President’s Council

Meeting Summary: Wednesday, September 11, 2013, at 9:00 a.m.
Location: Alumni Board Room

Attendees:
Tony Fernández, President
Janis VanHook, President's Management Assistant
Lori Stinson, Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mary Flores, Dean for Academic Programs
Rob Lohrmeyer, Dean for Professional-Technical Programs
Kathy Martin, Dean for Community Programs and Governmental Relations
Chet Herbst, Vice President for Finance and Administration
Trudy Alva, Budget Director
Andrew Hanson, Vice President for Student Affairs
Allen Schmoock, Chief Technology Officer
Howard, Erdman, Director of Institutional Planning, Research & Assessment
Mary Hasenoehrl, Director of College Advancement
Greg Meyer, Director of College Communications
Gary Picone, Director of Athletics
Ed Miller, Faculty Senate Chair
Jeff Phelps for Traci Birdsell, Professional Staff Organization Chair
Theresa Chrisman, Classified Staff Organization Chair

1. Guests introduction and welcome

2. Updates
   a. Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council visit (Chet Herbst)
      The Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council met and tour campus capital projects on September 5.
   b. September 12 Annual Emergency Notification Drill (Chet Herbst)
   c. ASLCSC-LC Pride Initiative (Andy Hanson)
      • ASLCSC wants to increase the visibility of the college by developing as well as selling and/or giving various businesses LCSC banners.
      • ASLCSC would like to contribute to decorating the smoke stack on campus. Potential ideas include painting it with LC colors and putting some lights at the top – perhaps a lit LC sign.
      • ASLCSC would like to contribute to a campaign intended to adorn the city’s lamp posts with LC flags/banners.
   d. BSU Hooding Ceremony (Tony Fernández)
      LCSC’s spring 2014 commencement will include the BSU hooding ceremony.
   e. CMS (5%) Changeover Issues (Allen Schmoock)

The following report combines elements from:
   • Ongoing management of LCSC’s website by College Communications
• Project management of LCSC’s new website by College Communications, and
• Recommendations from the 5% committee.

This report has been approved by the webmaster and director of College Communications.

Faculty and staff departments are building their website content in LCSC’s Umbraco Content Management System (CMS), and must include standardized CMS employee profiles.
• Departments can have forms created by Umbraco’s form-creation utility (called Contour). Staff members cannot have their own website.
• Faculty members are urged to use the CMS employee profile to its fullest extent, but if they choose to have their own academic website, can use their CMS employee profile to point to that website. Faculty who need their own website have two options:
  o Use Google Sites (https://sites.google.com/a/lcmail.lcsc.edu) - a service tied to LCSC’s LCMail.
  o Request a location on the application server from the Director of College Communications.

Faculty members that wish to continue to use their current academic website should follow the webmaster’s process for migration:
• Contact Greg Meyer to describe their current site and the institution’s need to move the site to LCSC’s new application server.
• Once approved, Greg will send the relevant technical information to the IT department
• The IT department will create a folder on the application server for the academic website and copy the current version to the new folder.
• Faculty members will be able to test the copied site to verify its usefulness in the new server environment.
• **Note:** neither College Communications nor Information Technology will be available for support of individual websites.

Departments are responsible for rebuilding their web forms within the CMS using Contour and migrating any needed applications to the application server (once approved by the Director of College Communications). Some forms have programming complexities that may go beyond the training time available to most employees.

• Julie Crea, Director of Events & Campus Card Services, is willing to provide training in Contour to help departments migrate forms that she created in Microsoft FrontPage. She is working on two forms herself:
  o Professional Development & Training (PDT)
  o Physical Plant work orders
• Jason Blazzard, Professor in Business & Technology Services, has a number of applications that he is moving to his server, including the LCSC Catalog and the Curriculum Proposal System.
• Athletics Administration has outsourced its website to SIDHelp, a product of eSolutions Architects. The company website describes SIDHelp as “a customizable web application that will assist anyone that is responsible for entering and updating information for their conference, league, or school website.”
• Student Affairs uses CollegeNET to develop complex forms and deliver data. LCSC’s webmaster will be responsible for migrating two forms from CollegeNET to an LCSC application within the new CMS by December 30th.
  o Admission’s application for degree seeking students
  o Admission’s request for information
Student Affairs worked with the previous webmaster to develop two forms that capture information and requests. LCSC’s current webmaster will be responsible for rewriting these forms to be compatible with the new CMS by December 30th.

