University Planning Committee (UPC)
Minutes
February 17, 2011

Attendees: Mr. Jerome DeSanto (Chair), Dr. Gerald Biberman, Dr. Lori Bruch, Mr. William Burke, Dr. Vince Carilli (representing Student Affairs), Ms. Meg Cullen-Brown, Mr. Jim Devers, Ms. Robyn Dickinson, Mr. Will Grogan (representing Student Affairs), Mr. Patrick Donohue, Dr. Joseph Dreisbach, Ms. Marise Garofalo, Mr. Mark Murphy, Ms. Lori Nidoh, Ms. Valerie Taylor, Ms. Patti Tetreault, Dr. William Wallick, and Ms. Kate Yerkes.

1.0 Welcome

1.1 Minutes from 11/18
The minutes were approved as submitted.

2.0 Institutional Effectiveness Updates

2.1 Draft Peer, Competitor, Aspirant list development
This has now been sent to the AC Tactical Planners so they can begin discussing at an Institutional level as well as in their individual areas to see if there are any other recommendations. The last AC Tactical Planners meeting was canceled so there are no further updates to the list at this time. It is on the agenda for the Tactical Planners meeting which is scheduled for March 1st.

2.2 Tactical Plan updates underway
Each division is currently updating their tactical plans. Discussion at the next AC/Tactical Planners’ meeting will focus on the Student Affairs plan. Since the board discontinued the Civic Engagement Committee until Father Quinn arrives, they split the functions of this committee into academic and non-academic. The work of the academic committee was moved to the Educational Excellence committee of the board and the non-academic work of the committee was moved to the University Community committee of the board. The goals, objectives, and main themes of the civic engagement plan have been moved into the tactical plans of the respective Vice President’s area.

2.3 Updated Planning & IE Model
Kate distributed the updated Planning & IE model. This model shows how the three levels of planning interact with one another and the kinds of assessment feedback that are used to help measure progress and continue development of all these. The only change was to the language under the headings strategic plan, tactical plan and academic & administrative program/unit plans. This was changed in order to keep current with what is being used today. There were some other additions to the notes section showing how this links into the budget process.

2.4 Governance review

2.4.1 Interview & focus groups
Kate updated the group on the status of this year’s governance study. The survey portion of the governance review process at the University has been completed and the results are being compiled. The interview process will begin shortly with the assistance from our graduate students in the Graduate Counseling program. They will conduct the one-on-one interviews as well as the focus group interviews so they can capture the information in an unbiased fashion. Once the information is collected, a final report will be written, which will include the results of the survey along with feedback from the interviews. Jerry will then discuss the report with the President and the AC to decide how this information will be distributed.
2.5 **Carnegie Classification Update**
Kate updated the group on the change to our Carnegie basic classification. The Carnegie Classification updates are mainly based on more current IPEDs data; the last time we were evaluated was using the 2004 data. The data that has now been used was submitted based on 2008. We moved from a Master’s Medium to a Master’s Large. The classification is based on the number of Masters Degrees you grant over a certain period. If the number is over 200 you are classified as a Master’s Large.

Some college campuses elect to participate in an elective classification. The University elects to participate in the Community Engagement classification. A question was asked as to whether or not there were other classifications other than the Community Engagement classification? Kate will look into this and see if there are any other classifications.

2.6 **Other institutional surveys – V. Taylor**
Val Taylor informed the group of some of the key surveys that are currently being handled in the Institutional Research office. The HERI faculty survey has been open for about one month and will be closing in two more weeks. The response rate so far for the HERI survey is 9%. In order to get more responses it was suggested that a note be sent to the faculty explaining how Institutional Research uses the data. A survey for freshman was conducted in the fall entitled CIRP. The data from this survey will be discussed at the next UPC meeting. The next survey that is scheduled to take place is the Senior Survey which will be administered April 11-12. This survey will be conducted as a paper survey because the students are getting so many web surveys that the response rates on the Institutional Research surveys are very low. There was a discussion on how to get more participation in these surveys.

3.0 **Discussion: draft Strategic Indicators**
The strategic indicators help in measuring the progress of the strategic plan. The strategic indicators are not the only way we measure progress on the plan. We use other things such as the annual report system and institutional surveys. These indicators are updated when a new strategic plan is adopted. We identify and measure each year on the set of data based indicators.

Kate distributed the possible strategic indicators for 2010-2015. She has distributed this list to the AC and to the Tactical Planners which they will be discussing at their March 1st meeting. Kate would like some feedback of the particular items on the list or suggestions on additional items for the list. Kate distributes a progress report, once a year on planning, progress to the university community as well as the Board of Trustees. This data is used very widely so we want to be sure we are accurately reflecting our institution in these areas. The indicators are a good tracking measure to show not only what we did well but track what things we may not have done well. There is a linkage with these indicators to the budget process.

A suggestion was made to move *increase faculty publications* from the Cura Personalis theme to the Magis theme. The *increase faculty/student research and publications* will remain in the Cura Personalis theme because this is more about the engagement of faculty and students working together. It was suggested that we add a footnote to the Cura Personalis theme indicator that reads; *increase racial diversity of student body by XXX%* because the definition of diversity has changed. The federal government through IPEDs has changed how we report ethnicity. The data we collect from students is different from the data we previous collected. A question was asked on the *Endowment % Growth* under the Rei Solicitudo theme on what we are measuring the Endowment growth against. The Endowment is more about budgeting and how we use it to fund initiatives. Some suggested additions include; 1) Measure staff engagement through service learning or campus activity. If we add it to the list it makes us more accountable. 2) Measure student retreats. 3) Measure the Ignatian Spirituality impact on staff members from Fr. Leo’s program. 4) Measure the Magis program from the Maryland Providence.
4.0 Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 10am. The next UPC meeting will take place on Thursday, March 17 at 8:30am in the PIR Conference Room, Alumni Memorial Hall room 103.