors think a program is important, they can support it. Others must be sustainable. Look at the funding they bring in and you will see profit versus loss.
  o That level of analysis is incredibly important and is being considered
• Elizabeth Dove, Art. Comments about productivity metrics from APASP. I was excited to see the ratios that I thought were missing from APASP. I noticed SCH is not on that. Relating them to Delaware numbers is very important for national benchmarking. Instructional FTE is not where you will find your money, it's the tenure track faculty.
  o The President will be following up with the Deans about the workload policies.
• Brad Allen, Art. The areas of excellence reads like a summary or like a list written by deans as a way to be protective instead of bold and innovative. The things that cut through those could also be focused on. They are cross-disciplinary but they could also be a focus. I hear these are the things we do well now and these are the things we are going to be good at in the future. I think that's why some seem specific enough and some seem universal. Maybe the areas we are already good at are easier to define.

Meeting adjourned.