- Admission’s non-degree seeking application
- New Student Recruitment’s request for campus visitation

3. Strategic Plan

a. Program Prioritization (Lori Stinson)
   Supplemental information on Program Prioritization on page 5 of this document.

### President’s Council Discussion on Program Prioritization

- Reviewed the 5 criteria proposed to the SBOE (Based on discussions with Deans’ Council and President’s Cabinet). These are for instructional programs; non-instructional program criteria determined with VPs – same and both are noted below in this chart.
- Need to define questions to be asked to determine if a particular criterion has been met, along with the associated data points/ sources.
- Provost has met with faculty via Budget Liaison Committee of Faculty Senate; needs similar opportunities with PSO and CSO. Input from many sources is being sought and will be considered as criteria/ indicators/ data points & sources are fleshed out.
- Group discussion/ exercise:
  - 2 groups: Instructional/ non-Instructional
  - Rank criteria from most to least important
  - Determine some questions/ date points for each criterion
- Discussed timelines; deliverables to the SBOE and future processes. More to follow at a future President’s Council meeting. Individual thoughts and input are welcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Criteria</th>
<th>Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Sample Questions</th>
<th>Sample Indicators</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact [justification, and overall essentiality]</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
<td>1. How essential is the program to the current and future success of the institution (mission critical)?</td>
<td>• Degrees granted/ successful transfer • Revenue generated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Outcomes</td>
<td>1, 2, 4</td>
<td>1. What is the quality of program outcomes?</td>
<td>• Specialized accreditation • Licensure/ certification rates • Degrees granted/ successful transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Demand/ Viability</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>1. Current/ future demand for program?</td>
<td>• Occupational/ labor forecasts • Unduplicated student head count/ majors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Demand</td>
<td>2, 3, 4</td>
<td>1. What is the internal demand for courses offered to other majors</td>
<td>• Current/ historical credit hours offered to non-majors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Revenue</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>1. What is the cost of program delivery?</td>
<td>• Cost per SCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Instructional Criteria</td>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Sample Questions</td>
<td>Sample Indicators</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact [justification, and overall essentiality]</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Outcomes</td>
<td>1, 2, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Demand/Viability</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Demand</td>
<td>2, 3, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Revenue</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Other**

Mary Flores reported that a group of faculty and division chairs are participating in State Board of Education General Education Reform discussions this week in Boise.

5. **Next meeting:** Wednesday, September 18, at 9:00 a.m. in the Activity Center Conference Room.

6. **Adjournment**
Weighting the Prioritization Criteria

*Prioritizing Academic and Administrative Programs* asserts that academic programs should be assessed and analyzed using 10 core criteria, but participants at the events had varying views of the relative importance of each criterion. In order to use these 10 criteria effectively to rank programs, it's crucial to assign relative weights.

In one exercise, chief academic officers and chief financial officers from independent colleges were asked to rank the prioritization criteria in ways that made sense to their institutions; they arrived at the following rank-order:

1. External demand for the program
2. Quality of outcomes
3. Size, scope, and productivity of the program
4. Impact, justification, and overall essentiality of the program
5. Costs and other expenses associated with the program
6. Internal demand for the program
7. Revenue and other resources generated by the program
8. History, development, and expectations of the program
9. Quality of program inputs and processes
10. Opportunity analysis of the program

It should be noted, though, that some participants preferred to merge revenue and cost into a new category: "net revenue."

Sources of Data to Support Program Analysis

It is one thing to identify the most important criteria for prioritizing programs, and quite another to identify the available sources of data for use in applying the criteria. In possibly the most useful takeaway from the Academic Impressions conference in Baltimore, MD in October 2010, participants shared what sources they would use to buttress the analysis of programs, under each criterion.

**TO ANALYZE EXTERNAL DEMAND FOR THE PROGRAM**

- IPEDS Reports: Enrollments
- College Board data
- Noel-Levitz reports
- HERI reports
- Incoming transfer students
- US Department of Labor projections
- Employer feedback
- Placement office reports on placement, alumni, professional association reports
- State/regional needs; economic development data
- Student application information
- Marketing surveys, new or non-traditional students
• Offer-to-acceptance rate trends
• State and federal requirements
• Program added or cancelled at nearby rival institutions

TO ANALYZE QUALITY OF PROGRAM OUTCOMES

• Measures of graduate satisfaction
• Graduation rates
• Job placement and success; earnings reports
• Success rates on graduate examinations (GRE, LSAT, MCAT, state licensure exams)
• Graduate and professional school enrollments
• Number of graduates completing graduate and professional degrees
• Involvement in community and public service
• Recognition and awards
• Student learning outcomes, portfolio quality
• Employer satisfaction surveys
• Alumni support, donor database
• Faculty awards, prizes, professional distinction
• Graduates' publications and presentations
• Other external validation of quality

