UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

APASP Task Force Meeting

Monday, January 22, 2018 | 103 p.m. | UC 225

Present:
Scott Whittenburg, Roz Haley, Erik Johnston, Chase Greenfield, Steve Schwarze, Jen Zellmer -Cuaresma, Ona Renner-Fahey, Liz Putnam, John DeBoer, Stephanie Domitrovich, Andrew Ware, Christine Fiore, Paul Haber, Braden Fitzgerald, Anisa Ricci, Tom DeLuca, Kate Shanley, Nathan Lindsay, Claudine Cellier, Dawn Ressel, Beverly Edmond

MEETING MINUTES

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes from December 13, 2017 – Minutes unanimously approved

3. Discussion of the Task Force's work with President Bodnar

President Bodnar thanked the TF for all their work on prioritization at UM and invited their questions and feedback.

- How do we embed continuous prioritization into our UM processes?
- Does President Bodnar want the APASP TF to deliver recommendations for units placed in Category 1?
- How will administrative service units be streamlined in relation to VSO?
- Felt disappointment that President Stearns' recommendations were not hard decisions. Have decisions been made, how, and when will they be implemented?
- The TF didn't have the opportunity to connect their recommendations with budgetary goals. Will there be an opportunity for that now?
- What is the mechanism for tracking and rewarding success in interdisciplinary programs?
- We need to keep track of lessons learned through APASP.
- Where do we go from here in connecting the work of the APASP TF with the strategic plan, diversity goals, etc?

President Bodnar sketched 4 circles on the whiteboard, representing a cycle between Strategy/Planning, Budgeting, Implementation, and Assessment. At the top of the whiteboard he wrote "Mission and Vision".

Strategy should drive budget. Planning assessment continuum. These roles exist at UM, but they may be a little confused at the moment. UM2020 – SPCC – APASP – UPC?

We need to get back into a clear planning, budgeting, implementation, assessment process; put in place structures to make UM a learning organization.

We can implement some APASP recommendations right now. Others need to be viewed through the lens of our strategy. President Bodnar continues to learn and think about this.

Reconstitute membership of University Planning Committee (UPC) – make its job to "re-look" the mission of the University, determine our North Star. Determine how we are meeting the needs of our students, State, nation effectively. Then re-look the strategy. How do we take our strengths and apply them to the greatest opportunities.

We have a good idea of our strengths through APASP. Are we applying those strengths to our greatest opportunities?

We have a significant budget deficit. Sources of revenue – state support and tuition. Big gap between expenses and revenues. We won't close that gap overnight. Not doing across the board cuts anymore. President Bodnar wants the University to invest in excellent, quality of academic programs. We may have to restructure how we deliver some of our programs. Expenses have to come down but the deficit won't be closed without revenue. UM needs to work hard on recruitment and retention strategies. Retention is a more powerful tool than recruitment.

What is the next phase of work for APASP?
President Bodnar sees APASP as a group that can provide recommendations and input to a newly chartered UPC. The TF has uncovered UM's strengths; what has the TF learned that the UPC should take into consideration as a key foundation for the reformulation of the 4-5 year strategy for the university? By the end of spring semester...

We need to be mindful of lessons learned – if assessment is going to be a rigorous, fair, objective part of our process, how will we make it a reality? For example, assessing interdisciplinarity. To ensure we are a learning organization, we need the right infrastructure in place to conduct meaningful assessment and focus on continuous improvement.

This is a high-level description of President Bodnar's thoughts at the moment. What remains to be done with input from campus is to reconstitute an effective UPC that can articulate our mission, craft the strategy to apply UM's strengths to opportunities and needs, in line with the budget to get us to a sustainable operating budget by 2022.

If all we do with APASP is take recommendations, make changes on the margins, we will have sold ourselves short. President Bodnar doesn't want to do that. APASP TF has done great work that should be transformative. We need to do a reconceptualization of UM and articulate clearly how we meet the needs of students and the state in a unique and effective way, without compromising high quality. We have an opportunity to do that.

