UPG Committee Meeting with Strategic Planning Coordinating Group
Tuesday, April 12, 2011
9:00-10:00 a.m
KFA 140

Attendees: Alan Tuchtenhagen, James Madsen, Steven Kelm, Brian Schultz, Stacey Stoffregen, Terry Ferriss, Brad Mogen, Dale Gallenberg, Gregg Heinselman, Dale Braun, Glenn Potts, Fernando Delgado, Michael Harris, Wendy Stocker (minutes)

Strategic Planning Coordinating Group: Alice Reilly-Myklebust, Glenn Potts, Joseph Harbouk, Fernando Delgado, Jim Madsen, Jennifer Borup (via teleconference)

- The Strategic Planning Coordinating Group last met on Monday, April 4

The overall goal of the Strategic Planning Coordinating Group is to:

1) Put process in place for upcoming strategic plan
2) Look back at current LTP (Living The Promise) and see where we are at, where we are going, make sure we have hands around existing LTP as we move forward

- Multiple meetings have taken place looking at process itself
- Last meeting with Faculty Senate – Need to review outcome of that discussion and move forward to provide update to UPG Committee.

Need to come up with new plan, move forward & present to Faculty Senate

Need to determine role of UPG –

Jim Madsen: “This is the only group that has representation from across the entire campus” – important committee for that reason

1) Need to look at current planning document “as it stands” before it goes forward before the entire campus
2) It will not be an exhaustive 90-100 page plan
3) Compare/contrast – but look more closely at what we are trying to accomplish with this plan – what are we missing, what to add/change
Concerns: Mike Harris - “Last time around/grad programs seemed to be an afterthought”

One of the things we missed as an opportunity:
“When is the appropriate time to do an academic plan?”
Concern that we did not do one last time.

“What is an academic plan?” Steve Kelm
*That is where we talk about relations of academic programs across different levels (access/achievement)
*Most of the campus schools have some doc that lays out in a very coherent fashion what their prioritization is for what the kind of academic institution it is going to be (Fernando Delgado)
*Learning outcomes
*Range of programs (signature programs)
*Relationship between main access/achievement institution
*How large
*Composition
*Got at this through academic program prioritization/but did not lead/or parallel the strategic process

Need to determine who initiates/who is responsible on campus
for beginning/owning it (Brad Mogen)

Varies greatly across campuses – FD

Driven by academic side of the house (Fac Senate)

Acad Affairs needs to be involved/deans

Hybrid Task Group – develops draft of plan/deans can address/E-Cab/Fac Senate and because of work OIP has done, we have primary/secondary data over years.

Need to get group of people together – have strategic plan we are developing/but over period of plan...we will also be doing this on the academic side of house...so at the end “we will look like this”

May be wise to put together data book and for a week over the summer...come up with a plan

Comprehensive Strategic plan exists – but need a linear plan associated with it

Dale – Shared vision for this campus is needed (missing from last strategic plan)
Critical prerequisite – change/uncertainty. Need shared vision of where campus wants to go. Needed to develop an academic plan (what programs we will keep/emphasize/change/eliminate)

Where will UWRF be 10 yrs from now and how it differentiates itself out from its competitors

Jim Madsen-“How would you see that being done?”

Dale: “Outside facilitator who does this as a business (doesn’t have history/baggage of university. Work with wider constituency of campus (faculty) – within workshop environment ...develop within a few days

Jen Borup: “Didn’t we do that last time?”

Dale: “Last time had workshop that listed problems of univ...but didn’t have a future cast to it....more focused on current plans.

Jen Borup – “Thought we did develop broad vision statement in the past few years”

Jim Madsen – “Strong feelings about not bringing in outside consultants”

Joseph Harbouk– Agrees with Jim...better to have Chancellor work with faculty to create a vision– against bringing in consultants.

Dale Braun – consultant can share a broader context what is happening in other institutions (that is working for them – and will provide us with more of an edge to be better ...while utilizing internal vision as well)

Brian Schultz: “Wasn’t what Terry/Connie presented to BOR in July 2009 our academic plan?

Fernando: “What was presented was two pages of powerpoint – plan should instead talk about 1) recognizing drivers we buy into, 2) point to how academics are supposed to move things in certain directions, 3) how external factors affect the plan, these points were missing.

Dale Gallenberg: Academic program prioritization – start of academic plan.

Expectations of following through on it. Was never in his mind to be “the academic plan”

Brad Mogen – helpful if we came out of meeting with an action item to put these things together as part of “an academic plan” – critical
How do you do a strategic plan if we don’t have this plan embedded into it?

