

April 2012 Monthly Report

Overview

The Constituent Engagement phase of the project expanded in April to solicit input from four key groups of stakeholders within the University community – the UT Faculty Council, the Alumni Legislative Council and UTAA presidents (immediate past, current and president-elect), the Compensation Advisory Board and Employee Relations Advisory Board and UT retirees.

In addition, the President and Chancellors defined terminology and System/campus roles, the project dashboard was further developed, budget planning continued, implementation planning began and the Steering Committee finalized the plan's goals, initiatives and actions for Years 1 and 2.

Constituent Engagement and Communications

Four groups of constituencies were invited to participate in mini online surveys regarding specific aspects of the first draft of the plan. Questions posed to the UT Faculty Council, the Alumni Legislative Council and UTAA presidents, the Compensation Advisory Board and Employee Relations Advisory Board and UT retirees targeted their particular vantage points and expertise – faculty participation in moving the plan forward, legislative needs and impactful plan messaging, “employer of choice” implementation and broader views of the UT brand. Twenty-two respondents provided comments that both affirmed the plan's direction and provided useful input for further plan development and institutional strategic opportunities.

The UT System Communications Office and The Napa Group consultants also developed a plan communications framework for May-June, when the plan will be presented for approval by the Board of Trustees.

President and Chancellors

In their April face-to-face meeting, the President and Chancellors reviewed the first plan draft thoroughly and provided perspectives that were incorporated into the draft goals, initiatives and actions. They affirmed terminology that will be used going forward to refer to the UT enterprise – the UT System and the UT System Administration (sun setting the term University-wide Administration). Confusion over these terms has surfaced throughout the project and the Steering Committee, the Task Forces and the administrative leadership sought consistent and aligned terminology.

The plan's successful implementation will require clear accountability and ownership of operational activities, and the following responsibilities will apply to either System or Campus/Institute roles. Some activities will engage multiple roles:

- **Process owner** – responsible manager of activities and processes; subject expert
- **Business owner** – responsible owner [leader] of organizational processes; responsible for organizational outcomes and results
- **Advocate** – ambassador, supporter, influencer of others
- **Responder-reporter** – provides comments and data requested; communicates upward and downward as required; participates in feedback loops as requested
- **Coordinator-facilitator** – ensures right people and processes are in place and are appropriately supported; links activities and processes
- **Resource generator** – funder or link to funds and resources
- **Policy and Standards developer** – subject expert responsible for development of policies and standards
- **Fully engaged participant** – individual who takes part in the activity or process team with defined roles and responsibilities
- **Gatekeeper** – monitors or oversees the actions of others; assures adherence to guidelines and policies

With these high-level accountabilities established, the President and Chancellors will appoint System and Campus “leads” for small task forces that will actually create the operational activities for Years 1 and 2. These teams will begin their work in July.

Dashboard and Budget

The plan's dashboard committee continued to work on a simplified and concise framework that will accompany the plan and allow for measurement and communication of both progress and impact. The committee is led by Dennis Hengstler, director of Institutional Research and Planning; Katie High, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and Student Success; and Executive Vice President David Millhorn. The dashboard will provide a visual snapshot of the plan's progress and impact and, through several tiers, more detailed data. To ensure consistency in reporting, the dashboard's design will be aligned with the new IT Governance Model, which is developing definitions and standards for data gathering and reporting across the UT System.

A specific “strategic plan budget” for the first two years of implementation will be developed to accompany the plan that is submitted to the Trustees. Most of the first two years of activity will be funded by existing budgets, including repurposing as needed. Much of the budget activity during the first two years will involve baseline setting, analysis and identification of new funding needs for subsequent years and integrated budget planning through cross-university councils and teams.

Final Plan Draft

The Steering Committee held its last meeting on April 23 to finalize draft 2 of the plan, which will be developed into two versions for another round of constituent review in May. An Executive Summary will outline mission statements, goals and the dashboard; a full-length comprehensive plan will chronicle the entire plan's development, goals and initiatives and implementation. Appendices will list participants throughout the 10-month project, the Year 1 and 2 action items and other details. These versions will be completed in early June for submission to the Board of Trustees.

Next Steps

- Final constituent review – May 2012
- Final plan development – May-early June 2012
- Board of Trustees action – June 2012