

Minutes of the Provost Retreat with Appendix

Monday, August 9, 2010 and Tuesday, August 10, 2010

Retreat Objectives. The objective of the two-day retreat on August 9–10, 2010 was to focus conversations on ways to energize learning, boost research, and build synergies. The immediate purpose was to identify action items for 2010–2011 as well as to discuss principles for future budget allocations and to prepare for strategic planning efforts. The retreat also included a fund-raising workshop on Tuesday morning presented by Advancement Resources of Cedar Rapids, Iowa. The summary below is focused on the other parts of the retreat, which occurred all-day Monday and Tuesday afternoon. We will follow up on the identified action items during the upcoming Academic Council meetings and meetings with the deans.

Participants. The participants, corresponding roughly to the Academic Council, included

- Danny Anderson, dean, Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Ken Audus, dean, Pharmacy
- Stuart Bell, dean, Engineering
- Lynn Bretz, director, University Communications
- Ann Brill, dean, Journalism
- Robert Clark, vice chancellor and dean, Edwards Campus
- Sarah Crawford-Parker, assistant to the provost
- Kathy Damron, director, State Government Relations
- Bill Fuerst, dean, Business
- John Gaunt, dean, Architecture, Design and Planning
- Shelley Gebar (KUMC), chief of staff to the executive vice chancellor, Medical School
- Richard Ginsburg, dean, Education
- Diane Goddard, vice provost for finance and administration
- Bernadette Gray-Little, chancellor
- Susan Gronbeck-Tedesco, vice provost, International Programs
- Lorraine Haricombe, dean, Libraries
- Chris Haufler, special assistant to the provost
- Mary Lee Hummert, vice provost for faculty development
- Mary Ellen Kondrat, dean, Social Welfare
- Jim Lichtenberg, associate dean, Education
- Linda Luckey, chief of staff, Provost Office
- Jack Martin, deputy director, University Communications
- Steve Mazza, interim dean, Law
- Karen Miller (KUMC), senior vice chancellor and dean of Nursing and Allied Health
- Fred Pawlicki, director, Continuing Education
- Fred Rodriguez, associate vice chancellor for diversity
- Barbara Romzek, interim vice provost for academic affairs
- Marlesa Roney, vice provost for student success
- Sara Rosen, dean, Graduate Studies
- Don Steeples, senior vice provost for scholarly support

- Paul Terranova, (KUMC), vice chancellor for research
- Deb Teeter, director, Office of Institutional Research and Planning
- Jeff Vitter, provost and executive vice chancellor
- Robert Walzel, dean, Music
- Steve Warren, vice chancellor for research and graduate studies

Organizational Structure and Process. The Monday portion of the retreat used a cyclical mechanism for rotating small groups through a discussion of each of the topics of *Enhancing Research; Admissions, Retention, and Graduation;* and *Community-Engaged Scholarship*. These discussions built upon the work of the chancellor’s three task force reports generated last year on Research Engagement, Admissions, and Retention and Graduation. In addition, the groups examined the potential for a scholarly-based approach to public service, generally referred to as scholarly engagement or community-engaged scholarship.

From these discussions, the working groups developed first-year action items. The full group ranked the priorities for each of the three topics in terms of importance, ease of implementation, and affordability. For the first two working groups, rankings were done separately for the university at large and for the College and schools. Those priorities that were ranked highly in importance as well as in one or both of the other categories are especially ripe for immediate implementation.

In each of the three topics and for each of the two target groups (university administration and College/schools), the three action items ranked most important are indicated in bold. Those action items were generally also ranked within the top three in terms of ease and/or affordability. The one exception is that the university action item to realign student scholarships for purposes of recruiting was ranked #2 in importance , but #5 in ease and #4 in affordability; however, the #4 ranking was only two votes shy (38 vs. 40) of a tie for #3. More significantly, this priority has historically been problematic at the College/schools level, where its primary responsibility is located; however, it was ranked overwhelmingly the #1 College/schools action item in terms of both importance and affordability, indicating a shift in appreciation of the importance of using scholarships for recruiting.

