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Overview of the Quality Initiative

1. Provide a one-page executive summary that describes the Quality Initiative, summarizes what was accomplished and explains any changes made to the initiative over the time period.

The University of Minnesota Duluth’s (UMD’s) Quality Initiative focused on Critical Reflection and Continuous Improvement (CRCI) of two key campus milestones: Strategic Planning (SP) and Program Prioritization (PP). CRCI was proposed as an intentional and ongoing process to reflect upon and improve the SP and PP frameworks/outcomes and the processes used to generate them. No changes were made to the initiative since the 2014 proposal.

Campus-wide SP, conducted during 2010-11, analyzed strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats; specified campus values; updated mission and vision statements; identified six campus goals; and created action steps for each goal. The Campus Assembly endorsed the plan in April 2011, and Chancellor Black approved the plan in May 2011. The plan provided focus for the PP, which was completed during 2013-14, due to a $12 million budget shortfall. PP involved a comprehensive review of academic and academic-support programs through data collection and analysis (Stage 1), followed by evaluation of results and prioritization decisions (Stage 2). PP provided detailed data that informed administrators’ decisions to strategically reduce expenditures and reallocate resources.

As the primary focus of the Quality Initiative, CRCI has led to considerable progress through improved plans and processes based on what the campus collectively learned from SP and PP. Key accomplishments include process improvements to the SP “update” that began Spring 2017 and to PP “Round 2” scheduled to begin Fall 2017. CRCI has also provided us with knowledge to improve upon SP and PP outcomes. For example, through CRCI, performance indicators for strategic goals were identified during plan implementation (e.g., student retention and graduation rates; demographic profiles for students, faculty, and staff; and sustainability metrics). Ongoing reviews of performance indicators and data provided UMD with better information for determining which measures best fit the goals; this information will be used to specify performance indicators within the 2017 SP update. Similarly, evaluation of PP measures led to the recognition that a better selection of measures must be used for the next round of PP to obtain more useful results for prioritizing decisions.

A related example of CRCI is the Spring 2017 review of the campus governance structure. A task force, comprised of faculty, staff, students, and one administrator from governance committees, collected survey data, hosted campus forums, and solicited input from all governance committees to inform revisions to the campus constitution and bylaws. By vote of campus governance members, the bylaws passed but the constitution did not. The revised committee structure, which will be implemented Fall 2017, represents an improved outcome that can positively affect governance committee processes. Campus-wide input also led to the development of a governance membership onboarding process beginning in Fall 2017.

Overall, the Quality Initiative has resulted in increased awareness across campus regarding the importance of communication as well as coordination of continued progress on the campus goals. UMD has also learned about SP and PP impacts on the culture of the institution.

Scope and Impact of the Initiative
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2. Explain in more detail what was accomplished in the Quality Initiative in relation to its purposes and goals. (If applicable, explain the initiative’s hypotheses and findings.)

This section lists purposes and goals from the Quality Initiative Proposal (bold font) with a summary of accomplishments for each:

- **SP: Organize collective experiences, resources, skills, and visions.** Creating the strategic plan was a collaborative process, including input from more than 2,000 campus stakeholders through task forces, world cafes, open forums, surveys, and draft feedback.

- **SP: Provide a clear vision.** The vision articulated in the strategic plan set the stage for six campus goals that administrators, faculty, and staff use as a decision-making framework:
  1) Promote integrated curricular, co-curricular, and living-learning undergraduate experiences that achieve UMD’s learning goals and prepare students for lifelong learning, globally engaged citizenship, and success in their academic, personal, and professional lives. 2) Create a positive and inclusive campus climate for all by advancing equity, diversity, and social justice. 3) Establish UMD as a center of excellence for graduate studies in the Upper Midwest. 4) Advance UMD’s stature as a major campus for research and creative activities, leveraging our region’s unique natural, human, and cultural resources. 5) Strengthen ties with Duluth and surrounding communities in an intentional, visible, and mutually beneficial partnership. 6) Utilize UMD’s infrastructure, technologies, and information, human, and financial resources to support the campus in a sustainable manner.

