University Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

March 29, 2018

Attendance:


Absent: Alford, Atteberry, Schwarze, Semanoff, White

Approval of Minutes:
- March 23, 2018 minutes approved

Mission/Identity subgroup update:
- Using the phrase "communities of excellence" instead of "areas of excellence"
- The narrative tries to explain that these communities live alongside other majors/disciplines that are not clearly stated.
  o communities implies people, which is better
  o The word "pillars' was unanimously rejected
- The graphic can be improved and strengthened before public presentation. We are not asked to do a branding exercise; we are not the branding experts.
- It needs to show that we are student-centered. Students are at the core of everything we do. We are focused on the development of students and need an intense focus on holistic student success.
- What's the difference between the MT Ways and the core?
  o The core is our core curriculum. The MT Ways is to articulate modules that might be in the core.
- We will need multiple graphics, presenting the ideas from very broad down to more and more specific.
- The Core needs to be lighthouse-level guidance to the gen ed committee for future work in this area. UM has specific bodies that are tasked with looking at curriculum and Gen Eds. The Chair of the Gen Ed committee was at our last subgroup meeting and involved in our discussions.
- The core represents the four core competencies we've agreed upon. Critical thinking, etc. The way we instill those competencies are through courses that embrace the MT Ways. Producing graduates who are leaders, innovators, informed citizens...lifelong learners.
- The ways are how (the ways) we deliver the core competencies.
- There are certain knowledge, skills and abilities we want our graduates to have.
- MT Ways incorporates place.
- It's a little bit like Ways and Means. It's like a rubric. It should define what some of our activities with our students achieve.
- I've heard you saying the MT Ways are the ways through which we build core competencies. If there were to be a flow, it is from the ways to the core competencies.
- The core competencies are things all students have to have. But there are different ways of delivering this. Every university will do this differently. And ours is the MT Way.

**Specific wording suggestions:**
- The use of the word "core" is confusing, but otherwise it makes sense.
- We need to remove all the negative language (drift, stumbling, etc). This statement should not include any of that.
- I vote for getting rid of the word "core" for competencies.
- The MT Ways. Let's have that be central.
- The "ing" is continuous. It's a process. Under the core it should be "think", "explore", "live", etc.
- The claim that we are a comprehensive research university is confusing. Let's remove comprehensive. Research University is a stronger, higher. Let's just say flagship Research University.
  - If you look at almost every other flagship research institution, it goes without saying.
  - But we are touting a lot of qualities about ourselves, I like including research.
  - Comprehensive AND research together tells that we do both.
  - Many other public universities describe themselves that way

**Specific design suggestions for the graphic:**
- Maybe put a globe to show we are taking people from MT and developing global impact.
- The communities need to show feedback loop. Well-functioning systems learn from themselves and flow back. I believe the golden ratio suggestion, a spiral, makes sense because that is how things grow. It starts from the core and grows out from there.
- The communities are where everything else happens. They are not an outcome, they are a container in which these things happen.
- Instead of a bracket, we could have arrows toward lifelong learners, and that would make it more circular.

**Purpose of this narrative document**
- It will eventually form part of the President’s report. But for now we should focus on the description of the communities of excellence and MT Ways--to explain the graphic more fully.
- The final report is going to be how we describe the unique way that UM prepares students. Getting these points out there and beginning to beat the drum is a key part of the President’s work to explain the value of a UM education.

- The communities of excellence are set. The group reached consensus.
- One thing that isn't mentioned yet, is that undergraduate students have unprecedented opportunities to participate in research. I'm not sure where this fits in.
  - It is a key part of student success. Faculty mentorship is a key component to providing students amazing opportunities.
  - Yes, and another area we are excellent in is community engagement by our students.
- What about the Mission Statement?
  - take out "comprehensive"
Feedback about accessibility being a confusing word.

- We have a model of education that enables people from all walks of life to come here and have a high quality experience.
- What about the next steps for narrative document?
  - Send feedback to the subgroup by Monday for next draft, including mission statement.

