

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

Planning Committee

Campus Governance

5-2-2012

Planning minutes 05/02/2012

Planning Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Planning Committee, "Planning minutes 05/02/2012" (2012). *Planning Committee*. 13.
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan/13>

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
May 2, 2012
Moccasin Flower Room

Present: Jim Barbour, Julie Eckerle, Jim Hall, Ken Hodgson, Arne Kildegaard, Jane Kill, Margaret Kuchenreuther, Leslie Meek, Josh Preston, Lowell Rasmussen, Jordan Wentz

Agenda

- 1) Look back over what we have heard about the One Stop and make a recommendation.
- 2) Nancy Helsper, Roger Wareham and Margaret made about one hour worth of thought experiments dealing with comparison groups. There is a hand out to follow along as we discuss that portion. This is by no means finished but it will demonstrate what was done, how and why. The results appear like we are heading in the right direction. More will be done when there is time.

(Margaret explained that being sick has put her items on hold. Minutes from the last few meetings she hasn't had time to deal with so once she has had a chance to go over them, they will be sent out for electronic approval. Margaret would have also liked to have a synopsis with what the relevant factors are for the size of our student body. Margaret will work on them over the summer and hopefully be ready for fall.)

1. What are opinions regarding the One Stop? Chancellor Johnson would like us to make a recommendation.

The One Stop would probably be a viable program in a larger institution. However, here at Morris the money and the stress already on other departments does it make sense? In the future, probably up to the next ten years, predictions for UMM will not move beyond the 2,000 student head count, so will still be a small campus. I feel like this will be a drain on the departments. Wouldn't it make more sense to put more employees into these departments, if there are extra funds? During the discussions, it appeared to have the primary effect on the Financial Aid Office. (Did anyone get the feeling that there was any burden on the Business Office and the Office of the Registrar?)

(Lowell) Definitely, most of the work load would focus on the Financial Aid Office, yes. The One Stop would be deal with somewhere around 80% for disbursement of financial aid and answering the question around financial aid is where it gets into the Business Office and the Office of the Registrar.

The good thing about this proposed department is the job shadowing/cross training portion. It is important for all departments on this campus to have the cross training so everyone has a backup. However there was something that Clare mentioned regarding a revolt in the Office of the Registrar when Fritz proposed cross training those two offices. I understand job descriptions are long and detailed so it may not be a trivial thing, cross training.

Would it be possible to train someone to answer about 80% of the questions with little training? If people/offices were cross trained here at UMM maybe we could be the "gold standard"!

If the One Stop were in place already, it would be a wonderful thing. However, there are so many hurting budgets in so many areas with instructional support it may be discouraging to see so much money go into yet another administrative type area, even though it is a service area. It may be viewed different if the monies were going into an instructional area.

In theory the One Stop Office sounds like a lovely idea. And there are lots of lovely things we could implement. We really do need to look at where our money is going. There are a lot of places that are important to our students that need funding. If we are saying is this a good idea? I could easily say yes. But is it "the" idea; is it the best use of our money right now? That is harder for me to say.

Obviously this is a tough issue. From a student perspective, my own in particular, I think it would be very beneficial for students to have those relationships and to build a relationship with individuals who know what is going on especially when it comes to the bureaucracy like how do I work with all the different offices in Behmler. It would be nice to start those relationships when you come to the University and carry them through the entire time through graduation. I am sympathetic with the idea of places to spend a windfall of \$120,000. However if we are going to be reluctant to say perhaps in the next year and a half (or whatever the timeline is) could we at least include something like this in the strategic plan? Stating something like X amount of years from now presumably we want more students here which would bring tuition dollars and might warrant something like this...just because it is not a top priority today it may be someday.

Jordan...I am not completely sold. In theory it is a good idea and I can see how it can be very applicable to places like the Twin Cities campus. However currently with our 1800 or whatever student head count and possibly in a few years the 2100 head count, I still don't see the demands that would justify creating an additional office. I do think the cross training is a good thing this institution is not the hardest thing to deal with. I have a financial aid work sheet I have to work with you

attach a form from the IRS. It is pretty self-explanatory and easy to figure out. I don't see the necessity for more hand holding than there already is.

(Josh) We do expect students to come in with a certain amount of background knowledge and that may be a privilege for some. I came here from a single parent home, we are classified as poverty, I am still learning the finance process so don't necessarily understand all the intricacies so seems quite foreign to me. I don't necessarily know what questions to ask or whom necessarily to speak to. I think we need to keep in mind there are people such as myself. What about students of color, other students from low income families, first generation students. I would like to think that high schools teach students these things, but that may be an idealists dream. It is something we can't presume.

