Executive Summary

The Academic Planning Group collected input from a wide range of campus stakeholders, including the Priority for Action teams, the Graduate School and Graduate Council leaders, academic advisors, Staff Senate, the UM Foundation, the Diversity Advisory Council leadership, ASUM and GPSA leadership, the University Design Team, and others. A thematic summary of that feedback is attached.

One overarching theme that emerged from these discussions is a desire for action. Stakeholders feel that the many planning exercises the University has engaged in in recent years have not resulted in meaningful change. They do not trust that the leadership will make hard choices and carry them through, and so they are reluctant to engage. To rebuild its credibility, the administration must take visible and concrete action.

In addition, several more specific recommendations emerged:

1) The “Vision for UM’s Academic Future” document and college plans should better address graduate education

Graduate students now represent more than a quarter of UM’s enrollment, and some graduate programs are growing. Research tied to graduate programs generates more than $100M for the University annually in recovered F&A. Yet the draft plan barely mentions graduate education.

In considering the role of graduate education in UM’s vision for its future, it will be important to recognize the different aspects of graduate education and the ways they impact campus:

- Professional schools, which have seen the highest growth rates on campus, generate significant enrollment revenue;
- Graduate programs in the traditional academic disciplines support graduate teaching assistants, who play a critical role in undergraduate education;
- Some graduate programs in both the professional schools and H&S generate substantial research dollars;
• It is unclear to what extent UM is pursuing R1 status; if that is a priority, graduate programs are key.

2) The “Vision for UM’s Academic Future” document and college plans should better address different learning modalities

To reach the new student populations we aim to serve while remaining competitive with our peers, UM must be more creative in how it offers its academic programs. While UM has made efforts in recent years to grow its online portfolio and to explore other flexible learning modalities, those initiatives are not prioritized in the draft plan. The pandemic demonstrated the possibilities for moving purposefully into the online space, and UM’s intent to expand to new learners and credentialing opportunities will require that we are open to creative and flexible learning modalities.

3) The “Vision for UM’s Academic Future” document and college plans should emphasize the importance of intentional design for students

While there are many potential impacts to take into consideration as we explore new structures and revised/reformed programs, we should emphasize and maintain focus on what our students need and deserve. Specifically, future iterations of planning documents should prioritize student experiences that are designed to promote applied and experiential learning, interdisciplinary opportunity, and connection to students’ 21st century needs.

4) The “Vision for UM’s Academic Future” document and college plans should make more explicit the commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion

To sustain meaningful progress toward a more just and culturally aware campus and a University that contributes to a more just society, UM must incorporate into its planning and implementation efforts the perspectives of underrepresented populations. Future iterations of planning documents should not just make clear that the University commits itself to making progress toward a more inclusive campus but also demonstrate how that commitment is reflected in the academic vision.

5) The “Vision for UM’s Academic Future” document and college plans should clarify the timeline and process for next steps

The campus community is uncertain about what comes next, particularly with respect to the potential for faculty cuts. Uncertainty breeds fear and reduces engagement. Being clear about how and when decisions are made about faculty reductions—as well as other significant programmatic and structural changes—will help assuage fears and make clear opportunities for meaningful participation in future planning.

6) As the “Vision for UM’s Academic Future” document and college plans are finalized, it will be important to ensure the tone of these documents and communications presenting them does not disparage current faculty and efforts

Some of the language in the documents could be read to imply that faculty have failed. While the reasons for UM’s enrollment decline are uncertain, there is no evidence that poor program
quality has been a major driver. Faculty buy-in for proposed changes will be stronger if the plan avoids language that appears to disparage faculty.

Additionally, the plan highlights a number of strategies that reflect areas of existing UM strength, e.g., experiential learning and interdisciplinarity. Future iterations of planning documents should guard against suggesting we are not doing these things but rather that we do them well in some areas and aim to build systems that allow us to scale and prioritize those strengths.
Academic Planning Group’s Collected Input, Thematically Organized

Question 1: What challenges do you foresee? How might those be addressed?

Five primary themes emerged from the feedback, composed of 76 responses (some from individuals; some from groups) on the question of challenges, with questions of budget and fiscal incentives running throughout.

Those themes are:

1) Fear, mistrust, and low morale;
2) Structural impediments to experiential learning and interdisciplinarity;
3) Structural impediments to GenEd reform; and
4) Inadequate attention to graduate programs;
5) Inadequate attention to providing flexible learning opportunities for new student segments;
5) Inadequate attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

The themes and quotations below document sentiments provided in 76 distinct responses by a combination of individuals and groups consulted.

Theme 1: Fear and mistrust

Respondents noted that people across campus fear change because they equate change with loss. They also expressed concerns about the efficacy, transparency, and inclusiveness of the process, and encouraged broad stakeholder engagement with early and frequent communication.

“Change = speculation about what it means personally, what loss to anticipate.”

“We should anticipate resistance to acknowledging change and innovation as ways to “preserve and refresh” what we deliver – in some cases, the resistance will be born of fear; in other cases, it will be born of fatigue; in others it will be born of an unwillingness to embrace the idea that change does not equal a rejection of tradition.”

“How do we know this isn't just another academic exercise? Often staff and colleges are involved in projects and requests by administration only to see little actual change.”

“We need to be very aware that any document/statement that talks about change in our current context will produce anxiety and angst across all employee types. People are poised to wonder what the change will mean for their own roles. Need to acknowledge that this document is not an articulation of our employment/staffing intentions...however may influence decisions in the future.”

“It almost feels like we need a separate plan for being proactive about how this affects our employees--both those that may be affected individually or as a unit, as well as overall morale/satisfaction/faith in UM.”
“Collective trust in data on campus. Methodology clearly articulated in the document, but the trust in those data is still a struggle.”

“Staff (and faculty) will want to know when and how they can be included in the planning process moving forward.”

“How are and how will deans be communicating with faculty (especially over the summer) as well as staff? How can we ensure this is equitable within colleges and across the academic enterprise?”

“Faculty need to be involved in PFA/UDT/ULC/SOR processes, but they are also generally off contract in the summer. How do we include faculty meaningfully while also getting work done year-round?”

**Theme 2: Structural impediments to greater experiential and interdisciplinary education**

*Respondents expressed concerns about UM’s ability to deliver high-quality experiential and interdisciplinary opportunities at scale. Faculty need training to do these things well, and administrative support is essential to connecting students with real-world experiences.*

“ELCS needs to be meeting with faculty at the department level to provide training and resources to support high quality experiential learning and career readiness; assist departments in creating an appropriate strategy to do this across the curriculum. This will ensure implementation of high impact practices and career readiness strategies are high quality and that good systems and communications with employers are in place.”

“The working document states that the plan is to create more interdisciplinary classes, but I worry that many current tenured instructors do not have the capacity, knowledge, or will to create enriched courses that meet these demands.”

“Students are eager to make a difference in the world, and we can help them to do that in meaningful, ethical, and exciting ways. However, we want to note that these types of programs require a lot of administration, for either full time administrators, or faculty release time. The combination of breadth, diversity of offerings, depth, and high touch learning is also very unlikely to improve our student to faculty ratio. How can we ensure that, by expanding individualized experiential learning opportunities for students, we do not overtax the faculty and staff?”

“...the budget model, and the data do nothing to promote or recognize interdisciplinary work.”

“The institution has never been able to produce a budget model, or an analysis of the data, that addresses the concerns and actually incentivizes interdisciplinary work.”

“Strong interdisciplinary programs are built on strength in the disciplines.”

**Theme 3: Structural impediments to GenEd reform**

*Respondents noted that the emphasis on SCH in the budget model creates financial incentives that discourage innovation in GenEd.*
“Certain departments have held the market on general education categories, those departments have populated the course schedule with a myriad of courses while other departments might include one course or no courses.”

“If we aim to limit GE choice, we need to create much more intentional outcomes for the GE experience.”

“Fiscal realities of GenEd: By eliminating obstructive fiscal incentives which lead to an overabundance of GenEd courses,” UM is essentially asking faculty to play a role in the planned obsolescence of some of their programs. For many units, the ‘obstructive’ fiscal incentive is simply survival, and it is not clear how our committee can eliminate or change the incentive for faculty to keep their jobs.”

“The existing fiscal incentives skew GenEd in terms of how courses are designed for students and how to develop curricula that is coherent and contributes to a shared experience of what is learned.”

“How will we fund the Gen Ed curriculum and protect it from being used as a tool to gain resources, i.e., how will we remove the incentives that cause departments to see Gen Eds primarily as a tool to bring benefit to the department rather than primarily as a tool to design courses that are part of a greater, coherent whole?

“Revision of the Gen Ed curriculum will take a tremendous amount of will and patience for probably complicated orchestration. We will need to remind campus, over and over, that our task is to design for students, not for departmental benefit. This will mean removing the primary incentive to offer Gen Eds to gain SCH and dollars.”

"Meaningful Gen Ed reform will require resources and a thoughtful and fair approach to how SCH are factored into the resource allocation model. It's easy to "think big" when it comes to Gen Ed reform, but operationalizing the vision is a different story that we haven't been able to achieve through previous attempts, largely due to resource limitations."

“...the existing fiscal incentives skew GenEd in terms of how courses are designed for students and how to develop curricula that is coherent and contributes to a shared experience of what is learned. The greatest challenges in GenEd will likely come from programs that don’t generate sufficient SCH through majors alone to afford their instructional faculty.”

“How will we be able to maintain instruction across the board to ensure students can complete graduation requirements (both Gen Ed and major-specific) in a timely manner while still having access to various electives across the disciplines?”

**Theme 4: Inadequate attention to graduate programs**

*Respondents noted that the draft plan contains little or no reference to grad programs, which now encompass over a quarter of enrollment and are some of the strongest programs in terms of demand and national reputation.*

“Graduate education is not well represented in the APG documents. Majors include graduate degrees, but they (grad degrees) are totally different in effort put forth for training, outcomes.”
“The lack of any recognition or seeming attention to graduate and professional students, the roles of their programs, their teaching and research contributions, and how those are affected by faculty cuts (or how graduate students could be leveraged to mitigate some of these losses) is glaring. Graduate and professional students could be important allies and support for experiential learning, but they appear to be unconsidered in the document.”

Theme 5: Inadequate attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion

Some respondents noted a lack of explicit attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion throughout the vision document and college-level plans. While the vision document acknowledges a shift in demographics and the need for us to be responsive to those shifts, it does not appear to enact a commitment to looking at our academic enterprise through a DEI lens.

“Overall academic plan needs to include how it serves DEI on campus. When UM looks at strategic reinvestment, important to not just look at growing programs but investments in DEI in colleges and academic programs.”

“Need to embed NACE approved career skills, which includes an emphasis on DEI. There is no clear acknowledgement that internships/experiential learning/career preparedness carry with them an equity imperative.” [https://www.naceweb.org/career-readiness/competencies/career-readiness-defined/]

“The deans claim they are committed to advancing DEI imperatives, but this generally does not show up in their college plans. Provost needs to show this commitment.”

Question 2: What opportunities do you foresee?

Three primary themes emerged from the feedback on the question of opportunities.

Those themes include:

1) Opportunity to build on existing strengths in experiential learning and career preparedness, and in summer programming;
2) Opportunity to reimagine existing structures to accommodate new goals through Gen Ed reform, stackable credentials, and mission-aligned professional development; and
3) Opportunity to pursue new and innovative solutions around alumni engagement, interdisciplinary teaching and learning, flexible degree delivery, and Grand Challenges as a way to frame UM impact.

Theme 1: Opportunity to build on existing strengths in experiential learning and career preparedness, in summer programming

Sub-theme: Respondents noted the potential for and need to build more meaningful and deliberate experiential learning and work-based experience, and career preparedness services, especially through ELCS.
"We have SUCH amazing [experiential learning] programs that are both at UM and affiliated with UM. We should do some type of campaign around this (our specific curriculum that promotes these opportunities) including our partners in the field."

