University Strategic Planning Group
Thursday, October 4, 2018
LSC Conference Room

Minutes

In attendance: J. Krukones, C. Brennan, T. Bruce, J. Burke, B. D'Ambrosia, R. Day, C. Dietz, E. Eickhoff, M. Farrar, D. Hareza, R. Hessinger, D. Kilbride, G. Lacueva, S. Levenson, K. Malone, M. McCarthy, M. Millet, M. Morgan, M. O'Connor, E. Peck, J. Rick, J. Schupp (19).

J. Krukones welcomed the group, and noted that the due date for tactics is October 12, and that these tactics will be discussed at the October 18 meeting.

The Minutes of the September 13, 2018, USPG meeting were approved.

T. Bruce brought up a previously determined, unused tactic – 3.2: Implement the USPG Program Approval Process – and inquired as to whether the committee members felt this was still a necessary tactic. After discussion, it was agreed that this particular tactic should be abandoned.

T. Bruce asked for suggestions as to the best way to gather community input for the 2020-25 Strategic Plan, noting that SWOT analyses had been utilized in the past. In discussion, it was agreed that utilizing the previous SWOT analyses was better than starting completely over, and could be used to demonstrate where we have built on our strengths, addressed some weaknesses, made progress or still have more work to do, and to offer reflection. It was also noted that the SWOT analyses are a good way to allow all to have a voice.

T. Bruce then led the committee through a series of data which provided an internal view of JCU, starting with the US Department of Education College Scorecard. This scorecard information is frequently used by students and their parents as they are searching for colleges. T. Bruce noted a trend in students bringing in more credits, emphasizing that the credits were brought in, not necessarily applied.

For the data segment noting faculty comparisons, there was a suggestion to add the percentage of classes taught by part-time faculty, visitors, and others (post docs, GA's), along with a breakdown of the number of first-year students each group taught.

Experiential Learning data were derived from the 2017 National Survey of Student Engagement (High Impact Practices), the 2015 College Senior Survey, and information from the Center for Service and Social Action, and demonstrated students' opportunities to apply learning inside and outside of the classroom. T. Bruce will check on the response rate to the Career Services survey.

In outlining the data for Outcomes: Retention and Graduate Rate, T. Bruce noted that data are collected at the 3-week semester mark, and cohorts stay together through graduation. He also

noted that the graduate information is used for IPEDS, and the Federal government is now asking for the data on 8-year graduation rate. The Federal government is now also requesting information on students who transfer. There was a suggestion to add the composition of transfer students to the data.

T. Bruce pointed out that the data show the fastest growing undergraduate majors are computer science and "self-designed." He noted that they will look into what students are self-designing, and if this indicates the possible need for new programs. He also mentioned that the external view will look at how the demand for majors is changing. There was a suggestion to add the 1, 2 and 3-year change to the data to show growth, along with including the year the new undergrad majors began.

In discussing Diversity and Inclusion student data, there was a suggestion to add a comparator bar. T. Bruce noted that the Pluralistic Orientation data cover students from orientation to the end of the fourth year, showing growth from the freshman survey. There was a suggestion to add a note as to who the comparative groups were for the Campus Climate Survey data. In discussing the Diversity and Inclusion faculty information, there was a suggestion to add information relating to visitors to the distribution of tenure and tenure-track faculty.

In reviewing data related to Well-Being, T. Bruce added the caveat that the low point in satisfaction was at the time of restructuring. Also, in reviewing the Great Colleges to Work For data, T. Bruce noted that the SLT has had a high turnover since the survey was administered. Institutional Improvement included the Learning Goals, Instructional Assessment at program level (now in its 2nd round), the start of administrative assessment, HR initiatives and policy reviews, and the new University committee structure.

The Resources: Endowment and Budget slide illustrated cost of attendance, and noted 70% of our revenue comes from net tuition, 62% of expenses are compensation, and 43% of the budget goes towards instruction. The slide on Resource: Classrooms data outlined the occupancy by times, showing that the Tuesday/Thursday 1:00 timeslot had the heaviest use. Further increases in enrollment could cause a bottleneck for classroom space. It was pointed out that a bigger constraint is room size.

T. Bruce stated that these data give us a sense of where we can go in the future, and will be combined with the SWOT analyses information for community input. Part II of the data presentation will incorporate market demographics into the comparison.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Lovequist