University Planning Committee Meeting Minutes
April 6, 2018

Attendance:

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

Absent: Schwarze

Approval of Minutes & Introductions:

- March 29, 2018 minutes approved
- Introduction of incoming Provost Jon Harbor. Much of the UPC work will be implemented by Jon. Welcome to Jon, we are excited to have him!

Data Analysis subgroup update:

- Dawn Ressel and the Social Science Research team put together a Tableau presentation of the data.
  - We’re still making sure the data is absolutely right; handful of little changes, not significant
  - Demand, on x-axis is measures of enrollment; instructional salary per credit hour on Y axis.
  - Captures benchmark of above/below cost, enrollment trend, budget impact. If you hover over a data point, it shows budget, grant funding, percent above or below cost benchmarks, in/out of state student percentages, WUE participation.
- They came up with a total number of $18 million of potential total savings if completely eliminated a program and all the faculty. This is not likely to occur for many programs. This is roughly a third more than we actually need to cut, which is probably realistic to get to the right amount.
- Looking at pure metric analysis, it shows many programs (nearly half) could be in the "further review" section
- Two-year programs are not included. We are focusing only on graduate and undergraduate. It is not possible to use the same analysis on the two-year programs, although they remain part of the process and the provost is working with Missoula College to review those programs.
- There are only a few arrows pointing up. Everything is either flat or down. Only a few are actually up. Are those the ones that are really pulling up the numbers?
- Since you didn't do quadrants, how did you decide which programs to draw into the "further review"?
  - They moved away from a quadrant analysis in response to concerns of the effect of looking at enrollment on one axis and how that was being measured.
  - We ranked programs on majors, graduates, SCH. They were ranked from 1-58. The highest number of majors got 58 points and the others were weighted. That smooths
out the spread by not using the actual numbers. There were concerns about that methodology. We did it again by the absolute numbers. It didn't make sense to make decisions on the programs just on size. What really matters is cost. You could have many smaller programs with low cost and wind up with the same effect as one large program.

- These numbers tell you about the budget impact. They started by looking at high-cost, low enrollment programs but then they looked at everything, including the underlying data. This was a conversation about whether there was room in that program for potential savings, to pull it into the pool.
- These programs are just being flagged for further analysis by the deans and the president and provost.
  - This was also reviewed by statisticians providing their educated opinion.
- The SCH is probably the most important indicator for those departments that do a lot of service teaching.
- Average grant awards is a 5-year average. This number we had the least confidence in, but we did take it into account. A high number of grant funding is a reason not to put something into the pool.
- Why don't we have confidence to assign grant funding with more certainty? Why is this not a strong indicator?
  - Some programs had a 0 that were bringing in millions of dollars. The Data Office was working to correct this to have good numbers for the next stage of analysis.
  - The emphasis on research hasn't changed that much. Research has always been discussed in the data group as an important consideration to pull programs out.
  - Maybe the Research Office can also provide supplemental information. Talk to Judy Fredenberg.
- There is a distinction to remember between major requirements and general education requirements. Example: Chemistry supports all the other sciences. You can see in APASP the contributions to other departments. This is where the Deans' expertise will come in.
  - No decisions were made based on the left-right axis of the SCH graph.
- President Bodnar: We are looking at a wholesale realignment of each school and college to become more productive and efficient. As we've shared this data on a non-anonymized basis with the deans, the three questions for them are:
  - Look at anticipated attrition over the next 3 years, in the context of the data we are seeing. What strategic vacancy savings can we realize (through faculty retirements, etc.)? This is not like VERIP where somebody departs and you don't backfill. If you anticipate a retirement in a department that is high-cost, you can plan for that.
  - Look at the rubric and identify those programs that should be discontinued or potentially curtailed.
  - What reorganizational strategies could be implemented to make our programs more efficient? Collaboration, efficiency, integration.
- President Bodnar: Thank you to the data group. This is a mountain of work that you've accomplished. It builds upon APASP and you thoughtfully and objectively addressed some of the shortfalls of APASP. No models are perfect. Some models are useful. And this is a very useful analysis. This will inform the Dean's review. Remember, this analysis was Stage One. Next the deans will add context for the Stage Two Analysis. Then I will take their insights and we will work through those to create preliminary recommendations. Those will be presented to Faculty Senate and then upon further refinement, will be presented to BOR.
- Paul did an insane amount of work. Thank you!
Mission/Identity subgroup update:

- Presented a draft document for consideration by the group.
- The lack of a global pretext has been brought up. There have been concerns about defining "Montana Ways". We should consider making an operational definition for that. It should involve our “Partnership with Place.”
- Should Technology find its way into the communities of excellence?
  - People also wonder why STEM isn’t mentioned. My answer is that STEM is in the core. Instead of adding a special area of emphasis, we need to do a better job of articulating what our core includes.
  - Add and call it “Business, Technology, and Entrepreneurship.” This would include a little of Missoula College. Technology drives entrepreneurship outside of Business.
    - If we are going to bring Technology into one of the communities, that’s where it would live most logically.
  - This relates to our partnership with the city and how we can create an ecosystem of innovation. As we talk to companies that are potentially coming to Missoula, many of whom are tech companies, a community of excellence would be of value.
  - We are very intentional about this with the Health & Medicine Initiative. We create public/private partnerships. There should be a city/community partnership with each of these communities.
    - The community has a deep interest in these "communities of excellence."
  - One drawback to adding “technology” is that we have outstanding technological advances in many of these communities.
  - There is deep technical innovation happening at this University. Whether we add the word or state it very clearly, we need people to realize we have excellence science and technology AND the great liberal arts core.
  - If we were really clever, we could find a way to draw threads between each of these communities. It would push us to a higher level of excellence. And that doesn’t happen the way it’s written now. Society, community, sustainability, technology, these are threads between them.
- We will not be all things to all people. But our goal is that many programs cross many of these communities of excellence. As we enter into a growth and restructuring phase, programs can understand how to align. It’s more than messaging. It’s how we rebuild and redirect the future of this campus. It’s a really exciting moment.
- This committee’s mission has never been to actually do a restructuring. Like the Health and Medicine community was intended to enable interdisciplinary work, how we do this structurally is something for the new Provost and deans to work through. We need to explicitly state the intention to head in a direction although we don’t know the route yet.
- The conversation is interesting about where words belong -- in the communities or the core or...Maybe we need to articulate more cogently that these are not intended to be silos, but multi-modal communities.
- The communities provide a scaffolding for groups from other disciplines to gather together and best articulate what lives in that community and how we will use it to bring students to campus and gather those experiences. It’s not about reshuffling the chess pieces to create new silos.
- The presence of STEAM would probably speak to a broader swath of options. We are primed to really go this direction and integrate our art programming with design, technology, etc.
- Let us not forget we already have a major connector -- it's the core.
• The core isn't inspiring or robust enough. We need to avoid being perceived as provincial with the “Montana Ways” being overly local. The core is still fundamentally missing diversity, cultural appreciation. We cannot have Montana Ways that do not include the tribal communities. But I recognize it needs to go beyond Montana. So everybody that comes to live in Montana, all ways are welcome but you will be exposed to a certain standard. I would strongly encourage us to include diversity.
  o We haven't emphasized this enough. In his presentation to Senate, the President will be discussing a stronger focus on diversity of faculty, staff, and students. Diversity will be a strategic imperative. It makes for a stronger campus and more effective learning opportunities. It's an opportunity to work across disciplines but also across cultures.
• Is there any overlap between these communities and how will the deans use this to review?
  o There is a rubric sheet that has been modified and simplified. It separates core contributions and contributions to areas of excellence.
  o Is this rubric specifically for programs under consideration or all programs?
    ▪ All of them. As a dean I have to think about the whole college. This is another way to provide context.
• What are students asking to learn that we aren't providing right now. It goes from living in a Global Society to taking care of yourself and fiscal responsibility.
• Steve shared a description of the core based on SPCC and the AAC&U Value Rubrics and includes cultural knowledge and competence.
• Add "traditional knowledge" to Ways of Knowing. It adds the indigenous communities here but also other ways of global knowing.
• Does this group believe foreign language requirements should be a part of the core?
  o Let's review how this is accomplished. We can't do 4 years of a required language--there are many ways out of the language requirement currently.
  o I don't think the committee can move ahead much farther defining the MT ways without the General Education Committee’s involvement. Let's keep talking about it, but getting it where it was today was incredibly difficult. There is a requirement that everyone satisfy the language but it's extremely varied across the majors.
  o This is one thing the President wants the Provost and Deans to examine. Language proficiency, exposure, working across cultures and language barriers.
  o The language debates came up as GLI was created and "Global Century" was a strategic initiative. It's hard to imagine how this is possible without language requirements. It's about the message we send about the global aspirations of our graduates.
  o Many of us come from small schools across Montana where public education doesn't provide language education.
  o This university has to provide its own expertise but also be a platform to access knowledge in other ways. Students have lots of options of how to access knowledge that is radically different from 15, 10 or 5 years ago.
• The revised Mission Statement was approved.

Next Steps:
• Mission group:
  o Find a way to make science & technology stronger
  o Somehow integrate the communities of excellence.
  o If you have suggestions for modification, send them to the mission group.
• We received pushback about using “we”/”our” in the narrative. I think it could lead to a perception that we have a sense of arrogance/top-down direction. Let’s just get rid of it.

• Data subgroup:
  o The Deans and Provost will use their work to move into Stage Two Analysis.

Public Comment:

• Professor Lebihan, Philosophy.
  o Many Philosophy alums questioned whether “artistic expression and communication” refers to only artistic communication or all types of communication. Maybe use “communication and artistic expression” instead.
  o My experience as the pre-law advisor is working with high-achievers from MT. These students are capable of far more than they can even conceive of. They are wonderful individuals with enormous potential. They need people to show them what opportunities are open to them and encourage them.

Meeting adjourned.