

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN-FLINT  
FOLLOW-UP TO THE  
CHANCELLOR'S ADDRESS TO THE CAMPUS COMMUNITY  
UNIVERSITY THEATRE  
DECEMBER 9, 2003

*The Future of the University, the University of the Future*

Juan E. Mestas  
Chancellor

**AGENDA FOR ACTION**

Fundamental commitments:

- To settle for nothing less than excellence in all we do.
- To maintain an environment in which our students feel academically and intellectually challenged, supported as individual learners and members of a learning community, and encouraged to be good citizens and eager participants in the care and improvement of their university.
- To reflect in our values and behavior society not just as it is, but as it should be, which is to say that we are committed to setting a good example.
- To ask as we ponder every important decision, "Is it in the best interest of the students?"

These thoughts, initiatives and recommendations were informed and shaped to a great extent by the work of the Student Learning Task Force and its purpose groups, but also by subsequent suggestions from other campus groups and individual members of the campus community.

1. **Background:** The purpose group on the enhancement of campus life relied to a great extent on the Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) administered in the fall of 2002. This was a reliable instrument, because the randomly selected sample consisted of more than 1,000 students. The results showed that the overall satisfaction of our students was significantly higher than the national average for four-year public universities. The margin of satisfaction was particularly notable in the area of campus safety. There was no statistically significant difference in the responses of minority and non-minority students, though females were generally more satisfied with their campus experience than males. The main concern expressed by students was the difficulty in getting the classes they need to graduate on time.

Our students have expressed this concern often, and I will address it later in these remarks.

- 1.a. Action: Administer the SSI (along with ten campus-based supplementary questions) every three years to a sample of 1,000 or more students and distribute the results widely to help campus units on their own self-assessment. In the years that the SSI is not administered, the students' perception of their campus experience will be ascertained through activities such as forums, focus groups, and fireside chats with the chancellor. Incorporate these actions into the standard practice and schedule of Student Services and Enrollment Management.

Facilitator: The Vice Chancellor for Student Services and Enrollment Management.

Timeline: Immediately.

- 1.b. Action: Issue separate reports on the status of women, minorities and the LGBT community every three years, preferably in the years when the SSI is not administered. These reports will cover students, faculty, and staff.

Facilitator: The Director of the Women's Educational Center will submit to the Chancellor a plan and schedule for the report on the status of women.

Timeline: May 2004.

Note: The responsibility and the timeline for issuing the reports about the other two groups will be assigned later.

2. Background: The purpose group on living-and-learning centers conceptualized life at the future student residences, integrating the learning experiences of the students into their residential lives. The group did an excellent job in paving the way for the future. In the process, it found that living-and-learning communities could be established even before we have student housing. This is an appealing idea and deserves to be encouraged.

- 2.a. Action: Advance the concept of living-and-learning communities on campus and in the neighboring community through educational and organizational means. Submit a progress report to the Chancellor.

Facilitator: The Director of University Relations, working with students and members of the faculty and staff, and with the counsel and support of Professor Theodosia Robertson.

Timeline: May 2004.

- 2.b. Action: In anticipation of student housing, move toward establishing an Office of Residence Life by fall 2005.

Facilitator: The Vice Chancellor for Student Services and Enrollment Management.

Timeline: A schedule for progress reports will be set up at a later date.

3. Background: The most persistent complaint we hear from students is that they are unable to enroll in the classes they need for timely graduation. We must remove all institutional impediments to timely graduation and do everything in our power to facilitate the students' completion of their academic plans. This effort requires a sustained focus on academic advising. It requires, too, a thorough review of the times when we offer classes to make schedules responsive to the needs of current and prospective students.

- 3.a. Action: Put in place by fall of 2004 the necessary mechanisms to make a firm, written commitment to students who request it, at the time they declare their majors, that they will graduate on time, provided that they follow successfully a pre-approved program of courses and receive periodic advising from their departments and/or the Advising Center. The departments that make this commitment will make appropriate substitutions when the required courses are not available. Submit an implementation plan to the Chancellor.

Facilitator: The Provost, working with deans and department chairs.

Timeline: June 2004.

- 3.b. Action: Appoint an advising enhancement task force, composed of staff, faculty, and students to examine closely our overall approach to advising and make recommendations that will make the system more efficient and more responsive to the needs of students.

Facilitator: The Provost and the Vice Chancellor for Student Services and Enrollment Management.

Timeline: May 2004. The timeline for the submission of recommendations will be determined once the task force is appointed.

