

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

---

Campus Resources and Planning Committee  
(Inactive)

Campus Governance

---

12-3-2008

# Campus Resources and Planning minutes 12/03/ 2008

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 12/03/2008" (2008). *Campus Resources and Planning Committee (Inactive)*. 25.  
<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/crpc/25>

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

**Campus Resources and Planning Committee**  
**Thursday, December 3, 2008**

**Members Present:** Kathy Julik-Heine, Escillia Allen, Zak Forde, Shannon Juhnke, Sara Haugen, Pete Wyckoff, Dave Swenson, Michelle Page, LeAnn Dean, Brook Miller, Bryan Herrmann, Ray Schultz

1. November 20, 2008 Minutes Approved
2. Responses to Recruitment Forum
  - a. Official CRPC response
  - b. R. Schultz
    - i. Felt that more information was presented than there was time for discussion, and that it would have been more productive to have a forum with more dialogue.
    - ii. Shannon Juhnke
      1. Expressed MSCA's response;
      2. Agreed that more dialogue would have been nice;
      3. Put an emphasis on the need fore more student involvement in the recruitment process.
  - c. B. Herrmann
    - i. Spoke in response to focus groups on why students come to Morris;
    - ii. Explained that current students have been surveyed;
    - iii. Shannon Juhnke
      1. Brought up ORL retention interviews and inquired as to why they were not used for recruitment
  - d. D. Swenson
    - i. Spoke from his experience on the Retention Committee
      1. Expressed his feelings that the ORL retention interviews were unorganized and not helpful for drawing information from.
  - e. S. Haugen
    - i. Expressed the need for real results:
    - ii. Said that we know that the surveys are being done, but we want to know what they are saying.
  - f. M. Page
    - i. Inquired on the Lipman Hearne marketing project results;
      1. Bryan Herrmann
        - a. Explained that focus groups after Lipman Hearne were open to the campus
  - g. R. Schultz
    - i. Emphasized his observation of "A lot of talk, and no action."
    - ii. Brought up the strategy of stressing our alumni satisfaction level (three months after graduation), use alumni more strategically;
      1. For example: Alumni who are secondary education teachers
    - iii. Explained the need to target where the majority of our students are coming from.
  - h. P. Wyckoff
    - i. Struggles with the lack of power of CRPC and continually asked the question, "What can we do as a committee?"
    - ii. Laid out CRPC's goal for the end of term to publish a report on CRPC discussions and considerations
  - i. B. Miller
    - i. Related the discussion back to the strategies that were presented on Tuesday
  - j. P. Wyckoff
    - i. Strategy Six – Value added and outcomes selling point
      1. Longitudinal surveys on alumni
      2. Decision made against alumni surveys
      3. These surveys need to come back
    - ii. M. Page
      1. How do we as an institution pull this data together so that it is easy to use and efficient?

2. How do we streamline this information so that it's usable?
  3. New Admissions position in charge of this?
    - a. Bryan Herrmann responds probably not
  - iii. L. Dean
    1. Data keeping is important to accreditation
    2. Not necessary because of themed reaccreditation as opposed to standard reaccreditation
  - iv. S. Haugen
  - v. Will PDF catalog free Nancy Helsper up for data research?
  - k. CRPC as a committee agreed to recommend the reviving of longitudinal alumni surveys
  - l. B. Herrmann
    - i. Explained that it is not as simple as sending alumni out to recruit, the need tasks and solid organization;
    - ii. Explained that they have tried to make strides working with alumni and there has been progress made.
  - m. S. Haugen
    - i. Asked Herrmann if the current climate of Admissions is open to spontaneous recruitment?
      1. B. Herrmann confirmed, but explained that recruitment training and stats need;
      2. Ray Schultz expressed his frustration with incorrect information being perpetuated by Campus Ambassadors.
  - n. S. Juhnke
    - i. Suggested that alumni information recruitment kits should be made available online.
  - o. R. Schultz
    - i. Brought up the notion of an Alumni drive;
      1. B. Herrmann- Fee informed the committee of the current waiver alumni drive.
  - p. M. Page
    - i. Questioned Herrmann regarding confusion on agreements with community colleges?
      1. Transfer and articulation agreements?
        - a. Herman responded that our programs are often too unique to have set tracks that people can take at other institutions.
      2. What is the institutional impediment in place that is restricting registrars office from creating an articulation agreement for transfer students?
- q. M. Page:
  - i. Questioned Herrmann, "How do 'college in the schools' translate to UMM credits?"
- r. K. Julik-Heine
  - i. Asked Herrmann why the data from Tuesday showed both the admit rate decreasing and yield rate decreasing.
    1. B. Herman's responded that more students that don't fit the profile are applying and more and more students are applying.
  - ii. He explained that it is now easier to apply initially but not complete an application and admissions simply cannot admit incomplete applications.
- s. D. Swenson questioned the statistics on students with composite ACT's above 27 who are not accepted.
  - i. Herrmann explained that Admissions looks at applicants comprehensively.
- t. B. Miller
  - i. Asked why are we concerned when we are currently and we have been historically above the national average in yield?
- u. It was explained that there is an emphasis on increasing yield rates
  - i. The question was then asked, "If we are already above the national average why are we putting so much stress on increasing yield rates?"
- v. B. Herrmann
  - i. Explained that it is difficult to compare because we function like a private college but we are a public school.
- w. D. Swanson
  - i. Brought up the fact that in the current state of the economy, private school endowment rates collapsing
    1. Asked of Herrmann, "Will this decrease scholarships offered by these schools and benefit institutions like ours?"
3. P. Wyckoff Wrap-Up: What to prepare for the end of term report:
    - a. Response to 8 strategies
    - b. Questions regarding strategies
    - c. New Strategies

- i. Alumni
- ii. Students Involvement
  - 1. Jazz Fest is critical to recruitment but if Admissions forces a recruitment atmosphere, then it risks ruining the already prime natural recruitment atmosphere.