October 17, 2013

University Planning Council

Minutes for October 17, 2013

In attendance: Anne Ponder, Gregg Kormanik, Melodie Galloway, Keith Ray, Don Diefenbach, Ellen Pearson, Shannon Earle, Leigh Whittaker, Stephanie Watkins-Cruz, Jane Fernandes, John Pierce, Bill Haggard, Buffy Bagwell, Christine Riley, Jessica Dunsmore

Guests: Greg Carter, Debbie Griffith, Sonia Marcus, Jill Moffit

Absent: Rob Bowen, Scott Walters, Fred Santos, Catherine Frank, Ann Marin, Jeff Brown, Nicole Norian

Staff: Elizabeth Becker

1. Chancellor's Update. Chancellor Ponder welcomed the Strategic Plan Benchmark Coordinators leaders in attendance.

a. UNC-TV is producing a series on each of the campuses in the system. The final product will be 6-7 minutes long and will include faculty and student interviews.

b. The update from the recent Board of Governor’s meeting includes the approval of the university’s $1.2 million land acquisition from UNC Asheville Foundation. The next steps are with the Office of State Property, Governmental Operations, Council of State and finally the Attorney General's Office. This group and others will be involved in recommending how the property will be used when we activate the comprehensive planning process.

2. Review of Updated Strategic Plan Benchmarks. Christine Riley reviewed the background for the strategic plan and the benchmarks with the group. The current strategic plan has been affirmed by UPC and the Board of Trustees for the next five years. Strategic Plan Workgroup leaders have been reviewing and revising the next generation of benchmarks. UPC has the opportunity to review proposed benchmarks and provide feedback before the revisions are brought to the Board of Trustees in December.

Strategic Plan Dashboard feedback from UPC members to Workgroup Leaders

Goal: Undergraduate Research:

The Annual report undergraduate research goal is a good addition. We will seek to have one for all of the goals.

Goal: Diversity & Inclusion:

a. Membership: Data on membership among people from underrepresented groups is a double edged
sword. It is good to measure, but it is not a great recruiting point. UNC Asheville is showing gradual improvements on this metric. Students recommended keeping the metric on underrepresented groups; it will encourage us to keep working on it.

b. Turnover: Use the term “retention” among Faculty and Staff rather than “turnover” and reverse the numbers. Make it parallel to data on student retention.

c. Recommended not including the "welcoming place to learn/teach/work" metric. Good candidates for employment review and study the strategic plan. Some do not like the phrasing of "welcoming place." Perhaps it’s the target that’s misleading? It reads negative, and gives no context. We do not have all the information that we need to understand the information. Compare our data with other PWI's (Predominantly White Institutions)? The language takes us away from the fact that most people who self-identified as underrepresented report feeling welcome here. We are clear that we want to do better. What is a good appropriate metric? Suggest adding a Reference point: Compare responses to this question from those who identify as underrepresented with responses from those who do not. The reader would know whether the results are better or worse for underrepresented groups than the overall campus. It would provide context.

Goal: Undergraduate Education:

a. Suggestion for new metric: Inter-disciplinary learning, as stated in the goal, is not measured here. There is a NSSE question for this [something like, “used information from a variety of courses to problem solve in academic work”] – consider using it?

b. Academic Challenge: how does NSSE measure Academic Challenge? It’s an indirect measure that uses self-reporting, student perceptions, observations. It is nationally normed data. Jessica Dunsmore will send the survey to the group.

- UPC students felt these results do not reflect the rigor of UNC Asheville. Is there a better measure? Would sophomores & juniors be in a better position to assess this?
- The metric is confusing. Are our students saying it was too hard or too easy? On the dashboard, we need to do a better job of describing what this metric tells us. Ask workgroup to recommend something?
- Also consider using NSSE question results on, “worked harder than I thought I could,” rather than the group of questions around academic challenge [that include “number of papers written,” etc.].
- Should we also be measuring freshmen perception? Only seniors are reported on the academic challenge benchmark. Sophomores and juniors might be a better measure, but we would not have any national data to compare ourselves to. The student UPC members both thought this result under-reported the academic rigor here. Not representative of their experience. What would get at this better?
- Administer our own survey? Sophomore and junior year are different. Ask students to reflect on their year.
- Should we remove the metric on academic challenge? No consensus. Refer to the workgroup to consider.

c. Define and measure “interdisciplinary;” one way to demonstrate that would be to link to the various programs and initiatives that demonstrate this.

Goal: Greater Asheville:

a. Consider adding indicator for percentage of students living in greater Asheville.
b. Add percentage sign to faculty and staff community service metric.

c. Annie Burton’s SCOPP survey asks a series of questions to differentiate different kinds of service. Send database survey link to UPC for help in getting others to complete it.

**Goal: Economic sustainability:**

a. Alumni Giving: Alumni data is understandable given our size and age as an institution. Dashboard shows green, because we exceeded our goal. But, we won't be ready for a capital campaign until we’ve doubled our alumni giving percentage. We are sending a mixed message: We encourage Alums to donate, yet our dashboard shows green which means we have accomplished our goal. Is there another benchmark to add [perhaps using COPLAC schools as a comparison] to show that we still have further to go?

b. Alumni Giving: Data is in ‘actual’ column for future years; needs to be moved to ‘target’ column. We have a small alumni base; can we elaborate on the numbers?

**Goal: Environmental Sustainability:**

a. The Campus Master Plan sustainability work group will now be advising the Director of Sustainability, Sonia Marcus.

b. Consider pulling forward some additional STARS metrics that are particularly compelling?

c. Consider adding a metric for levels of engagement in sustainability, or the sustainability literacy of our seniors, etc. Sonia and the advisory group will consider if there is one more metric to add under Environmental Sustainability this fall.

**Are there things that are missing?**

a. Create a measure of the health of our students, faculty and staff. Might this be part of social sustainability?

**Any we need to remove?**

a. Social Sustainability: Salary, metric tracks a variable that is mostly beyond our control. This measure hurts recruitment efforts, especially for faculty and staff from underrepresented groups. Salary information is public anyway. We should include it if we have control; if we don't have control, then remove from dashboard.
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