

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well
University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Planning Committee

Campus Governance

4-18-2012

Planning minutes 04/18/2012

Planning Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan>

Recommended Citation

Planning Committee, "Planning minutes 04/18/2012" (2012). *Planning Committee*. 14.
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan/14>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Planning Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

Planning Committee
April 18, 2012

Present: Jim Hall, Julie Eckerle, Arne Kildegaard Jane Kill, Margaret Kuchenreuther, Leslie Meek, Lowell Rasmussen, Jordan Wentz

The minutes were distributed from April 11, 2012 meeting, and approved.

During these discussions please remember the questions that Chancellor Johnson is hoping to be resolved.

1. Are the variables selected as the basis for creating comparison groups the right variables?
2. How should these variables be weighted?
3. To what extent should "shared mission" play a role in forming comparison groups?
4. To what extent should regional proximity or competitor schools play a role?
5. What balance should we strike between peer and aspirant schools?

Last week we had a presentation from Daniel Jones White from the Office of Institutional Research and Peter Radcliffe from the Office of Planning and Analysis. At this presentation we received a list of institutions as a result of their model. Margaret explained she heard some “rumblings” from various quarters that people don’t necessarily agree the choices of parameters were the best, that the list produced was not necessarily apropos. So Margaret thinks we need more discussion.

- 1) What you really thought of last week’s meeting
- 2) Especially Margaret would like to know if anyone would be willing and able to join her when she meets with Nancy Helsper Friday morning. There is room for one more person. The objective is to maneuver around the data bases Nancy has access to and try and see what we can come up with, as alternative things we can look at.

Margaret would be interested in other types of parameters the committee might like to use to come up with a different comparison group.

The question was asked if there was data available only on the list the Chancellor sent out. And if the committee know what was asked of each institution to gather the data.

It was then explained there are over 14,000 institutions whose data was used to arrive at the list. This data is collected from IPEDS (Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System). All institutions are mandated to submit their information to IPEDS if they receive any Federal funding. IPEDS contains tremendous amounts of data from all over the country. As this is the structure they used for their model we may be restricted to these institutions for comparison. However, there are other data bases such as COPLAC which may produce different results.

Isn’t it interesting to note that the current Morris 14 and COPLAC are so different from Morris. However, some do come close to us, i.e. the University of Maine at Farmington is a COPLAC school

and is close to Morris.

Arne vocalized a couple of concerns.

- 1) They (the OPA and OIR) condensed this long list of variables into 7 factors/dimensions. Then they weighted them equally. I can see no reason to weight them equally. They are creating a number out of a vector of numbers what number you end up with is based on the components. You can't just take that at face value, you at least think about it. Which of these 7 are the most important?
- 2) What do you want to use the data for? If you want to use the data for evaluating particular programs or particular aspects of your institution, you can't have already chosen that for your criteria, especially of your comparison group because that is banking it into the data.

So if you want the issue say salary for instance, and you have already chosen your comparison group on the basis of salaries then there is no new information. Whatever you really want to ask of this data, you should not have it as selection criteria. We need to think ahead

Another thing that is not captured in any of these variables, what is the mission, what is it you are trying to accomplish? Of course there are a lot of constraints captured here, i.e. what is your student body like, what is your faculty/student ratio like? There are a lot of constraints and you want those constraints similar. But you also and in our case to maintain the national recognition where original thinking is happening. I don't think that is true in many of these fundamentalist Christian colleges. I would be inclined to throw out colleges which don't have similar missions, not on the base if they are church affiliated, but on the basis of their mission, and hopefully they aspire to some of the same things we aspire to also.

Q. Are we trying to get too close by using so many factors for comparison?

Remark. Last week, Nancy gave me a packet of materials. In that packet were the Carnegie classification which is something else we should research.

Again we need to look at the list they gave us containing the closest institutions to us.

