University Planning Group Minutes
July 27, 2010

Time: Noon

Location: Willow River Conference Room, 334 UC

Present: Dale Braun, Stacy Stoffregen, Gregg Heinselman, Sarah Egerstrom, Brad Mogen, Alan Tuchtenhagen, Fernando Delgado, Brian Schultz, Kristen Hendrickson, Terry Ferriss, Dale Gallenberg, Steve Kelm, and Lee Monson.

Agenda Items

1) Campus Report on Progress
   • The Provost led a review of the LTP goals and the tasks completed or set in motion during the 2009-10 AY.
   • One member inquired about the status of task development for Goal 4.
   • The Provost enlightened UPG that senate might seek to eradicate Goal 4.
   • Discussion ensued focusing on where the oversight lies and UPG’s role.
   • The Provost informed group UPG’s role is to mandate FS.
   • One member wondered if Goal 3 was still in transition.
   • Other members mentioned there were staff transitions but the true distinction is now inbound vs. outbound global experiences. Inbound international students now come in through Admissions and then move to Student Affairs.
   • The Provost asked members to submit any additional feedback regarding the Progress Report by Friday, August 6.

2) Plan for 2010-11
   • Dale Braun led the group in a short informal presentation about tactical planning and execution and the usefulness of developing SMART goals.
   • Presentation showed goals should support and clarify the [strategic] plan, each action should have ownership (be the responsibility of individual/group), and actions should be measurable.
   • SMART is an acronym for Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time-bound.
   • The Provost asked members to work backwards and prioritize the initiatives and tasks rather than the bigger goals.
• Members broke into groups of three. Each group looked at two specific goals and pulled out top four tasks. (Did not look at Operating Paradigm, Goal 4, or Goal 6).
  i. Group 1= Gregg Heinselman, Jim Madsen, Brad Mogen (Goal 1&2)
  ii. Group 2= Kristen Hendrickson, Sarah Egerstrom, Dale Gallenberg (Goal 3&5)
  iii. Group 3= Alan Tuchtenhagen, Steve Kelm, Terry Ferriss (Goal 7&8)
  iv. Group 4= Brian Schultz, Stacy Stoffregen, Lee Monson (Goal 9&10)

• The Provost led prioritization discussion. (View the SMART Goal Activity Tables for a complete list of priorities and each group’s rationale.)

  ➢ Discussion about combining 7.1.3 &7.2.1.
  • One member commented upon the need to focus on teaching staff.
  • Another member asked if it was in the group’s best interest to place these tasks as a priority since it almost done and simply ran out of time to push through governance in 2009-10 AY.
  • The Provost feared connecting the two because one includes non-teaching staff.
  • One member suggested lumping the two tasks together does not mean both tasks must be addressed at the same time.
  • One member joined the conversation saying the umbrella is the campus workload issue and 7.1.3 (summer & J-term) must be looked at as a workload issue.
  • Group consensus reached. 7.1.3 and 7.2.1 connected. (Note: After the retreat, the Provost made an executive decision NOT to combine these two tasks because the workload issue is not based on a 12-month schedule.)

  ➢ Discussion about combining 5.1.1 & 5.1.3.
  • One member thought the tasks follow each other and should be connected.
  • The Provost posed the question to the group, “What is the role of Affirmative Action?”
  • One member spoke up saying he was unsure why there are two faculty governances. He proposed administration discuss combining the two.
  • One member informed the group of her understanding, which is that one of the groups is more informed of compliance and laws while the other group is more conceptual.
  • 5.1.1 combined with 5.1.3 and 5.2.1.
• One member noted a report and suggestions were made to the Cabinet for 10.2.3, and should reword the tasks to read as “pursue” rather than “explore”.
• The Provost stated this task is no longer strategic but operational.
• Same member suggested the task be made measurable. Example: “In two years, we have created two new programs that generate revenue.”