Research. The focus of these discussions was on ways to boost research. Strategies identified included establishing quantifiable metrics and incentives that will allow KU to expand its profile of excellence in research, scholarship, and creative activities. The discussions yielded seven action items for 2010–2011. Deans are encouraged to use these inputs as potential ways to strengthen the research engagement enhancement plans they are putting together for September 30, 2010. The provost and vice provost for research will also provide feedback on the initial drafts submitted in early August.

Action Item Priorities—Importance (1 = highest)

| University—Research | College/Schools—Research |
|--|--|
| 1. Develop goals, metrics, and assessment | 1. Develop goals, metrics, and assessment |
| 2. Energize post-tenure mentoring and review | 2. Energize post-tenure mentoring and review |
| 3. Communicate value of research (tie) | 3. Develop policy for differential loads |
| 3. Develop a resource plan (tie) | 4. Communicate value of research |
| 5. Develop policy for differential workloads | 5. Develop incentives for research scholarship |
| 6. Foster interdisciplinary research | 6. Foster interdisciplinary research |
| 7. Develop incentives for research scholarship | 7. Develop a resource plan |

Action Item Priorities—Ease

| University—Research | College/Schools—Research |
|---|---|
| 1. Develop goals, metrics, and assessment | 1. Develop goals, metrics, and assessment |
| 2. Communicate value of research | 2. Communicate value of research |
| 3. Develop policy for differential loads | 3. Develop incentives for research engagement |
| 4. Energize post-tenure review (tie) | 4. Develop policy for differential loads |
| 4. Develop a resource plan (tie) | 5. Foster interdisciplinary research |
| 6. Foster interdisciplinary research | 6. Energize post-tenure mentoring and review |
| 7. Develop incentives for research engagement | 7. Develop a resource plan |

Action Item Priorities—Affordability

| University—Research | College/Schools—Research |
|---|---|
| 1. Develop goals, metrics, and assessment | 1. Develop goals, metrics, and assessment |
| 2. Energize post-tenure mentoring and review | 2. Develop policy for differential loads |
| 3. Develop policy for differential loads | 3. Energize post-tenure mentoring and review |
| 4. Communicate value of research (tie) | 4. Communicate value of research |
| 4. Develop a resource plan (tie) | 5. Develop a resource plan (tie) |
| 6. Foster interdisciplinary research | 5. Foster interdisciplinary research (tie) |
| 7. Develop incentives for research engagement | 7. Develop incentives for research engagement |

Admissions, Retention, and Graduation. The discussions focused upon ways to energize undergraduate education and especially to improve KU’s performance in the areas of retention and time to graduation at both the university level and for College and schools. The action items identified undergraduate curriculum review, changes in admissions and aid practices, and enrollment management as key action items for improving KU’s ability to retain and advance students. These priorities recommend more focused attention by the university on the educational experience of students in the general education curriculum and more active role of schools and the College in recruitment, retention, and timely graduation of students.

The groups identified redesigning KU’s current general education requirements as a top university priority. These fundamental changes take time, but the necessary groundwork can begin immediately, engaging the entire university, especially at the departmental level, to collaboratively determine the desired goals and outcomes of the curriculum. The priority rankings below acknowledge the need to enlist faculty and school support at all levels of this endeavor, including in the recruitment of students to the university and the development of engaged learning opportunities beginning with first-year students. Instrumental changes can be accomplished more quickly, such as early interventions for underperforming students and the use of degree and career planning tools to help students to better understand their options and progress toward degree.

Action Item Priorities—Importance (1 = highest)

| University—Admissions, Retention, Graduation | College/Schools—Admissions, Retention, Graduation |
|--|---|
| 1. Engage in general education renewal | 1. Realign scholarships from reward to recruit |
| 2. Realign scholarships from reward to recruit | 2. Enlist faculty participation in recruitment |
| 3. Implement real-time interventions for students | 3. Develop a comprehensive enrollment plan |
| 4. Survey students about why they leave (tie) | 4. Implement freshman “direct admit” programs |
| 4. Develop a comprehensive enrollment plan (tie) | 5. Explore global recruitment |
| 6. Utilize 4-year degree and career planning tools | 6. Develop transition mechanisms from advising to mentoring |
| 7. Fund “one stop shop” for undergraduate research | |
| 8. Utilize interactive degree audit tools | |
| 9. Establish an office of engaged learning | |
| 10. Integrate advising best practices | |