Invitation to questions , feedback, comments

- APASP TF did some assessment of productivity and data, but APASP as an acronym needs to go away. The "P" for "prioritization" in APASP is what's really important. The setting of priorities needs to lie with the UPC. Some of the data APASP looked at can be embedded there. The true priorities need to live in strategy and planning.
  - When we did prioritization, what did we use aside from accreditation and efficiency and productivity metrics? Through what lens did we make prioritization recommendations? We need to define that lens more clearly.
  - The continuous prioritization the APASP task force develops needs to be worked into the work of the Planning Assessment Continuum,
  - Assessment and adjustment needs to be a continuous part of our work at UM.
  - The secondary charge for APASP was to come up with that process.
- Assessment for what end? For what purpose? Most academics think assessment is worthless. We need to be clear on the value of assessment to help determine where to place resources. The APASP TF never had the opportunity to connect values, ideals for UM with prioritization, and we need to find a way to connect the two.
  - How do we determine how our strategy/planning was successful? Through meaningful assessment, using meaningful indicators.
- Combination of qualitative and quantitative data would ideally reveal what programs need attention – without requesting lots of work from lots of faculty and staff.
  - That means that the data has to be accurate and we all need to agree on it. In APASP, the way UM collect data did not cleanly respond to the questions the TF was asking. The task force should give recommendations for what types of data are relevant and how to collect them.
  - We need to have one standard for all units of the University – one version of the truth – in our data, in speaking a common language. The disparities across campus are a huge source of concern, angst, bitterness that we need to address.
    - OK as long as you keep in mind that different units have different missions. There is no way to compare units apples to apples. But there are some things we can change to maximize some of our efforts, like for example, in managing interdisciplinary programs differently.
    - Regents are the most concerned about budget and implementation, not planning and assessment. Someone has to make things the priority and decide what to do with them.
      - To clarify, you have to have a strategy to implement. Strategy is where you articulate your priorities, implementation happens after that.
      - Development and articulation of Strategy/North Star needs to take place quicker than we would like (by end of spring semester)
- Lots of anxiety with people feeling defensive, we need to make silos more transparent, we need for the spirit of the University to go forward with a stronger sense of community that is shared, communicated, budgeted...
  - If I asked the group, What's the mission of UM, we'd get a variety of answers. We need to shorten, tighten up our current mission statement. Then make decisions on what to prioritize, as a family does. Keep in line with the essence of what the University is aspiring to be.
- Provost Edmond gave the group an update on what's next. In reading all the reports coming out of APASP process, there are 2 sets of recommendations: one set for immediate action, another

for further review and analysis. Provost Edmond has recommended that we confirm which recommendations can be implemented now, vet them with President Bodnar, and start moving forward with those items. The other recommendations that need further analysis will be further discussed while we move forward with the low hanging fruit. Decouple immediate action items from those that need more time.

- Some things on academic side (moratorium) need to start on that process… there are other items that need to just get started. How will we communicate about it so the campus community knows that action is taken?
- President Bodnar would like to move forward in a way that builds on what's been done, implements what can be done now, that we take necessary time to crystallize mission, where our strengths are, and how we'll achieve mission, then through that lens, make decisions on the other items. Tougher decisions will be made on academic programs and on how we organize as a University. Unlock and amplify the strengths we already have.
  - o Implement what we can
  - o Provide input on strengths and how we understand them
  - o Make sure we build effective assessment model using the "right" data, create assessment model for "fruits of different types", make assessment rigorous and regular…
    - ▪ When APASP retires as a committee, its secondary charge (*From the APASP Task Force Framework Document, section on the TF's Charge: "A secondary, but equally important charge of the APASP Task Force will be to recommend components of the prioritization process that can be incorporated into our ongoing systematic review of UM's academic departments, programs and administrative services. In particular, the APASP Task Force should look for opportunities to link prioritization processes, decisions and outcomes with the strategic initiatives and general platform for growth outlined in the University's newly created strategic vision."*)
    - ▪ To conclude, President Bodnar would like APASP TF to:
      - • finish review, prioritization and recommendations for units in phase 2, (as was done for units as best as TF can without overarching strategic lens) and
      - • Complete the secondary charge (see quote in italics above).
    - ▪ President does not think TF needs to continue to focus on units placed in Category 1 during phase 1 – those recommendations are moving forward in the process Provost Edmond described.
    - ▪ APASP TF has already begun phase 2 review. Given that Phase 1 programs were done iwhtout overarching strategy, do the same for Phase 2 so it's fair (albeit flawed). At least all review will be complete.
    - ▪ When we restart the revitalized Planning-Assessment Continuum, APASP recommendations will inform that process.
- President Bodnar thanked the TF for the work that has been done and for their willingness to to move prioritization forward. We have to get it right, and be clear on who we are, what we're doing, how we're doing it. Yes, we're at a structural imbalance that we have to eliminate, that's a cost question, but we have to look at costs and be intentional about how to reduce them with an eye to maintaining quality.
President Bodnar left the meeting.

4. Status of Phase II Review and Voting Process

All but 4 unit reviews have been completed. Voting is going well, 30-40% of the TF has completed voting. If you have a problem when you get into Citrix, and it appears you already voted when you haven't, email Dawn immediately.

Volunteers for reassignment: Tom, Andrew, Steve, Liz

5. New Business

Agreeing that the work of this TF now focuses on Phase 2, and the secondary part of the TF's charge - to make broad based recommendations on a continuous prioritization and assessment process…. How will TF approach this? The Framework committee drafted something subcommittee chairs should review and develop further for full TF review and comment. Subcommittee chairs share draft with TF for discussion at Feb. 5 meeting.

Question about whether we need a special meeting for prioritization of units in Phase 2? No, let's see how voting goes. We should be able to do at regular TF meeting times.

6. Adjourn Upon Completion of Business