

ADMINISTRATIVE MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT Long-Range Planning 1998-2003

NUMBER 366

DATE January 27, 1997

I. Introduction

Long-Range Planning, 1994-99 was adopted by the Board of Governors in November 1994. The schedule for future planning called for a revised plan to be adopted and published in 1995 in order to return to the normal cycle of revising the University's plan biennially in odd-numbered years. However, the large number of special studies mandated by the 1995 session of the General Assembly preempted preparation and adoption of a 1995 revision. Instead, a *Supplement to Long-Range Planning, 1994-99* was adopted by the Board of Governors on November 8, 1996.

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a schedule and guidelines for preparation of the next revision of the long-range plan of the University of North Carolina.

II. Long-Range Planning, 1998-2003

The next edition of the long-range plan will cover five years, 1998-99 through 2002-03. The planning process will place increased emphasis on comprehensive planning, linking enrollment planning, academic program planning, facilities planning, and expansion budget and capital improvements requests.

The preparation of the planning document will be a joint endeavor. Each institution, under the direction of the chancellor and after appropriate consultation with the faculty, will submit to the President any proposed revisions to its current mission statement, organization, academic program offerings, or enrollment plans. The proposed changes should reflect the institution's long-range or strategic plan and its physical plan and should be informed by the special studies undertaken by the Board during the previous planning period (e.g., educational access, accountability, reviews of academic degree programs and research and public service programs, service to public schools). *Each institution should append to its long-range planning submission a copy of its current long-range/strategic plan and physical/campus plan (if it has such plans—it is not expected to develop such plans especially for this process).*

The President's staff will also engage in University-wide planning as it responds to statewide needs and legislative concerns. The President, his staff, and the Board of Governors will continue to collaborate with the other education sectors through such vehicles as the Education Cabinet and the Education Commission (joint meetings of the governing boards of the three education sectors). The Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs of the Board of Governors will review issues of significance for higher education as it prepares to revise the strategic directions adopted in the *Supplement to Long-Range Planning, 1994-99*. A comprehensive planning document will be prepared by this office for review and consideration by the Planning Committee and Board of Governors after a thorough review of institutional proposals.

The planning schedule has been designed to facilitate articulation between the University's plan for 1998-2003, its enrollment projections, and its expansion budget and capital improvements requests for the 1999-2001 biennium.

A. Institutional Missions

Institutional missions were thoroughly reviewed during the 1990-92 mission review process, and revised mission statements that reflected the outcomes of that process appeared in *Long-Range Planning, 1992-97*. Mission statements were reviewed again in 1993 and revised as necessary to ensure that they gave "explicit recognition to the primary importance of teaching in the University," in conformity with the policy adopted by the Board of Governors in the report *Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina*. Some institutions made minor revisions in their mission statements in the 1996 *Supplement*.

Institutions may once again submit requests for minor changes in language that will improve or clarify the mission statement. However, any revisions that would reflect a change in descriptive classification should be proposed only if the institution has met, for at least two years, the criteria developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. In that case, the institution should at the same time provide documentation that it meets the Carnegie definition—e.g., level and type of programs offered, enrollments, number of degrees awarded by level and discipline areas, amount of federal research support received, etc.

B. Academic Program Development

1. Academic Program Review

During 1994 and 1995 the Board of Governors conducted a thorough review of all degree programs to identify those of low productivity or low priority or which were "unnecessarily redundant." As a result of this review, a total of 104 academic degree programs and an additional 19 degree program tracks were discontinued. Revision of Section 2, General Statutes 116-11 (3), which outlines the Board of Governors' responsibilities with respect to academic programs, requires that the Board conduct such a review every two years. Therefore, the second biennial review of academic degree programs will be conducted concurrently with this planning process, so that recommendations for program discontinuation or merger can be considered as a part of the preparation of the University's 1998-2003 long-range plan. (Instructions for the review process are included with this Administrative Memorandum as Enclosure #1. A list of programs to be reviewed will be sent to each institution, with a cover memorandum, within two weeks.)

2. Programs to be Discontinued

Proposals to discontinue existing programs or tracks, whether identified as a result of the biennial academic program review process or through other institutional procedures, should include a schedule for the proposed discontinuations. (See Enclosure #2 for format for requests to discontinue programs and tracks.)

3. Report on Recently Established Programs

Institutions with programs authorized by the Board for establishment 1-2 years ago and 3-4 ago years should provide a status report on the progress being made in implementing each program. (See Enclosure #3 for a list of recently established programs and the format to be followed in completing the reports.)

4. Reconfirmation of Previous Planning Authorizations

Institutions are to report on the status of those proposed new degree programs for which planning authorization has been granted previously, indicating whether the previous authorization should be withdrawn or reconfirmed. Institutions with planning authorization outstanding for several programs should consider whether some of these requests should be withdrawn, especially if little progress in planning has been made and they intend to seek additional planning authorizations. (See Enclosure #4 for list of current program planning authorizations and format to be followed.)

5. Authorization to Plan New Degree Programs

The concern for academic productivity evident in the mandated biennial program review process reflects both the fiscal constraints higher education is experiencing and the expectation that constituent institutions will be called upon to serve a growing number of traditional and nontraditional students in the next decade. Institutions considering requests for authorization to plan new programs should take these conditions into account and should also consider the growing potential of distance education and collaboration with sister institutions as alternative means of meeting new program demands in their respective regions.

Requests to plan new academic degree programs must be submitted in accordance with *Academic Program Development Procedures* (July 1994). (See Enclosure #5 for format.) Requests to plan more than one new degree program must clearly specify institutional priorities among such requests (e.g., 1 of 3, 2 of 3, etc.).