- **SP: Create a process to accentuate UMD’s high quality of educational and research opportunities (academic excellence).** A primary campus-level process that facilitates this work is the new governance structure designed to align the strategic plan with committees, such as the Teaching and Learning Committee and the Research and Scholarship Subcommittee of the Faculty Council. With representation from across campus, committees collect and analyze quantitative and qualitative data to inform decisions that impact the quality of education and research on campus. For example, the Research and Scholarship Subcommittee evaluates internally funded grant reports to determine new and revised plans for future funding.

- **SP: Better explain what we do and how we do it (quality teaching, research, and creative discoveries with measurable impact).** By developing a formal strategic plan with widespread campus input, presenting the plan to the Board of Regents, and consistently using the goals to frame and inform decisions, the campus has a means to provide a stable, coherent message regarding the work we do to those we serve. A formal update on the strategic goal action plans was publicly communicated in 2014. Since unit-level mission and goals align with campus-level mission and goals, units provided a summary of their activities to the Strategic Planning and Budget Committee for communication at the campus level in 2017. Work is in progress to identify a better process and tools to support communication efforts on a regular and ongoing basis, such as a campus dashboard to track SP progress and report out PP data.

- **PP: Examine programs, courses, and services to determine alignment with mission and growth potential.** More than 210 programs (academic and academic support) collected and reported data to PP committees, who created rubrics to rate the extent to which each program aligned with the campus mission, vision, and goals. Additional criteria used in the evaluation addressed demand, quality, operational effectiveness (e.g., program inputs and resources generated), and opportunity analysis.

- **PP: Use limited financial resources in ways that best meet students’ and community’s needs based on the strategic plan.** UMD experienced a $12 million budget shortfall soon after SP was completed, so PP gave administrators detailed data to analyze and evaluate programs using the extensive set of agreed-upon criteria.
described above. PP ratings were carefully reviewed to determine where changes to resource allocations were possible without sacrificing needs of students or the community. For example, PP ratings led to the decision to place monitoring of public engagement activities within each unit rather than having the centralized Office of Civic Engagement previously responsible for monitoring (Goal 5).

- **CRCI: Critique the extent to which SP and PP met or did not meet their stated objectives.** The accomplishments detailed above relate to SP and PP obtained objectives, while additional efforts have focused on ways the processes were not fully met to improve upon SP and PP as these processes continue. For example, shortly after the approval of the strategic plan, many campus decision-makers and SP Steering Committee members realized performance indicators were needed to measure the impact of goal achievement. A small group was assembled in fall 2012 to create implicit objectives and a number of measures for each of the six campus goals. The objectives and measures were updated in 2014 and 2016, and further revisions are scheduled to occur in Fall 2017. A related issue being addressed is how better to collect and record the data for these measures. Improvements to the data collection process continue each year to ensure specific groups receive data appropriate to their work.

- **CRCI: Involve inclusive participation.** The new campus governance structure is the primary mechanism for inclusiveness, involving a total of nearly 200 administrators, faculty, staff, and students from units campus-wide. Committee members report to and collect input from their respective units to inform committee work. Therefore, when committee recommendations are forwarded to administrative decision-makers, widespread input from campus constituencies has already been provided. Other campus processes include broad input as well, such as the Spring 2017 SP update process and the governance review mentioned previously.

- **CRCI: Embed processes into campus governance.** CRCI processes were embedded into campus governance through plans and meetings with the Strategic Planning and Budget Committee, the Graduate Council, the Research and Scholarship Subcommittee, and the Teaching and Learning Committee. A Faculty Fellow for Strategic Planning and a Faculty Fellow for the Quality Initiative were appointed to help coordinate data collection from various units and disseminate the data to appropriate committees.

- **CRCI: Provide transparency of data and results.** Data from SP and PP have been readily available across campus and remain on the respective web sites. Information related to CRCI is available through governance committee meeting minutes (e.g., Strategic Planning and Budget discussions of the SP update and the governance review task force discussions). This Quality Initiative Report will also be disseminated across campus.

