University Planning Group Minutes
October 12, 2011

Time:  1:00 p.m.
Location:  CAS Conference Room, 140 KFA
Present:  Fernando Delgado, Michael Harris, Stacey Stoffregen, Brian Schultz, Jim Madsen, Steve Kelm, Mark Meydam, Mike Miller, David Trechter, Mike Stifter, Hossein Eftekari, Tynan Heller, Kurt Leichtle, Wes Chapin
Absent:  Gregg Heinselman, Tyler Halverson

Agenda Items

- Introduction of members
- Formation of this year’s UPG
  - Faculty Senate appointed faculty members
  - Administration side going through transition period, still short a few representatives

1) Living the Promise Dashboard
- The Provost introduced the most recent dashboard. It was updated in August and is currently in draft form until the Chancellor signs off.
- Wendy Helm & Melissa Fitzenberger will continue to work with the dashboard.
- Academic & Student Affairs- based initiatives carry over from last year’s tasks.
  - Due dates will be amended based on milestones.
  - Percentage of completion will be carried over for these initiatives so we are not starting from scratch.
- LTP Year 4 Update is online at [http://www.uwrf.edu/StrategicPlan/upload/LTP4thYearSummary.pdf](http://www.uwrf.edu/StrategicPlan/upload/LTP4thYearSummary.pdf)
  - This report shows updates of all goals & tasks associated with LTP from beginning of the plan.
  - Updates were completed this summer by the Provost, Melissa Fitzenberger, and Tony Bredahl.
  - LTP goals are not always metrical so many have multiple steps

2) Composition of Steering Committee
- Review charge of group as defined by Faculty Senate
  - 2.6.8.1.1- review progress of the strategic plan dashboard does this.
    - In past, task sponsors present their progress to UPG.
    - Questions to group:
      - One member wondered if there are milestones UPG should include with each task?
        - The Provost informed the group that yes, we need to touch base
with the task leaders and update these milestones.

- New members wondered if it was beneficial to have these different groups report out during meetings.
  - Jim Madsen shared that there were mixed feelings about these sessions. Some reported too much detail. All UPG needs from the report out is a summary of what is happening with the goal.
  - It was suggested to have each task group answer key questions to assess where each group is at. UPG needs to triage- based on these responses/if need more detail, groups we be asked to join UPG. When groups come to UPG need to set a time limit.

- We are in the last year of LTP. It is a transition year and the UPG needs to provide guidance to the task groups now so they have sufficient time to complete the initiatives. UPG needs to get something in writing about their progress.
  - May include: perceived scope, deliverables, timeline, way to define a task target (different sense of completion- some rely on outside constituents)

- The Provost offered the opportunity to empower the steering committee to create the key questions for the task groups and monitor these responses, as well as manage the UPG meeting agendas.
  - Madsen noted in order to have productive meetings work must be done on the front end.
  - Some members voiced concern of the larger group simply being a “rubber stamp” if all the work is done by a small group.
  - Kurt Leichtle mentioned UPG should function as a board of directors and provide oversight and make decisions but not micromanage.
  - One member also noted UPG has representation from across campus and that this experience is needed when verifying and reviewing goal progress.
  - The Provost asked those that were on UPG at the beginning, what the intended purpose was when the steering committee was originally formed. Mike Stifter supplied that based on conversation the committee might not have the same purpose as it did five years ago. Back then, those who were not on the steering committee were liaisons to task groups which is not the case now.
  - After further conversation, group members thought the role of the steering committee was to take care of the details and report back from the task groups. The larger group cannot micromanage this committee. Decision-making still comes from the larger group.

- Looking ahead, members feel there is a need to provide closure and report out the achievements of LTP at the end of the academic year.
  - The Provost will speak with Blake Fry in January about various options for providing this closure/report out. Possibly another poster session?
  - Most planners would say a plan with the amount of work done we have managed is an achievement.
o **GOAL:** Have steering committee draft the key questions for the task leaders, have UPG provide their input on these questions, send out the questions to task leaders, get responses back as soon as possible.
  - Possibility of meeting in early December rather than November to allow more time for leaders to get their responses back into the committee
  - The steering committee will assess what questions to ask the groups and realize they may need to adapt questions from one group to the next.

3) **UPG Meeting Schedule**
   - Next meeting Tuesday, November 15
   - The Provost suggests the group meet in January.

4) **Other Business**
   - None

Meeting end time: 1:55 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by Melissa Fitzenberger.