TO ANALYZE SIZE, SCOPE, AND PRODUCTIVITY OF THE PROGRAM

• Ratio of students to faculty; adherence to such formulas
• Applicant-to-capacity ratios
• Applications-to-yield, by program
• Enrollments
• Section fill rates
• Five-year graduation rates, trend-line
• Volume of sponsored research results
• Student retention rates, by program
• Number of clients served, internal and external
• Redundancy of courses across the institution
• Proportion of faculty time spent in teaching/research/service

TO ANALYZE IMPACT, JUSTIFICATION, AND OVERALL ESSENTIALITY

• Contribution to reputation
• Contribution to state's economy
• Degree to which program is "mission-critical"
• Other measures of value
• Contains elements/resources for forward-looking new programs
• Potential to become a national leader
• Contribution to the advancement of knowledge
• Long-term need versus short-term demand
• Political influence
To Analyze Costs and Expenses

- Fully allocated cost per FTE student
- Allocated institutional support (library, computing, tutoring services, other administrative support)
- Required expenses for regulatory or specialized accreditation requirements
- Marginal cost of program (Delaware Study of Instructional Costs; Control Data stores; faculty salaries, credits generated by section, capital, and equipment)
- Informational technology costs (EDUCAUSE)
- Variable costs
- Analysis of long-term versus short-term costs
- Depreciation
- Cost of duplicate or redundant courses/programs/services
- Salary benchmark data

To Analyze Internal Demand for the Program

- Student enrollments in program (Institutional Research, Registrar, Admissions)
- Programs that support majors and minors of other programs
- Level of shared curriculum with other programs; cross-listing of courses
- Program mapping of courses delivered
- Student credits generated by: major, minor, general education, service courses
- Formal interdisciplinary programs
- Patterns of student self-directed programs
- Projections of future internal demand

To Analyze Revenue and Other Resources Generated

- Tuition, program-allocated
- Grant income and F&A
- Gifts and donations, program-specific
- State or federal funding, program-specific
- Revenue from clinics, centers, other enterprises; ticket, workshop income
- Special program fee income
- Online program revenues
- Other revenues obtained

To Analyze the History, Development, and Expectations of the Program

- Historical enrollment patterns
- Alignment with mission (academic plan, business plan, annual reports, self studies, program reviews, board documents, presidential and CAO judgments, mission statements)
- Relationship to national research agenda
- Relationship to labor market data
- State requirements and goals
- External reputation as measured by state coordinating board
- Geographic uniqueness in state, region
- Legacy programs with reputation that draws students
- Incubator of institutional faculty leadership and advancement
- Degree to which program contributed (and still contributes) to institutional expectations
- Extent to which program is "core" to the educational experience
Faculty and student data over time
Does the program address critical shortage areas in the state?

TO ANALYZE QUALITY OF PROGRAM INPUTS AND PROCESSES

- Student academic profile data
- Other schools applied to and enrolled (NSLC, FAFSA, ACT, SAT sources)
- Percent of faculty with Ph.D.
- Percent of faculty with awards or other national distinction
- Quality of holdings/equipment/facilities needed to execute the program
- Program review data; specialized program accreditation
- Faculty expertise in teaching methodologies
- Faculty experience

FOR OPPORTUNITY ANALYSIS

- New program opportunity: potential net revenues, potential for "signature" program status; potential for unique niche programs
- Exploration of alternative delivery mechanisms
- Formation of productive external partnerships and collaborations
- Potential for interdisciplinary programs
- Opportunity to realign or strengthen existing programs
- Specialized programs for key stakeholders

ADDITIONAL (NATIONAL) DATA SOURCES

- FAFSA data
- NSLC
- ACT/SAT
- AGB Information Mosaic
- NSSE Reports
- CIC: KIT and FIT Reports
- National College Health Assessment
- CUPA data
- AAUP Salary data
- IPEDS peer analysis tool; peer executive tool
- SCUP
- APAA
- EDUCAUSE
- Bond ratings from Moody’s, Standard and Poor’s

Other Issues that Surface when Setting Priorities

As might be expected, participants also raised additional questions specific to their institutions, including whether a school or college should undertake prioritization even if the university as a whole does not, whether to use one or two steering committees to review academic and non-academic programs, and how to strengthen the relationship between the CAO and the CFO during the process.