3. Evaluate the impact of the initiative, including any changes in processes, policies, technology, curricula, programs, student learning and success that are now in place in consequence of the initiative.

Intended impacts of SP and PP described in the Quality Initiative Proposal have been strengthened through CRCI. Initial SP set the foundation for widespread participation that continues to be integrated into campus-wide activities (e.g., SP update, governance review, and governance committee work). SP provided the campus with initial directions, and the SP update has generated a renewed sense of direction. PP’s intention to preserve the overall health and strengths of the entire institution has been reinforced as new financial challenges are encountered. Through CRCI, we know the institution needs to clearly identify priority areas in the 2017 SP update that can inform further PP decisions. CRCI has moved the campus toward a culture in which the review and evaluation of plans and procedures are accepted and expected. CRCI has also impacted administrative teams and committees through the new governance structure as recommendations from committees come forward.
recommendations are sent through the University Coordinating Council with the opportunity for other committees to review and comment on recommendations. This collaborative process allows for broad input from multiple perspectives and voices across campus and from all campus constituencies, reinforcing the culture of participation and information sharing.

Additionally, programmatic impacts have occurred, such as continuous improvement related to Goal 2. To support diversity and inclusion initiatives and outcomes, a Campus Change Team (CCT) was established, which led to the development of 18 Unit Change Teams (UCTs) across campus. The CCT focused its work to accomplish the action steps presented in the strategic plan and to support the UCTs. Chancellor Black also appointed an Assistant to the Chancellor for Inclusive Excellence and a Faculty Fellow for Intercultural Initiatives (now known as Director of Education for Inclusive Excellence). Related to CRCI, CCT regularly assesses the campus climate through surveys and analyzes the data to identify opportunities for improvement. Results of the Rankin & Associates 2015 campus survey were presented in 2016, and campus-wide discussions of the results occurred through forums for faculty, staff, and students. In Spring 2017, the CCT began leading a campus-wide process designed to make UMD more diverse and inclusive, and to address bullying and disrespectful behaviors. A sample of additional activities aligning with Goal 2 includes: 1) Intercultural Leadership Development cohorts; 2) an Intercultural Pedagogy Community of Practice; 3) Implicit Bias in the Search Process Workshops; and 4) an Equity and Diversity Certificate Program. To date, more than 400 faculty, staff, and administrators have participated in these activities.

Additional impact was made possible by Chancellor Black and his cabinet through $500,000 in Strategic Investment Grant funds promoting the campus goals. A sample of outcomes from these grants includes: 1) a Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning; 2) redesigned courses; 3) enhanced and increased community-oriented course projects; 4) intercultural development for leaders across the university; and 5) improved sustainability operations. A specific example of impact is the Silver rating UMD earned in 2016 from the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education STARS program; previously, UMD received a Bronze rating.

The impact of CRCI is especially evident in the work of the Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) Committee that coordinates enrollment targets and facilitates effective strategies to identify, recruit, retain, and students. SEM utilizes a vast array of data points to support its work, including internal data (e.g., enrollment trends, student demographics, admission inquiry activity, and attrition and persistence rates), external data (e.g., composition and projections of Minnesota high school graduates, available postsecondary educational options, and future occupation trends), primary competitor analyses, and stakeholder input. Performance indicators pertaining to actual and goal headcounts/percentages for enrollment, student body diversity, academic profile, persistence and graduation rates, and cost of attendance are reported, discussed, and updated annually. Progress is reported via a series of SEM action plans supporting new high school recruitment, new transfer student recruitment, student of color recruitment, and undergraduate retention. Action item updates are reviewed biannually by SEM, and reported within governance to the Strategic Planning and Budget Committee as well as to the Council of Deans and other administrators responsible for student enrollment and retention.