Has this been presented to the Finance Committee? Jacquie was at the meeting asking for an increase in student fees part of which would be allocated to help support the Student One Stop. The answer was yes, we support the idea of an increase in student fees that *might* in part support the One Stop, or other student support services. The Finance Committee basically endorsed it with a caveat. (Lowell explained his is ex-officio on the Planning Committee. He is certainly not going to try and steer this committee into some direction, I will respond to your questions, and if you want an opinion I will give you an opinion. However, the presentation to the Finance Committee was focused on "should we increase the student fees and if we did it would have to be under a caveat that those increases would have to directly go to benefit the students." One of the examples used was to partially fund the One Stop operation. Other support options were discussed by Bart to help increase academic support.)

When this was discussed earlier did the amount of monies needed include the construction costs? No, it did not include construction costs.

Margaret spoke to Robert in a non-professional setting. She asked him if he thought HEAPR funds could be used for this project. His response was well maybe, but there is a new person at the helm. He explained that these funds were able to be used before for renovating i.e. ACE, Career Services, Advising, so probably. She also asked him if furniture could be included in those costs, and he said yes, he thought that could too.

(Lowell) Those funds are competitive to a degree. The Legislature allocates "X" amount of dollars to the University. The University then uses a pro-rated formula which includes all the system campuses and delivers those funds at that time. A line item was put in that said renovations for student services and left it as vague as possible. Do we know if we are going to get HEAPR funds? No. Then also, if the funds get used for the One Stop they don't get used for something else. These are questions that Robert could address. It might be a good idea next fall if you invited Robert Thompson to a meeting. He could answer these kinds of questions. He has at least a 40 item list of possible HEAPR funding projects for our campus. And we are required to give them a matrix; give us a list for \$30m; give us a list for \$60m; give us a list for \$90m. So we have an extended list based on how much money we receive. It would be advantageous for this committee to have a conversation with Robert about this list. It is a moving list and doesn't necessarily stay the same every biennium. Things change and different items boil to the top at any given moment. For example if a wall starts to cave in, it moves to the top pretty quick. It might be a good place to start the fall meetings.

We have new people this year. For the first time ever, we were mandated we could only use HEAPR funds for elevators and roofs. This year we have 4 roofs and 3 elevators on the slate. Everything else on the HEAPR list dropped off. Robert had to put in just elevator and roofing projects. This was mandated from the Twin Cities. Lowell's guess is it is a University legislative trade off.

Is the One Stop an all or nothing project? Could it start small and grow? Financial Aid said no this was not the way, but could it? Their hope is to have 3 P&A personnel and \$12,000 for work study money. Counseling doesn't get \$12,000 work study funds. It seems to be top heavy. There are situations that arise in counseling also where someone may come in and want to cancel out of classes. Counseling can't do that process so someone has to take them to possible offices to see what it is that is going to affect them. Fewer credits might mean they can't have their job, many factors that are involved. It would be wonderful to be able to send them to one place. However could this be an omnibus person? A designated person when there is a case who shepherds the person around to make sure all the correct bases are touched, whether counseling, financial aid, business office or what.

If this started in finance and finance is being asked basically? And student fees some of which would go to the Student One Stop, has this already been decided upon? Now we are raising questions that seem to be not entirely expected. When this was originally presented to us, it seemed like it was a forgone conclusion. However Margaret's discussion with Chancellor Johnson last November or December, she said she (the Chancellor) would like the Planning Committee to make a recommendation about the Student One Stop. Then Margaret asked Jill to come and talk to the committee right away in January. However, Jill was not able to come until after Spring Break.

Lowell gave an opinion. The governance committees makes recommendations to the Chancellor. Only the Chancellor makes the decision about what resources are committed or not. The analogy I will use (and I think the Chancellor is trying to be prudent about this) is you never want to have a board vote 4-5. I think what Jacquie is trying to do is get the answers from the governance committees (the Student Services Committee, the Finance Committee, the Planning Committee) so she can see if there is a consensus. You don't want to commit money to something that has a split vote and may be contested. Nothing is guaranteed as you never know what actual resources are going to be available.

If we approve this and there is no money would it start small? It would go nowhere.

There are a couple of items from last week's presentation which were frustrating. The presentation began by saying none of the existing organizations have as their specific mission to be student centered. So the new organization would use this as part of their mission. It seemed to be a really strange comment and asked about this. She stood by her guns. I think they should change their mission and try and find a way to cooperate with each other. Then of the 10 points asked to be addressed, at least 3 were data related. The data content of the presentation was really thin, especially for the last point. I am not sure she knew what was meant by "data. The report was aspirational. When asked for evidence, numbers and data, there wasn't a drop of data presented. Has this been documented? Data hasn't been produced in a way that is convincing to this committee. So what is the rush? Can't we wait a year? Work a little harder, develop more rationale. If the Chancellor is really in her heart convinced this is the way to go, then she can bump it up the priority list at Campus Compact. And ask for incremental funds. It seems to put this committee in a really strange position to approve this while implicitly disapproving something else. If we approve this we are saying take something else away.