"We have all the ingredients to develop a 21st century liberal arts curriculum, one that both honors traditional knowledge domains and foundational abilities and teaches those through a rigorously applied lens. If fully committed and if our faculty believe in the project, we are capable of truly integrating a 21st century liberal arts curriculum with experiential learning and career preparedness."

"ELCS is fully fledged and has a permanent, full-time director (staffing is still a challenge). Within the new budget model, make experiential learning classes worth double student credit hours (incentivize). Capsource: new platform for matching faculty with employers for project-based learning experiences."

"The experiential learning opportunities that we already have need to be all in one spot to see what we have first and then build from there."

"Need to better integrate our advisors into the career preparedness talks and work - recruit them as ambassadors and potential career coaches beyond advising in how navigate courses."

“This is an opportunity to make our commitment to DEI clear in academics; use updated NACE career competencies, which include DEI.”

“On Page 3, can/should provide explanation of cultural diversity.”

“It seems to me that in many cases it is not that we don’t already offer, or even require, experiential learning in a big but small environment, but that we don’t do well to advertise that that is exactly what we do. And that we do it better than most.”

Sub-theme: Respondents noted the potential for summer programs to attract and retain new and different students.

"With Summer Start – I think this summer is an opportunity to see if adding transfers to our cohort makes a difference and better tracking to hopefully account for more students. With Summer Exploration and pushing Summer Institutes across UM – I think UM Summer should collaborate with OOLD (and maybe CES and/or Marketing?) to develop a workshop/training at the end of the summer to talk about how the program went – what went well? What challenges happened?"

"Developing more K-12 academic camps/institutes in the summer that helps showcase each Colleges’ offerings and helps develop a pipeline for recruitment. We need to stay in touch with everyone that steps foot on campus in the summer that is in 6th- 12th grade and need to make sure we have their names in a centralized data base."

Theme 2: Opportunity to reimagine existing structures to accommodate new goals through Gen Ed reform, stackable credentials, and mission-aligned professional development
Sub-theme: Respondents noted the opportunity to more meaningfully and deliberately build cohort-based, experiential, and interdisciplinary experiences into the UM experience for all students and specifically into a Gen Ed experience that is designed to promote certain student outcomes, infused with purpose, and connected to our students’ 21st century needs.

"Start with Big Sky Experience and student interests. Transition to first year seminar that is substantive. Transition into 2nd and 3rd year programming with experiential and service learning. Culminate in capstone in 4th year."

"I love the idea of a cohort-based Gen Ed framework, where students would be assigned to cohorts starting with the Big Sky Experience. These cohorts could stay intact through mandatory first-year seminars, sophomore and junior experiential learning opportunities (ideally with a service component), and culminating in capstone experience tied to the major."

"A GenEd budget would allow UM to incentivize the creation of innovative and interdisciplinary courses, build meaningful experiential opportunities, and to provide funding to critical programs in CHS that shoulder a majority of the GenEd courses."

“For GenEd to be successful UM needs to develop a model that provides financial resources to focus on student experiences."

“The GenEd program should have a budget."

“We should consider how to best incentivize GenEd by re-thinking how we weight GenEd SCHs in the current budget model."

“Potentially create a college of GenEd. GenEd is unlikely to change while governed by volunteer faculty with no budget and no real authority. The current budget model sends the implicit message that disciplines without lots of majors are not important. A college model would give faculty in critical GenEd disciplines a sense of community, purpose, and importance."

"Gen Ed - prime opportunity to build in career readiness and experiential learning."

"Gen Eds can and should showcase our best teachers! The Gen Eds are an opportunity to reflect our UM values and to give students something uniquely UM."

"Revamping the Gen Eds gives us an opportunity to create a common experience in the first year – one that connects students to each other and to their academic departments. This would help with retention and building a sense of belonging as a Griz."

"[...] the time is ripe to shift away from general education as a checklist (as it is sometimes seen by students) toward a more engaging and immersive experience with impactful outcomes for student personal and professional growth."

"We have an opportunity to significantly overhaul our Gen Ed curriculum to be both distinct and impactful, to make it a hallmark UM program that attracts students."
“We have an opportunity to make our stated commitment to advancing DEI more explicit by renewing the Gen Eds through a DEI lens.”

“The GEAHC is currently considering core, distributed, and hybrid models in the re-imagining of GenEd. However, we believe we may settle on a hybrid approach because we believe the time is ripe to shift away from general education as a checklist (as it is sometimes seen by students) toward a more engaging and immersive experience with impactful outcomes for student personal and professional growth.”

“The new GenEd model needs to be more student-centered and experience based, rather than driven by the interests of individual departments and programs.”

“It’s vitally important that we help provide students with a purpose – the why – behind the Gen Ed curriculum. They’d like to see more contemporary offerings related to the 21st Century they will be living and working in.”

“Grad students fill many experiential teaching/mentorship roles -- labs, internship supervisions, mentorship by graduate students, etc. They also student teach many of the GenEds”

Sub-theme: Respondents noted the opportunity, and in some cases obligation, to provide our students with stackable credentials/badging that allow them to both more easily signal their competencies and skills and more easily “stop out” of college with a completed credential that will serve them in the workforce.

"We have an opportunity to make Gen Eds signal competency. We could offer incremental badging and credentialing along the way, signaling the skills students develop (public speaking, writing, etc.). Students could display their badge/credential on linked in profile, in co-curricular transcript, etc. This would help not only with signaling but also in ensuring students who stop out can demonstrate what they’ve accomplished."

"The opportunities for stackable credentials are compelling, but will require buy-in from faculty to ensure these sorts of credentials make their way through the curriculum review process and "see the light of day" beyond experimental offerings."

"In particular, transfer and non-traditional students would like to see far fewer barriers to transferring in and getting credit for previous knowledge and education."

Sub-theme: Respondents noted the need and opportunity to continue focusing on more mission-aligned professional development for staff and faculty.

"Training supervisors to promote their employees' engagement in professional development and training ... Performance evaluations and role descriptions - this is the place where we can embed conversations about addressing institutional needs and academic vision aligned with employees' development and growth, too."

“We have an opportunity to provide DEI-focused professional development for faculty and staff, ensuring the curriculum is infused with a commitment to DEI.”
Theme 3: Opportunity to pursue new and innovative solutions around alumni engagement, interdisciplinary teaching and learning, and Grand Challenges as a way to frame UM impact

Sub-theme: Respondents noted the need to design for continuing education needs and alumni engagement.

"How are we incorporating Alumni into opportunities for professional development? The APG could frame a bit of how we can connect with alumni to improve outward facing views of UM."

"Ways in which lifelong learners/alumni/community members are taking advantage of UM classes can be grown through a range of modalities and credentials."

"More alumni networking events specifically with UM students in their career fields or perhaps a single platform to connect alumni with interested UM students wanting to connect with mentors/leaders in their degree fields."

Sub-theme: Respondents noted the need to think creatively about how to promote interdisciplinarity, especially through joint appointments and permeable boundaries between departments.

"If team teaching is going to be part of the Grand Challenges, we can learn from the GLI what works to incentivize that. The GLI had more team taught first-year seminars in its early years, but has very few now. OOLD could offer professional development on specific teaching techniques that might be helpful for addressing grand challenges."

"Joint hires across departments. We should be doing this to help make boundaries more permeable -- for both students and faculty."

"I think an interdisciplinary approach for courses and majors is a really strong opportunity to create leaders who can actually address problems from the source because they can see more perspectives and lenses."

"To every extent possible, if there eventually need to be reductions in one program and increases in another, seek to identify current faculty who can fill the need -- look internally first. Joint appointments."

"Joint appointments – how can we better orchestrate across departments and colleges (e.g., in COE, DPAP, etc.) to promote the hiring of joint appointment faculty?"

Sub-theme: Respondents noted the opportunity to frame UM’s impacts in teaching, learning, and research around Grand Challenges.

"For the UDT suggestion on Grand Challenges, it might be beneficial to focus on a reasonably small number of grand challenges that everyone on campus could line up behind. Topics like combatting racism or addressing climate change would allow for natural interdisciplinary collaborations and build on our existing strengths."
"Global Challenges - This might also provide a potential model for interdisciplinary curricular pathways that draw from varied disciplines to address global challenges.

Question 3: What questions should we anticipate?

Three primary themes emerged from the feedback on the question of questions to anticipate.

Those themes include:
1) Impact on individuals and broader campus community;
2) Interplay between face-to-face and online learning; and
3) Timeline.

Other questions fall into a fourth category.

**Theme 1: Impact on individuals and broader campus community**

*Respondents noted that many employees, when they see reference to change, will immediately wonder what the impacts on them will be. Many will read the document as a staffing document.*

"Will I still have a job? What does this mean for me and my work? My colleagues?"

“What programs will be impacted? How many positions will be eliminated?”

**Theme 2: Interplay between face-to-face and online learning**

*Respondents noted the need to clarify the role online learning plays in this academic vision.*

“What is the appropriate balance of face-to-face and online programs?”

“What is the expected growth in both areas?”

**Theme 3: Timeline**

*Respondents noted a lack of clarity about timeline for planning and implementation of items mentioned in the documents.*

“How will experiential learning opportunities be strategically placed in the two terms?”

“How will we prioritize what gets started first?”

**Other**

“How can we convince students to attend a college that has aging infrastructure compared to what is available at MSU Bozeman?”
“How can we do this new and important work without adequate staffing?”

“How do we provide voice to concerns about student support programs within the larger conversation about academic quality?”

“How will the college plans and potential structural changes interplay with our decentralized advising model?”

“What does the new student-faculty ratio mean in terms of facilitating faculty and graduate research?”

“How can we continue down this path while still providing an education that you can’t get anywhere else? What are we doing to preserve and strengthen what makes UM unique?”

Question 4: What else do we have to keep in mind to get this right?

Four primary themes emerged from the feedback on what we need to keep in mind to get this right.

Those themes include:
   1) Need for academic planning process clarity;
   2) Structural and departmental considerations;
   3) Need for a diversity, equity, and inclusion lens;
   4) Online and flexible educational opportunities for new student populations; and
   5) Graduate & professional education.

Other questions fall into a fifth category.

**Theme 1: Need for academic planning process clarity**

*Respondents noted some confusion about the way the working document and college plans fit into our larger planning processes, what purpose they serve, and what values will be taken into consideration in future planning.*

“What is the intention of the APG document? The deans need to clarify the purpose it aims to fulfill. Who is the audience and what is the purpose? How is it intended to be used?”

“How will a DEI lens be taken into consideration in thinking about curriculum, staffing, investments? Were BIPOC contributors involved?”

“How do we show people we really mean it this time? How is this different than 2018? We have a lot of engaged smart people on this—more so than in past efforts. Don’t be afraid of complexity.”

“To what level are students, staff, faculty, alumni, and the community involved? Can we broaden that?”

“Implementing the instructional staffing plan is the easy part. The hard part is leading the campus through loss: loss of jobs, loss of sense of identity, status, importance, etc. While simultaneously providing everyone with a sense of optimism and hope about the “new” version of UM.”

“What we need is a clear link between the budget model and the goals outlined in the first section.”
“This reads like it was written for administrators by administrators. Faculty may see it as a bunch of lofty rhetoric that will be used to justify cutting faculty.”

“I was surprised to see, unless I somehow missed it, that the very data that Paul Kirgis said the deans had been focusing on, SCH/FTE and $’s/SCH, are not in the spreadsheet.”

“With all documents, it talks around student experience. Are we really being student centered, though, or are we just focused on expenses?”

**Theme 2: Structural and departmental considerations**

*Respondents noted structural considerations and how they play out in our processes.*

“Donors and alums rarely know or care about college structures, so there are few risks associated with departmental moves that do not eliminate programs. Eliminating programs/departments will create enemies among alumni. That’s not a reason not to take actions that are right for the University, but it makes outreach to those groups and individuals critical.