CRCI has also become embedded across campus through assessment of student learning, which relates to SP and PP for academic and academic-support programs. With the development of the new governance structure, the Assessment Subcommittee was integrated within campus governance for the first time. Programs conduct assessment with the purpose of collecting data and analyzing results to improve the quality of student learning, and the programs review one another’s assessment practices to help identify areas for improvement in their assessment work. Overall, campus assessment practices were reviewed and evaluated by the Assessment Subcommittee during 2016-17 to identify recommendations that can campus assessment practices. New plans and processes will be developed and implemented in coming months with the intent to regularly review modifications for continued improvement. Assessment work will also provide data for forthcoming PP activities.
4. Explain any tools, data or other information that resulted from the work of the initiative.

Careful attention is paid to identifying and developing tools to obtain sufficient and useful data for SP, PP, and CRCI. The most common tool has been surveys of faculty, staff, and students, utilized throughout the development of plans and the ongoing and regular review of those plans. Examples include campus climate surveys, a survey to collect input on the campus SWOT in 2010 for initial SP, a survey in 2017 to assess faculty and staff views of the 2011 strategic plan, and a survey in 2017 to collect campus input regarding strengths and challenges specific to the 2013 governance structure.

Because the institution has deepened its commitment to assessment and evaluation in academic programs, co-curricular programs, and Liberal Education, faculty and staff now more frequently use rubrics as a tool for review and evaluation. The PP process relied on the use of a rubric. Many programs have integrated rubrics to assess course learning outcomes, and program assessment liaisons use a common rubric to annually evaluate the extent to which other programs employ effective assessment practices.

Data is summarized and reported to promote transparency and keep stakeholders informed. For example, in addition to items described previously, baseline information on internationalization was obtained and analyzed as part of the American Council on Education (ACE) Internationalization Lab during 2012-2014. The information was summarized and communicated in a comprehensive report. The results were used in decision-making to improve effectiveness and efficiencies, which included creating an Internationalization Advisory Committee to implement the UMD Global 2020 plan and coordinate international activities. An International Student Services Coordinating Council was also created to integrate services for international students; this council regularly reviews these services to make continuous improvements.

CRCI is supported by the Campus Labs technology system. Baseline is the platform for the Student Life division’s efforts to collect and monitor student survey data over time. Compliance Assist is the system for SP performance indicator data and assessment of student learning reports. Reports from Compliance Assist that include some SP data have since been shared with the Teaching and Learning and Research and Scholarship committees within the governance system. As individuals increasingly use this tool, input has been provided to campus administrators that will facilitate more effective widespread use of the system.

5. Describe the biggest challenges and opportunities encountered in implementing the initiative.

Challenges related to SP, PP, and CRCI are summarized from input received by campus constituents; as a component of CRCI the campus is learning from the challenges observed. General challenges: 1) conducting PP and CRCI during significant budget cuts; 2) changing senior administrators as SP initiatives, PP, and CRCI have occurred; and 3) gaining campus-wide acceptance of the need for planning and assessment. SP challenges: 1) implementing the plan after the initial action steps were completed; 2) making commensurate progress on all six campus goals; and 3) developing metrics and collecting data to measure plan success. PP challenges: 1) obtaining accurate information on all programs; 2) developing rubrics that were appropriate for diverse programs; 3) increasing competition for resources among programs and between faculty and staff; 4) operating in a culture that adds more programs than it eliminates; and 5) communicating the results of PP decisions. CRCI challenges: 1) initiating reflection and improvement processes across campus; 2) changing administrators in key positions responsible for institutional effectiveness and assessment; 3) obtaining data for some indicators of SP success; and 4) identifying appropriate benchmarks for some measures.
A number of opportunities emerged in the process as well. General opportunities: 1) engaging systematically in planning, prioritizing, reviewing, evaluating, and learning to make improvements, and 2) creating new avenues for talented people to address the challenges. SP opportunities: 1) obtaining broad campus input and buy-in when identifying values, mission, vision, goals, and action steps; 2) building a foundation for a new shared governance system; 3) creating the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee; 4) developing activities to address diversity and inclusion; 5) planning for increased internationalization; and 6) identifying a focus and direction for allocating financial and human resources based on campus priorities. PP opportunities: 1) creating a baseline process for identifying, collecting, and reviewing relevant data on all campus programs; 2) increasing familiarity of varied programs among people from different parts of the campus; and 3) being more fully informed when making necessary budgetary allocations. CRCI opportunities: 1) increasing analysis, reflection, and action based on existing data; 2) generating new data to serve as a basis for informed decision-making; 3) using an information system for data collection, storage, retrieval, and reflection; 4) recognizing units across campus are engaging in CRCI activities on an ongoing basis and can serve as models for other units; and 5) identifying units not engaging in CRCI activities and providing encouragement and resources for them to do so.

