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

Planning Committee

Campus Governance

2-10-2016

Planning minutes 02/10/2016

Planning Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Planning Committee, "Planning minutes 02/10/2016" (2016). Planning Committee. 90. http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/plan/90

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	Oscar Baldelomar, Brook Miller, Seung-Ho Joo, Sandy Kill,
	Committee:	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:	Brook Miller, Seung-Ho Joo, Sandy Kill, Austin
		Tipper, Gwen Rudney (ex-officio), Oscar Baldelomar, Matt
		Senger, Bryan Herrmann, Alison (West) Campbell - (secretary)
From:	Engin Sungur, Chair	
Subject:	Meeting Agenda	
	Date:	February 10, 2016 (Wednesday)
	Start:	2:30pm
	End:	3:28pm
	Place:	Imholte Hall 115

THE AGENDA

1. Approval of February 3, 2016 Minutes (5 min.).

Action: Approval of the minutes - yes with some changes

2. Brook's Budget email to Chancellor Jacquie

Action: Input meeting with Jacquie on Tuesday, February 16th at 4-5pm in the Prairie Lounge

Dear Jacquie and all,

Thank you for hosting today's meeting. Because time was short and I had to leave a few minutes early, I did not learn whether there is a recommended venue for sending feedback. So, I've included my questions and thoughts below. Please feel free to share them with whomever it would be appropriate as you plan our navigation of the budget. Also, please know that I offer these thoughts in good faith, in the hope that they will make a contribution to this difficult discussion.

Thanks,

Brook Miller Professor of English University of Minnesota, Morris 320.589.6260

Ideas for reductions:

- 1. Decide not to invest \$350k in merit scholarships (I understand we've been receiving money for merit from the system, but that is no longer happening); or
- 2. Ask the system to continue funding our increased budget for merit scholarships
- 3. Cut the football program and spend ½ of the savings to increase athletic opportunities in other sports for students (While I love football, I believe there is ethical urgency to ending our participation. The goal of the ½ spending is to keep the # of athletes the same, but at lower cost (is the annual cost close to \$1 million?))
- 4. Design staggered merit scholarship models that incentivize retention (i.e., scholarships increase with surpassing certain benchmarks as students go from first to second year, etc., as a spur to retention. This way we spend less on students who leave, and more on students who stay.)
- 5. Move away from a heavy reliance on large, time-limited grants unless there is a clear path for those grants to lead to structural revenue increases (directly or indirectly, such as through demonstrable increased retention)
- 6. Are there savings to be garnered from not committing to a long-term contract with new housing units in the old elementary school property?

Questions:

- 1. If we have arrived at a 'trough' in Minnesota graduating high school students, what's the 5-year outlook? Are there sunny skies ahead?
- 2. I've heard (from Colleen, specifically) we've been told (by system administrators) that our administrative costs are lean. Is there a data set that illustrates this?
- 3. Do we have the ability to offer a robust analysis of our budgetary profile in relation to useful standards, such as peer institutions?

Worries:

- 1. I don't see any long-term new revenue ideas (my understanding is that grant revenues are temporary). How can we generate good ideas effectively?
- 2. I don't have a clear sense of whether we believe the 1.4 million is an anomaly or reflects a worsening economic climate for us (I understand we don't have a crystal ball, but offering a robust, data-driven hypothesis regarding this is urgent); hope that there was an educated hunch
- 3. I don't see a careful granular analysis of the retention issue. Specifically, to what factors is our increased retention problem due (quality of advising? quality of educational program? Changing student relationships to higher ed? Changing UMM student profiles? Particular retention concerns for subgroups of the UMM student population, specifically of subgroups with increased numbers on campus?)? I'm concerned that there doesn't seem to be clear understanding of this, despite all of the investment we've made in retention.
- 4. The proposal to take back monies from certain funds (0&M) may lead to bad budget behaviors (spending unwisely at the end of the fiscal year, in particular).

Thanks again for considering my thoughts.

