



Louisiana State University

Office of Academic Affairs

April 21, 1998

Daniel Fogel
From: Daniel Fogel, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

To: Vice Chancellors, Academic Deans & Directors, Department Chairs & Heads

Subject: July 15 Response to University Planning Council

I am writing to provide some guidance on the preparation of the July 15 responses to the University Planning Council, which is currently engaged in a thorough-going analysis of the preliminary responses submitted to us on March 15. We wish to thank to all involved in the preparation of the very thoughtful and candid materials submitted last month. In the next few weeks, the UPC will be meeting with deans and vice chancellors to explore issues discussed in the March 15 submissions.

In my memos to academic deans and directors (1/29/98) and to the heads of non-degree granting units (2/9/98), I indicated that the materials due on July 15 should draw on previous planning efforts, should be consistent with the current version of the University Planning Document, and should incorporate measures of progress so that they can be continuously linked to implementation and assessment.

I also said that the July plans should emulate the master document in setting forth Vision, Mission, Goals, Strategic Directions, and Objectives. Responses need not, however, be ordered according to the nine strategic directions in the University Planning Document, nor do they need to address all nine. Rather, plans should address only those University directions and objectives relevant to the unit. As suggested earlier, these should be concise plans of no more than three to four pages for each administrative unit (college, school, department, etc.).

On the institutional level we will be working next fall on identifying specific activities that need to be undertaken to achieve each strategic direction and objective, on setting time lines, and on establishing performance indicators. We expect each unit to be going through a similar process. Thus, while the July 15 plans may not include action plans, time lines, and performance indicators, they should be developed with the next phase of the process clearly in view.

In particular, directions and goals should be practical and assessable. As you know, the Board of Regents and the Legislature are using ten peers from which to select performance indicators for evaluating LSU's progress. As implementation plans are developed next fall, units may use the same set of peers (University of Maryland, VPI,

N. C. State, University of South Carolina, University of Georgia, University of Florida, University of Kentucky, University of Tennessee, Auburn University, and Texas A&M) or they may select their own set of peers and/or standards against which they can measure their success in meeting goals. Peers should be both aspirational and practical: they should be selected because they set high but attainable standards that we aspire to match or exceed.

Finally, all units that have participated in accreditation reviews, Board of Regents program reviews, or the LSU program review process should incorporate the recommendations and agreements that resulted from these reviews in their planning process. Please let me know if you have questions about the July 15 responses not addressed in the present memo. If LSU is to progress, the Chancellor and I firmly believe that the leadership you are exercising in planning for LSU's future is critical. Thank you very much.

cc: Chancellor Jenkins