Table 3. Morris and its Estimated Nearest Neighbors

0	University of Minnesota-Morris	0.000
1	University of Maine at Farmington	0.376
2	Flagler College	0.585
3	University of Pittsburgh-Greensburg	0.590
4	Harding University	0.663
5	Plymouth State University	0.668
6	College of the Ozarks	0.760
7	Longwood University	0.800
8	Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts	0.805
9	Westfield State University	0.821
10	Keene State College	0.828
11	Evangel University	0.837
12	SUNY College at Potsdam	0.926
13	Abilene Christian University	0.975
14	College of Charleston	1.026
15	Radford University	1.027
16	Franciscan University of Steubenville	1.035

17	The University of Virginia's College at Wise	1.055
18	University of Nebraska at Kearney	1.082
19	SUNY at Fredonia	1.083
20	University of Mary Washington	1.119
21	Christopher Newport University	1.144
22	SUNY College at Oswego	1.148
23	Georgia College & State University	1.213
24	Freed-Hardeman University	1.229
25	Castleton State College	1.236
26	Citadel Military College of South Carolina	1.243
27	SUNY College at Plattsburgh	1.259
28	SUNY College at Oneonta	1.287
29	North Greenville University	1.295
30	Alma College	1.302
31	Winona State University	1.308
32	Murray State University	1.32 1
33	Waynesburg University	1.346
34	The Master's College and Seminary	1.358
35	Stevenson University	1.359
36	SUNY College at Cortland	1.368
37	Shorter University	1.374
38	Geneva College	1.378
39	Lipscomb University	1.392
40	Lee University	1.398
41	Coastal Carolina University	1.407
42	Cedarville University	1.420
43	Winthrop University	1.423
44	University of Hartford	1.437
45	Illinois College	1.438
46	Benedictine College	1.445
47	Baldwin-Wallace College	1.446
48	Northwest Missouri State University	1.456
49	Frostburg State University	1.458
50	Maryville College	1.465
51	Loards College	1.465
52	Samford University	1.487
53	University of Northern Colorado	1.492
54	Eastern Connecticut State University	1.502
55	University of Montevallo	1.503
56	Fitchburg State University	1.527
57	St Mary's College of Maryland	1.536
58	Truman State University	1.556
59	Huntington University	1.565
60	North Central University	1.584
61	Florida Southern College	1,592
62	Framingham State University	1.597
63	Worcester State University	1.607
64	Fort Lewis College	1.641
65	University of Pittsburgh-Bradford	1.642
66	Dordt College	1.643
67	John Brown University	1.646
68	Oral Roberts University	1.658
69	Western Illinois University	1.670
70	Carroll University	1.688
71	Salisbury University	1.694
72	Central College	1.700

73	Nebraska Wesleyan University	1.724
74	Grace College and Theological Seminary	1.735
75	North Georgia College & State University	1.742
76	Southeast Missouri State University	1.770
77	Crown College	1.791
78	Ouachita Baptist University	1.796
79	Pacific Lutheran University	1.807
80	Philadelphia Biblical University-Langhorne	1.810
81	York College Pennsylvania	1.813
82	Western Oregon University	1.833
83	Concordia College at Moorhead	1.835
84	Mercyhurst College	1.846
85	Carroll College	1.851
86	Lyndon State College	1.860
87	Centenary College of Louisiana	1.860
88	Covenant College	1.860
89	Western Washington University	1.874
90	Aquinas College	1.877
91	Northern Michigan University	1.879
92	University of Northern Iowa	1.886
93	Franklin College	1.894

Upon inspection of this list, the top 2 are University of Maine Farmington and Flagler. Both of these institutions are listed as Baccalaureate Diverse, I am not sure what Baccalaureate Diverse means. The University of Pittsburgh Greenburg (#3 on list) and UMM are classified as Baccalaureate Arts and Science. It appears the first few on the meet our same Carnegie classification. However, Harding University, 4th on the list is a large private, nonprofit Master's Degree granting institution.

So maybe on their list throw out schools that are not on our Carnegie Classification, that would takes us a little more toward our missions. And they didn't have Carnegie class in theirs, though I am not sure why. Does everyone else agree that this idea of mission is important?

Yes! Look at Citadel Military School of South Carolina which is on the list and I don't think you could find two schools more different...statistically salaries and certain numbers might be similar, but they have to be very different. They are a large master's degree institution for their Carnegie class

When looking at data bases problems will arise no matter which it is. There are problems even with COPLAC. We have institutions in COPLAC that are master degree granting institution and very large campuses it is a matter of how we look at some of these things. There is that filter that somehow has to be applied that makes that data more relevant to us. Regardless what data base we use, there are factors which need to remove i.e. anything that is listed with Masters large or Masters medium, Masters whatever.