Commitment to and Engagement in the Quality Initiative

6. Describe the individuals and groups involved at stages throughout the initiative and their perceptions of its worth and impact.

SP involved 2000+ respondents to a SWOT questionnaire; a 35-member Steering Committee; a 12-member Executive Committee drawn from the Steering Committee; 9 Vision Groups totaling 120 members; a 9-member Mission and Vision Task Force; an 8-member Campus Values Task Force; and 2 community groups involving approximately 40 people. One half-time Faculty Fellow worked on the planning process during the first two years (2010-2012), and a second half-time Faculty Fellow worked on implementing various aspects of the plan for the next three years (2012-2015). Literally thousands of staff, faculty, students, and administrators have worked on developing and implementing the goals and action steps from SP. Some of their activities are described elsewhere in this report.

The reported perceived worth and impact of the SP comes from meetings with the Chancellor’s Leadership Group, meetings with the Council of Deans and Academic Administrators, a survey completed in 2017 by 281 faculty and staff, and interviews with key individuals involved in SP. SP perceived worth: 1) many members of the campus community engaged in planning activities for the first time and were therefore committed to the planning process; 2) significant support and accomplishments were achieved for Goal 2 to create a more positive and inclusive campus climate; 3) competent campus administrators were attracted to UMD because of the plan; and 4) motivation was generated for improved campus governance. SP perceived impacts: 1) campus goals continue to be relevant and essential based on a 2017 survey; 2) mission and vision statements, along with core values, guide decision makers when challenge arise; 3) the mission statement and goals are used as criteria in making budget decisions; and 4) Goal 1 motivates a more holistic view of undergraduate education.

PP involved four primary groups during 2013-14. Two groups were the 10-member Academic Program Prioritization Committee and the 10-member Academic Support and Services Program Prioritization Committee that identified and obtained relevant data, developed rubrics to rate the data provided by departments, and rated each program. A third group consisted of department heads and other involved faculty and staff who provided information about academic departments, as well as directors and staff in other units who provided information relevant to their activities. Finally, administrators organized and supported the PP process and used the information to make decisions about resource allocations in times of a budget shortfall.
The perceived worth and impact of PP comes from focus groups with 14 of the 20 members of the PP committees, meetings with the Chancellor’s Leadership Group, meetings with the Council of Deans and Academic Administrators, and interviews with other key individuals who were involved in the development and implementation of the process and its outcomes. PP perceived worth: 1) more awareness internally of the nature and value of programs across campus; and 2) better understanding of how the programs on campus work together to achieve the campus mission and goals. PP perceived positive impacts: 1) more complete information for administration to make necessary budget decisions; and 2) use of a common language and process for examining program priorities. PP perceived negative impacts: 1) turf protection on the part of some units and individuals; and 2) separation between faculty and professional staff, who felt devalued by some members of the faculty.

CRCI has included hundreds of administrators, faculty, and staff from across campus who collected and submitted data and information; analyzed, reviewed, and evaluated data and information; created plans and procedures; and revised plans and procedures to make improvements. These individuals and groups were led by a Faculty Fellow for the Quality Initiative; the Chancellor; the Vice Chancellors; the Council of Deans and Academic Administrators; the Associate and Assistant Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs; the Student Life Associate Vice Chancellor and Directors; numerous governance committees; ITSS Director; Library Director; and Department Heads.

