

Planning Council Minutes
Wednesday, October 28, 2015
1:00 PM
President's Conference Room

Chris Fastnow
Martha Potvin
Terry Leist
Walt Banziger
Virginia Bratton
Tami Eitle
Janet Heiss-Arms
Wade Hill

Nicol Rae
Tricia Seifert
Nora Smith
Katie O'Keefe

Others present:
Kathy Attebury
Becca Belou
Ian Godwin
Ron Larsen

I. Welcome and Announcements

Budget Model Open Forum Friday
ASMSU endorsed new climbing boulder

II. Approval of Minutes from September 23, 2015 - approved

III. Information/Updates

A. Strategic Plan Year 3 Progress Report – Chris Fastnow handed out the year 3 progress report with thanks to University Communications and the Council and a request for successes to talk about in Year 4.

IV. Discussion:

A. New Budget Model – Terry Leist and Kathy Attebury

Terry Leist and Kathy Attebury presented the outline of the new budget model draft, described the process for gathering input, and answered questions.

B. Metric deep dive

1. L.1.2 – Core learning assessment – guided by Ron Larsen

- Core update recommendations and process
- Core measurement/assessment methods and process
- Where is each core area on the path?
- What defines mastery in this context?
- What to do about excluded students (test or transfer credits)?

Martha Potvin described the current state of the UPdate Core group's recommendations. UPdate Core is meeting again this fall with some new members and will make additional/revised recommendations in the Spring.

Ron Larsen responded to the other questions posed by the Council in the September meeting (above) with a handout (attached).

2. L.3.2 – Graduate school enrollment of BA/BS recipients – guided by Chris Fastnow

- Alternative target? How was target established?
- Data source and potential alternatives
- Peer comps

Chris Fastnow described the establishment of the target based on the most recent five year average of grad school enrollments at the time the SPC drafted the metrics. She showed the Council the Career Services Career Destinations Survey, which is the basis for this metric, using recent graduates' responses to current academic enrollment. Pros and cons of several alternative sources for grad school enrollment were mentioned: Dept of Labor and Industry data, surveying further out (5 or more years), using contracted services to contact alumni, PayScale, GRE test takers and scores. Peer comps are hard to come by in standard form.

Questions were raised about the normative goal and possible lack of control over grad school enrollments.

3. D.1.3 – Carnegie metrics – guided by Ian Godwin

- Which peers moved ahead?
- Doctoral conferral details
- Grant pipeline data – submissions, awards, expenditures

Ian Godwin described the Carnegie Classification system and the metrics chosen for this SP metric. He showed which schools had moved around MSU on the metrics of interest (attached) and our academic departments' OSP managed expenditures and doctoral degrees produced over time (attached).

C. Discussion guides for next month

No volunteers were immediately evident.

Post-meeting update: We will postpone some of the Access metrics until December and look at them alongside retention and graduation. November's meeting will look at A.1.2 (transfer enrollments), A.1.6 (financial need met), and S.1.1 (salaries). Volunteers are still welcome!

V. Other Business - none

Next Meeting: MONDAY November 23, 10am -12pm