

Minutes of the Meeting of the Faculty Senate March 8, 2006

In Attendance: Drs. Baruch-Bienen, Brackley, Evans, Krolick, Luduena, Olson, Parsons, Ruzicka, Sorenson, Vines, Yew.

Absent: Drs. Amaechi, Geelhoed, Kahlenberg, Keiser, Lam, Plastino, Robichaux, Shah, Tekmal, Vargas, Verrett, Whang,

Guest: Dr. Theresa Chiang
Vice President for Academic Administration

Convened: 4:05 PM

Institutional Strategic Planning

Dr. Theresa Chiang
Vice President for Academic Administration

The following is a summary of points made by Dr. Chiang concerning the ongoing strategic planning process:

The UT System has mandated the submission of a University Compact from each UT campus. There is an expectation that our University Compact will be extracted directly from our strategic plan.

The UT System is also in the process of developing an outline for its Strategic Plan. There is an expectation that our strategic plan will line up with the System's plan in that our goals should support UT System goals, and that all requirements to address issues of accountability will be met. The plan under development by the UT System can be found at:

<http://www.utsystem.edu/ipa/planning/ProposedTopics-Feb2006.htm>

The UTHSCSA Executive Committee has developed a framework within which UTHSCSA goals have been formulated. The development of this framework is the result of much research, although variable degrees of input was solicited from the faculty (depending on which EC member was responsible for a particular element of the plan).

Dr. Chiang provided the Faculty Senate with a draft of the plan, which was distributed to the faculty-at-large with a request for comments. Subsequently, the Faculty Senate submitted a response to Dr. Chiang regarding comments and concerns of the faculty about the EC's plan. The report can be found in the minutes of the special senate meeting called on February 22nd.

<http://www.uthscsa.edu/facultygovt/minutes/feb06Special.pdf>

The following faculty concerns were addressed by Dr. Chiang, many that had been noted in the Senate's report submitted to her office:

- The UTHSCSA Faculty Senate is anxious to provide whatever support it can as the Administration strives to create a Strategic Plan that is useful and well-respected by all at the UTHSCSA, as well as by the University of Texas System.

Dr. Chiang responded by reminding the senators that she has indicated since last year that she wanted to encourage faculty involvement in these discussions, and that EC members were instructed to promote whatever activities necessary to gather required input. There has been considerable unit-to-unit and school-to-school inconsistency with regard to faculty involvement.

- "Top-down" planning misses areas of concern to both the Administration and the Faculty; perceived by the Faculty as a fragmented wish-list of the Administration and not an actual strategic plan.

This approach to developing a plan for our institution, although inconsistent with conventional/familiar planning strategies, has been recommended by planning administrators at the UT System level. In addition, the expectation by the System is that the plan will be derived from, and be consistent with, our developing budget negotiations. Therefore, it was presumed that this approach would result in complete "buy-in" by those who could provide budgetary support for proposed objectives.

- Resources/funds are not clearly available for supporting the plan; priorities need to be set.

Dr. Chiang indicated that EC members have now been charged with developing strategies for prioritizing and implementing the proposed objectives, including proposals for identifying financial support for such implementation.

- No section of the plan is focused solely on faculty issues.

Dr. Chiang pointed out that the plan has not yet been finalized, and that the EC would consider additional objectives. She suggested that additions can be submitted either to Deans or directly to her office.

- Quantitatively specific Strategies are only appropriate if justification can be documented.

Dr. Chiang pointed out that considerable research was performed by EC members in order to develop the stated objectives and predicted outcomes. In addition, lengthy discussions among EC members produced the numbers cited in the document which represent “averages” of numbers provided by individual schools. She acknowledges that certain numerical outcomes may not be realistic or relevant to certain schools, but that on average, these are realistic institutional goals.

- Outcome Measures should provide precise descriptions of how outcomes are to be measured; and clearly stated assignments of accountability.

Dr. Chiang presented carefully designed planning grids to be used by EC members for reporting purposes. The grids are to include specific indications of step-by-step processes for implementing strategies, as well as who, exactly, is to be held accountable for overseeing the implementation. Examples of the reporting grids may be obtained from her office. The planning grid is also copied below for reference, although copying into this website may have resulted in formatting that is slightly different from the original.

- Some objectives are ambiguous due to vague language.

Dr. Chiang indicated that Some of the language was intentionally left vague to allow flexible interpretations by the prospective school/unit.

- The plan, as it now stands, does not speak to the need for each school to provide a school-specific strategic plan that funnels into and supports the institutional plan.

The planning grid shown below implies that there is an expectation that each school have a strategic plan that links with the institution strategic plan. It would also be expected that each department within a school have a strategic plan that links with the school’s strategic plan.

The meeting ended with a request from Dr. Chiang that representatives from each school address concerns to the planning document by proactively seeking interactions with their individual deans. Implementation strategies are now being developed, and are **due in her office by April 4th**.

Adjourned at 5:15 PM

**The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio
Strategic Planning Grid
Plan Period: September 1, 2006 – August 31, 2011**

| | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|
| Name/Title of EC Member/Unit: | | |
| Name/Title of Individual Accountable for Plan: | | |
| Name/Title of Official Approving Strategic Plan: | | Date Approved: |

| |
|--|
| Enter EC Member's Area Mission Statement: |
|--|

| |
|--|
| List Persons Who Participated in the EC Member's/Unit's Planning Process: |
|--|

| <p><u>Partner(s) in Implementing Plan</u> (List any individual/unit external to your area whose participation is needed who has agreed to participate to achieve goal)</p> | <p><u>Resource Requirements: One-Time and Recurring</u> (Provide estimates of the resources required by category (e.g., personnel, space, materials, equipment, fiscal, etc.) needed to complete the Action Plan for goal including one-time resource requirements and, if appropriate, recurring resource requirements)</p> | <p><u>If you CANNOT achieve goal ONLY using resources within your area, specifically describe how you propose to obtain additional needed resources</u></p> |
|---|---|--|
| | | |