“It would be great to see a stronger connection and interdisciplinary approach amongst all of the PFA’s.”

“We have to recognize this is not just a strategic academic or resource issue--this will be a very human resource/employee/PFA3 issue and concern.”

“Unit standards -- how can they be revised in support of our aims?”

**Theme 3: Need for a diversity, equity, and inclusion lens**

*Respondents noted the importance of designing our academic vision with a DEI lens in mind.*

“Lenses that consider non-White perspective are going to be key over the next few years, especially as the population majority/minority switches.”

“Very little attention to diversity, even in connected curriculum. Every workspace includes diversity. We’re not giving the students these skills. Cultural awareness is important. See the NACE competencies.”

“What are students’ inputs? What do they need and aren’t getting? They want more emphasis on DEI. We need money to be spent on what students want and need.

**Theme 4: Graduate & professional education**

*Respondents noted that the documents do not recognize or emphasize graduate and professional education.*

“Grad and professional students are now a third of our students, they need to be incorporated into this APG document.”
“Consider the potential for undergraduate involvement in graduate research. Consider the impact to graduate TAs (who are enormously underpaid) when teaching loads are increased. Consider the important contributions of graduate students to the overall University experience in terms of supporting research and undergraduate learning experiences.”

Other

“In all these discussions, it would be good to think of creative ways to recognize and compensate non-tenure-track faculty for their work outside of typical course assignments.”

"The current budget model sends the implicit message that disciplines without lots of majors are not important."

“Sustainability should have been emphasized more by the UDT, and maybe it was, so I hope it is recognized as a non-negotiable reality that needs to be dealt with proactively, rather than reacting to the latest challenge.”
Q1 - What challenges do you foresee? How might those be addressed?

What challenges do you foresee? How might those be addressed?

PFA 4: Related to experiential learning specifically: Experiential learning is a high-impact practice; to do it well requires resources and sufficient staffing (harder to do well with larger class sizes, for example). ELCS needs to be meeting with faculty at the department level to provide training and resources to support high quality experiential learning and career readiness; assist departments in creating an appropriate strategy to do this across the curriculum. This will ensure implementation of high impact practices and career readiness strategies are high quality and that good systems and communications with employers are in place. Low faculty turnout at ELCS’s college to career workshops: need support from deans and chairs in reaching faculty widely Lack of affordable housing (on and off campus) makes summer experiential learning in Missoula a challenge for lower-income students. (Opportunity: Is there a way to expand need-based aid for housing for students taking summer courses and/or doing research/internships/other experiential learning?) Other challenges: High turnover in administration makes it hard to implement new things well Faculty need to be involved in PFA/UDT/ULC/SOR processes, but they are also generally off contract in the summer. How do we include faculty meaningfully while also getting work done year-round? To work well, 2+2 agreements need consistency (vulnerable if one key faculty member goes on sabbatical or if there’s turnover of a key administrator);

Certain departments have held the market on general education categories, those departments have populated the course schedule with a myriad of courses while other departments might include one course or no courses. Every department should have input.

No mention of how we increase market share of populations other than 18-24 year old traditional markets. Our student body looks different now that it did 10 years ago. We need to be attentive to this. We need a diversified lens. And, we need to look at scheduling in being attentive to the new student markets. Look at this from a student needs perspective. No mention of retention measures in department. Pent up demand in programs that we have been able to attend to. We should focus on programs that will have a longer shelf-life. How are schools addressing the growing need for data management/literacy skills? Could this be built into Gen Ed? Scarcity of financial resources. Collective trust in data on campus. Methodology clearly articulated in the document, but the trust in those data is still a struggle. What about some deep dives into APS with dept chairs? Students who leave after year 1 with student debt and no credential. Can we do something like credential as we go? Could every program have an AA degree? Can we partner with MC on this? Can we target/design for more than one audience? Fold in graduation fee for AA at admission so that the AA is automatically awarded. 16 weeks and Carnegie units also limit some our innovation. Don’t see how experiential learning is built into college plans. Could partner with Kaplan.
We have already seen a lot of the challenges about perceptions of winners and losers. Need to set and root ourselves in the direction the students are setting the direction. The students’ interests should determine the course of the university. We see perceived winners/losers of this process. And instead of incoming students driving the process, it seems as though “we are inserting ourselves” to this process. Instead of directing the budget model through student desires. Communicate for external constituencies. Need to create plans to speak with alumni and donors. UM Foundation will help with those. We cannot preserve the liberal arts at the cost of what the students want.

College plans have the least connection to PFA3 (on the surface), but the group shares great concerns about morale - especially as it relates to fear of change (loss) and identity. Change = speculation about what it means personally, what loss to anticipate Staff (and faculty) will want to know when and how they can be included in the planning process moving forward. How are and how will deans be communicating with faculty (especially over the summer) as well as staff? How can we ensure this is equitable within colleges and across the academic enterprise? We need to find a way to effectively communicate that we are not anticipating massive cuts. Many employees will read these documents as staffing plans. People will wonder where they fit in. A push for annual evaluations and revised role descriptions may pose bandwidth challenges in HRS when the role descriptions must be reviewed.

- Identifying leadership for grand challenges. UDT/grand challenges recommend a strong curricular component. How is it related to gened or GLI or communities of excellence? - Graduate education is not well represented in the APG documents. Majors include graduate degrees, but they (grad degrees) are totally different in effort put forth for training, outcomes. - The drive toward interdisciplinarity erases the aquisitional models of credentials claimed by independent programs. - We already have so much interdisciplinarity and experiential learning on campus, the APG document doesn’t address what weaknesses we should address?

- If we don’t build the experiential learning and internship into the actual major, we will not be able to serve students in a meaningful way. - TRIO offered a college to career success course that had a 15-hour experiential learning/mini-internship component – was built in as a lab. Students who were enrolled completed it and valued it. Our first-generation students especially valued the opportunity and want it in person. This becomes in many ways an equity imperative. Everyone persisted, and many would not have otherwise been able to do the internship. - The modality and times of the Gen Ed courses are not designed around student needs. We need to integrate universal design principles – to fit the lives of our students – modality and times need to be designed. For example, the 10:00-2:00 schedule significantly limits our students’ opportunities to take a variety of Gen Eds. This is a major barrier to giving students more choice. Courses need to be offered during a broader span of time. - If we aim to limit GE choice, we need to create much more intentional outcomes for the GE experience. - Need to make sure we don’t create a GE structure that results in an extra layer of complication, especially when we have students bringing in so many already-recognized credits.

Responses below are from the PFA4 team (Jeanne, Andrea, Brad, and Nathalie): Challenges related to experiential learning specifically: --Experiential learning is a high-impact practice;
to do it well requires resources and sufficient staffing (harder to do well with larger class sizes, for example). --ELCS needs to be meeting with faculty at the department level to provide training and resources to support high quality experiential learning and career readiness; assist departments in creating an appropriate strategy to do this across the curriculum. This will ensure implementation of high impact practices and career readiness strategies are high quality and that good systems and communications with employers are in place. --Low faculty turnout at ELCS’s college to career workshops: need support from deans and chairs in reaching faculty widely --Lack of affordable housing (on and off campus) makes summer experiential learning in Missoula a challenge for lower-income students. (Opportunity: Is there a way to expand need-based aid for housing for students taking summer courses and/or doing research/internships/other experiential learning?) Other challenges: --High turnover in administration makes it hard to implement new things well --Faculty need to be involved in PFA/UDT/ULC/SOR processes, but they are also generally off contract in the summer. How do we include faculty meaningfully while also getting work done year-round? --To work well, 2+2 agreements need consistency (vulnerable if one key faculty member goes on sabbatical or if there's turnover of a key administrator); The Teaching Excellence Initiative could help with Interdisciplinary teaching efforts, but professional development work on that topic should follow creation of a budget model that supports and incentivizes this work.

- One of the main challenges we spoke about when we met was who will lead these challenges/efforts/hold people accountable for following through? - If we want to have more interdisciplinary and experiential learning in the summer (research/internships/co-teaching, etc.), we need to find a good budget model for this and we need to find a way to compensate faculty for the amount of work that they put into working with a student overseeing an independent study, internship, or research. - Coming up with an agreeable funding model for promoting courses for lifelong learners in the future and overall pedagogy and discussion on that (i.e., allowing lifelong learners to attend the same classes that college age students are attending for a much cheaper rate is a point of contention).

Making decisions before the budget model is adopted; inability for our campus leadership to make decisions.

The APG's working document is very inspiring and articulates productive vision to help guide the Colleges through their planning exercises. Two challenges that come to mind are financial resources and collective trust in data to inform Colleges’ decision making. I think the working document does a good job at articulating the methodology to be used for instructional staffing decision making, but given the history of data struggles on campus, I think trust in the data could be a challenge to overcome. Taking a deep dive into the APS platform and reviewing relevant data (and ensuring that everyone understands how to access relevant data in the system) with each dean and academic leader (i.e., department chairs and program directors) in the Colleges would be productive. I think this would help to alleviate some of the inevitable frustration that will likely occur when the time comes to shift how resources are allocated across the academic enterprise.

Fiscal realities of GenEd: By “eliminating obstructive fiscal incentives which lead to an overabundance of GenEd courses,” UM is essentially asking faculty to play a role in the
planned obsolescence of some of their programs. For many units, the “obstructive” fiscal incentive is simply survival, and it is not clear how our committee can eliminate or change the incentive for faculty to keep their jobs. Additionally, our committee is unclear how to interpret the phrase “overabundance of GenEd courses.” Is “overabundance” meant to suggest fiscal inefficiencies, educational incongruences, both, or something else? It is also difficult for our committee to understand “overabundance” within the context of the APG document which advocate for breadth, depth, and flexibility in curriculum offerings, since breadth, depth, and flexibility suggest a large number of courses. Regardless of the interpretation, the existing fiscal incentives skew GenEd in terms of how courses are designed for students and how to develop curricula that is coherent and contributes to a shared experience of what is learned. The greatest challenges in GenEd will likely come from programs that don’t generate sufficient SCH through majors alone to afford their instructional faculty. This affects a large swath of programs across the Arts and Humanities as well many of the professional schools. Additionally, there are still more units who partially depend upon revenue generated through GenEd. If these obstructions were lifted, we might see two outcomes: (1) programs could offer courses that were better suited to the GenEd experience; (2) a smaller set of courses might be developed for a given set of perspectives that provide students with choice and flexibility, but that as a group is more coherent in terms of content and student experience. To achieve this, we have three possible considerations. Core vs. Distributed: It’s an open question as to how many GenEd courses constitute an “overabundance.” It depends upon a number of considerations including: What is an ideal class size for a GenEd course? What is the minimum size to pay for instructional cost? Many of our current GenEd courses are also required courses within a major. If there are sufficient majors taking a GenEd course to justify its existence, is there a compelling reason not to offer this course as a GenEd option, too, so long as it fits the learning outcomes? Perhaps what is more compelling than trying to determine how many is too many, we should consider the philosophy around the type of GenEd model we think is most compelling for our students. We have exhaustively examined models across the nation, considered core vs. distributed, and engaged in meaningful campus conversations about what the ideal approach would be for our campus. Student experience and GenEd: The GEAHC appreciates the bold and futuristic thinking articulated in the APG document. We agree that we must integrate more interdisciplinary, high-impact, and experiential teaching and learning practices into the curriculum. We need to help our students make explicit connections between classroom learning, research and innovation, the workplace, our alumni community, and society. Students are eager to make a difference in the world, and we can help them to do that in meaningful, ethical, and exciting ways. However, we want to note that these types of programs require a lot of administration, for either full time administrators, or faculty release time. The combination of breadth, diversity of offerings, depth, and high touch learning is also very unlikely to improve our student to faculty ratio. How can we ensure that, by expanding individualized experiential learning opportunities for students, we do not overtax the faculty and staff?

climate change: would love to see a university uniquely focused to deal with the great challenges our society will be facing. This is done by incorporating climate change and
sustainability literacy throughout all courses and by having solid leadership and a program dedicated to helping support these adaptive challenges.

