

2-17-2016

Planning minutes 02/17/2016

Planning Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Planning Committee, "Planning minutes 02/17/2016" (2016). *Planning Committee*. 82.
<http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan/82>

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.

To:	Planning Committee:	Oscar Baldelomar, Brook Miller, Seung-Ho Joo, Sandy Kill, Jana Koehler, Mike Cihak, Helen Juarez, Austin Tipper, Rachel Evangelisto, Bryan Herrmann (ex-officio), Gwen Rudney (ex-officio), Matt Senger, Melissa Bert, Alison (West) Campbell - (secretary)
	Present:	Mike Cihak, Seung-Ho Joo, Sandy Kill, Austin Tipper, Oscar Baldelomar, Matt Senger, Bryan Herrmann, Jana Koehler, Melissa Bert, Alison (West) Campbell - (secretary)
From:	Engin Sungur, Chair	
Subject:	Meeting Agenda	
	Date:	February 17, 2016 (Wednesday)
	Start:	2:33pm
	End:	3:23pm
	Place:	Imholte Hall 115

THE AGENDA

1. Approval of February 10, 2016 Minutes (5 min.)
Action: Approval of the minutes – yes
2. Planning and Budget (10 minutes)
Action: Input to the Chancellor
 - Look at Moodle website in Budget section
 - Jennifer Herrmann is willing to come speak to the committee about retention/CSI
3. Metrics and Strategic Planning (contd.) (35 min. Melissa Bert)
 - Some of the progress card measures will be available to external audiences, so we should keep that in mind when making decisions about what should be presented.
 - Gold card changes/suggestions:
 - The suggestion was made to include the number of majors students complete. Because encouraging students to complete multiple majors is not a strategic priority, the decision was made not to add this to the progress cards.
 - Do we have data for each student group (transfer, Pell-eligible, etc.)? Nancy Helsper had tables that are broken down into student groups
 - Are they looking at transfer students for just the fall? – yes
 - Would there be a reason to pull a 6 year graduation rate for transfers?
 - We can look at the 4-6 rates to see if there is consistency with them (SAM)
 - Maybe report just the average number of years it takes students to graduate
 - Question: Is our goal to have our students graduate in an X amount of time and if so what are we doing to achieve that? – have a report by division the average number of years to completion
 - We would also need to look at the number of credits students transfer in
 - Would like the years to line up in the columns and rows
 - Trying to make everything line up may be hard to fit on one page
 - When we look up these score cards in data books for other schools and agencies this format is how it is done - Need to line it up with what percentage of that cohort graduated at that time (have graduation reports by year that can provide)
 - Would like to see the cohort effects
 - Need to look at what our goals should be
 - Number of graduates
 - People who graduate within an academic year (July through June degree recipients)
 - Also include backdated degrees

- Percentage of graduates is based on the First Destination Survey – Proposing that we combine graduates employed or in graduate school 1 year out of college is because the percentage is higher
 - Questions: Are we trying to impact number of students going to graduate school? Do we have initiatives in place that encourage students to get jobs related to their field? – they may choose to not be in their field
 - They do surveys on students who graduated a year ago – Jeff Lamberty sends out email and the student employees in the admissions office call in the summer to follow up on the survey and then look at social media
 - Including graduates enrolled both as full-time and part-time students
 - Almost 80% response rate since 2012 (first year started survey)
 - Do we want to include that this information was collected from a survey? Does it matter how we gather information?
 - Make footnote – include response rate for this section
 - Equifax – have started to do some research of providing employment history data for graduates
 - MN Department of Economic Involvement – they have a new tool out that shows graduates by county – basically looking at tax information
- Ranking – what are we reporting to them? – are the score cards worded like the surveys
 - We fill out a survey and put in the values that they use to determine our ranking
 - Could we match the score card measures with what they are asking?
 - Some of the things they ask we cannot capture
 - Want to use that for Planning Committee perspective –need a different study
 - Challenge is that 22-25% of the composite score includes responses to a survey sent to directors of admissions and their perception of their institution
 - Schools make cold calls and post cards to encourage better responses to the survey
 - Might be components of the higher ranked schools that we want to aspire to, making goals to achieve – value in looking at those rankings because students and parents are looking at them
- Maroon card changes/suggestions:
 - Average ACT scores for entering NHS – stayed steady over the years
 - We use to track high school rank and right now we use GPA but it is inconsistent
 - Degree-seeking students – include NHS and transfer
 - Do we want to break them into all three groups (NHS, transfer, and total)
 - Would be nice to include rows for degree seeking, non-degree and total undergraduates enrolled
 - Not including exchange students and PSU’s because considered non-degree seeking
 - Add online students and non-degree seeking
 - Add actual numbers next to percentages
 - Question: Do we have a goal in terms of on-line and transfer students?
 - Donor funded awards and scholarships – pull from Institutional Data Book
 - Include number or percentage of legacy students enrolled?
 - A discussion of the number of countries represented led to the decision to keep that section in the maroon progress card, with the caveat that attention should be paid to the sample size

(Continued next week – Feb. 24)