



UNIVERSITY of ALASKA SOUTHEAST
Strategic Planning & Budget Committee
(SPBAC)

Meeting Notes - October 4, 2018

Attendees: Michael Ciri, Rick Caulfield, Julie Vigil, Jon Lasinski, Kristen Handley, Lacey Hall, Trisha Lee, Marnie Kaler, Steve Atwater, Elise Tomlinson, Priscilla Schulte, Heather Batchelder (Faculty Senate), Kiwana Affatato (Staff Council), Kate Govaars (Staff Council), Nick Bursell (Student Government), Keni Campbell (meeting notes), Nathan Leigh, Joe Nelson

Michael noted these meetings focus more on metrics, core themes and objectives. They will be transitioning into focusing on budget in the upcoming meetings. All of these metrics, core themes and objectives need to be reviewed as part of the accreditation process, which is primarily led by Provost Karen Carey. Karen asked that the focus of this meeting today be on the metrics, core themes, and objectives. She is deep into writing the institutional self-study at this time.

This is not the time to be making big changes but it is a good time to identify which ones work, and which do not serve us well. Effectively we are setting the agenda for SPBAC one year from now. A number of the current goals have words like “improvement” or “growth” but without any specific metric associated in order to measure that improvement or growth.

Review of Core Themes & Indicators

Core Theme 1 - Student Success

1.1: Access

- Race metric seems to be working well for matching service area, looking at Alaska average.
- Marnie - Had a question about using the word “rural.” This needs to be better defined. Are these defined by proximity, by whether air travel is needed, by what? It would also be good to bring this to a statewide level, as the 3 universities and extended sites look at rural differently which would cause confusion.
- Lacey - They counted rural as everything excluding census areas of Anchorage, Juneau, Fairbanks, Kenai Peninsula, etc. Ketchikan then would be considered rural.
- Kristen - We should be using the same definition that the State of Alaska is using otherwise the data is meaningless. Either calculate UAS rate to match that or change the goal. Not sure if there is a systematic way that UA calculates.
- Joe - Probably could use something from OMB or another entity.
- Michael asked - is this goal useful?
- Marnie - it is important as an open enrollment institution that we reach out to all students, not just the ones that are easier. “Southeast area” may be something we want to include. We don't have a College of Rural Development like our peers, but that might be a way that we could look at it.

- Rick - it does raise questions about how we align with other goals we have set for ourselves - i.e. marketing and recruitment plan. Look at those 6 and see if they can be measured in these metrics, whether they correspond with one another.
- Marnie - the percentage of Alaska Natives is the only one we have that is part of that currently. FTFTF is also not listed anywhere, apart from AK Native population
- Michael - Should revisit later in the year. He would expect that these two would be closely aligned. It is critical that they support one another. If we have an enrollment priorities that is not one of our measures, that would be one we should revisit.

1.2: Preparation

- Lacey - Metric by race seems to be working well for matching service area, looking at the Alaska average. "High demand job areas" list is being phased out by the State, and they will no longer be providing that. Therefore, the metrics related to that will need to be changed.

1.3: Success

- Rick - another area we don't look good is completion rates. To the extent we want to improve those rates, they should be included on our list so that we can track progress to improve. Find out where to include on this list. IPEDS is the nationally used standard for what is included when calculating completion rates.
- Marnie - Metrics here do not match up with the current 6 priorities in the Marketing & Recruitment Plan:
 - Full-time Undergraduate student enrollment
 - High demand online programs
 - First time full time freshmen recruitment, retention, and completion
 - Alaska Native student enrollment
 - Adult degree completion (ages 25+)
 - Graduate enrollment in Teacher Education and Public Administration

Core Theme 2 - Teaching and Learning

2.1: Quality of Programs and Services

- Lacey - Regarding course ratings and student services ratings, alumni satisfaction -- those are tricky. Part of the problem is that we do not do an annual survey, so comparison is skewed. Also goals - what do we want to measure specifically? Currently not able to see much variance because we get one score which is an average of averages. Honors program - no numbers for that for this last year.
- Kristin - hesitation with 2 would be that she would want to have more conversations about course ratings - what do our evaluations look like? Do those questions relate to the quality of the programs and services? Would want to look at those to look for correlation. Improvement is too broad - need to know what that means. Alumni survey - if we are using that for accreditation we need a plan on how that will be administered. Are we doing the same as the rest of UA, can we compare ourselves to them? Make sure we are measuring against something that correlates.
- Nick - Course ratings by students - Nick thinks they are ok, but not super effective because you need to consider what would make people want to fill out a survey. He thinks that negative reviewers would be more likely to fill out the course survey. Maybe requiring completion of it would give a better understanding of a true rating. Think mostly people are not inclined to do that.