The perceived worth and impact of CRCI comes from meetings of the HLC Steering Committee, meetings with the Chancellor’s Leadership Group, meetings with the Council of Deans and Academic Administrators, and interviews with key individuals involved in the process. CRCI perceived worth: 1) enhanced culture of assessment both for student learning outcomes and for the goals and objectives of units across campus; 2) identification of and affirmation for units across campus that are engaging in CRCI; and 3) identification of units across campus that have not regularly engaged in CRCI and action to have these units integrate CRCI activities. CRCI perceived impacts: 1) increased use of data and analysis to make decisions by administrators; 2) increased use of data and analysis in shared governance committees; and 3) better overall identification of relevant data and use of this data across campus.

Overall worth and impact: 1) individuals and groups across campus have engaged in conversations about the campus and its future; 2) within the conversations, setting priorities and then implementing them is increasingly recognized as essential to UMD’s success; 3) the campus culture has moved toward collecting and reflecting on data as a basis for improving what we do on an ongoing basis; and 4) individuals and groups acknowledge that UMD cannot continue to do everything that was done in the past.

7. Describe the most important points learned by those involved in the initiative.

The most important points learned by those involved comes from the Chancellor’s Leadership Group; the Council of Deans and Academic Administrators; the HLC Steering Committee; a survey completed in 2017 by 281 faculty and staff; focus groups with those most directly involved in the PP; and interviews with key individuals involved in SP, PP, and CRCI.

SP important points learned:
- Widespread involvement of the campus community to develop an integrated SP, including mission, vision, values, goals, and action steps in six months is possible.
- Implementation of the plan must be an ongoing process.
- Clearly articulated action plans for implementing the SP are essential for success.
- Clearly articulated metrics are critical to assess how the plan is progressing.
- Those leading SP activities must communicate to the campus in an ongoing manner.
• The six campus goals remain relevant and important as indicated by a 2017 survey.
• The next iteration of the campus SP should be more focused with respect to goals and priorities and needs to include performance indicators from the start.

**PP important points learned:**

• Program prioritization is an important process that should be conducted regularly.
• Programs should know in advance the metrics on which they will be evaluated.
• The Office of Institutional Research and other relevant offices should provide data in a clear manner to departments and units on an ongoing basis.
• Rubrics for comparing programs need to align with the programs’ purposes (e.g., academic versus support).
• The rationale and outcomes for budget decisions should be clearly communicated to the campus.
• Program prioritization can be useful for reducing budgets, but programs should always be engaged in program optimization efforts as part of continuous quality improvement.

**CRCI important points learned:**

• The collection, analysis, and reflection on data to inform decision-making should occur at all levels of campus.
• Large quantities of data exist on campus, but some data is difficult to access.
• Some units are engaging in CRCI on an ongoing basis; these units (e.g., Student Life, schools with specialized program accreditations) can serve as models for other units to more actively engage in CRCI.
• Units that have not engaged in CRCI should be encouraged and supported in implementing CRCI processes.
• Communication across campus of CRCI occurring in various units is important.
• More emphasis should be placed on creating metrics to assess progress on goals and objectives at all levels of the campus.

**Overall important points learned:**

• More systematic planning, prioritization, and continuous improvement activities should be integrated into ongoing campus activities, including the work of campus administrators and shared governance processes.
• Communication about planning, prioritization/optimization, and continuous improvement needs to be ongoing, with progress reflected on informative websites.
• The UMD campus, and particularly some units, have changed the culture to be more accepting of planning and continuous improvement, but this culture needs to be expanded.
• Leaders need to be explicit about expectations and deliverables with respect to planning, prioritization, and continuous improvement.
• Units across campus require a supportive infrastructure for planning, prioritization, and continuous improvement, including resources, models, templates, access to relevant data, and feedback.
• Dashboards could be created to depict data relevant to campus decision-making.
• The campus made significant progress related to planning, prioritization, and continuous improvement in its efforts to achieve strategic balance, but we still have room for further improvement.
• This Quality Initiative was an expansive but worthwhile undertaking.

