

University Planning Advisory Committee 2022-23 Charter and Charge

Draft August 22, 2022

AUTHORITY

The University Planning Advisory Committee (UPAC) is an advisory and support committee formed at the request of the President working in conjunction with the University Executive Council (UEC). The President and UEC delegate management responsibility for the committee to the Vice President for Planning, Budget, and Finance. UPAC does not have governance authority within the meaning of UVU Policy 102.

RESPONSIBILITIES

UPAC has both ongoing responsibilities that must be fulfilled periodically and specific responsibilities delegated to it by the President or UEC annually. Annual responsibilities may be distinct from the ongoing responsibilities or may be specific instructions for executing ongoing responsibilities.

Ongoing

The ongoing responsibilities of UPAC are to:

- Maintain awareness of UVU's strategic and operating environment, advising the President and UEC regarding emerging forces in that environment and potential university responses.
- Review major university plans to ensure consistency with the university strategy, across planning efforts, and with initiatives of the State of Utah and Utah System of Higher Education.
- Assess whether UVU is fulfilling its mission and action commitments and whether it will be able to do so sustainably in accordance with the standards and policies of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU).
- Communicate findings to university leadership through UEC and to the wider university community through their organizational communication channels.

2022-23

In 2022-23, UPAC will:

- Carefully review and provide feedback on iterative drafts of the Vision 2030 refresh with particular focus on the connection with the 2022 SWOT analysis.
- Support implementation of Vision 2030 by identifying areas of focus based on the 2022 SWOT analysis, engaging with UEC on implementation and deliverables, reviewing measures of achievement for the plan, and coordinating Vision 2030 metrics with indicators for mission fulfillment.

- Prepare UVU's Mission Fulfillment Progress Report, considering revisions to the mission fulfillment indicators (KPIs) as appropriate in consultation with Institutional Research and based on the findings of the 2020 Mission Fulfillment Baseline Evaluation, the NWCCU Mid-Cycle Review, and other institutional priorities.
- Review USHE's Strategic Plan and identify opportunities for UVU to advance USHE's goals and objectives and review impact of proposed changes within USHE.
- Identify ways that UVU can effectively advance and promote its mission as a community college and university by reviewing and preparing responses and recommendations to the legislative-directed review of community colleges in Utah.
- Review and provide input for new and updated campus plans including Completion Plan 3.0, Inclusion Plan, and Strategic Enrollment Management Plan.

MEMBERSHIP

Executive Sponsor

The executive sponsor of UPAC is Linda Makin, Vice President for Planning, Budget, and Finance.

Co-Chairs

UPAC is co-chaired by a faculty member appointed by the university president for a two-year term on the recommendation of the executive sponsor and either the executive sponsor or the Director of University Planning & Effectiveness. For 2022-23, the co-chairs are Dr. Jeff Peterson, Associate Professor of Organizational Leadership, and Vice President Makin.

Executive Appointees

The executive sponsor appoints members representing each school or college and each non-academic division including one dean, an academic advisor, and a staff member from within Academic Affairs. These members are recommended by the co-chairs in consultation with the vice presidents and deans. The faculty co-chair is a presidential appointee. Presidential appointees serve two-year terms. If a presidential appointee is unable to continue serving as a member temporarily or permanently, a new member is appointed to fill the term for the duration of the vacancy.

Organizational Appointees

Organizational appointees hold membership by delegation or are appointed by offices with central roles in planning for the university's three action commitments and are, consistent with Robert's Rules of Order, full voting members of UPAC. Organizational appointees serve on an ongoing basis so long as they hold the designated position. These appointees include the following positions:

Position	Member
President	Astrid Tuminez
Provost and Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs	Wayne Vaught
Vice President of Institutional Advancement	Mark Arstein
Vice President of Digital Transformation/CIO	Christina Baum

Position	Member
Vice President of Planning, Budget, and Finance/CFO	Linda Makin
Vice President of People and Culture	Marilyn Meyer
Vice President of Administration and Strategic Relations	Val Peterson
Vice President of Student Affairs	Kyle Reyes
Faculty Senate President	Hilary Hungerford
PACE Representative	Bonnie Mortensen and Susan Dunn
UVUSA President	Lexi Soto
Associate Provost for Student Success and Retention	David Connelly
Associate Provost for Academic Programs and Assessment	Laurie Sharp
Achieve Action Commitment	Michelle Kearns
Engage Action Commitment	McKay Isham
Include Action Commitment	Vacant
Director of University Planning and Effectiveness	Vacant

Support Staff

UPAC is supported by the presidential intern and the administrative assistant to the executive sponsor. For 2022-23, these are intern Aaron Fairbourn and administrative assistant, Stacy Fowler. Both are entitled to participate substantively in the meetings on the same basis as other members but do not hold voting rights.

