



**Minutes
NCA Criterion 2
Preparing for the Future
Committee Meeting
March 31, 2003**

- Present: Fran Schoneck (Chair), Vickki Klingman, Norm Laurence, Christina Aguilera, Joan Lamborn, Mike Jacobs, Gary Hatch, John Clinebell, Chris Downen, Marianne Dinges. Not able to attend: Jay Lightfoot.
- Fran Schoneck opened the meeting at 2:30 p.m.
- Fran did not have a Steering Committee report. There has not been a formal meeting since our March 6, 2003 meeting. Groups are busy summarizing their findings.
- Fran asked each sub-group to summarize their findings to the committee:

1. Vickki Klingman and Joan Lamborn reported on Criterion 2A: The organization realistically prepares for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends. Special notes in addition to the report:

There is a relationship between University Plan and Facility Master Plan. There is a definite connection between capacity and planning. Fran suggested to Mike Jacobs that he should bring in the Enrollment Plan also.

The strongest thread in many department documents is technology.

The University has looked at demographic changes through enrollment. University Affairs also conducted the Bonnie Dean focus groups. Fran suggested that Mike identify what the shifts might be.

The Institutional Plan and Diversity Plan were discussed. Fran pointed out that Affirmative Action is changing nationally. The University has focused on looking at the role of Affirmative Action and how to implement it. We have combined the AAEO function with Human Resources for coordination in hiring.

We use an informal process of environmental scanning at the committee and programmatic level. Accrediting processes provide opportunities.

Budget reduction can bring about innovation.

The University Archives and the Restoration of the historic district on central campus are key in the preservation of the University's history and heritage.

Authority is designated through University organization charts. University is now moving toward consultation rather than centralization in decision-making. Several committee members believe delineated authority is not effectively declared and that we need to better document the planning process.



2. **Fran Schoneck reported on Criterion 2B: The organization's resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.** Special notes in addition to the report:

The University had adequate resources but the State revenue picture is an issue. Grants and Contracts have increased significantly.

One potential new resource is the Colorado Opportunity Fund (vouchers). Potential exemption from constitutional earning and spending limits. Tuition flexibility.

We need a better understanding of UNC Foundation resources.

The University will need an appropriate mix of tenured faculty and instructors to be flexible with enrollment.

Development of resources hasn't always been as good as it is now. In recent history the University has increased faculty salaries, increased budgeted expenditures on instruction and increased library funding.

The University has very flexible planning, which includes a flexible Enrollment Plan and Planning Council.

Our Facilities Master Plan will be web-based and we will have a new Technology Plan by December 2003.

We need to convince the team that we have processes in place to weather the storm.

3. **Gary Hatch and Christina Aquilera reported on Criterion 2C: The organization's ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.** Special notes in addition to the report:

Evaluation processes are at the college and program levels, i.e. Unit Level Program Reviews. Also evaluation occurs throughout the budget documents and in the Academic Assessment office.

We need to improve our ability to analyze the information. Databases are not integrated. Need to be more user-friendly and readily accessible. We need a relational database. My UNC is a step toward that goal.

The University has developed very strong feedback loops that are very appropriate. Several colleges track through data software.

Program Reviews are used in every college.

The University has committed resources to assessment. We have one full-time position and now have an Assessment Plan.



4. **Norm Laurence, John Clinebell and Chris Downen reported on Criterion 2D: All levels of planning align with the organization's mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.** Special notes in addition to the report:

Fran opened the discussion with the statement that this is the area in which the University fell down in the last accreditation.

The University centers all the various plans on the mission now and the various plans are integrated into one another, i.e. Enrollment Plan, Technology Plan, University Plan.

Planning and budget preparation is done together more than ever before. This is a strong point for us. The Board of Trustees designate their budget priorities based on information from all the planning documents.

All our plans are dynamic. Members meet regularly; the plans permeate through the institution and support changes in the environment.

The colleges have strong advisory committees and have developed numerous partnerships.

- Criterion 2D will meet and complete a summary.
- Criterion 2C will meet and do a summary also.
- Fran stated that her staff would put everything into a matrix this summer. The committee does not need to worry about that.
- Mike Jacobs asked each committee to let him know their priorities. What are the most important points to make.
- This is the last formal meeting of the Criterion 2 Committee. You may be contacted by Mike Jacobs or the Steering Committee writing team for clarification.
- Fran thanked everyone for their hard work and diligence on this committee.

cc: Donna Bottenberg