The following list is from the Carnegie List, excluding masters and large size. It brings the list down to 7 out of the top 30

College of the Ozarks is Baccalaureate Diverse
Flagler is Baccalaureate Diverse

Univ Pittsburgh Greensburg Baccalaureate A&S
Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is Baccalaureate A&S
Evangel is Baccalaureate Diverse
Virginia University College at Wise is Baccalaureate A&S
North Greenville University is Baccalaureate Diverse
Castleton State is Baccalaureate A&S

What is the delta number for the last one on the list? North Greenville University is listed as 29th and has a number of 1.20. That number is still smaller than the closest institution to the Twin Cities campus in terms of their factor analysis.

Morris has many institutions to choose from that are similar based on all their factors. We also need to think about comparison vs. aspiration. The comparison needs to be more than similar. We would like a group that has the same aspirations as we do. We have to remember the goal is to have 2/3 peers or at least what we consider peers and 1/3 aspirational. Comparison institutions should be 4 year liberal arts institutions where research matters for both faculty and students, not just teaching schools. Mission statements might vary but it is that basic profile which is important.

Criteria items could include
size,
demographics of student body (how expensive the institution is),
institutional aid,
4 yr grad rate, 6 yr grad rate.
selectivity ,
over all diversity

Another factor to question is what is the socio econ profiles as well and then that is inversely correlated with 4 yr. 6 yr. grad rates. The fed grant item is inversely correlated with all the other variables.

Do factors 2 & 3 seem over lapping?

Percent with federal grant percent with institutional aid...they seem to belong in the same category

(Factor 2 is based on the tuition and fees of an institution, percentage of undergraduates receiving institutional aid, as well as the selectivity or admissions yield. This factor identifies the dimension of institutions that on the positive end are highly selective, have high tuitions and give the students lots of aid and those with negative values are less selective, lower tuition and fees, and less aid for students.

Factor 3 is the access question. This includes the percentage enrollment of white students, percentage of undergraduate students that receive federal aid and both the 4 and 6 year graduation rate. There is an inverse between the percentage students that are white and the percentage of students that are getting federal grant aid. Which in our social economics and race are highly correlated.)

Privates institutions will have a different federal grant number as private institutions generally have large endowments and offer more institutional aid vs. federal aid.

Look at how tight factor 2 how tightly correlated fees with undergrad institutional aid...high positive loadings

There are also factors that really don't seem to be all that necessary. For example salaries, how can that be relevant with public and private which are most likely Somehow salary just doesn't seem to me to be significant in regards to picking institutions who are like us...just because we work for peanuts doesn't mean we shouldn't be compared to the rest of the world.

Isn't it possible to have different criteria to get different outcomes. One of the things you may be looking at is our peers in salary, but what are our peers in terms of graduation rates or retention rates. These things all don't have to be filtered at the same time.

We just need to remember our list needs to be fewer than 20. And that will change the list so maybe we want to ask the faculty salary question. And in order to get a realistic comparison we need to assign weights for not to assign weights is to assign weights. And so you have to make a call on what matters and what doesn't.

We will ask Nancy to re work weights and rerun lists...

It seems as if Factor 5 degree types are important. (**Factor 5** This area is the liberal arts area verses STEM dimension. In one direction you have the undergraduate degrees in the STEM field and going in sort of the opposite direction is the field of liberal arts field and the percentage of students that are women. We know that the number of women in the STEM field is relatively low. A positive value would indicate a higher emphasis on the liberal arts area and a negative value would place a higher emphasis on the STEM area (Science Technology, Engineering and Math.)

Is it possible to include the Carnegie Classification in Factor 5? That is probably not possible, but what might be possible is to run the data base and generate only the Carnegie classification that are nearest ours, using only baccalaureate institutions. And then with that list, apply the other factors.

As we are not sure what the baccalaureate diverse thing is we could run it with both baccalaureate diverse and baccalaureate A & S and baccalaureate institutions, and then apply their factors. (This list would be constraining to institutions that Carnegie thinks are like us.)

We would still need to sit down and clarify the weightings. Then we generate a list by this 2 step procedure and then we use our heads to say which are like us and which aren't with educated based information...so we would still have to have a manual filter at the end. Ultimately, this would help us arrive at a basis list that makes sense.