It is a doubtful benefit and we are not sure of costs yet. And we know there are other student support services that could use monetary help too.

One other comment, though it is great to think about efficiencies etc. what do you think of the language of "customer service"? It makes me feel like I am buying a product. It just seems a little weird. It just seems like strange jargon when referring to students. Would you rather be a client, inmate? One word was used that seemed a little more humanizing was commodity, an item, which is good.

Weren't they also asked to produce some sort of mapping? It was referred to more than once, but one never appeared. Lowell knows there is such a document and that tries to definitively lay out who is doing what in each of the three offices. But if it can't be produced maybe again it is too early to make a comment and/or decision.

Clearly there is a segment of the student population that would undoubtedly benefit from this.

Though isn't that what the Multi Ethnic Resource Center is for?

Aren't some of their people suited for this? But these people aren't necessarily trained for answering financial aid questions.

Then for those kinds of questions couldn't you go to the financial aid office and say ask Andy. They are going to help you.

However if you go to the Financial Aid Office with a question, my experience is there is uncertainty which questions to even ask. Then you are vaguely aware you need to get this done, but not sure how to go about doing this, so you ask the question, and you may be told, go upstairs and talk to this person, so you go upstairs, find the person explain that you were sent here by the person downstairs...oh ok, but before I can help you, you need to go talk to this person. About this time I don't know what I am doing anymore and just going to random people that I don't know and saying can you please help me, somehow? I owe money somewhere I think I am not sure...The point I am trying to make is...yes this would benefit people. However, what we have right now is not as accessible and not as welcoming or easily to use as it could be. I think though to make a recommendation where things stand right now, you are right, there is no overwhelming consensus that this is the direction that we should move. I think this could be a good thing and maybe we should strive toward this, but just now right now. There is more information needed.

Are there other ways to fix the problem? The outline of part of the problem is good, but does it have to be a One Stop?

With the increase of the student fee, maybe we could ask if given say \$30,000 you could use it however. So another question to them might be is it an all or nothing status.

Jill in response to that question said "The Twin Cities says we need to have 3 people. They are our mentors, and that is what they said is needed."

The idea is if we buy the argument we want to have enhanced customer service and to have a very student centered everything on this campus, and that things like retention and student satisfaction are really going to be tied to this student one stop, it is a good thing. However, what about students who are in really academic difficulty and need more help in the Academic Assistance Ctr. What about students who have really serious anxiety or serious mental health problems and could really use another counselor to help them be the best student they can be? What about all the academic units that could use new/more faculty or more SE&E. It is not just that one frustrating experience trying to get bills paid out weighs all the other elements of satisfaction and retention. It is understandable that Jill has a passion for the One Stop. It is a good thing, I am not say thing. What I am saying is I am not convinced that this monumental issue is more important than all these other things.

If the Chancellor is in favor of this maybe it is because it is potentially a more visible outreach on our part to the students. Because only some students use counseling, some students use the academic support services, some students use disability services, but potentially every student uses Financial Aid and the Business Office and the Office of the Registrar. This would be something we could really point to and brag about. And in that way it could potentially attract and retain students.

The Chancellor has to look at this in terms of survival, retention and the big overall financial picture and how we are perceived in the wider community. How we sell ourselves to the new group. And how do we keep the current students we have.

There are two very different ways of looking at this.

Another thought. Is there a possibility of pressure from Central Administration or our administration and staff in these various areas that wish they had less time dealing face to face with students and could do their work with fewer interruptions? So if they could get someone in place at the One Stop they wouldn't have to deal with the clients. Is this a possibility? An opinion is desired.

The opinion is that this is not coming from the Twin Cities. The concern heard here at Morris is it is wished they could do a better job. There are gaps and sometimes not necessarily the best advice is given to students. It is the advice given to allow each office to get its job done, but not necessarily advice given to help the student experience painless.

The comment made at last week's meeting there are regulatory agencies called auditors who review every one of those offices and it is a big stick. We got caught in an audit in the IT area (before Jim Hall's era) of being non-compliant. It took us 5 years to get off the Regents' Report. Every one of those offices is acutely aware of the audit responsibility that they have to follow. If they are non-compliant they are reported on a quarterly basis to the Regents. I understand the comment about why wouldn't you serve the students. However, there also the other side of the job that says if you don't do this in the prescribed manor that the University policy says how it has to be done, you will be punished. That tends to be an over-riding factor rather than how do I provide the best possible service to the student standing in front of me. In the finance area there would be jail time involved if things are non-compliant. It is a big impediment saying I know what I need to do, but I know what I must do.

The scholastic area runs into this all the time. There were things we really wished we could do for a student, but we just couldn't do it. Someone would have gotten into big trouble.

