

APRIP OC meeting summary 16 Apr 2015

## **APRIP Oversight Committee**

**April 16, 2015**

Present: Ellen Chaffee, Chair, Charles Bernacchio, Barbara Blackstone, Mary Louis Davitt, William Desisto, Kathleen Dexter, Tony Enerva, Kathryn Foster, Jeff Hecker, Cynthia Huggins, Gary Johnson, Eric Jones, Lois-Ann Kuntz, Chris O'Brien, Raymond Rice, Dana Saucier

Nathan Grant, Dave Stevens, Michael Stevenson

Absent: Gregory Johnson, Rebecca Wyke

Guests: Jan Kearce, Laura Moorehead

### **Communications**

OC reviewed attachments distributed with the agenda.

Academic team leaders will provide assessment of barriers to successful implementation of their recommendations. OC expressed no concern about making the midterm meeting summary available outside the OC and the teams. Team leaders have benefited from the opportunity to meet. Some teams have had difficulty getting together. A list of barriers has been framed as a list of needs to help the system make changes. Organizational Effectiveness staff continue to work closely with teams. Some teams may provide deliverables in phases. Some may not be consensus reports.

Quarterly update was well received by external audiences and should be distributed further. On campus feedback was minimal.

Documents focused on barriers were reframed in terms of solutions. The list is long and requires prioritization. Items in bold may reflect greater need. Potential Approaches draft outline summarizes brainstorming on solutions. This transition is predicted to take several years (e.g. 5). Team leaders will provide further feedback on the documents at a later date. Prioritization of support requirements significantly depends on the overall vision for the system. Current prioritization may reflect some assumptions that may not yet be widely held. It is important to remember that the APRIP Support Requirements spread sheet is from brainstorming and informed by the ongoing work of the teams. The list needs further discussion before consensus is reached on prioritization. A number of things on the list may be inter-related in important ways. Ellen will facilitate further vetting of the list, starting with revisions by the CAOs. OC members can provide input on the process.

CAOs will start conversation about updating administrative policy manual that will allow progress on APRIP. Five or six new academic programs are already in the pipeline before the new ARIP model has been fully implemented. APRIP and conventional processes need to coalesce soon. These items are included on the CAOs' May meeting agenda. Further discussion on "system" degree models would be useful.

Portfolio review is a piece of the APRIP process that is less clearly defined. Presidents have begun to discuss programs on their campuses that might require further deliberation. The Presidents have shared their thoughts with the CAOs for further discussion. We need a more

clearly designed process for the portfolio review and this important work needs to be done in concert with the marketing discussion.

Academic transformation team work is focused on strengthening programs through integration and collaboration. Portfolio review work includes a focus on programs that may be at risk in one way or another so that decisions on budgeting for 2017 can include a system-level perspective rather than continuing to focus exclusively at the campus level. We are not very far along in the developing that part of the process. This discussion should support the campus differentiation process. Presidents have focused on financial sustainability, state need, and the extent to which a program is core to a campus mission. It may be helpful to clarify the metrics that will be used in decision making. The system does not yet have the data and tools needed. An external consultant is working on a program-by-program financial analysis. More detailed market research is also needed. Portfolio review can also include certificates and stackable/collaborative curriculum. This represents a huge culture change in the way the university system operates.

Mission differentiation will allow campuses within the system to compete less with each other. At present, UMS is not successfully defending our market share. We have the opportunity to win back at least a portion of market share. Currently the budget process is driving the curriculum. We need to reverse this, perhaps using enrollment targets rather than balanced budgets. This will require changing the game. A recommendation concerning the financial structure of the system is forthcoming.

#### **APRIP support activities (Dave Stevens)**

*Market research RFP:* We received nine responses to the RFP. Those are now being read. Seven are being seriously considered. Proposals focus on market research by student type, competitor intelligence, and emerging trends in higher education.

*Lift360, internal communications:* Internal communications is a large and important effort. UMS does not currently have the capacity internally. A contract with Lift360 resulted from an RFP. Jan Kearce and Laura Moorehead discussed their work with OC. Currently, they are gathering information by sitting in on a variety of meetings. Their intent is to create a cascade of communication that includes communication facilitated by members of the OC. Lift360 is working with the UMS leaders to create the content and make it possible to communicate more effectively. Their intent is to engage campus communities, face-to-face and in groups, to help create a path forward. Currently, the "one university" theme is not well articulated and some are resistant to the idea, making it difficult for them to understand the nuances. To some, the one university construct also seems inconsistent with the mission differentiation idea. Lift360 will need to understand the resistance and concerns in order to assist UMS to be successful in communicating these complex messages. The relationships between APRIP and "one university" also remain unclear. "One university" is causing some fear of loss of identity and community, perhaps especially at small campuses. There may also be fear of centralization, bureaucracy, and loss of local control and autonomy. A consistent set of talking points would be useful, especially focused on institutional mission.

Communication has been difficult in part because we have little evidence that centralization is improving services so far. Lift360 invites further input from OC members via email. Lift360's work will focus on communication internal to UMS, not with external constituencies. Lift360 is coordinating with UMS communication personnel on external communications.

Electronic communication isn't currently effective. Face-to-face meetings, however, have prompted rich conversation. Using existing mechanisms on campuses may be useful (e.g. school meetings, faculty meetings). Timing is also a concern given we are approaching the end of a semester.

Continuing messaging should include our intention that this process will strengthen campuses, improve accessibility and service to students, and that the work is being done by faculty and institutional academic leaders - people we know and trust. OC members need to be able to talk with colleagues regarding the personal impact of this change (e.g. what is it going to do for me?).

A summary sheet of talking points will be very useful. This document could clarify what we know and don't yet know and clarify what outcomes are intended. The next message should include an invitation to participate in the ongoing conversation. The communication plan needs to be informed by the academic calendar (e.g. the end of the semester is coming soon). It might also include an FAQ. The circumstances are complicated by the fact that we will not have the first drafts of team reports until the end of May. It is difficult to be authentic in our communication with constituents and colleagues in the current circumstances – much is genuinely unknown. Clarifying how people can provide input and be engaged in the process might be helpful.

Lift360 appreciates this input. They will be meeting with presidents' council shortly for further consideration of the communication content and plan. Differentiating communication regarding various parallel processes will be important. OC members should focus their communication on APRIP processes.

*What we know:* We have learned a lot. Institutional leadership is dedicated to creating a cohesive plan by September or October. The Chancellor has been focused on the external messaging. In so doing, we were less successful in the internal communication. "One University" was primarily intended to focus the external message. We now need to figure out what that means. The campus differentiation process is well underway and success with that process should help us re-capture market share. A full scale financial review is also underway. The result of that review will include the availability of fine grained financial data. We have also learned a lot from the administrative reviews. Portfolio and program review are also well underway. We have fewer resources now than in the past despite the results of the last state budget proposal. Enrollments have not yet stabilized. Focusing on growing enrollments would mediate cuts.

Some communication over the summer may be possible, especially through department chairs and deans.

### **Talking Points, Final Thoughts**

The work of academic transformation is being accomplished by those most closely involved in the delivery of academic programs.

The "one university" construct has the potential to mean something positive for the institutions that make up the UMS.

OC is eager to review and support the reports from teams. We are learning a lot from this work and it will inform the work of the second round of teams that will commence in the Fall.

OC members acknowledge and appreciate the work of the teams and their leaders.

**Upcoming meetings**

No meeting in May. Possibly a conference call if needed

June 12 10 to 2 - will include CAOs and focus on transformation team reports [NOTE change of time]

July 10 regular meeting 10-2

September 18 regular meeting 10-2