Member Expectations

UPAC members are selected so that the committee can draw on a range of viewpoints from across the university. Members are not, however, specifically representing their organizations. UPAC members should approach their work from a “whole university” perspective rather than the interests of their organizations or positions.

UPAC’s members are expected to:

- Attend and participate in all meetings or find a substitute if unable to attend,
- Review all materials for committee projects and give input as requested,
- Facilitate two-way communication between UPAC and the broader campus community, particularly your own organizations,
- Maintain awareness of broader UVU and higher education issues in general, and
- Model the positivity and enthusiasm that differentiates UVU’s faculty and staff as Wolverines.

ORGANIZATION

Meetings

UPAC will typically meet every other week on a schedule coordinated by the committee leadership and support staff.

Executive Sponsor and Co-Chair Responsibilities

The executive sponsor and co-chairs share the responsibilities of committee leadership. Together, they will develop the annual agenda and agendas for each meeting and may add items to the agenda, at the request of the members, where the items are appropriate to the committee's responsibilities. They will introduce agenda items during the meeting and may determine the structure of discussion. The co-chairs will preside over discussion.

Deliberative Procedures

Under most circumstances, UPAC will operate informally and strive toward consensus using the UPAC Deliberative Procedures. These procedures should be used flexibly to promote collegial deliberations. Procedures for formal sessions, when necessary, are included in the attached UPAC Deliberative Procedures document.

UPAC Deliberative Procedures

*University Planning Advisory Committee
August 22, 2022*

BACKGROUND

The UPAC Rules of Procedure are an implementation of Martha's Rules of Order. This process was created by a housing cooperative in Madison, Wisconsin, with the intent of facilitating efficient, consensus-based decision-making. It recognizes that linear models of procedure such as Robert's Rules of Order are excessively majoritarian. In an organization that seeks to work toward consensus through negotiation, cooperation, and compromise, complex procedures often silence or discourage minority views, especially when there are significant differences among members' competence with formal procedure. Martha's Rules also recognize that fully informal discussion, however, may have the same effect, privileging those more comfortable with public speaking or who tend to contribute more forcefully in discussions. These procedures provide a structure for informal discussion that supports genuine consensus building.

The principles of Martha's Rules are consistent with the longstanding culture of UPAC. This specific implementation of Martha's Rules is adapted from the American Association of Philosophy Teachers Rules of Order, February 8, 2013, in order to promote more effective discussion within committee meetings.

PRINCIPLES

Effective, practical action is most likely to result from an evolutionary process of proposal, evaluation, and revision. Those opposed to a proposal often identify good reasons that it should not be adopted. But even with a good proposal, opposition can identify opportunities for clarity or improvement, enhance the entire group's understanding of the proposal and the larger issue it addresses, and build commitment among the members to implement it effectively.

UPAC members should approach discussion as group deliberation rather than debate. They must be willing to listen carefully and consider what others are saying. Everyone must make a good faith effort to understand each other before criticizing ideas. They must also be trusting and brave enough to speak their minds. The expectation is that every effort will be made to be clear but that there is no requirement or expectation that participants will present well-formed arguments on the spot.

Consensus does not mean unanimous support. Consensus is reached on a proposal when most members find it acceptable. This may result in adopting ideas that some members find only minimally acceptable, and even that a few members may continue to oppose. Those in the majority should continue to aim for as broad a consensus as possible and should cooperate to address objections. Those with concerns should not use the goal of consensus as a means of obstructing action.

PROCEDURES

Proposals

A proposal is a recommendation that a specific action be taken, often that UPAC express a specific conclusion in the reports that it produces. Once a proposal is made, it belongs to the group. As such the person who proposed it no longer “owns” the proposal and cannot withdraw it. There is no need to second a proposal.

The person making a proposal should be given reasonable time to explain it. It is helpful to provide time for questions to clarify the proposal before acting on it. A proposal that is adopted should be specific in wording and actions to follow from its adoption, but it is acceptable to offer a proposal conceptually and then allow specific wording and actions to take shape in deliberations.

It is natural, normal, and expected that there will be multiple proposals related to a specific topic to be on the table at any time in a discussion. Every effort should be made to ensure that all participants understand which proposal is being focused on at each point in the conversation. It is not practical to insist that discussion remain on one proposal prior to moving to another proposal on the same topic, especially when developing analytical conclusions or language. However, proposals on one topic should be settled before proposals on another topic are considered.

In discussing proposals, it is likely that they will be amended. The amendment will be adopted by a consensus model which mirrors that of adopting proposals more broadly. As the proposal belongs to the group, not the person who proposed it, there are no “friendly” amendments.

Consensus Check

As decisions are made by consensus, the majority of all proposals will be unanimously approved. When consensus is not immediate, UPAC should move toward consensus through an iterated process of consensus checks and discussion.