We need to convey some sentiment to the Chancellor. If we forward her the list of 10 questions as part of what we say wouldn't be a bad idea. And the sentiment that while in the best of all possible worlds, this is a great idea, but this may not be the time for it. And that the committee is equivocal at best regarding this venture.

It may be a good idea to see information from institutions our size that have implemented similar programs; see if/how it has affected their retention rates; see if there is any evidence/data that can support it.

There is still concern over two areas:

Lack of data produced though asked twice to present whatever is available

How much of this is a survival technique by these offices, so that they can do what is required to do, but finding the disruptions make it difficult to accomplish job tasks.

Margaret will draft something and email it. Please make comments and return to Margaret.

2) This handout is the first analysis/a thought experiment that Roger Wareham, Nancy Helsper and Margaret did based on the data received from the Office of Planning and Analysis in the Twin Cities. There are three outcomes. In the header of each outcome it talks about what was decided to do and the rationale of what would happen using different. All three

scenarios are united in the fact that before anything was done the choice of institutions to be used were only those that have the same Carnegie Classification that Morris has which is Baccalaureate Arts & Sciences. We actually looked at the Arts & Sciences and Diverse, because that is what Flagler was Diverse and that came out to not match us very well at all. So we went back to the Baccalaureate Arts & Sciences.

On the first page on the right hand side is how we weighted the 7 factors the Office of Planning and Analysis included.

What we did

Size important

Cost less important

Access standard weight

Salary we dropped out

Liberal Arts high

Undergraduate composition

Expenditure rate low

This run produced 150 institutions. Quite a long list.

The second run was basically the same thing Carnegie Baccalaureate Arts & Science but also specified institutions that had no accompanied graduate programs or some graduate coexistence (either one.) This run produced a smaller list of 75 institutions. These are starting to look like names that we recognize or might expect to be on a list with UMM

Margaret went to the websites of Albion College and Lycoming College.

For example Albion

has 1500 students,

located in Albion Michigan (not too far from Detroit)

all about Liberal Arts

welcomes things like dissent, diversity

historically related to the Methodist Church, but nothing in the mission statement overtly about a religious mission (the only thing Margaret saw was they encourage students to look at both western and other types of spirituality.)

She also looked to see if there was anything about research, though most places one cannot get to the tenure guidelines. She did find where they talked about faculty research accomplishments, scholarship accomplishments, creative accomplishments, links that weren't accessible for helping people get grants (listing of major grants received). I was gratified that these schools are pretty much like us.

Albion College

An independent, coeducational, residential college in south-central Michigan, Albion is committed to the liberal arts tradition. Founded in 1835 and historically related to the United Methodist Church, the College is dedicated to preserving the values of the past, to serving the needs of the present, and to anticipating the goals of the future.

Purpose of the College

Albion College is committed to liberal education in the arts and sciences. We believe such an education empowers individuals to live lives of constructive purpose and accomplishment, enriched by the confidence and pleasure that come from thinking logically, imaginatively and humanely. In light of this vision we seek to create and maintain, in a residential setting, a supportive, intellectually stimulating community which exhibits and prizes curiosity, creativity, dissent and diversity....

Diversity Statement

A liberal arts education, by definition, should liberate minds. This process is enhanced in a community that is committed to educational equity, diversity and unrestricted inquiry. We seek therefore to foster an environment of mutual respect, acceptance, appreciation and caring for all members of our community. To this end, Albion College condemns all forms of discrimination and harassment, while reaffirming our commitment to academic free speech. We also commit ourselves to the recruitment and retention of women and minority faculty, staff and students, the integration of cultural diversity in the curriculum, and the development of a truly inclusive multicultural campus environment.

Mission

Albion College is an undergraduate, liberal arts institution committed to academic excellence. We are learning-centered and recognize that valuable learning takes place in and outside the classroom, on and off campus. We prepare students to translate critical thought into action.

Values

As a measure of Albion College's commitment to our students, our public, and the liberal arts tradition, the vision espouses deeply-embedded core values.

Lycoming College

This school is located in Williamsport, Pennsylvania and this is its 200th year, founded in 1812. Also, it is in the top 10% of endowments in the nation, so not an impoverished institution. Its mission is very liberal arts, find information about faculty research and creative activity.

Margaret feels the Carnegie Classification approach is really important and removing things that have graduate programs. Model 3 has no graduate programs at all. What other things should be tried? Josh states that the schools he seriously thought about were listed in both Model 2 & 3.

The question was asked whether Factor 5 (degrees STEM, Degrees Lib Arts, enrolled Women) really needed have such a heavy weight. If colleges continue to appear on the lists regardless of the weighting that they are like us?

Once again we need to remember 2/3 of the schools should be like us and 1/3 should be schools we aspire to.