- Michael - "Response rate" could be a way to define the goal. We would like to see a score on this this this by at least x%, with a response rate of x% students - a high enough response rate for it to be reliable, along with a closer approximation of course rate.
- Kiwana - She adjuncts for a different university and notes that students there are required to fill out a survey before they get their grades.
- Kristen - At her previous institution, if survey was completed by a certain date, then grades were released at a certain date; otherwise they had to wait until a later time to get their grades. For seniors this was tied to graduation.
- Rick - For measures that have only one year of data - whether alumni or staff services ratings, this is not useful if only done every 5 years. He would like to think there are better measures to be found, perhaps some standard ones out there. We should also align with what UAA and UAF are doing, to give meaningful comparison. For alumni, memberships would be a reflection of engagement.
- Marnie - Sometimes using things like this as a carrot can cause issues.
- Rick - Regarding quality of programs and services - more thought should be given, more frequently than once every 5 years.
- Elise - At the time the 3-year report was written we were not using these measures; they have evolved since then. Asking now that the 7-year report is being drafted, how locked in are we to these goals and measures, a little hazy on at the time of year 3 report written, we were not using these measures? Can we go back and look at comparable data or are we stuck with these metrics? How much latitude do we have?
- Kristen - Probably not much latitude as we are so close to the accreditation date. Her recommendation would be to stick with this, and then create something more meaningful for next cycle. Constant improvement.
- Michael - The student services rating also has vague goal of "improvement" — could one have a goal of say 85%? Is there a reason not to have that goal?
- Lacey - The student services rating has only been done once since original, with the McDowell Group retention survey FY13 and FY17.
- Elise - McDowell surveys are fairly expensive.
- Kristen - Will we be spending to do that again?
- Julie - not annually.
- Kristen - Said she does have experience with survey design. We can chat about if we can make it in house and make it more of an ongoing thing rather than a one-off paid survey.
- Rick - McDowell was intended every 3 years.
- Joe - the survey is ours; we have it. The IE office can take it on and do that annually.
- Lacey - Also alumni survey done every 3 years (statewide survey)

2.2: Academic Excellence

- Lacey - Honors program - no numbers for that for this last year.
- Steve - "Completion rates" metric is urgent. As a group, what are we after -- the State's definition or something different? There are 4 definitions for Alaska urban, urban edge, and rural remote (tends to be the one most people think about)
- Marnie - Is there a plan to bring back some kind of honors program? Knows it is on hold right now, but it would make it easier to recruit high achieving students, if there is something for them here, something special. They are used to having benefits for this in high school. Currently we will list it as "on hold."

- Michael - "On hold" seems to be in conflict with the "growth" metric. Whatever the status of the program should be reflected in the goal.
- Priscilla - Suggested going back and seeing what was in the program review. It was systematic, and if enrollment was down and revenue down, those would have factored in.
- Elise - It seemed to be too focused on too narrow of an area based on one faculty member willing to take it on. Students who were potentially honor students in other disciplines felt there was nothing for them there. Should look for ways to expand that. At that time UAS was at a point where we were losing a lot of faculty and adjuncts.
- Michael - My spin is that we had an honorary program and had a goal of growth, there was none, so put it on hold. Not about hitting it out of the park, but rather to show that we have viable metrics. Will ask Karen's opinion when she gets back. Currently we only have a review or reconsideration goal, not a goal of growth.
- Trisha - Asked about how degree completion is looked at -- for students who complete an associate's degree, and that was their final goal, would that count against us if they did not go on to complete a bachelor's degree?
- Steve - If you tease out those people who got the AA and then got a job, you are right. That's how you run into problems with this type of exercise. It will lead to misleading information. A lot are descriptive but some are not.
- Michael - Finds it interesting that UA averages our goal. Assumes we want to be the same as our peers or that we don't expect there are environmental conditions that would cause us to not look like our peers.
- Steve - I think you are right. My point is that it is easy to have variance
- Michael - In this arena, is there a difference in an AA vs AAS? Like AA being something that would go on to bachelors, and AAS would be a terminable program?