3. Planning and Budget (30 minutes) - Bryan showed Enrollment Predictions Chart

- Challenge is multi-faceted reaction students have to lower GPA in college than in high school effects retention
- Problem with retention is we don't get them back as a sophomore/junior/senior so the percentages keep getting smaller as they progress in years.
- Enrollment Predictions coming from Finance Committee:
 - o Fall 2015 415 freshmen 78% retention
 - o Continuing Students Fall 2014 = 1012 (projected and attained)
 - So Cohort 372
 - Ir Cohort 307
 - Sr Cohort 272
 - 5 yr Cohort 61
 - o Continuing Students Fall 2015
 - So Cohort Projected 82% = 337- ended up with 76% = 316
 - Ir Cohort 312
 - Sr Cohort 270
 - 5 yr Cohort 49
 - Missed it in the "other" category (students who started in spring or in school for 6-7 years) Projected 50 and ended up with 24 (spike in number of graduates)
 - 1790 students set the budget but actually got 1741 hit our freshmen and transfer numbers but did not hit our returning student numbers
 - o Transfer students come from all over community colleges, 4 year colleges (could have any number of credits coming in) 109 transfers this year
 - o Continuing Students Fall 2016 projections = 1710
 - New high school students (NHS): 420 / New transfer students (NAS): 105
 - So Cohort 324
 - Ir Cohort 275
 - Sr Cohort 268

- 5 yr Cohort 50
- We are 80 students off from Fall 2014 = short in tuition revenue, therefore, retention impacts us tremendously, ex: increasing by 17 students is roughly \$170,000
- Follow up Questions:
 - What is the reason why the students aren't staying? What type of students are we recruiting?
 - The percentage chart shows a lot of variance from year to year Is there no cause we can figure out?
 - o What are the factors leading to these outcomes?
 - Noel Levitz built a predictive model based on data from previous years of students who have been retained and who haven't
 - o Retention Rates compared to peer institutions -
 - We are 2nd behind Twin Cities- they increased to 92%
 - Across MN we are #2
 - Compared to private schools we are in the middle
 - ACT looks at us based on selectivity should be 86%
 - o We shouldn't be 5 or 6% off of other institutions
 - There is not one factor that is the solution.
 - Jen Herrmann has some data about why people have left looked at different populations
 - Data is trying to say something to us multiple things have changed since 2012 curriculum, student demographics, MCSP program helped with retention
 - Is there anything that the Twin Cities did that we can follow?
 - They have invested in developing support systems for students and focusing on retaining students.
 - o We have a lot of students from China Are they leaving in large numbers? Can we ask them in an exit interview?
 - International students that leave to Twin Cities are not on the percentage chart because they are transfer students, they are not tracked the same as freshmen
 - Students might not be honest with why they are leaving
 - Never going to have 100% retention rate but it hard seeing us recruit 100 students that end up leaving by the next fall.
 - We have been focusing on freshmen retention rate do we have patterns on the other grades throughout?
 - o How do new students coming in with junior status impact the chart?
 - If they graduate they are still retained but don't count as enrolled.
 - More students are coming in with credits

APPENDIX 2 (Continued). Background on Planning and Budget Agenda Item

Using UMM Strategic Plan(s) as a Guide to Address Budget Challenges

- *Honors College.* Adjust, eliminate, and modify the related funding and investments (merit scholarships, ACE etc.
- Recruitment vs. Retention. Possibilities and limitations of having more students.
- Assessment of Advising Initiatives. For example, assessing the impact of early alert etc. on retention (how many left got an early alert) (maybe sent an email to the student as a check up on how they are doing)

- Outreach Organizational Structure. Unifications and economies on CST and Office of Community Engagement, Primary role of this institution etc.
- *Grants and UMM Contributions.* Balancing use of UMM funds for grants.
- Administrative Units. Efficiency, direct mission.
- Factors effecting Retention. Initiatives that might "scare" students.
- Online Learning. Clear decision and reflection on funding.
- Green Initiatives. Assessment, need to continue or stop.
- **4-year Graduation vs Longer Graduation**. Creation of programs meaningful programs that will lead to 5-year tenure at UMM. UMM Strategic plan calls for support for multiple majors and minors. Advertise encourage 5-year joint programs (such as teaching licensure etc.)
- 4. Metrics and Strategic Planning (contd.) (15 min. Melissa Bert Sick)