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Original charge to JTFSO (May 9, 2013)

1. Make recommendations to the Chancellor with respect to a high-level Strategic Plan which will serve as the institution’s mandated response to NEASC, due August 15, 2013.

2. Complete the new Strategic Plan, building on the “Framework for Excellence” but also moving beyond it, perhaps in ways suggested by the National Academies Report, Research Universities and the Future of America, in order to create one the leading public universities of the next generation.

3. Monitor the subsequent development of administrative and academic unit plans, and lead the discussion of and response to them.
**JTFSO Status Report**

- **Charge from the Chancellor** *(March 4, 2015)*
  - “The key task is understanding the extent to which work to date has carried the campus’ strategic priorities forward as hoped and intended.”
    - Has academic unit planning unfolded according to expectations?
    - Did colleges and departments respond to the prompts coming out of Phases I and II?
    - Are there broad issues deserving additional consideration?
- Although unit planning continues, we must keep our focus on campus-level planning, as well
  - What is the status of implementation, especially in terms of the destination of choice priorities?
**JTFSO Actions on JTFRA Recommendations**

1. Endorsed further exploring the proposed new budget system through the ‘parallel process’ recommended by JTFRA.

2. Charged JTFRA to provide ongoing oversight and evaluation for the allocation model, and the campus-wide and College-level budget development processes.

3. Established a joint JTFSO/JTFRA subcommittee on administrative costs and services (JSACS).
   - Develop recommendations for the review and determination of administrative and support (A&S) costs, including prioritization and resources needed to support evaluation of costs and services.

4. Requested that JTFRA develop a summary and timeline of the entire system as it would unfold during the parallel process to show what the exploration would entail, how the experience would differ from current practice at all levels, and the checkpoints in the process at which feedback would be considered.

5. JTFSO will continue to provide general oversight of the budget process discussion to ensure alignment with the strategic plan process and priorities.
**JTFSO Status Report**

- **Academic Unit Planning: Part One**
  - Part One reports available beginning of the spring semester
  - JTFSO review
    - Broad focus, looking for themes and patterns
    - Observations of two kinds:
      - What was the pattern of responses (i.e. what did departments talk and plan about?)
      - What issues deserve continued attention?
## Attractiveness/Competitiveness
- Recruitment/Pipeline
- Admissions Yield

## Overall Effectiveness
- Student Progress
- Student Experience
- Career Preparation
- Offerings/Organization

## Student Engagement
- Faculty Interactions
- Academic Advising
- Class Size

## Teaching Effectiveness
- In the Major
- Across Courses

## Student Outcomes
- Self-reported Learning
- High-impact practices
- Specific Outcomes

## Effective Use of Resources
- Instructional Productivity (SCH)
- Instructional Productivity (sections)
- Instructor mix

### Approach
- Multiple readers
- Evaluation rubric
- Looked only at whether and in what form topics were addressed — no judgments about ideas or plans themselves

### What kind of response?
- Narrative/examples
- Analysis of evidence
- Action plans

### What level of engagement?
- Brief mention or reference
- Developed to some extent
- Major focus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Off-People</th>
<th>Career Preparation</th>
<th>Academic Advising</th>
<th>Teaching in the Major</th>
<th>High-Impact Practices</th>
<th>Class Size</th>
<th>Student Engagement</th>
<th>Student Outcomes</th>
<th>Graduation Rates</th>
<th>Faculty Interactions</th>
<th>Instructional Mix</th>
<th>Dept-specific Outcomes</th>
<th>Teaching Effectiveness</th>
<th>Effective Use of Resources</th>
<th>Self-reported Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department B</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department C</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department D</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department E</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continues...)
Preliminary observations and findings

• Considerable variation in responses
  • Partly intended, to allow departments to focus on issues of importance to them
  • Varying interpretations of the charge (Part One vs. Part Two)
  • Some very comprehensive responses
  • Some with little reference to the planning prompts
  • In general, future plans were the area least well developed
Preliminary observations and findings

• **Most attention**
  - Recruitment/Pipeline
  - Program offerings and organization
  - Career preparation
  - Academic advising
  - Teaching in the major

• **Least attention**
  - Admissions yield
  - Instructional productivity
  - Self-reported learning
  - Teaching across courses
Did plans match up with topics inviting attention?

- In areas where plans were not a major focus, was it because of departmental strength?
- Did areas suggesting concern serve as a focus of departmental plans?
- Looked at patterns across the different metrics related to planning topics.
| Attractiveness/Competitiveness | • Recruitment/Pipeline
| • Admissions Yield |
| Overall Effectiveness | • Student Progress • Percent graduated in four years
| • Student Experience • Satisfaction with overall experience
| • Career Preparation • Satisfaction with career preparation
| • Offerings/Organization |
| Student Engagement | • Faculty Interactions • Quality of faculty interactions
| • Academic Advising • Satisfaction with academic advising
| • Class Size • Percent of SCH in classes >100 |
| Teaching Effectiveness | • In the Major • Satisfaction with teaching in major
| • Across Courses • Mean course evaluations |
| Student Outcomes | • Self-reported Learning |
| • High-impact practices |
| • Specific Outcomes |
| Effective Use of Resources | • Instructional Productivity (SCH) • SCH per TT Faculty member
| • Instructional Productivity (sections) • Sections per TT Faculty member
| • Instructor mix • Percent of UG SCH taught by TT |
Preliminary observations and findings

- Some departments had well-developed plans
  - Including some where performance was already strong
- In some cases it can be seen that plans were “missing” in areas of strength, where one might not expect elaborate discussion
- In other cases plans were not developed even where evidence would suggest attention was needed
Preliminary observations and findings

- This first pass at unit planning of this kind was encouraging
  - Many thoughtful responses
  - Clear focus on issues important to student success

- Unevenness in responses suggests there is still work to be done
  - Especially in areas that received relatively little attention

- Important to maintain a balanced perspective as results of “Part Two” are integrated