Action Item Priorities—Ease

| University—Admissions, Retention, Graduation | College/Schools—Admissions, Retention, Graduation |
|---|---|
| 1. Survey students about why they leave | 1. Develop a comprehensive enrollment plan |
| 2. Implement real-time interventions for students | 2. Implement freshman “Direct admit” programs |
| 3. Develop a comprehensive enrollment plan | 3. Enlist faculty participation in recruitment |
| 4. Utilize 4-year degree and planning tools | 4. Explore global recruitment |
| 5. Realign scholarships from reward to recruit | 5. Realign scholarships from reward to recruit |
| 6. Develop “one stop shop” for undergraduate research | 6. Develop transition from mechanism of advising to mentoring |
| 7. Integrate advising best practices | |
| 8. Engage in general education renewal | |
| 9. Establish an office of engaged learning | |
| 10. Utilize interactive degree audit tools | |

Action Item Priorities—Affordability

| University—Admissions, Retention, Graduation | College/Schools—Admissions, Retention, Graduation |
|---|--|
| 1. Engage in general education renewal | 1. Realign scholarships from reward to recruit |
| 2. Survey students about why they leave | 2. Develop a comprehensive enrollment plan |
| 3. Implement real-time interventions for students | 3. Implement freshman “Direct admit” programs |
| 4. Realign scholarships from reward to recruit | 4. Enlist faculty participation in recruitment |
| 5. Utilize 4-year degree and career planning tools | 5. Develop transition from mechanisms of advising to mentoring |
| 6. Integrate advising best practices | 6. Explore global recruitment |
| 7. Utilize degree audit tools | |
| 8. Develop a comprehensive enrollment plan | |
| 9. Develop “one stop shop” for undergraduate research | |
| 10. Establish an office of engaged learning | |

Engaged Scholarship for Public Service. These discussions explored ways to promote a scholarly approach to public service at the University of Kansas that simultaneously advances scholarship and service. One feedback was that community-engaged scholarship at KU will benefit tremendously from a broadened view of research and creative scholarship—a campus culture that embraces the value of scholarship that serves the public through the application of new knowledge or creative activities, for example, through entrepreneurship, K–12 partnerships, social entrepreneurship, and innovative public projects. Other feedback suggested that the university should help faculty develop their research and teaching to have community impact by identifying opportunities for new synergies and to a lesser extent by providing training and incentives. Making progress in this area can be guided by identifying and building upon the existing successful activities of KU faculty members. The development of an exchange portal to facilitate connections and identify potential synergies was highly recommended; possible sites to host such a portal/office included an expanded Center for Service Learning (to build upon its teaching and community connections) and KUCR (to build upon its research infrastructure). Such a portal or office could bring people and resources together for research activities that are mutually beneficial to university and community participants.

Action Item Priorities—Importance (1=highest)

| |
|--|
| University and College/Schools combined—Engaged Scholarship for Public Service |
| 1. Develop an exchange portal |
| 2. Establish a broadened definition of scholarship |
| 3. Identify existing successful activities |
| 4. Reward success |
| 5. Identify key strengths to market |
| 6. Develop a communication plan |
| 7. Engage in faculty and community training |

Action Item Priorities—Ease

| |
|--|
| University and College/Schools combined—Engaged Scholarship for Public Service |
| 1. Identify existing successful activities |
| 2. Develop a communication plan |
| 3. Develop an exchange portal |
| 4. Identify key strengths |
| 5. Establish a broadened definition of scholarship |
| 6. Reward success |
| 7. Engage in faculty and community training |

Action Item Priorities—Affordability

| |
|---|
| University and College/Schools combined—Community Engaged Scholarship |
| 1. Identify existing successful activities |
| 2. Establish a broadened definition of research |
| 3. Identify key strengths |
| 4. Develop an exchange portal |
| 5. Reward success |
| 6. Develop a communication plan |
| 7. Engage in faculty and community training |

Recap of Monday Discussions. Some basic themes emerged from the prior discussions. One theme involved the importance of accountability and annual review of faculty and programs. Increasing faculty productivity in research and scholarly activities is important for the university and crucial for its overall quality and sustenance. We should strive to develop a culture that values research, scholarship and creativity more strongly. And within that culture we should embrace a broader view of research, scholarship and creativity, so that research, scholarship and creativity with public impact are valued in the same league as traditional scholarship.