The consensus check aims to discover how the group feels about the proposal. The co-chairs state the specific proposal being considered, and then takes count of the following:

1. Who substantially supports the proposal?
2. Who finds the proposal acceptable?
3. Who is uncomfortable with the proposal?
4. Who is uncertain about the proposal?
5. Of those with concerns, whose concerns are strong enough that they would object to adopting the proposal by majority rule?

This is repeated with all the proposals on the particular topic. The co-chairs or support staff track the results of the consensus check.

Based on the results of the consensus check, four paths are recommended.

1. If all members support the proposal or find it acceptable, then the proposal is considered to have consensus and is adopted without a vote.
2. If most members are uncomfortable with the proposal, no further action should be taken on it.
3. If many members are uncertain about the proposal, it should be clarified or more information gathered prior to checking for consensus again.
4. If any members of the meeting are uncomfortable with the proposal or a small number of members are uncertain about it, then discussion should continue until consensus is reached.
5. If it is determined that consensus is not possible then a vote should occur.

Discussion

Further deliberation following a consensus check is oriented toward building consensus. The discussion should focus on the concerns of those who are uncomfortable with the proposal or uncertain about it.

1. Those with concerns should first be invited to explain the concerns, seek additional information, and identify elements of the proposal that should be clarified.
2. The entire group is invited to offer explanations, thoughts, or information to help resolve the discomfort and uncertainty and move the group toward consensus.
3. As deliberations become more focused on specific issues, amendments to the proposal can be considered that would incorporate the concerns while maintaining what supporters find valuable in it.

Following discussion, the consensus check should be repeated to evaluate whether consensus has been reached. Moving to a consensus check should not occur until it is clear that all voices on a proposal have been heard.

Voting

If it becomes clear that some members will not be able to be satisfied with the proposal, but it is still desired to have clarity on the issue rather than reconsidering it at a later time, then it should be put to a vote. Moving to a vote should not occur until it is clear that all voices on a proposal have been heard. The need to move to a vote is demonstrated if there appears to be a substantial majority in who at least find the proposal acceptable and either:

1. There is no movement toward consensus following a discussion post-consensus check, or
2. Any number of members who are uncomfortable or uncertain state that that they do not see themselves being moved to at least finding the proposal acceptable by further deliberation or amendment.

The question at hand for every vote is, "Should UPAC adopt this proposal over the stated concerns of the minority, when a majority of the committee thinks that it is at least acceptable?" A majority of those present and voting is required to adopt a proposal. All voting members present may vote. A proposal that is defeated by vote should not be reconsidered without significant revision.

FORMAL SESSION

Should formal procedure prove necessary, any member may request that the co-chairs move the committee into formal session. The decision of the co-chairs may be appealed to the committee. In the event that the co-chairs are divided on moving to formal session or their decision is appealed, the committee shall enter formal session on the vote of a two-thirds majority of those present.

In formal session, the committee shall operate according to *Rosenberg's Rules of Order: Simple Parliamentary Procedures for the 21st Century* (Sacramento, California: League of California Cities, 2003). The committee will remain in formal session until the agenda item for which formal session was entered is completed and will then revert to informal session without further vote or action from the co-chairs.

University Strategic Review Process

*University Planning Advisory Committee
August 22, 2022*

Overview

Throughout the strategic process, look for patterns of actions that affect success (what do you see going well and what are areas of improvement)

- a. What is the organization's sustainable competitive advantage (presently)?
- b. How do we define success? (Vision/Mission/Values)
- c. What is the organization's current strategic goals?
- d. Remember the three tests of a winning strategy: Fit, competitive advantage, and high performance

External Environmental Analysis

What does the external environment look like? Consider:

- a. External Environment Scan (PESTEL)
- b. Industry Analysis (Porters 5 forces)
- c. Competitive Analysis (Porter's Soar)

Is the organization competitively stronger or weaker than key rivals?

Outline competitive strengths.

Internal Analysis

How well is the organization's present strategy working? What ratios or KPI's is the organization using to measure success? Which ones should they be looking at?

What are the organization's most important resources and capabilities, and will they give the company a lasting competitive advantage? (VRIN/VRIO test). Does the organization have a high level of competence? In which areas? Can the organization compete?

Value Chain Analysis

What is the Customer Value Proposition? How do value chain activities impact the organization's cost structure? What can the organization do to improve their value chain?

Analytical Summary

Based upon the findings of the previous steps, what are the organizations strengths and weaknesses in relation to market opportunities and threats? (SWOT Analysis)

Organization Strategy

What should our core strategy be based upon? (Cost or Differentiation advantage). Should the organization be on offense or defense?

- a. What moves should they make? Which tactics employed?

- b. Any vertical/horizontal integration elements required?
- c. What international moves should be made? (if any) How should this be done?

Reality Check: Does the organization have the right resources/capabilities for good strategy execution? What is the culture like? What is great and what needs to change?

Managerial Focus

What strategic issues and problems merit front-burner managerial attention?