**WORKDAY MINUTES**

**June 26, 2014, 10:00-12:00**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present** | Richard Starnes, Lowell Davis, Mimi Fenton, Dana Sally, Dale Carpenter, Brian Railsback, Darrell Parker, Alison Morrison-Shetlar, Susan Fouts, Carol Burton |
| **Guests** | Melissa Wargo, Chip Ferguson for George Desain, Greg Hodges, Alison Joseph, Tim Metz, Johnny Lail |
| **Recorder** | Anne Aldrich |

**DISCUSSION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Enrollment Management Metrics (Melissa Wargo/**  **Alison Joseph/**  **Tim Metz/**  **Johnny Lail)** | Alison distributed a draft handout of the list of potential efficiency and effectiveness operating metrics for WCU which she reviewed with the council.  These have been approved by BOG. We will continue to discuss how we will gather this data.  Melissa provided handouts to the council. Some of this information will be familiar and some will be new. Melissa shared how the funding model flows and how SCHs are generated and converted into dollars. Melissa provided the 120 page funding formula manual to Alison and will be happy to send it electronically to the deans.  The funding model is set by the General Assembly and then administered by General Administration.  It is a legislative decision to make any changes to the model.  General Administration can make changes in how it is administered.  Six to seven years ago the model was reviewed and a better way could not be determined so aside from some tweaks it has not changed significantly in 15 or more years.  The funding model is predicated as a change model.  Melissa reviewed the handout and how the process works-- to generate dollars not to determine how many faculty positions to hire.  The general institution support rate is anything non-academic – e.g., new grounds person, money for non-academic support units, etc. The funds come from appropriations as well as tuition and fees. The average annualized FTE is determined by converting SCH’s into an approximate number of full time students and how much they are paying in tuition and fees.  As you get into enrollment projections from now through the fall, change in the SCHs is what we project to have in the next two years, not what is current. Projections are made in odd number years; in even number years we plan for the next two years.  In odd years we can make adjustments if we have more or less expected growth.  How we have arrived at where we are now – in the past UNC institutions were held harmless for enrollment projections that were not realized.  That is no longer the case.  We are not being held harmless.  There are over 200 individual enrollment projections made in order to determine the final number.  It is very challenging to get accurate projections on over 200 points.  We chose to go with a new model, a weighted average approach, that is inherently conservative and it has kept us from getting into a bind with over-projecting as happened in the past.  Prior to about three years ago there was no input from the deans or colleges.  Even now there will not be a one to one relationship between what deans submit and what is submitted for the institution.  The weighted average model does not automatically take into consideration changes because it is based on historical data.  There will always be manual manipulations to account for known upcoming changes (program additions, deletions, etc.).  Alison wants the council to be involved in the process as it moves through the process. This model only counts credit hours that are fundable.  The model is in no way to be utilized as a resource allocation model for the individual campus.  Tim Metz introduced his team and distributed handouts.  Each year we submit projections to the state, one year a two year projection, the next year a one projection.  This fall is the projection cycle for 2015-16 and 2016-17.  Alison Joseph presented a PowerPoint presentation with a handout of slides.  She will share the breakdown of resident and distance credit cheat sheet to help this make sense to all.  Retention is defined for these purposes as first time full time freshman – the usual definition by state, etc. |
| **Student Success/**  **Summer Session**  **(Lowell Davis)** | Lowell distributed handouts regarding **student success**, specifically the requirement of providing alternatives to success for students (e.g., a student wishing to major in nursing that is not accepted and needs to transfer into a program that will allow graduation in 4 years). Currently we do not have a clean way to do this. Please discuss with your departments that control curriculum; if you see any acceptance requirements that appear to be excessively high, please review. Please take the months of July, August and September to review and to work with Lowell and his units to remove any barriers in place that may be perceived as working against the student. We have to report this data to GA. Discussion ensued.  Regarding changes to the catalog, all deans need to respond to Lowell whether there are changes or not in that information. Lowell will send out the request electronically to be returned to him by August 1.  **Robust Summer Session** – Lowell distributed a handout regarding summer session compensation after having had meetings regarding this topic. In additional there will be a summer session task force that includes some of the individuals on this council.  According to this model, compensation would be based on rank and allow for a possible bonus for class size above the required enrollment which is still being determined. Lowell reviewed the handout. The purpose of a robust summer is to enhance time-to-degree as the first priority. We would still need to determine what graduate and undergraduate courses need to be offered, e.g., should they be predominantly Liberal Studies for undergraduates. As we increase enrollment, funds will go back to colleges and graduate stipends for summer to increase retention as well as give faculty an additional stipend to go to their college or support research.  We reviewed summer tuition at four other institutions in the UNC system – our students are paying more than three of those four, aside from Chapel Hill. This model will bring us more in line with what our peer institutions are paying. Discussion ensued.  There are issues with the College of Business and the Kimmel School regarding pay structure – it is a challenge for them to teach summer session at the current pay scale, much less if it is reduced. Kimmel School has faculty that have lucrative contract work in the summer that pays a great deal more than teaching WCU summer session. Over the past few years, summer session has been driven by the faculty. Our summer enrollment has remained flat while our peer institutions’ enrollments are declining. Our summer session tuition rates are the second most expensive in the UNC system. Some colleges don’t have a choice but to offer classes in the summer – a decision the dean will need to make. There are quite a lot of permanent salaries that are coded to summer, which is an issue for sustainability. Discussion ensued.  There were concerns voiced regarding structuring faculty pay according to rank. In years past, summer session salaries were paid in this fashion and there were complaints voiced. The concerns suggested lower rank faculty members will simply wait to teach until they attain a higher rank. Other concerns voiced regarded faculty doing the exact same level of work but being paid at a different rate. |
| **Distance Education/Liberal Studies (Susan Fouts)** | Susan distributed handouts from some data-mining Educational Outreach has done. Susan reviewed handouts with the council. We plan to continue the conversation to help these students graduate. We generally lose military students who have to go elsewhere in order to get a liberal studies course. This is a primer to our conversation as to where we want to grow distance learning strategically – having an online liberal studies program provides a strong foundation. Most categories in WCU liberal studies now have online options thanks to the deans and faculty. |