Ok...so what I will ask Nancy to do

First run filter by Carnegie classifications

(And we may do that in more than one way, looking at what the Carnegie classifications actually mean...i.e. is Baccalaureate Diverse really different that Baccalaureate A & S. It could mean something like they have a nursing school or such. However, upon looking at Flagler, who is listed as Baccalaureate Diverse, they don't have any science major. They teach science courses because they have to have them for their gen eds but they are heavily weighted toward social services and business

type degrees, so they are really not like us.)

So which other of these factors do we need to consider or are the ones that you deem most important from the multi-page hand out we received? All the variables are on the 2nd page of their handout. We can only weight the major factors.

Size should be weighted heavily
Liberal Arts
Research (factor 1--though that is PhD research)

(More discussion regarding factor definition.)

The expenditure factor tells you something about their fiscal status. It would be interesting to know what other schools look like so we see where we fit it in that continuum. It may not finally end up as search criteria but again it might be one of those variables things that you say gee it would be interesting to see what we look like.

Variables like institutional support FTE, instructional support FTE, research support FTE, academic support FTE, student services FTE, student faculty ratio and percent admitted. That sort of gets it if you are really rich. But standardized test scores like ACT, isn't that a necessary factor?

However, that quickly gets to retention rates as all of you here today know that is dependent on the curriculum you have, the scholarships you offer, the higher ACT you bring in the better your graduation rates are going to be...all those variables roll into the ultimate matrix of what it looks like. Nancy does have access to data though I am not sure which data bases she was using though she does have estimated mean SAT/ACT scores, which can be used for comparison. That would be a very important piece of data. Yes, some sort of standardized test scores are important and needs to be a factor. That is one of the constraints. One I don't believe showed up in their model.

We shouldn't let ourselves be constrained to the 7 factors from their model. IPEDS data has a lot of data fields out there, maybe there are somethings in the IPEDS that you want to include. I got the feeling they weren't being prescribed. I think this is what it looks like from what they did...now it is up to us to look at it and say yes, no, maybe or maybe we need to change it.

Q. Do you think we should compare ourselves to all publics, publics and privates?

A. Public and privates. I think we are similar in many respects to schools like Gustavus or Concordia. I think we do have some similar things. I know a lot of my peers are trying to decide between Gustavus and Morris or Concordia. That would indicate we are close to the right list when the Gustavus and St Olafs start appearing on the peer list. I can also see how they are so far away from us because of the high cost high aid, even though the salaries are similar for the most part, the ACTS are probably similar, it's the whole fiscal structure that can throw it off, maybe we could weigh the high cost high aid down with the salaries?

Also, when I look at this list and I think back to my college selection process, Winona State would never have occurred to me. I wouldn't put it in a class of being anything like Morris, and seeing it on this list is kind of shocking.

You raise an interesting point in that we are looking at schools we think are comparable to us. Another point you just highlighted is what does an 18 year old think of us, which might be a totally different metric.

Now Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts I can see that
Are St Olaf, Gustavus or Concordia even on this list of the 93 on the list?

NO

What else other factors do we need to try?

Cost of attendance would put that figure in a bigger spread and we need to remember the cost of attendance doesn't mean cost to the student, in this area we probably very close.

That is why we should do what has been suggested and weigh faculty salaries at 0 (which seems to be we are all leaning toward)...factor 4 should be 0 but also factor 3 maybe it is high tuition which should also be weighted low so that it allows those schools back into our comparison group?

Q. Would it make a difference if one factor the cost of tuition in addition to all the percent of aid and scholarships bringing it down to how do you actually pay (how rich are you)

A. I am not sure you can get that information from IPEDS

Q. Are you saying factor 2 should be weighted low

A Yes

Q. I am thinking the data you are looking for institutional data should be 100% aid which is really expensive, if we can fix factor 2 to include the average price paid by the median student?

Q. Does it ever occur to anyone here about first generation first time college students in the family?

A. I don't think that is in here, but Morris actually has a high percentage of first gen students, like 35 percent, which is good because we are providing access. However, that is not one of their variables.

It might be in the data set. And if so, it is something that we could get. We can say we would like to look at these following fields and include others we feel important to the list.

I think Factor 3 is where there average ACT or some kind of a standardized test score should go. And also the percentage of first generation student. Although I don't know if we will be able to add it to factor 3 because didn't they come up with these variables based on the lack of correlation with something else?