Conflict avoidance and a general reluctance to lose anything may sabotage the process with stakeholders moving to save their turf, instead of looking to the future. I think you address it by embracing the conflict, exacerbating it, and keeping it at a low simmer until the planning process is complete.

How do we know this isn't just another academic exercise? Often staff and colleges are involved in projects and requests by administration only to see little actual change.

Grad student: historically interdisciplinary studies has been an option for students but departments haven't done it because too tough to put together individual plans for students. Lots of student desire but structurally tough. Departments have become more and more insular. Need to determine how better incentivize and make it easier for students and faculty. Grad student: interdisciplinary desires students have. ability to cross list classes is one way to help remove the barriers to interdisciplinary work. Grad and an undergraduate student: Curricular innovation -- our processes are labor intensive and slow -- stifles collaboration and innovation. Our Faculty Senate procedures are too cumbersome. Need a much more innovative space for faculty.

Grad student: In discussing the University's future plans with other graduate students, the continued broad focus on the liberal arts seems in tension with a possible move to have UM focus on its core strength programs and regional draw. For instance, focusing on its forestry and environmental programs as well as its professional schools seems like it would attract the out-of-state students needed to boost enrollment. Continuing with its previous "brand" as Montana's liberal arts institution seems like it may not be as likely capture either in-state or out-of-state attendees. The continued liberal arts focus also seems in tension with the dismantling of the Gen Ed core. While there are many who are attached to UM's previous identity, in fact this proposal may not go far enough to shed some of that and move forward into a sustainable future for UM. This is also clearly a "messaging" to soft-land the bad news about the budget. It might feel more honest to be upfront about the cuts in a direct and specific way earlier in the document. People I shared the document with felt burying the needed changes to the student-faculty ratio (which people read as coming faculty cuts) so late in the document appeared / felt disingenuous. Finally, I believe my colleagues addressed this, but the lack of any recognition or seeming attention to graduate and professional students, the roles of their programs, their teaching and research contributions, and how those are affected by faculty cuts (or how graduate students could be leveraged to mitigate some of these losses) is glaring. Graduate and professional students could be important allies and support for experiential learning, but they appear to be unconsidered in the document.

Pg 3 - there are "significant opportunities for experiential learning" at UM, it is neither encouraged nor required of all disciplines/majors; Pg 4 - no UM office holds administrative accountability or advising for "learning through research" - give it to ELCS and staffing to go with that program; Pg 5 - include Study Away & Study Abroad - UM created National Student Exchange in 1968, why are we not PROUD to be the pioneers of this national program?;
It seems as though instructional staffing will be stressed over the coming years. The working document states that the plan is to create more interdisciplinary classes, but I worry that many current tenured instructors do not have the capacity, knowledge, or will to create enriched courses that meet these demands. When tenured, the incentive to teach outside of a small number of courses is low. As an advisor, I know that there has been a small number of courses taught year after year and because of this, students feel we don’t offer many courses. Instead, we need to incentivize innovation in instruction and subject.

We need to be very aware that any document/statement that talks about change in our current context will produce anxiety and angst across all employee types. People are poised to wonder what the change will mean for their own roles. Need to acknowledge that this document is not an articulation of our employment/staffing intentions...however may influence decisions in the future. Because the document is relatively high level, which is totally appropriate, it leaves room for people to read into it what they want/fear. For many, there will be a propensity to overreact in the absence of concrete prescribed actions. Staff in particular will feel like they are going to be let go. Faculty staffing timeline is not clear. People do not understand when and how those decisions will be made. People don't fear change; they fear loss. For example, many the obstacles around Gen Ed reform are due to people considering what they will lose (SCH, budget).

When reviewing these documents with a PFA3 focused lens, I think we need to really focus on the human side of these proposed changes or challenges. This may be an exercise in planning for our academic future, but people also recognize that beyond degrees and metrics, this could potentially result in changes that people will not like (loss or reprioritizing of budgets/jobs). It almost feels like we need a separate plan for being proactive about how this affects our employees--both those that may be affected individually or as a unit, as well as overall morale/satisfaction/faith in UM. Internal communication especially.

see the gen ed ad hoc committee response

The challenges will be communicating academic planning through the full lens of the university--not just through one college or department. We need to ensure we have voices representing all of campus helping to share our message. Right now, only two departments are speaking out about the process.

The academic planning exercise that the Colleges are completing are illuminating a consistent theme of restricted resources for student support. I am very concerned that in an environment of such scarce resources, the first things let go of will be those services that assure student success -- tutoring, IT support and advising. How can we provide a balance in our budget planning that provides students with not only quality instruction, but also quality academic support?

Cross campus collaborations will be harmed with reduced staffing impacts in other colleges. We need to look for creative solutions. We have concerns about how the reductions in faculty will impact COB accreditation. We have ongoing discussions with AACSB. Our faculty qualifications are a concern, the lack of funding support for research and hiring qualified faculty were flagged in our last peer review visit. We are looking for ways to make changes in faculty and research support and researching how to apply 2020 standards to meet AACSB requirements with our current resources. We are sowing curricular flexibility which create
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bottlenecks for student matriculation in four years. We need to grow enrollment in undergraduate programs to be able to offer more sections. However, please keep in mind we already run twice the size of campus in our student to faculty ratios. With the reductions in tenure track faculty, we lose leadership and service in programs for mentoring students and renewing curriculum.

**Academic Future Section**

- We should anticipate resistance to acknowledging change and innovation as ways to “preserve and refresh” what we deliver – in some cases, the resistance will be born of fear; in other cases, it will be born of fatigue; in others it will be born of an unwillingness to embrace the idea that change does not equal a rejection of tradition. • It will be challenging to come to consensus on what we’re aiming toward when we say “interdisciplinary experiences.” The definition from the perspective of a student’s experience may be broad exposure to the way varied disciplines approach a challenge or particular topic, e.g., by working on interdisciplinary teams. Some faculty, on the other hand, may think we mean the dissolution of disciplines – not what I think we mean. Others may think we are suggesting the creation of new opportunities for highly-specialized faculty to work around a challenge or particular topic. • There’s a persistent claim that both our budget model and our systems obstruct the ability to work in interdisciplinary ways. Whether that’s true or not, we need to address this perception. • Thinking about how some will respond to the focus on career outcomes/readiness/preparedness part of the vision... We need to persistently and loudly reject the notion that focusing on career outcomes/preparedness somehow reflects an intention to become a trade school. First, those who say with derision that we’re aiming to become a trade school suggests an elitism that claims CTE is beneath us. It is are not. CTE and trade schools are different but not less valuable. We should resist engaging in a debate that makes us appear like we fear being “reduced” to CTE. Instead, we need to make clear that we provide something in addition to and equally as necessary as what trade schools provide. Second, reducing the discussion of “career readiness” to a discussion about trade schools or CTE is unsophisticated and an anemic way to talk about career readiness – it distracts us from the need to demonstrate more clearly the importance of a liberal arts education to career outcomes. • Revision of the Gen Ed curriculum will take a tremendous amount of will and patience for probably complicated orchestration. We will need to remind campus, over and over, that our task is to design for students, not for departmental benefit. This will mean removing the primary incentive to offer Gen Eds to gain SCH and dollars. • As Gen Eds change, how do we make sure that H&S and CAM are not unduly harmed in the transition? COB • The draft plan suggests any reductions will be managed through retirements and attrition. This does not appear strategic. CFC • Appears poised for growth but hamstrung by the need for investment.

**DAC feedback:**

Who was part of writing the document? Did it include under-represented, BIPOC included? Not DEI in the document. Deans should be asked this as well. Do they have a diversity working group? * Wider level doc. contradicts what college has stated re: faculty and staffing. Where did UM Academic Future come up with number vs. college numbers. * College doc: only 2 mentioned diversity in mission statement, only 3 total mentioned diversity anywhere. * Overall academic plan needs to include how it serves DEI on campus. Reference to how UM
will strategically invest in this area. * When UM looks at strategic reinvestment, important to
not just look at growing programs but investments in DEI in colleges and academic programs.
*On page 5, para 4. NACE approved career skills in life as diversity. No overlap with UM plan.
https://www.naceweb.org/career-readiness/competencies/career-readiness-defined/ * AOs
asking for assistance to incorporate DEI but this is not showing in documents. Reed needs to
show this commitment. * Acknowledgement that UM is committed to diversifying faculty.
Q2 - What opportunities do you foresee?

What opportunities do you foresee?

PFA 4: Related to experiential learning: ELCS is fully fledged and has a permanent, full-time director (staffing is still a challenge) Within the new budget model, make experiential learning classes worth double student credit hours (incentivize). Gen Ed - prime opportunity to build in career readiness and experiential learning Capsource: new platform for matching faculty with employers for project-based learning experiences
https://umt.capsource.io/educators/ New "high impact practices" definitions process and structure: creates uniformity across UM, more accurate data. Future of Work initiative led by Mike Braun (related challenge: there are so many different initiatives, silos) Micro-internships are more accessible to students and provide much needed career development experience (challenge is getting more Montana employers to use the system and post opportunities for our students) https://info.parkerdewey.com/umt Create marketing plan to re-connect with industry leaders/businesses and explain the new ways in which they can collaborate with UM to connect with student talent, think about a having summer "Summit" for employers in MT. Other opportunities: New articulation agreement with SKC Current work with tribal colleges to change tribal languages designation from "foreign languages" to "First Nations languages"

At some universities, there is one general education requirement, writing. The rest of the curriculum is left up to the departments with students having a choice of some elective credit. While insisting students have a broad base of general eds and giving them the choice between numerous courses seems ideal there may be too many departments using the general eds as their reason for existing. The advantage to requiring certain topics for students is that they are exposed to what is deemed essential to be a good citizen.

Enroll everyone in MC for their first two years. Pro-active messaging to students that promotes MC as a means to earn an AA and proceed into a 4-year degree. Financial literacy for students—can this be integrated into career-ready courses? Create homegrown EverFi module? Optimize need-based aid 4 career focused courses will be offered this fall in collaboration with Kaplan. These will be asynchronous, and can be white-labeled and offered to alumni. Could be done in place of 1st year seminar. Gen Ed reform could incorporate financial literacy. Cohort based general education. Start with Big Sky Experience and student interests. Transition to first year seminar that is substantive. Transition into 2nd and 3rd year programming with experiential and service learning. Culminate in capstone in 4th year.

Academic Planning document can help ground strategic enrollment planning. -help meet student needs. -from international engagement perspective, happy to see real world problems and experiential learning paths. would like more emphasis on internationalization at home in addition to study abroad. COVID has highlighted this need to expand internationalization at home. - interdisciplinary approaches this process will require us to invest more into, and how to create more valuable educational experiences. -Right sizing is critical to stop winnowing away at the academic enterprise. allow us to build and change the narrative. this is a good disruptive process. three musketeer moment. -very helpful that the
deans are all working together to make a comprehensive document. And helps to overcome conflict and misunderstandings. From a global initiatives office perspective, want to see more on internationalization opportunities, especially “at home”. Excited to see this being a comprehensive process with many people talking together. Sees “right sizing” as a critical process and opportunity. been really helpful that the deans are working together.

A really strong internal communication plan. Continuing to discuss and focus on the progress we are making on our institutional priorities (OOLD). Training to adjust to the upcoming changes...what % of your role description is dedicated to training? Training supervisors to promote their employees' engagement in professional development and training and how does that tie in with the SI Work Smart? Performance evaluations and role descriptions - this is the place where we can embed conversations about addressing institutional needs and employees' development and growth, too. New initiative - start from scratch with an annual evaluation template, require it, and track completion. Include goals, one of which is related to training and development. And prompt revisions of role descriptions. We need (and can and should) carefully outline and guide supervisors in having these conversations? We need metrics on who is completing these annual evaluations. We need to hold each other accountable.