➢ Discussion about 8.1.1.
• One member argued technological changes/improvements have been global (eSIS, etc) and not for individual classrooms.
• One member mentioned Tech Council and while the structure is in place there is a lack of knowledge of resources.
• The Provost summarized the sources of concern were two-fold: process and outcome. He suggests this should be connected to 1.1.3 (the Center for Teaching and Learning).
• One member mentioned this concern relates a lot to advocacy.
• Another member advocated that this task not be lumped with 1.1.3 because technology is its own entity. He suggested the task be wordsmithed.
• Additional member cited the huge issue being the fact that we cannot support what we currently have and therefore we cannot make additions. Suggested step one is to analyze what we do have.
• The Provost gave software licenses as an example of this problem. He also let the group know that these prioritized tasks will compete with baseline issues and the other tasks on the list for support/funding and people need to understand that and be okay with dropping something in return.
• Tasks not connected. (Note: A conversation needs to take place with Steve Reed regarding technology before a connection can be made.)

• A member asked how important a ranking of these tasks was to the cabinet.
• A member posed the question if everyone was supposed to trust the prioritization of the individual groups.
• One member assumed the prioritized list would not be the only ten tasks that would be funded and other initiatives would be looked at later.
• One member mentioned he would like to give 5.1.1 and 5.1.3 to the committee.
• Same member commented that everyone needs to participate in 5.2.1 and that it does not take any resources but time.
- One member voiced concern that goal 4 would fall by the wayside. He felt UPG should not lose sight of it.
- The Provost voiced that he did not want to eradicate goal 4 but mentioned bringing individuals (staff/faculty) who already “own” this goal together and see how they do it. Should not “develop” engaged leaders but “expand” and “enhance” the work. He assured that goal 4 and 6 are not off the plan.

3) Identify a Distinctive & Unified Future
- The Provost asked the group to partake in aspirational identity planning. The current SP had too many goals. UWRF does not have enough resources to fulfill all goals. The plan was aspirational but not concrete. He posed the question, “At the end of five years what will UWRF be? What will UWRF be known for?”
- One member suggested UWRF would be known for unique and quality educational programs and for being student-centered.
- One member said UWRF would be known for its affordability, location, size, and the UW brand.
- The Provost challenged by asking what is unique or quality. It is hard to identify without metrics. He said these items are what UWRF already is. They are descriptive.
- One member said UWRF is the sustainability campus of UW system (identity aspiration).
- Another member suggested the campus’ identity lies within being the leader in true commitment to student learning and the assessment thereof (programs, learning, teaching, student engagement).
- A member mentioned UWRF needs to become the most “metropolitan” campus in the region.
- One member commented that UWRF has historically been a school of opportunity.
- Another member agreed that everybody wants selectivity so it is a good role for UWRF.
- One member commented that UWRF does not want to be the “cheap and easy” school, however. Need to be most affordable school in the Metro area and need to project the affordability.
- One member suggested UWRF is “The” agricultural school of the system.
- The Provost argues UWRF’s future road to success for COEPS is to focus on the Professional Studies aspect rather than TED- everyone has TED.
- A member mentioned UWRF would be known for its faculty reputation of commitment to achievement of individual students.
- The Provost suggested that if UWRF is going to be known for its faculty’s reputation of commitment to achievement of the individual then it needs to translate into professional development, job descriptions, the hiring process, the tenure process, etc.
- The Provost also commented that the SP is a contact sport.
- Another member voiced the need to stop looking at borders (MN, WI, IA). He suggested UWRF should receive regional and national provenance and recognition.
- Member commented she did not want to be viewed as “just River Falls” any longer.
- Another member said he was glad what was not on the board was to aspire to be Eau Claire.
- A member brought the group back to the earlier comment regarding faculty commitment to the individual student needs to be passed on and instilled within new staff and faculty by placing expectations in job descriptions, etc.
- The Provost asked the Student Senate President why he came to UWRF.
- Student Senate President admitted he came to UWRF in part because of the location (close to home & Twin Cities) and his friends chose to attend UWRF.
- The Provost commented he would like to change the attributes to “UWRF is aggressive”. How do we tell our story internally, yet, externally? We need to leverage messages where UWRF is recognized and where there are metrics to verify our excellence.
- The Provost reiterated the need to have observable and measurable goals.
- He also spoke of the importance of owning this SP but also the need to go back to one’s constituencies and get their thoughts and come together to put into effect.

Meeting end time: 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Melissa Fitzenberger

Next Meeting TBA