I don't do this sort of statistical technique but I think they thought some of these things were proxies for a bunch of other stuff because they co-vary

But there is a possibility again with this information, and what Nancy has run a list and not have to use their model. Rather mess around with our available data and see what happens.

It would be interesting to hear from you after you mess around with data like that and come up compare it with places like Gustavus in the list, what data was changed to get that on the list? I agree until we can come up with a list that has colleges we feel are like and close to us...though we are not necessarily looking nationally, we don't necessarily know all the colleges who might be like us nationally

One other thing is we need to consider the private liberal arts colleges in Minnesota to be aspirational with us because generally they have double faculty etc...so in many ways we are alike but in many ways we are very different.

So it gets back to the instruction cost and how all things are nestled in together with everything else.

In factor 3, if we include first generation and ACT, this would really be about the student body and I would like to give that a high weight when adding those corrections. It needs a high weight.

So again we have
size, liberal arts and diversity all have high weights
High tuition/high aid/high salaries have lesser weights

That is what we have sort of been talking about in terms of amount of money per FTE...that student FTE, not employee FTE correct?

If spent on institution support and instruction research academic support student services and those are inversely correlated to student faculty ratio and the percent admitted...what does that mean? If you spend a lot on research then you have a low student/faculty ratio...that would make sense because and you would have a low percent admitted.

Those things are like the selective colleges, that have a lot of money...those colleges that can spend a lot of money can be selective and have a low student/faculty ratio

Grinnell, Carleton

Q. I don't understand any of these categories: institutional support dollars times

A. I presume it is FTE students. Yes, I think that is what it is, Nancy can confirm that.

Q. So what is institutional support

A. I think be given all the rest of the categories, might be like what the physical plant cost to run, non-academic, but that is a guess.

Then there is instruction research, academic support which I think is like secretaries for division offices etc. Student Services...positions like Jane Kill. And your office Jim (Hall) would be academic support

It might be useful to have Nancy define some of the terms from the IPEDS, so you would have an index

that says the IPEDS field is this.....and this is what it means

I don't see us getting done with this by the end of the year. But I do think we can clarify and put forth something less opaque than this into the next year. That isn't that far off and if we can make a decision about 5 & 6 and throw it back to somebody to re-crunch the numbers...oh I mean 6 & 7

Factor 6 is GRS...graduate student, right because he said that the reason there were negative values for the first 2 things is because those are reflecting our traditionally aged students

So we would only want graduate student undergraduate ratio graduate students entering a weight of 0 Then part time to full time. That is a residential campus kind of thing

Q. But if we are looking at factor 5 as liberal arts kinds of things then do we need 6?

Q. Maybe we don't need 6

Q. If factor 5 is working the way I think to get liberal arts colleges for the most part, then can factor 6 slide by?

A. Yes, I think that is right. The part to full time could be put back into factor 3

Q. What about those students we have that are going onto graduate school?

A. I don't think that is even in this data, and I don't know if it is in IPEDS. Those data are hard to get, what happens to students when they leave?

Remember, Nancy has access to COPLAC schools and Morris 14 data, and there maybe fields in there you might want to look at

Arne:

If I just knew what the first 5 factors were in number 7, I would feel more comfortable running with this

Can you ask Nancy when you meet with her on Friday?

Margaret

Yes, I can do that. Let's say they are what I think they are which is money dumped from the institution into all these categories per student

Arne

Is that all the categories or are there more to expand the possibilities

Margaret

How much the institution spends on its programming is that something that should be weighted heavily? Or is it something to ignore?

Arne:

What isn't that correlated with how expensive the institution is? Is that because of the way the funds are collected from the students?

Margaret:

I don't know what it's not, they suggested that it's not

You would think tuition would be in factor 7

We can try running it with and without that and see what happens

Arne:

I wonder if you couldn't throw that one out and try to rescue the bottom 2 out and roll that into something else student/faculty ratio

Factor 3 is getting really crowded

Either there or factor 5

Margaret

I don't know if their model if we are going to mess around with their factors except weighted as a

The way their model is set up, we may have to take or leave a factor rather than parts of factors

Lowell:

We can get them to change it

Margaret:

Yes, we can get them to change it, but on Friday I have little confidence we will be able to make the factors different

But we can ask them to look at it in different ways.