PFA2 is ripe to change its membership, supporting UM summer, the teaching excellence initiative. Getting supports in place to support evidence-based practices, active learning, inclusive teaching, addressing racism bias in the classroom. But many proposals are curricular, the content, not the means of delivering. This is a faculty purview, so the membership of PFA2 could morph to a faculty centered membership. However, the faculty senate doesn't want PFA2 dictating curricular content to the faculty. But the PFA2 could set incentives, push for support for the process of increasing interdisciplinarity. --How are we incorporating Alumni into opportunities for professional development? The APG could frame a bit of how we can connect with alumni to improve outward facing views of UM. Developing more K-12 academic camps/institutes in the summer that helps showcase each Colleges’ offerings and helps develop a pipeline for recruitment. We need to stay in touch with everyone that steps foot on campus in the summer that is in 6th-12th grade and need to make sure we have their names in a centralized data base. For example, “you came to campus last summer for our AIMS STEM camp” what do you think about coming next summer for our Spectrum CSI “Crack the Case” camp? This is when it runs and this is how much it is... etc.” -In regard to experiential learning, we have SUCH amazing programs that are both at UM and affiliated with UM. We should do some type of campaign around this (our specific curriculum that promotes these opportunities) including our partners in the field (Aerie Backcountry Medicine, Flathead Bio Station, Wilderness Institute, Wild Rockies Field Institute, etc.) The experiential learning opportunities that we already have need to be all in one spot to see what we have first and

- Gen Eds can and should showcase our best teachers! - The Gen Eds are an opportunity to reflect our UM values and to give students something uniquely UM. - It is not clear what our current Gen Eds add up to – how does it build and how are the courses related? What’s the relationship among the courses? When faculty propose courses, it’s not clear that they are doing so with thought about how those courses fit into a larger whole. We have an
opportunity to change this. • Revamping the Gen Eds gives us an opportunity to create a common experience in the first year – one that connects students to each other and to their academic departments. This would help with retention and building a sense of belonging as a Griz. • It is irresponsible that we don’t have digital literacy build into the Gen Ed curriculum. This is a chance for us to integrate this as a core competency. • We have an opportunity to make Gen Eds signal competency. We could offer incremental badging and credentialing along the way, signaling the skills students develop (public speaking, writing, etc.). Students could display their badge/credential on linked in profile, in co-curricular transcript, etc. This would help not only with signaling but also in ensuring students who stop out can demonstrate what they’ve accomplished.

Related to experiential learning:
-- ELCS is fully fledged and has a permanent, full-time director (staffing is still a challenge) --Within the new budget model, make experiential learning classes worth double student credit hours (incentivize). --Gen Ed - prime opportunity to build in career readiness and experiential learning --Capsource: new platform for matching faculty with employers for project-based learning experiences https://umt.capsource.io/educators/ --New "high impact practices" definitions process and structure: creates uniformity across UM, more accurate data. --Future of Work initiative led by Mike Braun (related challenge: there are so many different initiatives, siloes) --Micro-internships are more accessible to students and provide much needed career development experience (challenge is getting more Montana employers to use the system and post opportunities for our students) https://info.parkerdewey.com/umt --Create marketing plan to re-connect with industry leaders/businesses and explain the new ways in which they can collaborate with UM to connect with student talent, think about a having summer "Summit" for employers in MT. Other opportunities: --New articulation agreement with SKC --Current work with tribal colleges to change tribal languages designation from "foreign languages" to "First Nations languages"

For the UDT suggestion on Grand Challenges, it might be beneficial to focus on a reasonably small number of grand challenges that everyone on campus could line up behind. Topics like combatting racism or addressing climate change would allow for natural interdisciplinary collaborations and build on our existing strengths. OOLD is already working on intensive teaching supports in both of these areas that could support such foci. The Faculty Development Office used to run research networking sessions, which we could revive around the grand challenge topics. There are many opportunities as we expand the learner markets we are reaching out to, and types of degrees/credentials/educational offerings that we can provide. Ways in which lifelong learners/alumni/community members are taking advantage of UM classes can be grown through a range of modalities and credentials. If team teaching is going to be part of the Grand Challenges, we can learn from the GLI what works to incentivize that. The GLI had more team taught first-year seminars in its early years, but has very few now. OOLD could offer professional development on specific teaching techniques that might be helpful for addressing grand challenges.

• More alumni networking events specifically with UM students in their career fields or perhaps a single platform to connect alumni with interested UM students wanting to connect with mentors/leaders in their degree fields. • “Lunch and learn” sessions with each of the
Colleges about what they are doing to move the needle in all of these efforts. • Developing more K-12 academic camps/institutes in the summer that helps showcase each Colleges’ offerings and helps develop a pipeline for recruitment. We need to stay in touch with everyone that steps foot on campus in the summer that is in 6th-12th grade and need to make sure we have their names in a centralized data base. For example, “you came to campus last summer for our AIMS STEM camp” what do you think about coming next summer for our Spectrum CSI “Crack the Case” camp? This is when it runs and this is how much it is... etc.” • In regard to experiential learning, we have SUCH amazing programs that are both at UM and affiliated with UM. We should do some type of campaign around this (our specific curriculum that promotes these opportunities) including our partners in the field (Aerie Backcountry Medicine, Flathead Bio Station, Wilderness Institute, Wild Rockies Field Institute, etc.) The experiential learning opportunities that we already have need to be all in one spot to see what we have first and then build from there. • With Summer Start – I think this summer is an opportunity to see if adding transfers to our cohort makes a difference and better tracking to hopefully account for more students. • With Summer Exploration and pushing Summer Institutes across UM – I think UM Summer should collaborate with OOLD (and maybe CES and/or Marketing?) to develop a workshop/training at the end of the summer to talk about how the program went – what went well? What challenges happened? Steps if someone else wants to host a program for 2022. And open this up to anyone who knows they want to host a program in 2022 and/or anyone who has ever thought about doing one – just to get ideas, suggestions, support, etc. • With summer in general – I think that doing a survey at some point to see how people (students and instructors) feel about the seven sessions and an opportunity to perhaps change the schedule (fewer sessions? Different lengths?) moving forward. And the dashboard is a GREAT opportunity to track more and stay updated.

Ability to make a decision that doesn't prevent growing programs to continue to use resources to fund other parts of campus

The opportunities for stackable credentials are compelling, but will require buy-in from faculty to ensure these sorts of credentials make their way through the curriculum review process and "see the light of day" beyond experimental offerings. I see the potential opportunities for students to earn credentials at the end of each year of their four-year experience being very appealing to prospective students and families, and this would help to address the situation of many students leaving the institution prior to degree completion with debt and nothing to show for it. It’s a different way of thinking about designing the curriculum that will require everyone to be open to new ideas and approaches. This also includes possible Gen Ed reform. I have served on relevant Faculty Senate subcommittees that have been charged with exploring Gen Ed reform and we have been through three visioning exercises for this over the past 5 or 6 years that frankly went nowhere. Meaningful Gen Ed reform will require resources and a thoughtful and fair approach to how SCH are factored into the resource allocation model. It's easy to "think big" when it comes to Gen Ed reform, but operationalizing the vision is a different story that we haven’t been able to achieve through previous attempts, largely due to resource limitations. I love the idea of a cohort-based Gen Ed framework, where students would be assigned to cohorts starting with the Big Sky Experience. These cohorts could stay intact through mandatory first-year
seminars, sophomore and junior experiential learning opportunities (ideally with a service component), and culminating in capstone experience tied to the major. Experiential learning opportunities that are meaningfully woven into the curriculum present another exciting opportunity. The sky is the limit on this when I think of potential partnerships with community organizations and engaging opportunities for students to supplement their time in the classroom.

Consideration 1: The GenEd program should have a budget. We have long had a distributed GenEd model that favors competition among departments for SCH. A GenEd budget would allow UM to incentivize the creation of innovative and interdisciplinary courses, build meaningful experiential opportunities, and to provide funding to critical programs in CHS that shoulder a majority of the GenEd courses. We also recognize that this approach would require a dedicated staff member to operate as the Director of GenEd. Consideration 2: Invest in quality GenEd courses. We should consider how to best incentivize GenEd by re-thinking how we weight GenEd SCHs in the current budget model. Weighting at 3:1 or 4:1 could ultimately lead to incentives and resources to offer high-quality courses that provide the most meaningful GenEd experience for our students. Of course, this would take a re-definition about what constitutes a GenEd course and also requires faculty to participate in a rigorous process of ensuring their course meets the GenEd perspective. We would also argue that this approach will require additional institutional support for a dedicated staff member to operate as the Director of GenEd. Consideration 3: Potentially create a college of GenEd. GenEd is unlikely to change while governed by volunteer faculty with no budget and no real authority. This approach would allow for an “executive leader” (e.g., a Dean) with the responsibility and accountability for GenEd and the budget to make it work. The current budget model sends the implicit message that disciplines without lots of majors are not important. A college model would give faculty in critical GenEd disciplines a sense of community, purpose, and importance. Consideration 4: Allow the GEAHC to continue to deliberate on what is the best model. We are uniquely positioned to consider how to best unify campus around GenEd and will work tirelessly to that end. Our guiding principles will emerge this month and we are excited to share them with APG and the campus community to gather feedback. Consideration 5: We will most likely be somewhere in the middle of core vs. distributed. The GEAHC is currently considering core, distributed, and hybrid models in the re-imagining of GenEd. However, we believe we may settle on a hybrid approach because we believe the time is ripe to shift away from general education as a checklist (as it is sometimes seen by students) toward a more engaging and immersive experience with impactful outcomes for student personal and professional growth. Consideration 6: The new GenEd model needs to be more student-centered and experience based, rather than driven by the interests of individual departments and programs. This will disrupt the status quo in ways that may negatively impact some departments and programs, yet we must remain agile and committed to serving the evolving needs of our students in the best way possible. Consideration 7: We need to invest financial and human resources in GenEd to make the program experientially based. We can overcome some of this challenge through innovation, such as partnering with local and state businesses, offering team-based capstone experiences, and embedding peer-to-peer mentorship and leadership into the curriculum. However, resources will be required to make this a reality.
The challenge is the opportunity. This draft does a great job of identifying the challenges being faced by UM and then molding them to be advantages (size, agility) to meet shifting demands.

We have the opportunity to allow our present and future students to participate in shaping UM. To tell a story as we embrace this process and to invite our customers to be a part of shaping the product they want.

I'd feel that this is being done backwards where the administrators are creating a vision and expecting everyone to just see that vision. I see a lot of opportunity for employees, alumni, and the community to be involved.

Grad and undergrad students: create space and incentives for curricular innovation (safety net) Reimagine the first-year experience: note that graduate students have lots of contact with our first-year students - quality of our graduate students matters (which will require increase in grad student stipends, i.e., reduce the financial burden on graduate students) Joint hires across departments. We should be doing this to help make boundaries more permeable -- for both students and faculty. We could do a much better job getting our advisors/coaches/faculty to talk about career relevance with our students -- can happen outside the classroom. Especially important for faculty to be talking about career and applied options with students. Need to better integrate our advisors into the career preparedness talks and work -- recruit them as ambassadors and potential career coaches beyond advising in how navigate courses.

Grad student: People I spoke with were strongly in favor of addressing the problems with the Gen Ed core. In particular, transfer and non-traditional students would like to see far fewer barriers to transferring in and getting credit for previous knowledge and education. The new plan and its focus on experiential learning appears to be aligned with the potential to advertise to these students and to assist them in expedited paths to degree completion. The focus on experiential learning is positive and seems practical. It should also consider how already-existing models, particularly in graduate and professional education, reflect this focus. For instance, the Law School has one of the longest-standing clinic models in the country and differs from other law schools in its focus on practical skills. This "experiential ethic" could more broadly acknowledge models and examples to be continued and strengthened, as well as proposing changes.

