University Planning Committee
February 18, 2011 Meeting, 10-11:30 am

Attending: Rosemary Battalio, MJ Brukardt, Susan Harrison, Rosemary Jadack, Andy Nelson, Lori Snyder, Rama Yelkur

The group discussed ways in which we can help “nurture human resources” by supporting our colleagues during the uncertainty of the budget discussions.

Following on the January meeting discussion regarding KPIs for our seven Centennial goals, MJ reported on discussions with key people who are spearheading efforts to evaluate progress. She and Andy met with Mark in Business and Finance to develop Goal 5 KPI. Troy expressed an interest in working on the Goal 7 KPIs.

MJ reported on a meeting with the Provost about completing the master academic plan. The Provost is receptive to UPC support of the effort; the meeting was then spent providing feedback on the plan components and a process that will be open and engage the academic community without adding undue time and work burdens on faculty and staff.

Highlights of the discussion included:

About the history of Academic Planning
- Generally academic planning has focused on graduation requirements
- Academic planning has focused on university-level requirements, not gotten down to the college/program levels
- The group felt there would generally be positive reactions to a more comprehensive approach.

Framing the MAP process
- All agreed that faculty and staff need to hear a compelling rationale for the MAP—it will provide a big-picture roadmap for future decisions, a timeline for implementing change, and will help us take advantage of opportunities during times of significant change
- Another rationale has to do with potential turn-over in the coming months --The MAP can be an important tool in helping us to maximize our staffing
- Senate and campus need to be reminded about the planning that has already happened—be intentional about connecting current planning efforts to what has been done in the past

Connecting the MAP
- This should not be presented as another separate initiative. There may be some morale concerns among faculty—“oh no, not another project to work on!”—but the process we
discussed could mitigate that by reducing the amount of “new” work that would be required.

- Frame the MAP as the umbrella that will link the work we’ve already done—PEEQ and HLC especially.
- Select the major themes for the MAP from what we learned from the HLC self-study and PEEQ—and make those links explicit.

Content of the MAP

- The proposed content list included:
  - Liberal Arts Core: principles, timeline for revision, assessment
  - Graduation Requirement guidelines
  - Enrollment Management highlights
  - Program Array—projected additions to majors & minors utilizing existing environmental scan data
  - HIPs guiding principles, how measured, timeline
  - Service Learning and Wellness timeline
  - Advising
  - Assessment and quality improvement principles, structures
  - Graduate Education—opportunities
  - Continuing Education
  - Technology plan, online learning goals
  - Student Affairs & Academic Affairs collaborations
  - Facilities impacts
  - Decision-template for System initiatives

- In addition to the above outline, the group said the MAP should address Blugold Commitment priorities
- Either the MAP should address staffing implications or the MAP should be the basis for a follow-on analysis of staffing by chairs/directors
- The program array should outline what will be reduced or eliminated as well as what will be added
- Linking to facilities is very important

Process for the MAP

- The UPC liked the idea of a small steering committee that would gather and coordinate all the work already done/currently underway. This reduces the need for new work groups.
- Steering Committee should communicate the names of all the individuals who are in any way contributing to the MAP—as the HLC self-study did, printing the names of the many people who served on various task forces. This will communicate that the MAP is being developed from the work of many individuals without asking people to serve on new work groups.
- The UPC suggested a summer stipend for those writing the report
- Steering team should have a student on it
- The UPC felt that the HLC self-study was a good model for effective use of a small steering team that pulled in the work of diverse groups.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 am.