- 3.c. Action: Appoint a task force to review the academic schedule and make recommendations and recommend changes that will make it more responsive to student needs as well as policies and procedures that will ensure the continuation of good practices.

Facilitator: The Provost.

Timeline: September 2004.

4. Background: The central recommendation of the purpose group on online curriculum development was to increase the number of degree or certificate programs—not just courses—that can be completed online or in a mixed-mode setting. This increase would have a positive effect on our efforts to increase enrollment and to bring flexibility to the academic schedule.

- 4.a. Action: Identify or develop degree and certificate programs, as well as a sequence of courses that that will satisfy the general education requirements, that can be completed online or in mixed-mode delivery. Submit a progress report to the Chancellor.

Facilitator: The Provost, working with deans and department chairs.

Timeline: September 2004.

- 4.b. Action: Develop a marketing strategy for the online/mixed-mode curriculum. Submit a report to the Chancellor.

Facilitator: The Director of University Relations and the Director of Admissions.

Timeline. September 2004.

5. Background: The deans of the three professional schools and the College of Arts and Sciences have expressed the need to review all academic and non-academic programs on a regular basis. The Chancellor and the vice chancellors agree. The purpose of these reviews is to ensure quality, compliance, viability, and consistency with the mission and strategic directions of the university.

- 5.a. Action: Revise the review system for academic programs in terms of the above criteria and other relevant considerations, such as effective use of student outcomes assessment, participation in interdisciplinary academic activities, use of new delivery technologies, and responsiveness to students. Submit a report to the Chancellor.

Facilitator: Provost, working with the deans.

Timeline: September 2004.

- 5.b. Action: Do a viability review of all academic programs to identify those that are not productive, in terms of enrollment and graduation rates, and could be discontinued or merged with other programs. Other factors should be considered in making this determination; e.g., quality, reputation, contribution

to general education, and ability to generate external funding. Submit a report to the Chancellor.

Facilitator: Provost, working with the deans.

Timeline: September 2004 for the submission of the report; Fall 2005 to implement the recommendations.

- 5.c. Action: Develop a system (criteria, processes, procedures, and schedule) for the periodic review of non-academic programs and activities.

Facilitator: Chancellor, working with the executive officers.

Timeline: September 2004 to have the system in place. September 2005 to start the review cycles.

6. Background: There is room for improvement in our relationship with community colleges in general and with Mott Community College in particular. Our aim is to create a seamless transition for community college students to our campus once they have completed the requirements for their associate degrees. The purpose group on the improvement of community college articulation made the following specific recommendations:

- Increase the number of program articulation agreements, evaluate the effectiveness of those already in place, and establish a system or periodic review.
- Develop more two-plus-two and two-plus-three programs, and explore the possibilities of integrating online and mixed-mode delivery courses into these programs.
- Maintain up-to-date transfer guides, including specific course equivalences, and make them available through interactive, user-friendly web access.

- 6.a. Action: Set in motion the academic aspects of this enhancement effort and submit a progress report to the Chancellor.

Facilitator: Provost, working with deans and department chairs.

Timeline: May 2004.

- 6.b. Action: Set in motion the admissions and marketing elements of this enhancement effort and submit a progress report to the Chancellor.

Facilitator: Directors of Admissions and University Relations, jointly.

Timeline: May 2004.

7. We need to revise our budgeting philosophy and improve the process by which we develop our annual budgets. In addition to providing for the good management of resources, the new budget model will create financial incentives for individual units to grow and be entrepreneurial and creative. It should also give greater responsibility to the units for the administration of their own resources.

7.a. Action: Develop a new budget model for the university.

Facilitator: Vice Chancellor for Administration in consultation with the Chancellor, the other vice chancellors and the BP/CAC.

Timeline: For implementation in FY06.

8. Background: UM-Flint needs to establish its own niche of excellence within the framework of a comprehensive institution that integrates its liberal arts core with professional programs. We need to determine what areas are going to define our identity and place our efforts and resources in making those areas as good as they could possibly be.

8.a. Action: Develop a strategic plan for the university.

Facilitator: The Chancellor, working with the Chancellor's Council and the BP/CAC.

Timeline: April 2004 to develop the process, January 2005 to complete the plan.

9. Items with undetermined timelines:

9.a. Action: Facilitate and encourage the transferability of students among the three campuses of the University of Michigan.

Facilitator: The Chancellor with the support of the Provost and the Vice Chancellor for Student Services and Enrollment Management.

9.b. Action: Plan and lead the UM-Flint part of the University of Michigan's capital campaign.

Facilitator: Vice Chancellor for Institutional Advancement.