Pg 6, We do not have an alumni-student channel for connection - this is an opportunity.

I think an interdisciplinary approach for courses and majors is a really strong opportunity to create leaders who can actually address problems from the source because they can see more perspectives and lenses. It seems that some programs (like Counseling) should receive an increase in funding so they can admit more students into their program. Any program that turns away 60% + of their applicants should likely be able to hire to increase revenue for the University. Increases for some seem unfair, but if it benefits the entire University, then I support them.
To every extent possible, if there eventually need to be reductions in one program and increases in another, seek to identify current faculty who can fill the need -- look internally first. Joint appointments!

This could be an opportunity for us to demonstrate our Permission to Play values as well as our "Mission First, People Always" ethic--if we handle this with compassion and care for our employees, not as an afterthought but as a part of the entire process. If we demonstrate empathy, listening, and transparent communication, we show our employees we care about them as people.

- In the big picture, this process has the potential to set UM on a course for success over the next generation. • The opportunity to create a gen ed program that is (by far) the best in the state, and create a long-term competitive advantage for UM. o It will help with recruiting and retention o It will improve student skills and job preparedness o It will help our students be better citizens in our complex, modern world of General education revision is a very difficult task. That makes it very hard to copy or replicate. If we create a truly superior gen ed experience, MSU won’t be able to copy it any time soon.

I see opportunities to increase awareness of our offerings among both perspective students and policymakers. We have perception issues related to our academic offerings, and this process allows us to better highlight our corners of campus that are growing and achieving high-end academic output.

I think there may be opportunities for restructuring the departments/colleges etc. to reduce the extreme differences in the size and complexity of H&S vs the other colleges. While that would require a shift of resources to provide leadership for more than one entity, it would also balance the portfolios for the deans somewhat and possibly make it easier for us to hire and retain leadership.

The MBA can grow, but we need more resources to increase the MBA beyond its current capacity. We need resources to create innovative online or interdisciplinary programs that can attract students. We need a method on campus for investing in promising programs such as an online bachelor’s in business administration, and post COVID opportunities for online. Post COVID we have new 2+2 opportunities with partners abroad, that brings the international students on campus for a shorter time period, because foreign institutions are now less resistant to online education.

Academic Future Section • We have all the ingredients to develop a 21st century liberal arts curriculum, one that both honors traditional knowledge domains and foundational abilities and teaches those through a rigorously applied lens. If fully committed and if our faculty believe in the project, we are capable of truly integrating a 21st century liberal arts curriculum with experiential learning and career preparedness. • The GLI is a proven model for interdisciplinary, applied educational experience: students work with others from across disciplines around a particular topic to address a challenge. Are there components we could scale for all students, and could this be part of the Gen Ed curriculum? We have an opportunity to significantly overhaul our Gen Ed curriculum to be both distinct and impactful, to make it a hallmark UM program that attracts students. • The Communities of Excellence serve as a potential organizing principle around which we could create interdisciplinary conversations. • The document’s call for experiential learning pathways in all programs has a
running start in ElevateU. But to be successful and to truly sit at the heart of a UM experience, we need to scale up department/faculty involvement in ElevateU so that it is integrated into the academic curriculum rather than offered as adjacent. • Joint appointments – how can we better orchestrate across departments and colleges (e.g., in COE, DPAP, etc.) to promote the hiring of joint appointment faculty? CAM • The integration of communication studies with program across CAM seems very promising. • eSports – seems we could go big here – one of the potential future Strategic Initiatives proposed by the UDT demonstrates great potential of eSports as an experiential learning opportunity. • The design-based certificates being developed – digital design, Adobe, graphic design, etc. – seem ripe as career-relevant learning that students across colleges should access. • Science communication – really exciting. How can we integrate the Media Lab, Communication Studies, Journalism? COB • Moving computer science for new synergies seems promising, but how do we ensure computer science retains its strength in supporting research in the sciences? Seems like a good opportunity to better connect COB to other H&S programs. CFC • The graphic provided in the document is a useful model for how colleges across campus might demonstrate the application of varied disciplines to a central set of “Global Challenges.” This might also provide a potential model for interdisciplinary curricular pathways that draw from varied disciplines to address global challenges. • The teaching-focused TT positions and the professor of practice positions provide a model other colleges should consider. I wonder, too, how broader use of the professor of practice role could help to advance our commitment to career outcomes/experiential learning, e.g., how could programs in H&S, especially the humanities, integrate professor of practice roles? DHC • The DHC curricular path provides examples of the interdisciplinary and experiential learning the academic future section of the working document promotes. COH • The interprofessional education model provides yet another example of how we might enact interdisciplinary experiences for students around a central topic/challenge/task. MC • As we look at “student migration patterns,” how can we better integrate foundational courses and disciplines across the MC and Mountain Campuses, e.g., math, writing, communications, etc.? 

DAC Feedback:
DEI lens can and should be used in reviewing Gen Eds, curriculum, investments. * Doesn’t read like opportunistic document. * Would be clearer if diversity was included more explicitly, opportunity is to make commitment to DEI clear in academics * Page 3, need explanation of cultural diversity. * Internships/career preparedness = can and should be described as an equity imperative
Q3 - What questions should we anticipate?

What questions should we anticipate?

N/A

Why now on top of everything else.

What are our real values? What are we trying to do? I think everyone is pretty hungry for specific information on the academic staffing plans. What programs will be impacted, how many positions will be eliminated, how will we be able to maintain instruction across the board to ensure students can complete graduation requirements (both Gen Ed and major-specific) in a timely manner while still having access to various electives across the disciplines? Budget allocation model and scramble for SCH—how do we attend to this and not be so reactionary? Will I have a job? What does this mean for my work? Resources available?

-in each area, "How does this affect me? How do I take action on it?" Be ready to address proactively. -public reception on the colleges explanations that the accreditation is at risk in many of the colleges. This could threaten the reputation of the university and colleges. o The foundation sees opportunities to help with alumni outreach, especially with changes that may bother some alumni o Everyone should anticipate “how does this affect me”?

-the role of online learning in PFA2, should it be represented more fully in the APG documents? What is our balance of f2f and online? We are striving in enrollment to raise both areas, f2f will continue to be bread and butter, UMOnline is, however, a significant way to raise new learners and traditional programs. How is the portfolio balanced in the future? (connections with Wiley, how large do we want to grow them, and other programs not connected to Wiley). -what about certificates, badges, etc., are they well represented in the APG document?

- How will the college plans and potential structural changes interplay with our decentralized advising model? • How will we ensure not student is harmed in the transition to a new GE model?

What are the expectations for growth in Wiley online programs in the coming years? What is the appropriate balance of traditional face-to-face classes and programs with fully online programs? Do we expect approximately equal growth in both of these areas? What are ways in which we connect the New Learner Initiative with efforts in the Academic areas? with UMOnline support/resources?

- The Winter and Summer terms are great places to see much of the “Connected Curriculum” p. 4, taking place especially for experiential learning opportunities (internships, research, study abroad, etc.). What are the Deans and Associate Deans and Chair’s plans to strategically place these opportunities in these two terms? The placement of curriculum is almost as important as the curriculum itself. • Who is responsible and is there a timeline? AND how to prioritize what gets started first?

I think everyone is pretty hungry for specific information on the academic staffing plans. What programs will be impacted, how many positions will be eliminated, how will we be able
to maintain instruction across the board to ensure students can complete graduation requirements (both Gen Ed and major-specific) in a timely manner while still having access to various electives across the disciplines?

How can we convince students to attend a college that has aging infrastructure compared to what is available at MSU Bozeman?

Questions that expose the fear of loss that is rampant across campus.

In a resource constrained environment, how are we going to support these things, many of which appear addictive?

How can we do this new and important work without adequate staffing? We are losing staff right and left. The workload is too much, respect too little, pay embarrassing, and opportunity for campus advancement nil. There is no reward for loyalty or institutional knowledge. Could we open jobs as "on-campus" first to give our own staff an opportunity? Staff can’t compete when someone from God knows where moves here with more experience because they had greater opportunity in a bigger city. 6 colleagues (high achievers) quit UM the last 2 months - ask why, then do something about it.

Questions about transparency. I think if you're going to increase budgets for some departments, explain why (Like increased revenue for the U). I also think departments will be unsure about teaching when the student-faculty ratio is adjusted to the primary majors in the departments, how will general education students fit into this? Larger class sizes aren't the best option either. Students have expressed often that they enjoy smaller classes.

What is the intention of the APG document -- need to clarify the purpose it aims to fulfill. Who is the audience and what is the purpose? How is it intended to be used? Clarifying this upfront will be helpful.

In looking at this from a PFA3 lens, I think the elephant in the room is--people are going to want to know what they are going to lose. The budget constraints and issues are not really directly referenced through these plans. It seems that we are dancing around one of the fundamental pieces. Do these plans mean people might lose their jobs and/or if their friends and colleagues might lose their jobs? Since we just finished our adaptive leadership program, I have that on my mind and this below quote really sticks out to me. People are afraid of the losses that may accompany these plans, and they are going to want to know why it's happening and if there's any way they can avoid it. "You know the adage 'People resist change.' It is not really true. People are not stupid. People love change when they know it is a good thing. No one gives back a winning lottery ticket. What people resist is not change per se, but loss." (The Practice of Adaptive Leadership, Heifeitz et al). I think we need to keep this in mind as it relates to employee morale/satisfaction and how we communicate about this process and any changes that result.

What does this look like when it is operationalized? Are you going to cut programs? Cut faculty but keep all the programs? What does “flexibility” of programs mean in this context? What do “breadth” and “diversity of offerings” mean in this context? Tons of questions about the details, fairness, and implementation of the budget model

Grad student: What does the new student-faculty ratio mean in terms of facilitating faculty and graduate research?
Whenever there is a job loss in a community of this size, it is significant. We need to be better prepared to communicate about any reductions that will force folks to lose their job. At the same time, we need to communicate about the growth and additional jobs that will be created as a result of the allocation process.

How do we provide voice to concerns about student support programs within the larger conversation about academic quality? I believe students succeed because of excellent teaching in partnership with excellent support. How do we assure both?

Academic Future Section • It’s unclear what we mean when we say “interdisciplinary education.” We need to clearly define this. (See above under “what challenges do you foresee?”) • How will we fund the Gen Ed curriculum and protect it from being used as a tool to gain resources, i.e., how will we remove the incentives that cause departments to see Gen Eds primarily as a tool to bring benefit to the department rather than primarily as a tool to design courses that are part of a greater, coherent whole? • To retain the “big yet small” feel, what size do we need to maintain? • We should anticipate some who argue change is only warranted when we can prove there is a problem. These people may ask: What’s wrong with what we’re already doing? Why do we need to revamp curricula?

DAC Feedback: Desire for Reed to be more present in discussions with deans and campus about diversity. * PFAs show that we need to explicitly say DEI is included. * Diversity needs to be clear, articulated ways in document, as well as actionable ways. If this is accomplished, and create more diverse campus, there are many opportunities. This will get us closer to fulfilling the promise of what UM is. * What’s the follow through? This needs to be explicitly written out.

Q4 - What else do we have to keep in mind to get this right?

What else do we have to keep in mind to get this right?

UM Foundation (Williams, Ritrievi): With respect to college structure: Donors and alums rarely know or care about college structures, so there are few risks associated with departmental moves that do not eliminate programs. Restructuring will require a reassessment of development strategy going forward, however. UMF is engaged in an analysis to identify potential donors rated for major gift capacity. Once that is complete, it will show where there are greatest needs for development resources across H&S, which, in turn, will allow for strategic allocation of development officers within any new structures. With respect to faculty and program reductions: Eliminating programs/departments will create enemies among alumni. That’s not a reason not to take actions that are right for the University, but it makes outreach to those groups and individuals critical. The Foundation will work with campus leadership to plan for outreach to alums of programs slated for reductions.

