Strategic Planning: Academic Planning Working Group Meeting
2 October 2014, 3:30-5 PM
Hammond 314

Members attending: Randall Grometstein (chair), Jeannette McMenamy, Chris Picone, Michael Turk, Sam Tobin, Jeff Godin, Linda LeBlanc, Lisa Gim

Guests attending: Jane Fiske,-Paul Weizer, Chris Cratsley,
Meg Hoey; Michael Leamy, Aruna Krishnamurthy, Eric Budd, Anthony Wilcox

Consultants: Larry Large, Arnie Yasinski

1. Minutes were passed out from our meeting on Sept. 18.

2. A summary was also presented from the Sept. 25 meeting from **Academic Values.** Their minutes have been posted.

> MH: Let the Goals guide the LA&S program, rather than fit the pieces together. People crave a more coherent goal to LA&S.
>
> How we could realize that is no small matter. Many ideas have been tried before (e.g., first year experience).
>
> Our task is to develop the overarching set of values to pursue, and leave it to the LAS Council to carry out that long discussion.
>
> How can we have an integrated whole that drives all of these pieces, such as retention?

3. MT/LG. We cannot answer those questions until we answer the question about what it means to be a university. LG and MT drafted a pre-white paper based on FSU Vision and Mission. Clarify what we are so we can articulate what we do and what we can do better. **What is our IDENTITY? That question is critical to all of our other issues.**

> MT.
> Should we strengthen language offerings?
> Curriculum innovation: adapting to the 21st century
> What interdisciplinary fields make sense in the future?
> How do we strengthen and develop new programs?
>
> MH. The EC is asking that we describe what an ideal end-state will look like. We do not have to be "operational."
>
> MT. If we are university, we should not have a "science" department, but individual departments. We should strengthen language programs as befits a university.

We sometimes have to suggest that students transfer to UMass to complete some programs.

MH. Is it sustainable to try to be a mini-UMass? We cannot offer too many programs.

LG. Correct. But there are some areas that we have rolled back, such as the library.

RG. Are we looking to be broader than we are, or build the identity we have?

MT. This is EXACTLY the discussion we need. How much depth should we add to programs we have now, where students cannot complete a minor or major?

RG/ML. What is the right mix? What are the programs, esp. Masters, that we might want to expand?
ML. Example. One might target retirement planning as Boomers retire.
PW. Accreditors were surprised there was no Finance concentration in the Day program.

ST. There are other ways to be different. Example: Game Design is unique. Specific courses, our Nursing program, are all unique to FSU. Take advantage of the structure we already have, and the frank discussions we have in governance. At other institutions faculty would not have the chance for these kinds of discussions, <u>and we do that well.</u>

<u>What is the small college environment</u>? An open question…
- MT. Familiarity between faculty and students.
- PW. We have the lowest faculty: student ratio of any of the state universities. We compare very well to our peers.
- MT. And that affects our ratings in US News, and therefore admissions.
- AW. Articulate to our students how that familiarity is unique here so they appreciate what they have.

4. How might GCE factor into our academic planning? (See comments on Blackboard)

Let's make explicit what we cannot be by state mandate (e.g., a PhD program).

Our references to the "small college experience" means we prioritize the day program. But should we increase emphasis on our grad program as a university? Make it more of our image?

5. Increasing the six-year graduation rate? (See comments on Blackboard)

We need to keep our identity. Use degree completion as a lens to streamline our curriculum.

We need better planning and coordination of initiatives. For example, CCA-GPS conference this Friday is about retention, but these things happen in isolated pockets.

RG. We need student voices in our discussions of completion rates. Data are coming: "How do we help you complete…"

No one is responsible for the curriculum as the student takes it. Whether it makes as a whole. We have majors and LAS, separately managed.

LG/RG. We need a sense from students of WHY they did not complete. Who left, when, and why?
AW. Stan B. collects responses from students who withdraw. Mainly financial.

This lens of completion rates will help resolve other pieces of our white paper. For example:
are there technologies that might help a student complete after they move away?
Technology is a delivery, not a goal itself.
Could we make sure a student could complete something like IDIS when they cannot complete their major?

MH. Student Success is the Value that should shape all planning.

LL. Completion is a great lens. How do we engage the student to keep them? That might include a little technology. It also means a partnership so there is student buy-in. Do not just provide the path. Need an active learning process, not a passive one. We can provide this…not what will YOU (student) provide to your educational process?

Access. Affordability. Attainment.

LG. Is that captured by "small college" environment?

Arnie: Focus on making sure students here now do not drop out, rather than focusing on getting students to come back.
Students often say $$$ was the issue for dropping out, when in fact it was curriculum.
There is lots of national research on improving completion:
- e.g, Is there early identification of students who need help in a course?

RG. Should we streamline the curriculum? It sounds like a trend, but we should frame it around student completion.

PW. Why do students drop out? One study showed the following:
1. New Job interfered
2. Dissatisfaction with program
3. Inconvenient course time
4. $$$ factors
5. Parking

They can be reached out to, and complete their program. Successfully done elsewhere.

JM. How to create the environment for student success? Lots discussed today, but how do we make it into a paper?
Clear pathways for our students.
Early indicators when not doing well
Academic maps: we should not be saying students cannot complete their interest here.
Create inspiration for students, high impact practices.
Small class sizes
Etc.,
These are threads, but we need to see them as part of one goal.

What are the STRUCTURAL RECOMMENDATIONS we want to make?

The six-year advising plan?
PW. Now the average student is here for 6 years. We can help them plan better when we work with that reality.
LL. We can make the six year plan built into the student planning.
Provide "flexibility" centered around student needs.
LG. The six-year pattern (of low retention) is largely financial. It is not driven by a curriculum barrier.

MT. We already advise like that.
RG. But we could **plan** for 5-6 years with partial tuition. Some students end up taking just as long, but save some money and may increase degree completion.

White Paper idea: Help develop 4-6 year plans, rather than assume a 4-year plan.

- Admin. will need to help faculty keep track of how many advisees are finishing in 5, 6 years or dropping out.

Larry: Nationwide, we need to drop the moniker of "4-year colleges." Call them Masters Degree and Higher.

MT. **Is cost being addressed?**

    PW. Few of our students have parent loans. Most take out their own loans.

    Arnie. To keep the best people, costs increase beyond inflation. So cost savings often include reducing people costs. Or look to fundraising. Or look to being more efficient by reducing staff.

    PW. Raises from the recent contract will cost FSU $300-400K annually without hiring another person.

[end]