

Strategic Planning Team (SPT)

Meeting Minutes

April 11, 2013

Present: C. Douglass, B. Wilkes, A. Motz, S. Lawrence, K. Wright, T. Galarowicz, O. Perez, C. Crespy & B. Griffin

Absent: *L. Hella, T. Guinn, V. Cavataio, J. Bentley, L. McConnell, M. Hancock & P. Gates*

1. Developing Campus support for metrics/notification

We have continued to talk to the Council of Deans about the metrics. Last year, they seemed to be more engaged than this year. Douglass recommends that at this point, we take the draft metrics we have to the campus community for input.

We talked about having an open forum so that the campus can provide input on the draft metrics. The Campus Master Planners had open forums and they worked well – people could come and go as they wish.

Douglass mentioned that she has been working on the metrics for Priority 2. She has looked at other institutions strategic plans and no one has metrics as detailed as ours for a similar priority. General metrics don't work, but maybe metrics this specific won't work either. The next step may be for the Deans to ask the colleges for measures that apply to them.

Wilkes said that we need broader metrics at the university level and departments or colleges can have more specific goals/actions plans/metrics that work toward the broader metrics. Lawrence agreed that specific metrics can report up to more general ones.

Douglass reminded the group that President Ross really wants to use the tables for the metrics. Having the open forums for people to give input on specific numbers will help.

Galarowicz said that tracking the number of publications at a university level is fine – but each college can also track individually if they want. Crespy does not think it's best to state a certain number of journals as a goal. This might promote quantity and not quality.

Perez mentioned that there are impact factors for social science and political science, but numbers are unreliable and the bylaws do not talk about them. A new provost may force areas to use impact factors. His area just debated whether or not journals should be listed or not. Faculty Association is against listing journals. If you talk about impact factors, it is hard to have a University level measure.

Crespy talked about Z-scores and Thomson Reuters. Douglass said that initiatives are action steps – not outcomes and that it is important to measure the steps along the way.

Douglass and Wilkes presented the metrics to the Senior Leadership Team at a recent meeting. Douglass asked the group what they feel is the next step for the metrics – take out to the University community and ask for input? We discussed holding open forums for campus input. A few committee members were concerned about the timing. We realized that these forums would need to happen before the end of the semester and that people are very busy toward the end of the semester. So we need input right away.

Perez and Galarowicz mentioned that they have not heard anything about strategic planning from their deans. Galarowicz asked what feedback we are expecting to get from the open forums. After all the research we have done, and the discussions we have had, what new ideas would we get? She is afraid the response might be negative.

Douglass said we just need to roll out these draft metrics and people need to understand that these are institutional metrics and that their areas will roll up into these. Galarowicz agreed. Douglass stated that people just need to have the opportunity to say something and have input with regards to the metrics. Galarowicz asked how many people will really care about metrics at the university level when they are writing their own. Wilkes agreed and said the strategic planning message is: here are the priorities and initiatives don't get hung up on metrics that may not apply to you.

2. Identify metric data sources

Crespy reminded the group that there are certain metrics that have to be met to receive state funding. Wilkes said that the metrics will evolve and change and that 5 years down the road, they may not be the same as they are currently. Lawrence said that metrics will all be different, but working together, all these metrics will move the university in the right direction. We need specific numbers or measures so progress and improvements can be made, we can set goals and strive to meet them. We are all trying to go in the same direction to meet the overall goals.

It was decided that open forums are the best way to share the draft metrics and we will stress that they are “draft”. If there is strong opposition to any of the metrics, then we can re-evaluate. Wilkes mentioned that it would be helpful to have faculty members at the open forums. Douglass mentioned that she is presenting the draft metrics to the Council of Chairs on April 17th.

We will ask for help from University Communications to publicize the open forums. We will need to invite academic senate members and have Merodie communicate with global campus. Douglass asked – how do we get the campus to rally around these metrics? Wilkes said they will need to flow down from the Dean, to the Chairs, to the departments.

Crespy said that when candidates are interviewed, they post impact factors on their resumes and a spreadsheet is kept in the Dean's office.

For Priority three – we need to remember to add a question on the staff survey: Were you given the opportunity to participate in professional development? And did you?

3. Reporting mechanisms

It looks like we will be using the tool that was developed for Vision 2010. President Ross likes this tool. Each unit enters goals/action steps – starts with initiatives and the goals/action steps report up. Each area can pick and choose those initiatives that roll up. HR currently uses this tool. Academic divisions do not use it, they do annual reports. Instead of numerous annual reports, President Ross wants one tool used – to be able to look at all goals.

We talked about having a template table set up for people's annual reports – so the information can easily be transferred into this reporting tool.

Some suggestions for times/dates for the open forums were given. It was also suggested that we distribute metrics online to people and ask them to email input back to us.

Crespy stated that we need to have forums in the next 2 weeks or they will be perceived as an after- thought. Perez said he is concerned the forums will not be well-received as they are happening too late in the semester and the faculty are all very busy. We should use Fall 2013 to solidify metrics when people are more focused, and then start measuring in Spring 2014.

Douglass and Wilkes will meet with the President on April 18th to discuss progress on the metrics.

Galarowicz asked when the metrics will no longer be considered "draft". Wilkes said that to a certain extent, the metrics will always be "draft" at a certain level, as they may change over time.

We have two open forums scheduled:

- **April 25, 3-5 Lakeshore Room**
- **April 30, 3-5 Maroon Room**