University Planning Group Minutes
April 14, 2010

Time: 9:15 a.m.

Location: KFA Conference Room

Present: Dale Braun, Stacy Stoffregen, Gregg Heinselman, Sarah Egerstrom, Michael Miller, Brad Mogen, Alan Tuchtenhagen, Fernando Delgado, Brian Schultz and Kristen Hendrickson, David Rainville, Terry Ferriss  Absent: Dale Gallenberg, Steve Kelm, and Josh Brock.

Agenda Items

1) End of year progress report:
   - The Provost distributed a draft letter which he propose be presented to the Chancellor and Faculty Senate.
   - Discussion regarding the purpose of the letter
   - Discussion about the role of University Planning Group and what and how it can monitor the progress of the Strategic Plan
   - Discussion of whether the UPG works directly with the committees and committee chairs or directly with the Chair of FS and other methods to be considered by UPG
   - Question by member of how priorities can be changed or priority status changed
   - The Provost suggested that the UPG report the items completed during this year – nothing punitive only solicitous
   - A member agreed that a positive approach makes sense
   - A member suggested that without measurable outcomes, when is it complete?
   - Consensus of the group to send the letter.

2) A Vision for “Living the Promise”
   - Discussion commenced regarding the Strategic Plan and how to move forward within the remaining time period of the existing plan
   - Dale Braun suggested converting some of the remaining goals into a “smart goal” format and focus on outcomes
   - Fernando spoke about only one year of life in the current SP and the next year should be used to transition to the next strategic plan and that, in his opinion, this is a role for the UPG. UPG has seen the strengths and weaknesses of the current SP and can forward that knowledge to the next SP. Fernando suggested that the UPG can assist the Faculty Senate by working as a consulting group for the creation of the next SP
   - Discussion about the best approach to the next SP
Discussion regarding the roles of Chancellor and Provost in the creation of a new SP. A member suggested that they should initiate a vision for the conversation and the UPG help create the forum for the inclusion of the campus and prioritization.

Member suggested that an expert outside group possibly be used to define and model a new SP.

Member suggested that the best practice is for the body who owns the creation of the SP is the governing body, which is our Cabinet and another group be used to facilitate and/or oversee the process and that might be the UPG.

Member commented that if the ideas in the second to last paragraph of the letter go well, that may be a good position to start the process.

Continued discussion of the completion of the current SP, transition strategies to the next SP and how to communicate the process and results to the campus community.

Fernando suggested that the UPG meet during the summer to prepare for the 10-11 AY.

Meeting end time: 10:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Zoerb

Next Meeting May 14, 2010