Grad School/Grad Council (Kinch, Rinfret, Nelson, Voronina): The plan does not recognize or emphasize graduate and professional education, which now account for approximately 25% of our enrollment and represent some of the strongest programs on campus. Suggestions for
modifications to better take graduate education into account include: 1) Make a commitment to graduate and professional education explicit in the plan; 2) In the data, separate graduate enrollment from undergrad enrollment to allow for more accurate consideration of impact of restructuring plans on grad programs; 3) Determine a consistent methodology for counting graduate teaching assistants in instructional FTE.

To: Academic Planning Group
From: General Education Ad Hoc Committee
RE: Response to working document for APG
Date: April 13, 2021

Thank you for the opportunity to engage in conversation about the APG working document. We recognize that the APG is quite busy and as such, we want to offer our written feedback. There are several components of the working draft that signal/nod towards GenEd and we appreciate it. We want to explicitly identify the sections that resonate with the GEAHC and provide recommendations. The overarching consideration for APG is that for GenEd to be successful UM needs to develop a model that provides financial resources to focus on student experiences. We welcome further dialog integrating GenEd into the proposed budget and academic planning approaches.

Fiscal realities of GenEd: By “eliminating obstructive fiscal incentives which lead to an overabundance of GenEd courses,” UM is essentially asking faculty to play a role in the planned obsolescence of some of their programs. For many units, the “obstructive” fiscal incentive is simply survival, and it is not clear how our committee can eliminate or change the incentive for faculty to keep their jobs. Additionally, our committee is unclear how to interpret the phrase “overabundance of GenEd courses.” Is “overabundance” meant to suggest fiscal inefficiencies, educational incongruences, both, or something else? It is also difficult for our committee to understand “overabundance” within the context of the APG document which advocate for breadth, depth, and flexibility in curriculum offerings, since breadth, depth, and flexibility suggest a large number of courses. Regardless of the interpretation, the existing fiscal incentives skew GenEd in terms of how courses are designed for students and how to develop curricula that is coherent and contributes to a shared experience of what is learned. The greatest challenges in GenEd will likely come from programs that don’t generate sufficient SCH through majors alone to afford their instructional faculty. This affects a large swath of programs across the Arts and Humanities as well many of the professional schools. Additionally, there are still more units who partially depend upon revenue generated through GenEd. If these obstructions were lifted, we might see two outcomes: (1) programs could offer courses that were better suited to the GenEd experience; (2) a smaller set of courses might be developed for a given set of perspectives that provide students with choice and flexibility, but that as a group is more coherent in terms of content and student experience. To achieve this, we have three possible considerations. Consideration 1: The GenEd program should have a budget. We have long had a distributed GenEd model that favors competition among departments for SCH. A GenEd budget would allow UM to incentivize the creation of innovative and interdisciplinary courses, build meaningful experiential opportunities, and to provide funding to critical programs in CHS that shoulder a majority of the GenEd courses. We also recognize that this approach would require a dedicated staff member to operate as the Director of GenEd. Consideration 2: Invest in quality GenEd courses. We should consider how to best incentivize GenEd by re-thinking how we weight GenEd SCHs in the current budget model. Weighting at 3:1 or 4:1 could ultimately lead to incentives and resources to offer high-quality courses that
provide the most meaningful GenEd experience for our students. Of course, this would take a re-definition about what constitutes a GenEd course and also requires faculty to participate in a rigorous process of ensuring their course meets the GenEd perspective. We would also argue that this approach will require additional institutional support for a dedicated staff member to operate as the Director of GenEd. Consideration 3: Potentially create a college of GenEd. GenEd is unlikely to change while governed by volunteer faculty with no budget and no real authority. This approach would allow for an “executive leader” (e.g., a Dean) with the responsibility and accountability for GenEd and the budget to make it work. The current budget model sends the implicit message that disciplines without lots of majors are not important. A college model would give faculty in critical GenEd disciplines a sense of community, purpose, and importance. Core vs. Distributed: It’s an open question as to how many GenEd courses constitute an “overabundance.” It depends upon a number of considerations including: What is an ideal class size for a GenEd course? What is the minimum size to pay for instructional cost? Many of our current GenEd courses are also required courses within a major. If there are sufficient majors taking a GenEd course to justify its existence, is there a compelling reason not to offer this course as a GenEd option, too, so long as it fits the learning outcomes? Perhaps what is more compelling than trying to determine how many is too many, we should consider the philosophy around the type of GenEd model we think is most compelling for our students. We have exhaustively examined models across the nation, considered core vs. distributed, and engaged in meaningful campus conversations about what the ideal approach would be for our campus. Consideration 1: Allow the GEAHC to continue to deliberate on what is the best model. We are uniquely positioned to consider how to best unify campus around GenEd and will work tirelessly to that end. Our guiding principles will emerge this month and we are excited to share them with APG and the campus community to gather feedback. Consideration 2: We will most likely be somewhere in the middle of core vs. distributed. The GEAHC is currently considering core, distributed, and hybrid models in the re-imagining of GenEd. However, we believe we may settle on a hybrid approach because we believe the time is ripe to shift away from general education as a checklist (as it is sometimes seen by students) toward a more engaging and immersive experience with impactful outcomes for student personal and professional growth. Student experience and GenEd: The GEAHC appreciates the bold and futuristic thinking articulated in the APG document. We agree that we must integrate more interdisciplinary, high-impact, and experiential teaching and learning practices into the curriculum. We need to help our students make explicit connections between classroom learning, research and innovation, the workplace, our alumni community, and society. Students are eager to make a difference in the world, and we can help them to do that in meaningful, ethical, and exciting ways. However, we want to note that these types of programs require a lot of administration, for either full time administrators, or faculty release time. The combination of breadth, diversity of offerings, depth, and high touch learning is also very unlikely to improve our student to faculty ratio. How can we ensure that, by expanding individualized experiential learning opportunities for students, we do not overtax the faculty and staff? Consideration 1: The new GenEd model needs to be more student-centered and experience based, rather than driven by the interests of individual departments and programs. This will disrupt the status quo in ways that may negatively impact some
departments and programs, yet we must remain agile and committed to serving the evolving needs of our students in the best way possible. Consideration 2: We need to invest financial and human resources in GenEd to make the program experientially based. We can overcome some of this challenge through innovation, such as partnering with local and state businesses, offering team-based capstone experiences, and embedding peer-to-peer mentorship and leadership into the curriculum. However, resources will be required to make this a reality.

Not all students want to be involved in math and science, that is their choice. The creation of better jobs for all students should be society’s goal. Certificates don’t get people high-paying jobs in tech, tech companies are disappointed by the students’ lack of knowledge in the subject area. To really make money in tech means math and science. Exposing students to a broad base of "liberal education" is meant to create better citizens. It is society's role to create meaningful work for all people. If a student is a sociology major they want to make a difference with people not churn out widgets for sale. The bottom line isn't always about money. Exposing students to a better way of living in their community should remain our goal.

How do we show people we really mean it this time? How is this different than 2018? We have a lot of engaged smart people on this—more so than in past efforts. Don't be afraid of complexity.

- The process for creating the plans form college pitch to trying to get something high level. this may not be ready for an external audience. - the AP reads very negatively. Can we make sure we highlight the re-deployment of resources that are important and have value? Needed external pressure to improve that shows responsible stewardship. -we still have remarkable success during a hard decade. -we are a comprehensive university not just a liberal arts college. too much focus on liberal arts leads to a negative narrative. -interdisciplinary does not drive enrollment. it is worthwhile, but it does not bring students in the door. o There are multiple thoughts, that this reads ‘very negative’. Are there ways in which the consolidation of resources has actually helped us improve? How do we tell that story? But, how has this opportunity to streamline improved us? This is seen as an opportunity not only to tell our story positively, but to soften some of the negative language present throughout all of the college plans.

PFA3 foci: Annual evaluations (push as soon as June) Bring in support/consultants to help with the operational challenges

-the APG document doesn’t include any reference to research, how does this fit in? Grad and professional students are now a third of our students, they need to be incorporated into this APG document. In the summer grad students make up ½ of our enrollment. -This campus hasn’t embraced the graduate program, even at the UDT level. We are a graduate research -summer: experiential learning: where will the experiential learning take place? Summer and winter session (when, as where), so much of the experiential learning takes place then. So the APG document should consider how we are delivering these opportunities. Also, how are we compensating faculty for shepherding these experiential learning opportunities. -the UDT and APG documents make it seem like we want to do it all. We will do everything. At
some point we need to think of it as choices, not just as an increase in everyone’s workloads (in terms of more interdisciplinarity and experiential learning opportunities for students)

- Students see the current Gen Eds as a check list, as just a set of requirements to fulfill. “Just tell me what to do/take.” It’s vitally important that we help provide students with a purpose – the why – behind the Gen Ed curriculum. We owe our students our effort to connect gen eds to “real world,” to translate for our students the connections between the Gen Eds and their lives after college. Students desperately want to apply their learning to the current environment. Students see our gen eds as drab. They’d like to see more contemporary offerings related to the 21st Century they will be living and working in. • It is unreasonable to expect faculty to be well versed in Gen Eds, especially when they are so complicated and moving.

In all these discussions, it would be good to think of creative ways to recognize and compensate non-tenure-track faculty for their work outside of typical course assignments. The Alumni Association could become a more active partner in the work of departments around connecting with alumni, offering internships, and sharing real-world applications of coursework. Create avenues for faculty to make use of the resources of the Alumni Association.

- It would be great to see a stronger connection and interdisciplinary approach amongst all of the PFA’s. For instance, for PFA #5 “Proudly Telling the UM Story”, it seems that University Relations and UM Communications is largely is front facing on telling UM’s story. They are doing a phenomenal job as of lately, but I’m curious what the connection/process is between PFA #2 of “Driving Excellence and Innovation in Teaching, Learning, & Research” and PFA #5 is? For further clarification, who is responsible for telling the folks in PFA #5 (and supporting units) what is the best content in Academic Affairs/Innovation in Learning/Teaching/Research to “proudly tell”? I cannot speak to the communication process, and maybe they already have a process, but if they do it would be helpful to widely share that with campus. Right now, it almost seems like an ad-hoc basis of what stories they can grab or share or are told to share.

Thank you all for the hard work on this document. We appreciate the vision and look forward to finding paths to advance these ideas. Submitted by Libby Metcalf on behalf of the GenEd Ad Hoc Committee

This draft is pretty solid. I like the example university you have used as a model for success. My focus on sustainability is important. This should have been emphasized more by the UDT, and maybe it was, so I hope it is recognized as a non-negotiable reality that needs to be dealt with proactively, rather than reacting to the latest challenge.

Stakeholder involvement throughout the process. To what level are students, staff, faculty, alumni, and the community involved? Can we broaden that? We should build in public and let our entire community give feedback during the process. Have key faculty tweet progress reports, open a submittable suggestion box to create a feedback loop into the system. We are a public institution, let’s invite the public to help us design the perfect University to meet their needs.

What is the goal of this project? How do we know we have met the succeed or end point?
Lots of graduate student teach gen eds! This needs to be kept in mind! Need to consider how changing the gen eds would impact this. Grad students fill many experiential teaching/mentorship roles -- labs, internship supervisions, mentorship by graduate students, etc. Graduate students will be attracted to UM if they know they can develop these professional skills (teaching, etc.)

Others’ emotions. This is such a challenging situation, but everyone needs to be met with humility and transparency. Departments and staff really are cut thin right now and everyone feels stressed. Whatever decisions are made need to be the right ones and need to make progress for the University both short-term and long-term. I also suggest we find a way to infuse the humanities into a large majority of our coursework at the University as that gives students the critical lens to be successful in the workforce. Lenses that consider non-White perspective are going to be key over the next few years, especially as the population majority/minority switches. This is not a time to hold out on White power, but to finally move to relinquish it. If we can start to do that, then this University will be unstoppable in the next 50 years.