Another theme involved the need for broad participation by faculty across the campus, which will be especially needed to boost educational and scholarly involvement.

Recruitment, especially in light of the large decrease in undergraduate enrollment for the 2010–2011 academic year, requires the active participation of the College and schools, especially by the faculty members within those units. The undergraduate aid (scholarship) process needs to be reconfigured to maximize its value for recruitment and admissions rather than to reward students already at KU.

Budget Allocations. The budget discussion on Tuesday afternoon focused on the challenge of developing a budget process that would yield the planning benefits and incentives of a Responsibility Center Management (RCM) model without the disadvantages and fragmentation that often accompany such systems. The budget allocation discussion identified a need for a budget system that is more transparent and based upon quantifiable performance metrics such as alignment with strategic university priorities, enrollments, program quality, and research and scholarship productivity. The goal is to have the process sufficiently clear that leadership in academic and support units can anticipate the budget implications of program and enrollment growth and decline. There was strong support for developing a comprehensive enrollment plan and model for the university. The group discussions identified the challenge of aligning performance goals and metrics with budget decisions at all levels.

Priorities—Budget

| |
|---|
| 1. Develop an enrollment plan for the University |
| 2. Schools should be evaluated and funded based upon a set of performance metrics |
| 3. Review SCH per FTE using a 3-5 year window |
| Other action items in no particular order— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider all sources to fund a program • Establish a central competitive process for additional funding • Understand the cost of multiple areas, external study • Transparency • Collect and utilize more data |

Summary of Strategic Directions. In this session, the group looked back at the underlying priorities that guided the prior discussions of action items—learning, research, and building synergies—and asked if they are the proper long-term goals and, if not, how they should be modified or augmented. The discussion reinforced these three goals and also brought up the important topics of graduate education and diversity. Ultimately, it was recommended to build graduate education and diversity into the three main goals and/or overarching enablers.

The discussion identified several key enablers for a successful plan at both the university and academic unit levels. The upcoming capital campaign will be a key enabler for the successful implementation of the strategic plan, and conversely the capital campaign can best succeed if a compelling vision emerges from the planning process. Another enabler is budget transparency to support our collective goals, allow effective planning, and promote excellence. The consideration of space as a strategic planning priority recognizes that facilities on main campus are in need of significant upgrade and that addressing this need will require budget resources and sustained planning in the form of an updated campus master plan. Diversity and the related focus on personnel development and recognition both point to the importance of people—especially the faculty, staff, and students of the KU community— as key contributors to our long-term success. The group assigned the following priorities of importance:

Priorities—Enablers for Strategic Planning

| |
|--|
| 1. Resource acquisition and fundraising (68 votes) |
| 2. Budget transparency (52 votes) |
| 3. Space, updated campus master plan (41 votes) |
| 4. Diversity (29 votes) |
| 5. Personnel development (23 votes) |

Principles for Strategic Planning. The last session of the retreat focused on the steps and principles for successful strategic planning. The discussion suggested that the strategic planning process should be carefully framed to reassure faculty members that we are leveraging prior planning efforts. In particular, we should make clear that we are building upon the prior vision set out in *Initiative 2015* and upon the recommendations of the chancellor’s three task forces. Also important for success is a focused approach to planning. The plan should highlight a small number of focused goals for the next five years, clear and focused implementation strategies to achieve those goals, and a small number of key metrics to measure our success.

We need wide faculty, staff, and student participation in the planning process to identify the best ideas as well as to assure the buy-in needed to successfully implement the plan. The plan should be organized in phases that enable units to demonstrate forward movement on an annual basis. The process should rely on institutional data to build implementation plans and annual reports.

There was discussion in favor of tying future budget allocations to the strategic plan and institutional priorities. This sentiment meshed well with the earlier discussion to tie resource allocation to university priorities, enrollments, program quality, and research and scholarship productivity. On the theme of strategic investment and budget management, discussion ensued about ways to identify not only programs to promote but those to wind down or discontinue. There have been initial efforts in each school and the College to characterize which programs are high-quality, which programs are on the cusp with the potential to become high-quality, and which programs are declining. It was recommended that such efforts continue and that we engage the College/schools leadership and perhaps community overall in those sometimes difficult discussions.