**Data Analysis subgroup update:**

- They shared a visual model of the program prioritization used to graph the programs based on demand and cost.
- They have developed an anonymized scatter plot to depict where programs fall.
  - It will be put into Tableau to help also provide context. Red could mean it is below Delaware benchmarks. Arrows can show trend. Pop-ups can display research funding.
- We are trying very hard to present this information to campus in an understandable way.
- Because we need to hit a dollar figure, we are planning to start in the corner and add up dots until you get to the number. Not every dot will be included because some dots are very efficient by Delaware standards, or have high-research, etc. However, other programs might be inefficient by Delaware standards or have declining enrollment trends, etc.
- They have scheduled a day-long retreat for Saturday, April 7 for the President and the Deans. They will look at that pool of programs and determine and then create action plans together. Some programs will be reorganized, some will be curtailed (reduced faculty but not eliminated, CBA term), some will be discontinued. At the Faculty Senate meeting on April 17 the President will share this list. However, many of the details can be accomplished during the summer.
  - Some of these decisions may be able to move forward but many will need to be worked out over the course of the next year.
- Budget information will attach to the programs. Implications are different from undergraduate and graduate level. Cutting a graduate program will likely result in a trickle-down, making those faculty available to teach at an undergraduate level, saving money on adjuncts and lecturers. Cutting undergraduate programs has different potential savings. It’s hard to imagine cutting everything associated with a program; there will be savings related to a percentage. We will overshoot in gathering programs for that reason, not all savings will be captured for each degree.
- Missoula College is very tricky. We should also really be looking at certificates. In many of the programs, there are larger operating costs and lower personnel costs.
- When are the $5million in savings needed?
  - Over the next 3 years.
  - But if we do nothing over the next few years, our costs actually increase due to inflation. It’s not simple math, due to inflation.
  - What about attrition savings? It would be nice to understand what our turnover rate would be.
    - The subgroup has asked HR for that information.
  - Altering teaching loads could also have a huge impact on faculty decision to retire or leave. This could accelerate the amount of savings.
  - We are already losing faculty based on the uncertainty surrounding UM.
    - Hopefully this plan can help eliminate some uncertainty.
    - Research-intensive areas will see unwanted attrition if loads are increased.
This is one reason why the President has asked each dean to explain their workload policy. We don't want to lose researchers and we hope that's captured in this analysis. We don't need the same model across colleges, but to understand each other.

- Discussing eliminating graduate programs and moving faculty to undergraduate teaching only and increasing teaching loads would result in many faculty leaving. There is not an across-the-board rule. You can look at Delaware data to see average loads as well.
- This is why it's important to understand how we allocate work. Teaching is not the only work accomplished. But there is some other unit of accounting for that work.
  - This won't function without deans having freedom to work through the process. One thing UM does not do very well is enforce when members of a particular program are not research-productive but still have a research buy-out. That's another source of unused person power.
  - The deans and the President have to be the final arbiters. They should have more inclusive information.
    - The UPC is just showing the zone of consideration and the deans can still have that discussion.
    - If you hand the deans this list, if they do something different than the data shows, there would still be a rationale.
    - I think the UPC is not just counting $5 million. We are taking research, qualitative measures into account.
  - I still have some uneasiness about the data. Only the deans can understand all the nuances of the data. But I hope they will not feel constrained by this. I'm still hoping there's some level of strategic oversight. We also haven't talked about how much comes from undergraduate, graduate and Missoula College. Be very careful to give Missoula College the power balance. We need to be fair to them and they don't have a dean. Give them a voice.
  - This subgroup developed a rubric. It is also intended to bring in the identity subgroup's work. It is very important to the campus that we can justify our decisions.

The Mission/Identity subgroup can take a look at the rubric and provide that guidance. Please modify as you believe appropriate.

Next steps:
- Data Subgroup:
  - If the deans are meeting April 7, the deans need the data and input in advance of that meeting. The full UPC will see it Friday before it’s given to the deans for their retreat.
- Mission Subgroup:
  - Continue to refine the mission statement, narrative description, and graphic representation.

Public Comment:
- One graphic has two "exploring creatively"
- When you talk about the mission, I wonder if you are looking at branding or an inside vision. We could have very different language if we do an inside introspection versus outside. Branding to students, the legislature, and inside UM could be very difficult. They are different discourses.
- Do you look at cost and enrollment first, and then what you have for the core mission? What happens if most of the programs are high-cost and low-enrollment serve the mission best? Unlikely but there will be some programs that serve the mission highly. Or amending the mission.
o We do have in mind that the rubric would be the mechanism to save programs.

Meeting adjourned