

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Planning Committee

Campus Governance

---

4-8-2014

### Planning minutes 04/08/2014

Planning Committee

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Planning Committee, "Planning minutes 04/08/2014" (2014). *Planning Committee*. 46.  
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan/46>

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](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

**Planning Committee Minutes**  
Tuesday, 4/8/2014  
11:00 a.m., Moccasin Flower Room

Attendees: Arne Kildegaard, Jon Anderson, Jim Barbour, Michael Eble, Julie Eckerle, Jane Kill, Sarah Mattson, Lowell Rasmussen, Jordan Wentz

**Introductions / announcements**

Arne Kildegaard suggested the committee read the following articles, in advance of the Planning Committee meeting:

1. <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2010/03/09/hauptman>
2. [http://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/confessions\\_of\\_a\\_community\\_college\\_dean/making\\_it\\_up\\_in\\_volume](http://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/confessions_of_a_community_college_dean/making_it_up_in_volume)

The meeting itself was dedicated to a discussion of what we have learned so far, and how we would like to chart the endgame to our optimal-enrollment investigation.

**Review: Planning Committee Study of Optimal Enrollment Target**

Background: Prompted by the Chancellor, and informed by the 2006 UMM Strategic Plan target of 2100 enrollment, the Planning Committee began (fall, 2012) investigating the optimal enrollment number. We assumed that the high fixed costs of the institution and the high marginal revenues of additional students implied that higher enrollments would translate into more resources for the campus. Accordingly, we devoted our attention to physical capacity constraints that would be most difficult to overcome. The plan was to identify these as a cap on enrollment, and then work backwards to determine whether the additional variable costs of enrolling more students could be justified by the additional revenues.

1. An analysis of physical constraints (hardest and slowest to change)
  - Classroom space
  - Laboratory space
  - Office space
  - Dormitories

**Guests:**

- o Office of the Registrar
  - o Office of Residential Life
  - o Also: Email survey of campus
2. An analysis of variable costs in Academic Services (Guest: VCAA Finzel)
    - Constant student faculty ratio (15 or 16:1)
    - Desire to expand Academic Assistance
  3. An analysis of feasibility from Admissions (Guest: Bryan Hermann)
    - Macro picture very challenging

- # of MN graduates
- composition (family income; ethnic composition)
- -\$2500/matriculant spent
  - needs clarification: average cost?
- emphasis on retention
  - needs more compelling case
    - efforts effectual?
    - efforts cost-effective?

#### 4. New info

- Gross \$6500/student
- Variation by Int'l., NatAm, Other
- Including most basic costs only (student/faculty and student/admissions counselor ratios constant)
  - Average net ~ \$500/student
  - Lose money on each student, but make it up on volume!

Arne also shared a spreadsheet he drafted, proposing ways to optimize a projection to 2100 students relative to income and expenses.

#### Discussion followed:

- Do we need more retention and statistical data to further this discussion?
- (LR) - We have the highest cost to provide education to students in the U of M system, per UMTC Linc Kallsen's report from last year. We elect to do that and it shows in our satisfaction survey, graduation and retention rates.
- (AK) – what has become of UMM's merit aid?
- (LR) – Admissions now has a funded merit aid program. We have increased this program intentionally to increase enrollment and retention.
- (JK) – what is the advantage to increase our enrollment?
- (JA) – A number of things are advantaged by the increased enrollment, for example there is a richer upper division experience and campus social and residential experience.
- (JE) – this is complicated. If we expand now, do we have the classroom space? What happens to discussions regarding competitive faculty salaries and morale? Bryan Herrmann expressed concern that there are not more students to gain?
- (LR) – the Chancellor has made arguments in the most recent year's campus compact meetings for salary increases for faculty and P & A staff. We have targeted \$300,000 over the last 3 or 4 years for faculty salary adjustments. We should not do one or the other, but do both more efficiently.
- (ME) – Saw a level of optimism in each speaker – can we get funding from alumni to support this work? Are there other alternatives for income, like using facilities in the summer when they are typically dormant?
- (SM) – we continue to target increases each year, can we let it grow 25-50 students each year and then the infrastructure can adjust as needed?

**Next Meeting**

Next meeting will be Tuesday, April 15, 2014, Moccasin Flower Room, at 11am.

Meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.