University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Campus Resources and Planning Committee (Inactive)

Campus Governance

9-25-2008

Campus Resources and Planning minutes 09/25/2008

Campus Resources and Planning Committee

Recommended Citation

Campus Resources and Planning Committee, "Campus Resources and Planning minutes 09/25/2008" (2008). *Campus Resources and Planning Committee (Inactive)*. 34.
https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/crpc/34

Members Present: Pete Wyckoff, Shannon Juhnke, Bryan Herrmann, Dave Swenson, Kathy Julik-Heine, Shannon Juhnke, Zak Forde, Sara Haugen, LeAnn Dean, Ray Schultz, Lowell Rasmussen, Brook Miller, Escillia Allen, Karen Cusey, Maddy Maxeiner, Jacquie Johnson, Sarah Mattson

Guests: James Morales

Minutes from 9/18 approved as modified by motion from Ray Schultz, second by Dave Swenson.

Regarding the Campus Assembly discussion on the proposed mission statement, Pete's instinct is to not bring it back to this committee. He feels there needs to be more campus by in before bringing it back to Campus Assembly.

Enrollment Strategies

James Morales reported that there are five points he would like to address with this committee that have come from conversations with Admissions staff and Chancellor Johnson. Those five include the following: organizational structure; visit experience overhaul; degree programs; messages/reputation/outcomes; and transfer student recruit.

Organizational Structure

James Morales reported that we have not had a Director of Admissions for almost two years due to budget constraints. He believes it is time to revisit that notion and make a change in that area. In the competitive arena of liberal arts colleges, the old model of traditional approaches no longer works. We won't abandon some of those strategies but our emphasis needs to be modified to enhance new technologies. It behooves us to adopt a different model of how we recruit students of color and our linkage with athletics. Other pieces to address include streamlining our registration system to allow us to better forecast and predict. Jacquie Johnson added that we don't have all of the details worked out in terms of organizational structure for the office. We have had conversations with athletics and recruiting expectations of our coaches and we will work with them to define what our admissions expectations are. We will also be more intentional in how we use faculty for co-curricular programs. James added that we need to consider the need for overall enrollment goals under one office including degree seeking and non-degree seeking. Pete asked if that would include recruitment and enrollment for Continuing Education. Jacquie said we have operated in two different arenas and we can't keep doing the same things in the same way. We need planning and communicating on the front end to allow us to plan/predict. James added that it's important to have Continuing Education at the table as we build forecast models. James also mentioned that there would be an incentive plan for admissions staff tied to achievements and accomplishments along with teamwork and attitude, i.e., merit pay and promotional opportunities. The reverse side will be laid out as well if goals are not achieved in a specific time frame. Jacquie added that the admissions area is unlike other areas with a kind of empirical component of measurability and performance. Ray Schultz was interesting in knowing what kind of work we are doing with our alumni to help with our recruitment. James responded that we have a network of alums in high schools and we have done some initial work that would include our alumni application fee waiver. Dave Swenson noted that the Twin Cities is already moving to different technologies and wondered if we could use some of those tools. James said we would need someone dedicated to those types of areas to reallocate and recast. Sara Haugen asked if we have live evening chats with prospective students. Bryan responded that we mostly do instant messaging now. Brook wondered if there are young programmers who can help us with recruitment strategies and how we monitor those and asked how a director of admissions would help us with this. James said we want leadership in that area that can think creatively and who have a different set of skills. Pete commented that Maddy Maxeiner has given this group formulas and data for staffing in her area and CRPC has not heard this from the enrollment area. He wondered if we don't have enough people? Or not doing the right things with the people we have? How do we compare with our peers? James responded that we were understaffed when he arrived at UMM. He thinks we'll see titles that are different now but agreed that it is time to review what our competitors are doing. Pete added that last year our application numbers were up but we didn't get the number of students we wanted and wondered if that would change how the office should be organized. Our problem seems to be convincing students that we are better than some of their other choices. James added that we need to be clear about the value added piece if they come here.

<u>Visit Experience Overhaul</u> – to be discussed at future meeting

<u>Degree Programs</u> – to be discussed at future meeting

<u>Messages/Reputation/Outcomes</u>

James reported that we need to have an office responsible for crafting message and persuasive arguments about why prospective students should come to Morris. The right messages will be tied to outcomes and our reputation. We would also establish an AAR that we would use a cutoff. The AAR is the ACT score x 2 plus high school rank.

<u>Transfer Student Recruitment</u> – to be discussed at future meeting