2.3: Quality of Faculty & Staff

- Kristen - Faculty and staff diversity - match the Alaska average, but need to make sure that goals are attainable so that we can succeed.
- Kristen - Is there a reason we don't have student faculty ratio as a metric under teaching and learning?
- Michael - Knows it is talked about a lot. Again, a pin for us to revisit next fall. Is our goal to have a higher or lower number?
- Joe - Efficiency has been something that has been stressed. People hear those numbers differently depending on who you are talking to.
- Michael - From an HR perspective employee turnover rate is what we talk about as a metric. We need to explore what the best measure would be. Revisit in a year promotions, the degree we develop our staff, increase leadership. A commitment to development and having people succeed, would be a way to show improvement in that area. Turnover rate is negative focus. Would hope that people get promoted because they are quality.
- Steve - Employee satisfaction is what we are talking about.
- Jon - Are employee satisfaction or turnover rates an indicator of quality?
- Rick - Could look at it from training angle.

2.4: Effectiveness & Efficiency

- Nathan - Michael asked if within theme of teaching and learning, especially in the objective of efficiency should facilities be mentioned? Nathan agrees, perhaps utilization of classroom space

or quality of the spaces, square footage per student (something that gets reported to the BOR), maintenance (also reported).

- Priscilla - In career ed, certainly it is space available for welding, etc. need a certain level of quality in order to teach. But in terms of e-learning, what we need changes, i.e. blended classes, need for smart classroom. Not sure how to put that all down. But e-learning changes depending on the technology.

Core Theme 3 - Community Engagement

3.1: Individual Engagement

- Lacey - Alumni engagement is mentioned in this section as well - Memberships as a ratio compared to previous years graduates. Core theme 3 goals don't have a lot of direction besides "growth" - need it to say something like a target so we put in 3% per year but it does not really mean anything.
- Michael - are you saying we can measure but we don't have a goal or are we saying
- Lacey - This is trickier to measure, no systematic way to track.
- Kristen - Regarding 3.1.2 for internships, etc. Do we have the staff to be able to grow that number?
- Rick - Goal is to grow the number of high impact learning opportunities. If we agree those are valuable we may need to invest more in those. If we see a decline in those then we should make more investments to make them happen. Maybe a ratio would make more sense. Compare to student FTE rather than headcount.
- Kristen - We would just have to decide what the denominator is - what are we measuring against.
- Michael - Regarding students walking across the stage - how many of those people participated in an internship at some point during their academic career?
- Kristen - She has done similar things at previous institutions. Not easy to get but is possible.
- Trisha - We could pull a report with any graduates of who experienced that within their time as a student. It would be in course history.
- Steve - Some programs require it and some don't.

3.2: Institutional Engagement

- Lacey - Core theme 4 goals don't have a lot of direction besides "growth" - need it to say something like a target so we put in 3% per year but it does not really mean anything.
- Kristin - For this one wonders whether the goal of growth makes sense. For example, there are a finite number of entities with which we can form community partnerships. Is growing by 3% attainable, or is there a list of specific partners that we can have a goal to reach toward relationships with those? Then the percentage of that list to compare to the next one, too.
- Trisha - We do have partnerships with organizations without having a MOA or MOU on file formally.
- Michael - We could get that up just by completing the paperwork and bringing those up to date, but that does not show true growth.
- Michael - 3.2.2: Community Engagement, #UAS sponsored forums, lectures, workshops, etc. - Who counts those? Asked Kiwana if could be tracked through Astra/room scheduling.
- Kiwana - There will be a lot of things that are not counted. Could pull that info, but there are some that exist that do not go through her and get into Astra.