Roger and Margaret unanimously agreed that once the list was decided upon, you would have to apply your brain and do the research from websites and other investigative information, finding evidence. If we could narrow it down to 50 candidates and then hone it down to a list of 20. There are some that with little investigation could be checked off the list right away, i.e. Wabash College is an all men school. Both Carleton and St Olaf come out in the top 30. This is a pretty good list of liberal arts colleges; Beloit, Knox, Reed, even St Mary's which is a COPLAC and on the Morris 14.

It might be interesting to compare some of their mission statements.

Who is it that wants this list and what is it used for? The Regents use it all the time. Every year we have to do an accountability document.

How do the Regents actually use this list? They may compare for example, how are the retention rates among these schools. Roger Wareham would like it for salary comparison so we can say we are definitely under paid.

Another question is how many of these schools have their own comparison list, who is on it and how do they use it? Do you think Lycoming is worried about comparison schools as they are self-sustaining?

Are we currently using the correct procedure, factors and weightings to gather a correct list? Margaret thinks the current results and how obtained should be sent to the Office of Planning and Analysis, saying this is more what we are looking for, can you adjust factors to look like these?

Institutional Groups Identified Using the Radcliffe/Jones-White Comparison Group Generator Model, April 2012

On 4/20/12, for discussion purposes, Kuchenreuther, Wareham, and Helsper, representing the Planning Committee, Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee, and Institutional Research, respectively, formulated three experimental groupings of institutions from which a UMM comparison group could conceivably be chosen.

In a first look at the "Comparison Group Generator" model, all institutions in the Carnegie Classification of "Baccalaureate Colleges—Arts & Sciences" were identified. Then those institutions were rated for the seven weighted factors in the factor analysis where the highest weight was given analysis where the highest weight was given to the size and liberal arts factors, middle weight was given to access and undergraduate composition and low weight was given to cost and expenditures. Zero weight was given to salaries.

MODEL #1: Bac-A&S Group

	Institution Name	Average of WEIGHT SSD
1	University of Minnesota-Morris	0.0000
2	University of Pittsburgh-Greensburg	0.3714
3	Maryville College	0.3868
4	Goshen College	0.392
5	Nebraska Wesleyan University	0.4226
6	Central College	0.4546
7	Castleton State College	0.4652
8	Shorter University	0.4697
9	Hiram College	0.4869
10	Millsaps College	0.5841
11	Siena College	0.5962
12	Monmouth College	0.617
13	Centenary College of Louisiana	0.6173
14	Clearwater Christian College	0.6264
15	Concordia College at Moorhead	0.6505
16	Coe College	0.7196
17	Georgetown College	0.7283
18	William Jewell College	0.7581
19	Green Mountain College	0.7908
20	Birmingham Southern College	0.8256
21	Presbyterian College	0.8637
22	Ouachita Baptist University	0.8695
23	Illinois College	0.8943
24	The University of Virginia's College at Wise	0.8993
25	Carthage College	0.9325
26	Simpson College	0.9384
27	Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts	0.9443
28	Eckerd College	0.9538
29	Albion College	0.9567
30	Wittenberg University	0.9695
31	Lycoming College	0.9809
32	Hope College	1.1048
33	Doane College	1.1212
34	Eastern Mennonite University	1.1394
35	Alma College	1.1982
36	Roanoke College	1.2249
37	Gordon College	1.2831
38	Luther College	1.2893
39	Wisconsin Lutheran College	1.2977
40	40) Fort Lewis College	1.3042
41	Saint Vincent College	1.3499
42	Houghton College	1.3618
43	University of North Carolina at Asheville	1.3739
44	Ripon College	1.3788
45	Washington & Jefferson College	1.3852
46	Calvin College	1.391

Filters:

Carnegie Class: Basic

21-Bacc. Colleges--Art & Sciences

Factor: WEIGHTS

Average of F1_SIZE	3
Average of F2_COST	0.2
Average of F3_ACCESS	1
Average of F4_SALARY	0
Average of F5_LIBARTS	3
Average of F6_UGCOMP	1
Average of F7_EXPEND	0.2

Factor Components:

Factor 1-Size

PhDs-Research
PhDs-Professional
Master's Degrees
Bachelor's Degrees
Executive RTE
Professional FTE
IR&P FTE
Non-professional FTE
Public Service Expense

Factor 2-High Tuition/High Aid

Tuition & Fees
% UG with Institutional Aid
Admission Yield

Factor 3-Access

% Enrollment-White
% UG-Federal Grant
4-Year Grad Rate
6-Year Grad Rate

Factor 4-Faculty Salary

Avg. Professor Salary
Avg. Assoc. Prof Salary
Avg. Asst. Prof. Salary
FT Retention Rate

