University Planning Group Minutes
September 13, 2010

Time: 9:00am

Location: CAS Conference Room, 140 KFA

Present: Fernando Delgado, Lee Monson, Stacey Stoffregen, Dale Braun, Kristen Hendrickson, Jim Madsen, Brad Mogen, Terry Ferriss, Steve Kelm, Sarah Egerstrom, Dale Gallenberg, Brian Schultz Absent: Alan Tuchtenhagen, Gregg Heinselman

Agenda Items

1) Introductions
   - No need for introductions as newly appointed CEPS representative was not in attendance.

2) Living the Promise Dashboard
   - The Provost led discussion of formation of the LTP dashboard- originated at UPG summer retreat, were taken to Cabinet summer retreat and wordsmithed and a few priorities were added.
   - Some tasks reworded to make measurable- language tweaked but did not reword LTP.
   - Dashboard presented to Faculty Senate last week (9/8) and created some discussion.
   - The Provost and his Academic Affairs reports will be using the dashboard as their goals for the year.
   - One member mentioned his concern about Chancellor Van Galen’s email regarding the LTP dashboard and mention of these not being the only goals worked on this year.
   - The Provost informed the group that everyone is committed to the dashboard.
   - It was decided that clarification should be made that there are not two lists.
   - One member commented on the need for commitment from administration to publicize and make an effort in accomplishing the dashboard tasks because the perception is that there has been no work towards accomplishing LTP goals and initiatives.
   - The Provost brought up the possibility of adding an additional column to the dashboard to include the original goal/task (language) to alleviate confusion.
   - The Provost mentions to group he does not see need for steering committee and opens this up to the group. See #4.

Return to #2
Another member raised issue that FS felt should have been included in the voting of LTP priorities. Received dashboard as informational piece (like last year). Perceived sentiment amongst faculty is that they have lost their input and are being overridden by academic, non-teaching staff. She also mentioned there is a desire to be partners, for a fresh slate.

The Provost made the point that we cannot speak to past practice as it is not minuted and that the process this year was the same as last year where there was no objection.

FS chair also made it clear to group that he has made great efforts to be open to FS and inclusive of FS input.

Discussion ensued stating no matter what the committee does there will always be an unhappy or dissatisfied individual and how simply have to be consistent.

One member spoke of his frustration with UPG, wondering if the group really does have a role.

Discussion broke out and the Provost assured him that it is an administrative committee with a role.

The Provost returns to the notion of no steering committee. See #4.

Return to #2

9:55am TF, BS, SS left

The Provost asked the group if it would be helpful to pull material from other universities on transitioning of strategic plans.

Discussion regarding need for better communication and clarification between the committees followed.

FS chair shares that it is unclear what FS can/should do (FS approves strategic plan but does not appoint/approve priorities).

10 am DB left

It was declared by the FS chair that people want indication that their work is paying off and not disappearing- some initiatives take multiple years to achieve.

Another member countered the lack of productivity was because projects/initiatives were held hostage by committees in the past and it plays role for argument as to why cabinet should have control/sponsorship.

10:04 SK left

The Provost made it known that if the strategic plan was to be discussed at the mid year retreat the FS chair and vice chair should be invited.

Discussion regarding need for developing trust, good faith understanding, and setting ground rules now.

The Provost commented on the culture here- the only people faculty trust less than the administration are one another- becomes difficult to get work done at all when there are trust issues within governance.

Group would like to be optimistic and productive.
• FS chair mentioned he will hold private conversations with members when needed. Also pointed out that many initiatives were accomplished without FS last year.

3) Status Report (Not discussed)

4) Steering Committee
  • In the middle of discussion of the LTP dashboard, the Provost also mentioned his desire to continue without a steering committee. Due to the small size of the group, he would prefer to hear all voices UPG.
  • One member raised the point that the appointing of a UPG steering committee is in the handbook and questioned if it is Faculty Senate’s (FS) role to make those changes in the handbook. The handbook is littered with inaccuracies.
  • The Provost commented on this remark. During previous conversation with FS chair, Jim Madsen, it was decided the handbook does need to be cleaned. He feels it is the responsibility of each sponsor to bring desired changes to FS.
  • Further conversation returned to the issue of the dashboard. Return to #2.
  • Conversation regarding a steering committee continued.
  • One member asked how the Provost foresaw future usage of meeting time.
  • The idea for future meeting format is that the charters/goals/timelines/reports of the LTP priorities will be shared.
  • One member mentioned it would be a waste of time for the steering committee to simply plan, but did mention it was beneficial in the beginning when researching and reporting needed to take place.
  • Another member echoed that logistics were handled at the steering committee level.
  • Conversation veered back to LTP. Return to #2.

5) Website (Not discussed)
  • http://www.uwrf.edu/Administration/UPG.cfm

Meeting end time: 10:12am.

Proposed future agenda items: term membership, preliminary planning for next strategic plan (need upfront process and involvement).

Respectfully submitted by Melissa Fitzenberger.