Next Steps. The action items identified in the retreat provide a robust agenda for the university and for individual units for the coming year. We summarize the top three action items below in the areas of learning, research, impact/synergy, and budgeting, as a general guideline for the most important action items:

Research

| | |
|---|---|
| University—Research | College/Schools—Research |
| 1. Develop goals, metrics, and assessment | 1. Develop goals, metrics, and assessment |
| 2. Energize post-tenure mentoring and review | 2. Energize post-tenure mentoring and review |
| 3. Communicate value of research (tie) | 3. Develop policy for differential loads |
| 3. Develop a resource plan (tie) | |

Learning

| | |
|--|---|
| University—Admissions, Retention, Graduation | College/Schools—Admissions, Retention, Graduation |
| 1. Engage in general education renewal | 1. Realign scholarships from reward to recruit |
| 2. Realign scholarships from reward to recruit | 2. Enlist faculty participation in recruitment |
| 3. Implement real-time interventions for students | 3. Develop a comprehensive enrollment plan |

Engaged Scholarship for Public Service

| |
|---|
| University and College/Schools combined— Engaged Scholarship for Public Service |
| 1. Develop an exchange portal |
| 2. Establish a broadened definition of scholarship |
| 3. Identify existing successful activities |

Budgeting

| |
|--|
| 1. Develop an enrollment plan for the University |
| 2. Schools should be evaluated and funded based upon a set of performance metrics |
| 3. Review SCH per FTE using a 3-5 year window |

Long-term Strategic Goals

| |
|------------------------------|
| 1. Learning |
| 2. Research |
| 3. Building Synergies |

While the top three action items ranked most important in each category give a general indication of feedback, in reality all action items should be considered carefully. For example, the action item that got top priority for the College/schools was to direct scholarship dollars toward the recruitment of incoming freshmen rather than to use them for upper level awards. However, it is substantially easier for professional schools to direct scholarships to freshmen if the schools do a significant number of direct admits. (It can be worked out otherwise, but generally it is simpler with direct admits.) Moreover, direct admissions can aid the recruitment of high-achieving students who know what they want to major in. Therefore, it makes sense for professional schools to actively expand the pool of direct admits, even though that particular action item was ranked #4 for the College and schools.

The item of recruiting globally was ranked #4 for the university administration, and the Board of Regents is actively encouraging increased out-of-state enrollment, so strengthening external undergraduate recruitment can be a good focus for recruiting high-achieving students.

High importance for the College/schools in the research area was attached to the action item to establish differential teaching loads for purposes of fairness. In the engaged scholarship area, high priority went to incorporating a broadened view of scholarship. A related action item that enables both of these action items is to do balanced annual reviews in order to recognize people for what they do best. It was listed as an action item, though not with as high a priority, but it is closely connected with the two high-priority items listed above.

These key issues described in this report will drive the agenda in this year's Academic Council meetings, and we will look to them as key objectives for judging progress during the 2010–2011 academic year. In the area of research, we have begun discussions on developing the infrastructure for assessing faculty productivity, which will provide support for the other action items. The preparation for general education review and boosting our recruitment can start immediately; the latter will be further aided by the imminent hiring of an associate vice provost for recruitment and enrollment. The general arena of community-engaged scholarship is also a ripe one that builds upon pockets of excellence and can aid our efforts in research and learning.

