## **Planning for Distinction Informational Sessions**

## **Tuesday, January 31, 2017 Morning Session** 40 participated out of 65 attendees

What guiding principles should shape The University SRA process?		
Recommendations strongly considered	6	
Clear goals	9	
Do what's best for university and not individuals	9	
Transparency	13	
Inclusive	9	
Qualitative data assigned a rank and number are not quantitative data	1	
Fairness	10	
All units considered equally	7	
Importance of program quality	4	
What does society (regional and national) need NMU to address	2	
Open to change	6	
Not "doing more with less"	2	
Data informed not necessarily data-driven	4	
Trust the process	3	
Academic and support on equal fields	8	
Full transparency at all levels	5	
Have a clear university identity in mind	9	
Consider outside influences of program importance and necessity –	2	
how does NMU support the model, industries, and the U.P.		
Consider how NMU identity might/should be updated	0	
Well-rounded task force	9	
Value added	0	
Balance of qualitative/quantitative measures	5	
Data-based decision-making	8	
Change is ok	5	
Change is required	2	
Qualitative value ≠ sacred cow	0	
Put the interests of the students first	1	
Ask for clarification if needed	10	
Push information out to the campus	1	
Equity is important to everyone	2	
The institution is a face-to-face physical entity first, an online presence	2	
second		
Avoid the "always been this way" mentality	12	
University mission	3	
Remember what students need, not what they want	1	

What benefits will The University realize from successfully ca	arrying out the
SRA process?	
Informed decision making about resources	12
Chance for programs to learn about each other/possible partnering	4
A better understanding of what happens all over The University	6
Comprehensive understanding of <u>all</u> entities on campus and their	13
impact on the overall mission	
Budget decisions based on data not across the board cuts	12
Provide resources to programs that are thriving or have the	10
potential to thrive	
Find our real mission	3
Programs that need more funding will get it	8
Changes made based on data	9
Any overlapping programs will be exposed	2
Opportunity for business process evaluation (meaningful)	2
Could replace other existing 'clunkier' processes on campus for this	4
type of review	
Identify our marketing points	0
Hopefully positive impact on students and enrollment (:	5
Stay focused on things that are important to the overall mission of the	4
institution	
Stronger commitment to what works	7
Possible morale boost to come areas traditionally overlooked	8
Strengths and weaknesses come into focus	5
Sustainability	4
Clearer identity for NMU	7
Realize just how transparent and responsive senior administration is	1
Programs more appropriately resourced	5
The growth of Northern	0
Identify underperforming programs to phase out	6
Better understanding across campus of relative contributions of	7
different programs	
Path to move forward on going	1
Cooperation and better relationships between programs	2
Vision for future growth	3

What pitfalls would arise from carrying out the SRA proce	ss?
Bad decisions from bad input	9
Recommendations could be made with no follow through	10
The hard decisions are not acted on	9
Turf wars	4
Good faculty and staff may leave or become disenfranchised	
Loss of employees	1
Low morale	6
Reallocation without enough immediate follow-up	4

Highlight bad data	3
Honeymoon phase will end	3
Interdisciplinary programs could suffer	3
Fear of impacts to individuals/departments	5
Loss of enthusiasm/motivation for those who work in bottom 2	9
quintiles	
Finger pointing. Cut them, not me	9
Lose credibility with Marquette country communities	0
Allowing biases to creep in	3
Good faculty and staff may choose to leave	8
Too much focus on a narrow range of academic opportunities	1
The campus questions/disagrees with the data and therefore	2
distracts/disagrees with outcomes	
Could thwart new ideas (short term)	1
Loss of faith in leadership if recommendations are not carried through	3
Upset alumni or community partners that value programs up for	4
elimination	
Disenfranchised employees	5
Nothing changes ):	1
People letting their emotions guide both their choices and interpretation	1
We lose students when they perceive that their program is being cut	11
People may feel their work is not important is lowly rated	4
Tension amongst faculty in different disciplines AKA turf wars	5
Could diminish focus on creasing student headcount	
Staff vs. Management fear	1
Cannibalism	0

What advice can you offer to the task forces that will carry out the SRA process?		
Focus on good of entire University	17	
Don't be an advocate for your own program	7	
Set aside pre-conceived notions/opinions about what you are	12	
assessing		
Leave egos at the door	17	
Than about NMU's long-term health and development	6	
Remember: This is about The University, not individuals or	13	
individual programs		
Declare metrics of why decisions are made	8	
Focus on what is good for the students	9	
Provide most accurate data possible	4	
Be aware of the "tentacle" effects of decisions	0	
Bring concerns to the group-not people <u>outside</u> of the task force	3	
Suspend Bias (as much as possible)	2	
Involve all appropriate stakeholders – so know who they are	2	
Don't share info until it is ready to be shared in a coordinated fashion	5	

Try to break free of the "This is how we always have done this"	3
attitude	
Stay on task and target of end goals, and time frame	1
Everyone has equal voice	12
Don't undervalue small academic programs	7
Be fair and keep an open mind	11
Know goals at all times	4
Keep Northern's core values in mind	1
Bring your B.S. detectors when reviewing templates	2
Keep work true to the structure	2
Be mindful of confidential data	2
Communicate	3
Always keep the overall good of the U. foremost	2
Spend the necessary time to do a good job – provide good input	4
Be objective and fair	5
Be clear about definitions	3
Ask for feedback or clarification	9
Communicate	2
Inclusiveness	0