When I applied to colleges and universities, I was drawn first and foremost by their character and reputation; UM has a lot of work to do on both. At the core of this issue is the question: "What does this school offer that I can't get anywhere else?" It can be prestige, it can be special programs and unique degrees, it can be exceptional faculty members, etc. So far the University's decision-making has reduced our prestige, eliminated special programs and unique degrees, and forced exceptional faculty members out the door. How can we continue down this path while still providing an education that you can't get anywhere else? What are we doing to preserve and strengthen what makes UM unique?

(Again, through the PFA3 lens) We have to recognize this is not just a strategic academic or resource issue--this will be a very human resource/employee/PFA3 issue and concern. Beneath all our degrees and the finances are the humans who work in these areas and who will have to implement these changes. I know we understand that but we should also make this a fundamental part of the plan--how to communicate about changes and how to guide people through some of the inevitable losses. "There is a myth that drives many change initiatives to the ground: that the organization needs to change because it is broken. The reality is that any social system (including an organization or a country or a family) is the way it is because the people in the system (at least those individuals and factions with the most leverage) want it that way....No one who tries to name or address the dysfunction in an organization will be popular. Enough important people like the situation exactly as it is, whatever they may say about it, or it would not be the way it is." (The Practice of Adaptive Leadership, Heifeitz et al).

At the risk of being simple, meaningful change requires meaningful change. Implementing the instructional staffing plan is the easy part. The hard part is leading the campus through loss: loss of jobs, loss of sense of identity, status, importance, etc. While simultaneously providing everyone with a sense of optimism and hope about the “new” version of UM. Good luck and thank you for doing this difficult and important work.
We need to be firm. At some point, we need to make a decision and say that it is final. The longer the "collaborative dialogue" continues, the longer we will be on the defensive about this issue.

I see a challenge selling this. The document reads like two separate documents. First, we have a rambling, repetitive, poorly organized section that is full of jargon and lofty goals. For example, the term “experiential learning” is used over and over, and not clearly defined until page 5: “Experiential education, typically defined to include internships, undergraduate research, study abroad, and service learning,…” There are some great ideas here, but this section could be boiled down to about one page that defines experiential learning, interdisciplinary learning, and alignment with actual outcomes (what employers want). The second section is technocratic. The budget model is boiled down to one number: the ratio of student credit hours (SCH) to faculty FTE. There is no connection to the lofty goals in the first section save some handwaving like, “other factors need to be taken into account,” and, “commitment to maintain areas of study that may not generate large amounts of revenue but are central to that mission.” What we need is a clear link between the budget model and the goals outlined in the first section. For example, graduate programs enable undergraduate research experience, which is crucial to the experiential education goal. Research expenditures are mentioned now, but graduate programs are not mentioned, nor are they included in the budget model. Some questions that that come to mind are as follows. What action will we take to achieve the goals on the bottom of page 6? How do the financial incentives created by the budget model align with those goals? How do we go about, “eliminating obstructive fiscal incentives which lead to an overabundance of Gen Ed courses, and redesigning the core curriculum to focus on the kinds of highly integrated, deeply experiential approaches students seek and employers value?” Importantly, who is the intended audience? This reads like it was written for administrators by administrators. Faculty may see it as a bunch of lofty rhetoric that will be used to justify cutting faculty. In this view, the bottom line is this sentence, “All college plans should identify any programs that cannot be continued given staffing constraints.” There is an opportunity to create incentives for interdisciplinary educational approaches by aligning financial incentives to take into account contributions towards interdisciplinary classes or programs. As far as I can tell, the budget model just reinforces the academic silos, which creates incentives for each unit to compete with each other to get a bigger slice of a shrinking pie. How will we make the pie bigger?

Today I took some time to look at the “Academic Planning Data” in the box folder. I guess this isn’t really on our list of tasks, but I’m a numbers guy and I wanted to see if there was something new there that I hadn’t seen before and that would provide some guidance. I was surprised to see, unless I somehow missed it, that the very data that Paul Kirgis said the deans had been focusing on, SCH/FTE and $’s/SCH, are not in the spreadsheet. The working document states that “the primary metric for aligning instructional resources to student demand is the ratio of student credit hours (SCH) to faculty FTE.” I suppose that with some significant effort one might tease the SCH/FTE out of the data that are in our spreadsheet. But there are no data at all regarding costs. I also spent some time with the working document. As I said at the meeting, the document presents a fairly high level view for which it is difficult to provide specific feedback. I don’t know that I am able to respond to the key
questions, but I’ll provide a few impressions (I apologize for the chemistry and biochemistry examples...but that is what I know best, and they are examples of what is going on across campus): One major goal of the vision is to implement experiential learning across the curriculum. This does not seem to be all that much of a departure from what we already do. The document itself states that “UM has a strong tradition of providing experiential education opportunities to students in all of its colleges.” Approximately 25-30% of graduates of chemistry and biochemistry, for example, will coauthor a peer reviewed publication by the time that, or soon after, they graduate. All of the students in the Forensic Chemistry option must complete either a research or an internship experience, and about half of those graduates complete internships at the Montana State Crime Lab before they graduate. It seems to me that in many cases it is not that we don’t already offer, or even require, experiential learning in a big but small environment, but that we don’t do well to advertise that that is exactly what we do. And that we do it better than most. The emphasis on interdisciplinary study is both ironic and fraught. I do think that we can do a much better job of making clear to students the connections and intersections between disciplines, perhaps as part of general education, but I am not convinced that we should strive to save costs somehow by offering several interdisciplinary degrees without strength in the disciplines. It is Ironic because the budget model, and the data (including those in our spreadsheet) do nothing to promote or recognize interdisciplinary work, and because in my experience UM is one of the most cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary universities I have ever experienced, in spite of the barriers that the institution puts in the way. Faculty who have developed and been involved in interdisciplinary programs will tell you that “no good deed goes unpunished.” Look at Biochemistry (an interdisciplinary program by definition) as an example. The data in in our spreadsheet place all of the productivity (SCH, Majors, etc.) for Biochemistry, and other interdisciplinary programs, in a generic “College of Humanities and Sciences,” and not with the departments/units or faculty who do the work. About 75-100% of the teaching in the undergraduate biochemistry program is done by faculty in Chemistry and Biochemistry. The graduate program is shared somewhat more equally between multiple programs and across colleges. Faculty from across the institution have complained about this for years and years. And yet, the institution has never been able to produce a budget model, or an analysis of the data, that addresses the concerns and actually incentivizes interdisciplinary work. It is Fraught because it would not be wise to develop “interdisciplinary studies” programs or degrees at the expense of disciplinary programs, with the idea that there would be cost savings in this approach or that it would attract more students. First, I have a hard time believing that there are a lot of high school juniors and seniors out there who are thinking “what I’ve always wanted to be is interdisciplinary; ever since I was young this is what I’ve dreamed of.” Both of my kids, for example, chose colleges with strong programs that fit their interest in a particular discipline (music, trumpet specifically, in one case and engineering in the other); it was me who strongly advised them to go where they could get a broad-based liberal arts education rather than to a music conservatory or an engineering school. Provost Humphrey said at Faculty Senate on Thursday that “we don’t want to take any products off of the shelf,” which would imply that interdisciplinary programs would be in addition to what we already offer. It is hard to see cost savings in that. Second, as Mike Mayer has pointed out several times this year, strong
interdisciplinary programs are built on strength in the disciplines. So if the idea here is to keep only a skeletal crew in each of the disciplines so that they can support interdisciplinary studies degree programs, it will not work. The final pages of the document, which refer to data metrics and decision making around the data, are essentially disconnected from the vision statements in the first part of the document, which emphasizes experiential learning and interdisciplinarity. Because of the of the way the data are calculated, presented and treated, without recognizing interdisciplinary work, any decisions based on the data will invariably diminish, if not punish, interdisciplinary programs. The analytics are not aligned with the vision or the goals. Those are some first impressions.

Next fall, when we see a significant bump in enrollment programs will need to ramp up quickly. At the COB, because of collapsing sections, the lower core significantly past capacity. Grad student: Consider the potential for undergraduate involvement in graduate research. Consider the impact to graduate TAs (who are enormously underpaid) when teaching loads are increased. Consider the important contributions of graduate students to the overall University experience in terms of supporting research and undergraduate learning experiences.

DAC Feedback: Need conversation with Reed to get this right. They need to hear what he wants so they can respond to this. * Page 4, connected curriculum, isn’t anything about diversity covered in this. Every workspace includes diversity. We’re not giving the students these skills. Cultural awareness is important. * With all documents, it talks around student experience. Are we really being student centered though or are we just focused on expenses? * What are students input? What do they need and aren’t getting? All programming costs money. Training, ethical diversity efforts, cost money. We need money to be spent on how students want and need it to be spent. * How can we update unit standards in support of our DEI values?

Research is highly successful at UM and consistently touted for the record $100+ million in funding and fast growth. Because it is successful, there may be little focus on this critical foundational element of our university that impacts our reputation and a significant amount of fiscal, experiential, recruitment, retention (student and faculty) support. Thus, it should be recognized that many units, including that of graduate school units and faculty, feel the burden of this research and scholarship without adequate supports to complete the extensive grants/research/scholarship required to continue the successful, related graduate programming. We may be burning out our units and faculty, who often run on borrowed resources and steam and may feel unrecognized for their vital and foundational efforts to the overall university success. We need to formalize structures that support (teaching buy-outs, recognize loads of research theses/independent studies, and related experiential learning) ideal for undergraduate and often essential for graduate programming success. We need to formalize the university leadership roles and better integrate structures (VP for Research; start-up packages, OSP) that can support the engines of the research success. We need to increase transparency of the budget (and the indirects coming in) to better demonstrate how this research funding is being mindfully used at the university to support the work, faculty, and students that it is intended to support. We need to increase the awareness of the critical partnership work that is being implemented and essential funding that is coming in across our
units by the of quiet workhorses of faculty and unit teams – so there is a better understanding and appreciation of research and related graduate school expansion that is essential for UM success. We need to move beyond the dominant conversation limited to talk of SCHs and undergraduate teaching that, although very important and reform may be needed for UM success, is not the only focus of other units who have great success in graduate, professional, partnership, and research endeavors.

Innovation and a focus on the possibilities of diverse distance education endeavors, I believe are needed in the SPG discussion and recommendations. Although traditional on-campus face-to-face courses are important a distance accessibility foci should be essential and key, given our rural mission and innovation focus for the Flagship of the Future. If we as a university are to grow our new learner base, be relevant the online and distance learning trends and signals of the nation and world, and continue to create essential rural accessibility – it is vital that UM focus on continuing to expand and grow the possibilities in this area. Currently, compared to MSU, we are ahead of the game in this market that has huge potential - but this will be short-lived if we do not take action now in strategic and large-scale ways. UM needs to focus its energies in this way by creating positions, infrastructure, and support in a coordinated and integrated way. Currently, there are many pilot programs and partnerships that are not successful but not yet coordinated with campus. Moreover, many UM programs are poised to launch new training but need strong leadership and support to create new partnerships such as with the Wiley OPM - for large-scale recruitment and expansion. Gone are the days when units can go it alone for much more expansion and our current resources are too stretched to adequately support that. Although UMOnline created the foundations for partnerships and new ideas, it is imperative that a strong, coordinated, and directed leadership be put in place with a relevant and coordinated organizational infrastructure (that may need to be reorganized) and created to support this programming. This will include the need for integrated leadership of online, partnership, and strategy efforts across the President’s and Provost’s organizational structures. If done right, this integrated programming across the university can provide the essential funding and student expansion needed to support the APG recommendations, such as the APG highlighted interdisciplinary, Gen Ed, partnership, and stackable programming.