Factor 5-Liberal Arts

% Degrees-STEM
% Degrees-Lib. Arts
% Enrolled-Women

Factor 6-Nontraditional

GRS to UG Ratio
GRS to Entering Ratio
Part-/Full-time Ratio

47	Hendrix College	1.4035
48	Eastern Nazarene College	1.4143
49	Bethany College	1.4236
50	St. Mary's College of Maryland 1	1.4388
51	Transylvania University	1.4851
52	Ursinus College	1.509
53	Pennsylvania State University-Penn State Beaver	1.5125
54	Juniata College	1.5213
55	Gustavus Adolphus College	1.5835
56	Wartburg College	1.5929
57	Virginia Wesleyan College	1.6161
58	Saint Norbert College	1.6345
59	Cornell College	1.6673
60	Ohio Wesleyan University	1.6787
61	Westminster College	1.6948
62	Bridgewater College	1.7112
63	Lyon College	1.7336
64	The College of Idaho	1.8922
65	University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma	1.916
66	Emory and Henry College	1.9276
67	McDaniel College	1.9681
68	Earlham College	1.9822
69	Susquehanna University	2.0274
70	Linfield College	2.0522
71	Albright College	2.0777
72	Beacon College	2.0833
73	Allegheny College	2.1142
74	Randolph-Macon College	2.1153
75	Lawrence University	2.1248
76	Pennsylvania State University-Penn State Abington	2.1348
77	Southwestern University	2.1424
78	University of Puget Sound	2.146
79	Illinois Wesleyan University	2.1576
80	Wells College	2.247
81	Judson College	2.2478
82	Austin College	2.2489
83	St. Olaf College	2.2701
84	Erskine College and Seminary	2.2716
85	Augustana College	2.2753
86	Hanover College	2.2776
87	Kalamazoo College	2.2964
88	Brevard College	2.3152
89	Western State College of Colorado	2.3159
90	Willamette University	2.3995
91	Franklin and Marshall College	2.4356
92	Berry College	2.4433
93	Bucknell University	2.4495
94	Moravian College and Moravian Theological	2.4559

Factor 7-Institutional Expenditures

Inst. Supp \$/FTE
Instruction \$/FTE
Research \$/FTE
Acad. Supp \$/FTE
Stud. Srv. \$/FTE
Student/Faculty Ratio
% Admitted

	Seminary	
95	Bethany Lutheran College	2.4697
96	Northland College	2.4818
97	Saint Michael's College	2.4943
98	Wofford College	2.5301
99	Oberlin College	2.5676
100	Berea College	2.5707
101	Lafayette College	2.6098
102	Whittier College	2.6099
103	Hartwick College	2.6147
104	Anselm College	2.6147
105	DePauw University	2.6436
106	Washington College	2.6659
107	Hampden-Sydney College	2.7333
108	Beloit College	2.8549
109	Knox College	2.8596
110	University of Wisconsin-Parkside	2.8817
111	Carleton College	2.9196
112	Pacific Union College	2.9816
113	Mesa State College	3.0109
114	Stonehill College	3.0692
115	Westmont College	3.1182
116	Reed College	3.1505
117	Muhlenberg College	3.1541
118	Furman University	3.1819
119	Dickinson College	3.38
120	Gettysburg College	3.427
121	Penn. State University-Penn State Greater Allegh	3.4287
122	Oglethorpe University	3.4373
123	Rhodes College	3.445
124	University of Richmond	3.4518
125	Guilford College	3.4553
126	Haverford College	3.4704
127	Drew University	3.5595
128	St Lawrence University	3.6218
129	College of Saint Benedict	3.7294
130	Whitman College	3.7606
131	Lake Forest College	3.9202
132	Colorado College	3.9452
133	Saint Mary's College	3.9934
134	Grinnell College	3.9935
135	Wabash College	4.0544
136	Hampshire College	4.0736
137	Washington and Lee University	4.2158
138	Macalester College	4.2284
139	Sweet Briar College	4.2284
140	Pomona College	4.2352
141	The College of Wooster	4.443

142	Morehouse College	4.4533
143	Saint Johns University	4.5177
144	Sewanee-The University of the South	4.5576
145	Centre College	4.5816
146	Hamilton College	4.616
147	Lambuth University	4.6291
148	Simpson University	4.7275
149	Swarthmore College	4.8158
150	Denison University	4.8983

Institutional Groups Identified Using the Radcliffe/Jones-White Comparison Group Generator Model, April 2012

A second attempt at producing a comparison group of institutions once again included all schools in the Carnegie Classification of "Baccalaureate Colleges--Arts & Sciences." The Bacc-A&S group was filtered to include only institutions with no accompanying graduate programs or only some graduate coexistence. Again, those institutions were rated in the same manner as Model #1 for the seven factors where the heights weight was given to size and liberal arts component, middle weight was given to access and undergraduate composition, and low weight was given to cost and expenditures. Zero weight was given to salaries.

