

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

Campus Resources and Planning Committee
(Inactive)

Campus Governance

2-15-2010

Campus Resources and Planning minutes 02/15/ 2010

Campus Resources and Planning Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/crpc>

Recommended Citation

Campus Resources and Planning Committee, "Campus Resources and Planning minutes 02/15/2010" (2010). *Campus Resources and Planning Committee (Inactive)*. 37.
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/crpc/37>

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 Campus Resources and Planning Committee (Inactive) by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

Campus Resources and Planning Committee

February 15, 2010

Present: Mark Privratsky, LeAnn Dean, Brook Miller, Kathy Julik-Heine, Sara Haugen, Sarah Mattson, Bryan Herrmann, Dave Swenson, Pete Wyckoff, Zak Forde, Sydney Sweep, Bart Finzel, Carol Marxen, Jacquie Johnson, Pam Gades, Sarah Mattson

Guests: Gwen Rudney, Michael Korth, Janet Ericksen, Pareena Lawrence, Cheryl Contant

Minutes from 1/25/10 and 2/8/10 were approved as presented.

An additional CRPC has been scheduled on Friday, February 26 at 2:00 p.m. where Lowell will be on the agenda.

Enrollment projections

Bryan distributed a handout with various enrollment projection scenarios from 2010-2014. He has been putting UMM data into the projection model provided by Peter Radcliffe. Each scenario has four groupings. None of the numbers have changed since the last time the committee reviewed the numbers with the exception of continuing students from Spring 2010-Fall 2010. Regarding continuing students, Bryan hopes we will come in between 1057 and 1090 although he would error on the side closer to 1057. Pete asked how we're doing regarding incoming students for this fall. Bryan said it is too early to tell but at this point, the deposits are comparable to last year at this time. We hope to hit the 405 number but that number could potentially be higher. Brook asked if that includes transfers from community colleges. Bryan said yes, but that those articulation agreements take time and we are working to get those in place. Pete said because we are talking about a major revenue source for next year, he would like to hear opinions from committee members and asked how we come down on the balance of being too confident or too cautious in our projected student numbers.

Kathy believes the numbers should increase. Bryan added that we have a mid-range estimate (1603 full time, degree seeking students for Fall 2010) that he believes is a somewhat conservative estimate. He added that the landscape of higher education will be ultra competitive in the next few years. Lowell added that have to use a number that we have a level of confidence in. It behooves us to be very careful. Jacquie said it really is a balancing act. The number we decide on has to be credible. If we underestimate, that challenges our credibility. We have to be confident that we have a reachable number. Cheryl wondered if we used the larger of the two numbers and then exercised a huge restraint in the budgeting process, if that accomplishes the same thing and also starts to build reserves. Lowell said the problem with using the larger number is if you don't get to that figure then you don't get the reserves. Cheryl is concerned that if we go with the lower number, that doesn't put the fire in our belly to get students in the door. If you build a budget based on higher numbers, that puts pressure on the system to deliver—not just the Admissions office. Bart added that Bryan is in the best position to suggest a number and if he thinks 1603 is reasonable then he doesn't know why we wouldn't go with that number. Zak agreed.

Merit academic scholarship

Bryan distributed a handout with scholarship projections. Currently a 2.5 GPA is required to renew a scholarship. If we decide we want to change that requirement, we need to consider whether it will hurt retention or hurt certain groups of students. Bryan added that many schools have a much higher GPA requirement with the intention that you will lose the scholarship after the first year. While the GPA question is an interesting one, Pete said is not particularly germane to the current budget discussion. Pete added that the next time the committee reviews the spreadsheet, he will plug in one of Bryan's mid-range projections (1603 for fall 2010). However, this has consequences as we allocate what we want to budget in different budget lines. We need to determine a baseline. Jacquie reminded the group that the role of this committee is to make recommendations, but in the end, the actual doing of the budget belongs to the people in the budget office. She appreciates Bryan's work of bringing policy issues to this group. While the committee needs to weigh in on indexing, etc., she wants to be clear about roles and

responsibilities.