C. Enrollment Goals

In response to a memorandum from the President to the chancellors dated May 16, 1996, institutions submitted enrollment goals (following two scenarios) that reflected their responses to the challenge of serving the statewide enrollment growth anticipated for the period 1996-2005. In this edition of the long-range plan it will be necessary to update this information to run through 2007-08. A table that summarizes your institution's enrollment goals under both scenarios (as submitted last August) is attached (see Enclosure #6). It compares General Administration's regular session enrollment projections (included in the supplement to the 1994-99 plan) with your institution's long-term enrollment goals for both regular session and extension enrollment. A separate form is provided as part of Enclosure #6 for you to use in updating enrollment data.

Please note that the new data to be provided should be based on the enclosed projections of public high school graduates (part of Enclosure #6) and on the assumption that extension enrollments will be funded starting in the 1998-99 academic year (FY 99), i.e., one year later than had been assumed in your August submission. Based on these assumptions, please prepare scenario 1 and 2 projections as well as a "mostly likely scenario" projection (i.e., scenario 3) if it differs from your scenario 1 and 2 projections. Note that your updated scenario 1 and 2 projections should reflect funding for capital projects—including funds for planning—coming from the 1996 session of the General Assembly. Separate extension and regular session enrollments in your projections. For the years 1997-98 through 2002-03, please show breakouts by degree level and residency status. For later years, show only the total headcount. The form for this purpose is part of Enclosure #6. Note that only fall headcount enrollments are requested.

It may help you distinguish clearly among the three scenarios by considering the three questions that they address. In scenario 1, we ask how many students you are prepared to take if future funding for capital projects were limited to those that are currently under construction or funded for planning. In scenario 2, we ask how many students you are prepared to take if future funding for required capital projects were assured. In scenario 3, we ask for your traditional

enrollment projections, in which you indicate how many students you expect to enroll if all of your planning assumptions for the future are realized. Thus, the projections under scenarios 1 and 2 are best characterized as your enrollment goals subject to two different sets of assumptions about the availability of new funds for capital improvements, while the projections under scenario 3 are best characterized as your best look into the future based on an analysis of past trends and other factors that determine your enrollments.

In order to give you an opportunity to take account of fall 1997 enrollments in making your projections, we are asking that the enrollment projection form in Enclosure #6 be **submitted separately in October when the 1997 fall Student Data File is submitted.**

Requirements for new or renovated facilities to accommodate enrollment growth proposed in Scenario #2 should also be reflected in the needs and priorities expressed in campus capital improvements requests, so that there is consistency between enrollment planning and facilities planning.

D. Reports on Institutes and Centers

In accordance with Chapter 407, Section 1, Senate Bill 393, 1993 Session Laws, the Board of Governors recently completed a review of all research and public service institutes and centers formally approved by the Board of Governors prior to July 1995. Therefore, for this planning period, institutions should submit reports only for those centers and institutes formally approved by the Board of Governors between July 1995 and July 1996 and those five institutes and centers identified by the recent review for further study during 1996-97. Any institutes or centers recommended for discontinuation (including those not under review at this time) should be identified, indicating the proposed phase-out period and effective date of discontinuation. Enclosure #7 includes a list of the institutes and centers to be reviewed and the required format for the reports.

Institutions are also to indicate the *status* of proposed new centers and institutes for which planning authorization has been granted previously (e.g., planning underway; external funding being sought; established by the Board of Governors since January 1997; etc.). The report on the status of planning should be followed by a *requested action*, either: (1) planning request withdrawn, or (2) reconfirmation requested, with the estimated date for submission of the request for authorization to establish. Information should be added regarding any additional centers or institutes authorized for planning by UNC General Administration which are not included in the list in Enclosure #7.

E. Organizational Charts

Each institution's organizational chart showing its academic organization, as it appears in *Supplement to Long-Range Planning, 1994-99*, is attached (Enclosure #8). Each institution should note any organizational changes (as of May 1, 1997) *in red ink on this copy* and return the corrected copy with its other long-range planning submissions. Any proposals for major reorganization of the administrative structure of the institution (e.g., establishment of new colleges or professional schools) must be approved by the Board of Governors.

III. Schedule

Planning materials should be submitted to the President by May 2, 1997. Five (5) copies are requested for review. Type the abbreviated name of the institution at the top of each page so that it may be identified easily. Loose-leaf binders or notebooks should be used for easy insertion or removal of pages.

Consultations will be held with the Chancellors or designated institutional representatives to clarify proposals or to fill gaps in information.

Following the review and evaluation of institutional materials, a draft plan for the University of North Carolina, 1998-2003 will be submitted to the Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs of the Board of Governors. It is anticipated that the committee will make its report and recommendations to the Board of Governors by January 1998. This will enable the Board to link its long-range plan and strategic directions to its instructions and priorities for expansion budget and capital improvements requests for the 1999-2001 biennium.


C.D. Spangler, Jr.

**Order of Documents to be Included with Institutional Submission for
Long-Range Planning, 1998-2003
(5 copies — due May 2, 1997)**

1. Reports on academic degree programs included in 1997 academic program review.
2. Requests to discontinue academic degree programs and tracks.
3. Reports on academic degree programs established within the previous 1-2 or 3-4 years.
4. Reports on status of planning of academic degree programs for which planning has previously been authorized.
5. Requests for authorization to plan new academic degree programs.
6. Enrollment goals and projections (to be submitted separately by October 15, 1997, on form included with long-range planning instructions).
7. Reports on institutes and centers and reports on the status of institutes and centers previously authorized for planning.
8. Updated institutional organizational charts (academic organization).
9. Institutional strategic/long-range plans and campus/facilities plans (if available).