MODEL #2: Bac-A&S: No/Some Graduate Program Coexistence Group

	Institution Name	Average of Weight SSD
1	University of Minnesota-Morris	0.0000
2	Albion College	0.9567
3	Lycoming College	0.9809
4	University of North Carolina at Asheville	1.3739
5	Hendrix College	1.4035
6	St. Mary's College of Maryland	1.4388
7	Ursinus College	1.5090
8	Cornell College	1.6673
9	Earlham College	1.9822
10	Allegheny College	2.1142
11	Randolph-Macon College	2.1153
12	Lawrence University	2.1248
13	Southwestern University	2.1424
14	University of Puget Sound	2.1460
15	Wells College	2.2470
16	Judson College	2.2478
17	Austin College	2.2489
18	St. Olaf College	2.2701
19	Hanover College	2.2776
20	Kalamazoo College	2.2964
21	Willamette University	2.3995
22	Franklin and Marshall College	2.4356
23	Oberlin College	2.5676
24	Lafayette College	2.6098
25	DePauw University	2.6436
26	Washington College	2.6659
27	Hampden-Sydney College	2.7333
28	Beloit College	2.8549
29	Knox College	2.8596
30	Carleton College	2.9196
31	Reed College	3.1505
32	Dickinson College	3.3800
33	Gettysburg College	3.4270
34	Rhodes College	3.4450
35	Haverford College	3.4704
36	Drew University	3.5595
37	St Lawrence University	3.6218
38	Whitman College	3.7606
39	Lake Forest College	3.9202

FILTERS:

Carnegie Class: Basic

21-Baccalaureate Colleges--Arts & Sciences

Carnegie Class: Undergrad Instructional Program

3-Arts & science focus, no graduate coexistence

4-Arts & science focus, some graduate coexistence

Factor WEIGHTS:

Average Of F1_SIZE	3
Average of F2_COST	0.2
Average of F3_ACCESS	1
Average of F4_SALARY	0
Average of F5_LIBARTS	3
Average of F6_UGCOMP	1
Average of F7_EXPEND	0.2

Factor Components:

Factor 1-Size:

PhDs-Research
PhDs-Professional
Master's Degrees
Bachelor's Degrees
Executive FTE
Professional FTE
IR&P FTE
Non-professional FTE
Public Service Expense

Factor 2-High Tuition/High Aid

Tuition & Fees
% UG with Institutional Aid
Admission Yield

Factor 3-Access

% Enrollment-White
% UG-Federal Grant
4-Year Grad Rate
6-Year Grad Rate

Factor 4-Faculty Salary

Avg. Professor Salary
Avg. Assoc. Prof Salary

40	Colorado College	3.9452
41	Grinnell College	3.9935
42	Wabash College	4.0544
43	Hampshire College	4.0736
44	Macalester College	4.2284
45	Sweet Briar College	4.2284
46	Pomona College	4.2352
47	The College of Wooster	4.4430
48	Sewanee-The University of the South	4.5576
49	Centre College	4.5816
50	Hamilton College	4.6160
51	Swarthmore College	4.8158
52	Denison University	4.8983
53	Trinity College	5.5305
54	Hobart William Smith Colleges	5.5342
55	Occidental College	5.5658
56	Williams College	5.7471
57	Randolph College	5.7479
58	Louisiana State University at Alexandria	6.0356
59	Wesleyan University	6.0612
60	New College of Florida	6.1194
61	Scripps College	6.5141
62	Bowdoin College	7.1631
63	SUNY at Purchase College	7.3253
64	Marymount Manhattan College	7.3816
65	Bryn Mawr College	7.4332
66	Mount Holyoke College	7.4481
67	Skidmore College	7.8117
68	Claremont McKenna College	7.8117
69	Wheaton College	7.9571
70	Colgate University	7.9999
71	Amherst College	8.2205
72	Thomas Aquinas College	8.3424
73	Davidson College	8.4253
74	Goucher College	8.4899
75	Hollins University	8.7754

Avg. Asst. Prof. Salary
FT Retention Rate
Factor 5-Liberal Arts
% Degrees-STEM
% Degrees-Lib. Arts
% Enrolled-Women
Factor 6-Nontraditional
GRS to UG Ratio
GRS to Entering Ratio
Part-/Full-time Ratio
Factor 7-Institutional Expenditures
Inst. Supp \$/FTE
Instruction \$/FTE
Research \$/FTE
Acad. Supp \$/FTE
Stud. Srv. \$/FTE
Student/Faculty Ratio
% Admitted

Institutional Groups Identified Using the Radcliffe/Jones-White Comparison Group Generator Model, April 2012

In this third look at comparison groups, all schools in the Carnegie Classification of "Baccalaureate Colleges--Arts & Sciences" were again chosen. The Bacc-A&S group was filtered to include only institutions with no accompanying graduate programs. Again, those institutions were rated in the same manner as Model#1 and #2 for the seven factors where the highest weight was given to size and liberal arts component, middle weight was given to access and undergraduate composition, and low weight was given to cost and expenditures. Zero weight was given to salaries.