- Elise - Noted they recently revised the Egan library reservation form. Got rid of “university sponsorship” - is that valuable? It was changed because they did not find it valuable on the form, but need clarity if it would be valuable for metrics.
- Kiwana - The room scheduling page notes a list of some community partners. In addition, although it hasn't had to be used often, for organizations that don't have an MOU or MOA, we have a sponsorship form that can be sent to a department requesting their sponsorships. The Dean has to sign it, noting that someone will be at your event, and that it has to serve the mission. Seems to be working pretty well. Department takes on the cost also, which helps the person reserving, and helps their willingness to put their name on paper. This is posted on the room scheduling site.
- Michael - Ketchikan uses Astra but Sitka does not. Was thinking of Astra as a regional solution.
- Nathan - Facilities has also been involved in some informal community engagement activities - like allowing the SWAT team to use buildings for training.

Core Theme 4 - Research and Creative Expression

4.1: Engagement

- Lacey - Goals are asking just for growth, need to be more specific, more understanding of what we are trying to be improve, and a mechanism to track progress.
- Elise - Jennifer Ward has spoken to Dean Thornton about the way that UAA did this. Their faculty approved an agreement to endorse open access communication. How faculty submit stuff to academic scholarworks on things they have published or written in the UA. Have it be more a part of the tenure or promotion stuff. Often people don't submit to them as they didn't know.
- Jon - Asked what happened with grant awards FY14 etc.
- Lacey - Noted there was a multiyear grant awarded in FY14
- Jon - Noted that it says “amount requested.” Would it be better to say “amount received” instead? Also wonders if growth is attainable in the case of a large grant.
- Michael - Could we do more of a ratio comparison?
- Julie - Part of the problem is the proposal of x\$ over 5 years, but it is not always evenly divided between the years — sometimes more in the first year.
- Kristin - A goal could be that we always want to maintain a certain level of funding.
- Heather - Thinks this needs to be brought up to faculty senate. Presenting something that makes it easier, would fit in nicely with their work toward having an electronic binder.
- Elise 4.1.1 is different than 4.1.3. That first one could be Title III as opposed to research grants.

4.2: Learning Impact.

- Elise - are there other types of awards besides URECA?
- Priscilla - BLaST is one.
- Lacey - only URECA is included in the tracking right now.
- Rick - Count number of high impact learning opportunities. We do have to budget for that, and have to pull money from various places like Arts & Sciences and UA Foundation. Will matter how we characterize that growth, otherwise it is kind of like throwing a dart. We do want to increase the number of opportunities.
- Michael - Goal should be to get to a certain plateau -this many faculty, this much capacity, create the pipeline, then maintain. Mentioned AKCOE - what is counted for UAS and what is counted as other institutions?

- Elise 0 URECA is just the name but could expand it out to be more genetically “awards to undergraduates for research and creative activities”
- Heather - Consider a way to track undergrad and grad research - not just numbers but how that research is used.
- Michael - Thinking as a group could come up with a goal that articulates who we want to be better, not just sciences but also inclusive of education.
- Joe - For grants, the bigger question is will feedback result in anything changing in this document? Some of these took some heat. Large grants will stand out and ask what you are measuring and why. Perhaps define engagement related to new grants - what goals could we have here? Grants submitted, win rate, new grants awarded, consider how to account for multi-year. What is the volume of grants flowing through eh budget year to year? Perhaps shoot for a range instead.

Conclusion:

This will be a good conversation to revisit post accreditation. Change now would not make sense, but there is some cleanup we can do. Certainly for next round after the self-study and site visit, in the spirit to continuously improve. A year from now will be in a place to revisit and refine and improve. Cannot do substantive change at this time in the cycle, other than cleanup or clarification. These thoughts can at least be documented, and continue conversations on the things that have come out of it including MOA process improvement, Astra tracking of events, tracking of publications, a deeper dive into student surveys, etc. Annotate these ideas, and maybe get feedback from the accreditation team with suggestions.

Assignment for next meeting on November 29, 2018:

Each division will report with assessment of Core Themes and Objectives for 2017-2018 academic year (5-10 minutes each - come prepared). Intent is to work and accomplishment and ways of assessing ourselves. Will send a reminder and clarification.

Upcoming meeting dates:

November 1, 2018

November 29, 2018

January 17, 2019

February 14, 2019

March 14, 2019

April 11, 2019