Appendix

Tables with full vote counts of priorities along key dimensions

| Research | Importance | | Ease | | Affordability | |
|--|------------|-------|------------|-------|---------------|-------|
| | N votes | Score | N votes | Score | N votes | Score |
| University Administration | | | | | | |
| 1. Assessment—goals, metrics, benchmarking | 27 | 79 | 25 | 73 | 26 | 79 |
| 2. Mentoring and review of post-tenure faculty | 23 | 67 | 16 | 33 | 20 | 51 |
| 3. Communicating value—external and internal | 17 | 39 | 21 | 53 | 20 | 40 |
| 4. Develop resource plan consistent with goals | 20 | 39 | 18 | 33 | 21 | 40 |
| 5. Develop policy for differential loads | 17 | 37 | 20 | 46 | 21 | 48 |
| 6. Foster interdisciplinary research | 15 | 26 | 14 | 29 | 12 | 23 |
| 7. Develop incentives for research scholarship | 14 | 22 | 15 | 28 | 15 | 19 |
| College/Schools | | | | | | |
| 1. Assessment—goals, metrics, benchmarking | 28 | 83 | 23 | 62 | 26 | 76 |
| 2. Mentoring and review of post-tenure faculty | 25 | 67 | 19 | 35 | 22 | 51 |
| 3. Develop policy for differential loads | 20 | 45 | 21 | 46 | 25 | 59 |
| 4. Communicating value—external and internal | 17 | 36 | 23 | 55 | 22 | 44 |
| 5. Develop incentives for research scholarship | 21 | 31 | 22 | 49 | 16 | 24 |
| 6. Foster interdisciplinary research | 18 | 28 | 21 | 42 | 16 | 26 |
| 7. Develop resource plan consistent with goals | 13 | 21 | 16 | 26 | 16 | 26 |

| Learning Admissions, Retention, and Graduation | Importance | | Ease | | Affordability | |
|---|------------|-------|------------|-------|---------------|-------|
| | N votes | Score | N votes | Score | N votes | Score |
| University Administration | | | | | | |
| 1. Establish general education renewal task force, implement in Fall 2012 | 28 | 97 | 10 | 20 | 24 | 73 |
| 2. Realign scholarships from reward to recruit | 21 | 50 | 13 | 28 | 19 | 38 |
| 3. Infuse real-time interventions for students, nimbleness | 20 | 38 | 22 | 46 | 22 | 40 |
| 4. Survey students to know why they leave, what KU could do | 12 | 23 | 23 | 64 | 22 | 56 |
| 5. Develop comprehensive, strategic enrollment plan (April 2011) | 13 | 23 | 18 | 34 | 12 | 17 |
| 6. Implement 4-year degree/career planning tools | 12 | 22 | 16 | 33 | 14 | 23 |
| 8. Fund "one stop shop" for undergraduate research experiences | 9 | 21 | 14 | 24 | 6 | 9 |
| 7. Develop and implement interactive degree audit tools | 10 | 17 | 13 | 18 | 10 | 20 |
| 8. Establish office of engaged learning | 5 | 11 | 11 | 19 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. Integrate advising best practices | 5 | 6 | 15 | 22 | 14 | 22 |
| College/Schools | | | | | | |
| 1. Realign scholarships from reward to recruit | 29 | 96 | 19 | 44 | 22 | 74 |
| 2. Faculty participation in recruitment (grad and undergrad) | 25 | 51 | 23 | 50 | 22 | 52 |
| 3. Develop strategic enrollment plans (grad and undergrad) | 24 | 50 | 26 | 64 | 26 | 62 |
| 4. Implement freshman "direct admit" programs | 22 | 42 | 23 | 59 | 21 | 55 |
| 5. Explore global recruitment (undergrad) | 19 | 31 | 22 | 45 | 16 | 26 |
| 6. Transition from mechanisms of advising to mentoring | 17 | 27 | 18 | 34 | 17 | 33 |

| Engaged Scholarship for Public Service | Importance | | Ease | | Affordability | |
|--|------------|-------|---------|-------|---------------|-------|
| | N votes | Score | N votes | Score | N votes | Score |
| University Administration/College and School Combined | | | | | | |
| 1. Identify university-wide program or mechanism to define, oversee, manage a potential "exchange portal" | 25 | 63 | 22 | 39 | 22 | 40 |
| 2. Validate broadened definition of scholarship within overall context of research intensive public university | 23 | 57 | 21 | 36 | 23 | 59 |
| 3. Identify existing successful activities | 25 | 50 | 30 | 94 | 29 | 89 |
| 4. Reward success—awards, annual review, P & T | 24 | 49 | 18 | 34 | 16 | 33 |
| 5. Identify key strengths to market | 17 | 36 | 20 | 35 | 18 | 42 |
| 6. Develop internal and external communications plan | 21 | 34 | 23 | 50 | 20 | 31 |
| 7. Faculty and community training and development | 12 | 21 | 10 | 16 | 8 | 12 |