MODEL #3: Bac-A&S: No Graduate Program Coexistence Group

Institution Name	Average of WEIGHT_SSD
1 University of Minnesota-Morris	0.0000
2 Albion College	0.9567
3 Lycoming College	0.9809
4 St. Mary's College of Maryland	1.4388
5 Ursinus College	1.5090
6 Cornell College	1.6673
7 Earlham College	1.9822
8 Allegheny College	2.1142
9 Randolph-Macon College	2.1153
10 Lawrence University	2.1248
11 Southwestern University	2.1424
12 University of Puget Sound	2.1460
13 Wells College	2.2470
14 Judson College	2.2478
15 Austin College	2.2489
16 St. Olaf College	2.2701
17 Hanover College	2.2776
18 Kalamazoo College	2.2964
19 Willamette University	2.3995
20 Franklin and Marshall College	2.4356
21 Lafayette College	2.6098
22 DePauw University	2.6436
23 Hampden-Sydney College	2.7333
24 Beloit College	2.8549
25 Knox College	2.8596
26 Carleton College	2.9196
27 Reed College	3.1505
28 Dickinson College	3.3800
29 Gettysburg College	3.4270
30 Rhodes College	3.4450
31 Haverford College	3.4704
32 St Lawrence University	3.6218
33 Whitman College	3.7606

FILTERS:

Carnegie Class: Basic

21-Baccalaureate Colleges--Arts & Sciences

Carnegie Class: Undergrad Instructional Program

3-Arts & science focus, no graduate coexistence

Factor WEIGHTS:

Average of F1_SIZE	3
Average of	0.2
Average of F3_ACCESS	1
Average of F4_SALARY	0
Average of F5_LIBARTS	3
Average of F6_UGCOMP	1
Average of F7_EXPEND	0.2

Factor Components:

Factor 1-Size:

PhDs-Research
PhDs-Professional
Master's Degrees
Bachelor's Degrees
Executive FTE
Professional FTE
IR&P FTE
Non-professional FTE
Public Service Expense

Factor 2-High Tuition/High Aid

Tuition & Fees
% UG with Institutional Aid
Admission Yield

Factor 3-Access

% Enrollment-White

34	Lake Forest College	3.9202
35	Colorado College	3.9452
36	Grinnell College	3.9935
37	Wabash College	4.0544
38	Hampshire College	4.0736
39	Macalester College	4.2284
40	Sweet Briar College	4.2284
41	Pomona College	4.2352
42	The College of Wooster	4.4430
43	Sewanee-The University of the South	4.5576
44	Centre College	4.5816
45	Hamilton College	4.6160
46	Swarthmore College	4.8158
47	Denison University	4.8983
48	Hobart William Smith Colleges	5.5342
49	Randolph College	5.7479
50	Louisiana State University at Alexandria	6.0356
51	New College of Florida	6.1194
52	Scripps College	6.5141
53	Bowdoin College	7.1631
54	Marymount Manhattan College	7.3816
55	Claremont McKenna College	7.8117
56	Wheaton College	7.9571
57	Colgate University	7.9999
58	Amherst College	8.2205
59	Thomas Aquinas College	8.3424
60	Davidson College	8.4253
61	Vassar College	8.8748
62	Kenyon College	8.8813
63	Tougaloo College	9.2027
64	College of the Holy Cross	9.8494
65	Agnes Scott College	10.0497
66	Shimer College	10.1464
67	Wellesley College	10.3208
68	Salem College	10.5202
69	Pitzer College	10.6074
70	Colgate University	7.9999
71	Amherst College	8.2205
72	Thomas Aquinas College	8.3424
73	Davidson College	8.4253
74	Goucher College	8.4899
75	Hollins University	8.7754

% UG-Federal Grant
4-Year Grad Rate
6-Year Grad Rate

Factor 4-Faculty Salary

Avg. Professor Salary
Avg. Assoc. Prof Salary
Avg. Asst. Prof. Salary
FT Retention Rate

Factor 5-Liberal Arts

% Degrees-STEM
% Degrees-Lib. Arts
% Enrolled-Women

Factor 6-Nontraditional

GRS to UG Ratio
GRS to Entering Ratio
Part-/Full-time Ratio

Factor 7-Institutional Expenditures

Inst. Supp \$/FTE
Instruction \$/FTE
Research \$/FTE
Acad. Supp \$/FTE
Stud. Srv. \$/FTE
Student/Faculty Ratio
% Admitted