Joseph- There are specific needs from each committee member, which are outside of the academic plan. Need to “close loop” on LTP plan (handout shared from Joseph) on goals/timeline moving forward:

- Need report summarizing what worked/didn’t work
- Here is what we have accomplished so far
- Communicate to campus
- Last piece during summer (cabinet retreat) – this UPG group will take Goals from summer and move them forward and accomplish them in 2012-13
- Goals will drive us – some goals will have to move into new one
- Some will be completed prior to establishing new plan
- Engage this group and then engage entire campus
- Examine how much technology was used last time? This time around – survey will be administered to all campus for their feedback on good/bad
- Key item for this group to focus on is reporting of all the hearings that took place

Strategic Planning Coordinating Group has a goal of April 2012 to have strategic plan in place and begin implementing Summer 2012

Close loop on LTP within this summer.

Fall 2011 – fac/staff engage in meetings, discussion groups, online surveys

Summer 2011 – data research/SWOT analysis / so when fall comes this will all be handled/closing loop on LTP

- Sub committee of UPG has always prepared these reports. Fernando can provide pdf’s to committee if need be.
- Mogen suggests one meeting of UPG Steering Comm to come up with all documents and reports prepared over last few years. Steering Committee can present this to entire UPG for review
- UPG will forward this information to Joseph/Fernando

Jim Madsen- 2 different things we are looking at here:

1) collection /reporting task – here are notes from meetings. Need to put all information/data from different meetings together in coherent fashion
2) Bigger issue: What we interpret / who will interpret
Who will infer what the outcomes are from this info
Contradictory suggestions – from same person
Need to have everyone involved/but everyone is burnt out
Editorializing is essential piece

UPG Steering Group will come up all of the data/information
UPG will make recommendations/interpretations and synthesize... here is what the bullets said/key subjects

Strategic Planning Coordinating Group will take that and determine what will work and if they agree with what UPG is recommending/interpreting
- They will determine what to forward to Executive Cabinet/Faculty Senate

Handout from Joseph:
Front page – summarizes charge to UPG, review notes, develop report of what worked/didn’t work, acknowledging that there may be conflicting arguments/contradictory remarks which Coordinating Group will interpret

UPG is collating several sets of notes that others took

Difference between product and process

Interpreting notes – content stuff

Looking for input on how the overall process went – gathering information from people –

Gathering info has taken place/focusing solely on process now

1) Report on process of LTP plan (from multiple stakeholder groups)
2) Develop report on accomplishments of LTP over first four years of plan

Jim Masen: “Feels there is value for UPG to provide their input / interpretations / recommendations

Coordinating group could interpret these in a different way...but it doesn’t make sense to have UPG simply collate and report back.

If UPG can do more....than they should do so

FD – Agenda items for next UPG are all in place:
1) Report on goals accomplished over last four years
2) Draft memo to Coordinating group “based on our analysis...we would recommend the following things...
3) Final meeting – group would look at this memo

Accomplishments – put everything into one document (measurements against the goals...not the task levels).

Then what 5-10 things are left that we need to work on?

Brian Schultz-Executive Cabinet – “With the many budgetary things to be considered, Do these things take precedence over other things that are in LTP?

Fernando: “Filter of what we can do....however, need to be pushed...need other voices to bring goals to the table to weight priorities”

Fernando will email members of UPG and ask them to respond to FD and Melissa.

Determine tasks/duties to prep for next meeting.

Next meeting will likely be scheduled finals week

Planning document for next strategic plan needs to go before Faculty Senate...that would mean there wouldn’t be an opportunity for UPG to review prior to Faculty Senate meeting. So - have to provide feedback electronically.

Jim suggests sending out to committee members...if requires UPG to meet, could schedule a meeting...but Jim would prefer more eyes to review/broader input/support before going forward to Faculty Senate.

Plan for the process is what would be coming to Faculty Senate...before the plan for the process is developed...need this information / reports first.

Dale Gallenberg posed the question: What will come before Faculty Senate for approval then – Joseph responded with, “More of a general outline...with details being approved later”.

Jim Madsen cautioned that this could be “Recipe for disaster...generally plan that outlines who is responsible for what and an agreement saying that is okay”.

Need to lay out Road map to be followed – details of how we’ll collect info will not be there/simply a commitment to collect.
Coordinating group – (how much input will Joseph need on the process development piece that is going to senate?)

Will it be broad/general enough for this group to even need to meet? (Terry Ferriss)

- Will cabinet have reviewed/looked at it before going to Senate?
  *will try/but may run out of time

3 more meetings for FS before end of semester

Jim is requesting input from UPG – being inclusive upfront – many eyes looking at things – will allow for full realm of input.

At close of meeting: Fernando will email UPG Committee members to assign who will be collecting data/information based on where they have had the most experience/exposure.