**Resource Provision**

8. Explain the human, financial, physical and technological resources that supported the initiative.

**Human resources** that directly supported this initiative include: SP Steering Committee, SP Executive Committee; Program Prioritization Committees; Unit Change Teams; Faculty Fellow for Diversity and Inclusion; Assistant to the Chancellor for Inclusive Excellence; two Faculty Fellows for Strategic Planning; a Faculty Fellow for Internationalization; and a Faculty Fellow for the HLC Quality Initiative. Many administrators supported the
Quality Initiative, including the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Associate Vice Chancellors, Deans, Academic Administrators, Department Heads, and Directors. Faculty, staff, students, and administrators who participate in shared governance also made significant contributions.

**Financial resources** specifically supporting the initiative include: Strategic Initiative grants from Chancellor’s Office ($500,000); buyouts for Faculty Fellows (~$400,000); financial support for the ACE Internationalization Lab (~$40,000); and supplies and expenses associated with numerous campus-wide meetings related to the work of individuals and groups identified above.

**Physical resources** supporting this initiative include: a new Master Plan for facilities; walking and biking connections to the emerging campus village adjacent to campus; a renovated campus center; a renovated dining center; and office space for Faculty Fellows.

**Technological resources** include: the Campus Labs system; websites for strategic planning, program prioritization, and global engagement; and online surveys related to the strategic plan and internationalization.

**Plans for the Future (or Future Milestones of a Continuing Initiative)**

9. Describe plans for ongoing work related to or as a result of the initiative.

To update SP in 2017, a SWOT analysis was prepared during Spring 2017, and open forums were held in April 2017. The 80 faculty, staff, and administrators attending the open forums generated ideas for a new campus vision and proposed possible goals. The anticipated 2017 SP results will include revised objectives within the six existing goals, along with accompanying action steps and performance indicators.

Once the SP update is completed, review and planning processes for the campus strategic plan will be regular and ongoing to develop new plans as needed. When new strategic plans are formulated, mission and vision statements; strategic goals; objectives; and performance indicators to measure progress will be reviewed and revised as necessary. Future SP will continue to involve inclusive participation. Communication about the plan and its implementation will be ongoing, including regular email correspondence and updated websites. Clear expectations about deliverables and data collection will be publicly provided.

PP will also occur as needed with the next round beginning Fall 2017, and optimization activities will be developed for use on an ongoing basis. The 2017-18 PP will be similar to the 2013-14 PP, but the forthcoming process will be modified based on what was learned from previous accomplishments. Work has begun to identify metrics for which data will be assembled by the Office of Institutional Research. The decisions made based on program reviews and the rationale for these decisions will be explained to the campus community.

The plan for ongoing CRCI involves collecting relevant data at the campus, vice chancellor, college, department, and program levels; reflecting on that data at each level; and taking action based on data analyses to improve functioning. The frequency of reflection and actions for improvement may differ by unit, but the goal is for all units to engage in CRCI activities on a regular cycle. Again, the results of these efforts toward continuous improvement should be transparent and clearly described.

The overall goal for ongoing work related to this Quality Initiative is that SP, PP, and CRCI activities will be integrated into UMD’s enduring life. These activities have enabled our campus to make giant strides toward becoming an institution that 1) involves all segments of our community in developing a comprehensive strategic plan; 2) aligns our programs with that plan; and 3) takes action based on collecting relevant data, critically reflecting on that data, and working to continuously improve our programs to meet the needs of our students,
state, region, and other stakeholders. Enhancing these processes in the future will enable UMD to achieve its vision of becoming a premier comprehensive university recognized as world class for its learning-centered student experiences, research, creative activities, and public engagement.

10. Describe any practices or artifacts from the initiative that other institutions might find meaningful or useful and please indicate if you would be willing to share this information.

Several practices and artifacts that other institutions might find useful can be found at the following websites:

Strategic Planning process and documents: http://d.umn.edu/strategic-planning

Program Prioritization process and documents: http://www.d.umn.edu/vcaa/program_prioritization.html


Campus climate surveys, campus forums, and plans: http://champ.d.umn.edu/campus-climate

Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM): http://www.d.umn.edu/vcaa/sem/