

**Strategic Planning Committee
of the
BOARD OF REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

AGENDA & NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING

CONDUCTED VIA TELECONFERENCE ORIGINATING FROM
1ST FLOOR BOARDROOM, 39 WOODLAND STREET, HARTFORD, CT

11:30 a.m., Thursday, April 11, 2013

A meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee of the Board of Regents for Higher Education will be held at 11:30 a.m. on Thursday, April 11, 2013, originating from the 1st floor Boardroom at 39 Woodland Street, Hartford, CT. The agenda for the meeting is below.

- A. Call to Order
- B. Approval of previous meeting minutes – [September 10, 2012](#)
- C. Review Metrics report
- D. Goal 4--Innovation and Economic Growth (identifying definitions; what we are trying to achieve)
- E. Development of metrics
- F. Management Updates
- G. Future Meetings
- H. Adjourn

s:\board of regents\strategic planning committee\2013\april 11 spec\spc-agenda-04-11-2013.doc

Board members - Strategic Planning Committee

Dr. René Lerer, Chair
Nicholas M. Donofrio
Matt Fleury
Merle Harris
Michael Pollard

ITEM

Report from the metrics work group

RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE ACTION

Management recommends the Strategic Planning Committee

- accept the work group's report following review by the Committee
- discuss some aspects of the goal statements and proposed metrics
- endorse the work group's plan to disseminate the report to faculty, staff, and students to collect comments on the metrics

Deferral of Committee action until early May to recommend adoption of metrics to the full Board would allow for sufficient time for the comment period recommended in the report.

BACKGROUND

The BOR resolution taken on September 25, 2012 adopting components of the strategic plan also directed the BOR president to form a working group to develop strategic indicators for each of the five goals.¹ The attached report provides a description of the work group's composition, deliberations, and recommendations for metrics to monitor success on the high level goals identified in the components of the strategic plan approved by the Board.

¹ Two related directives were also issued: (1) Discuss the vision, mission and goals (VMG) with the Faculty Advisory Committee, the Student Advisory Committee, the Council of Presidents and other stakeholders and (3) Form five working groups (one for each of the above ConnSCU goal areas) to identify the high level strategies that drive success on that goal. The discussion of vision, mission, and goals has been ongoing. The five working groups will have members identified over the course of the summer, with inaugural meetings in August 2013.

Report of the

Strategic Plan Metrics Work Group

April 2013



CONNECTICUT STATE
COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Strategic Plan Metrics Work Group Report

On September 25, 2012 the Connecticut Board of Regents for Higher Education (BOR) adopted several components of a strategic plan including a Vision for Connecticut, a Vision for the Connecticut State Colleges and Universities (ConnSCU), a mission for ConnSCU, and five goals. The Board also resolved to form a working group to develop strategic indicators for each of the five goals.¹

Following a review of the goals of the plan, data about the state colleges and universities, and principles for metrics selection, the group proposed 3-5 metrics for each goal, factors to be considered in the selection of comparison institutions, and a plan for communication. This report details these recommendations.

Members

Peter Bachiochi, Professor of Psychology, Eastern CSU
Robert Baer, Dean of Students, Norwalk CC
David England, Dean of Inst Effectiveness, Tunxis CC
Gena Glickman, President, Manchester CC
Oz Griebel, President & Chief Executive Officer, Metro Hartford Alliance
Dorsey Kendrick, President, Gateway CC
Marianne Kennedy, Provost, Southern CSU
Ed Klonoski, President, Charter Oak State College
Brian Donohue Lynch, Professor of Anthropology & Sociology, Quinebaug Valley CC
Barbara McCarthy, Academic Dean, Asnuntuck CC
Jack Miller, President, Central CSU
Jay Morris, Vice President of Education & Institute of Excellence, Yale New Haven Hospital
Wilfredo Nieves, President, Capital CC
Michael Pascetta, SVP, Chief Financial & Administrative Officer, Women's Health USA
Tom Phillips, President & Chief Executive Officer, Capital Workforce Partners
Paul Reis, Chief Financial Officer, Western CSU
Leonora Valvo, Chief Executive Officer, eTouches

Board of Regents and Management/Staff Participants:

René Lerer, Chair of the BOR Strategic Planning Committee and Executive Chairman
Dennis Murphy, Interim Chief of Staff, BOR and Deputy Commission of Labor
Braden Hosch, Director of Policy and Research and Interim Director of Academic Affairs, BOR
Annmarie Davis, Office of Policy and Research, BOR

¹ Board of Regents for Higher Education (2012). Meeting minutes from September 25, 2012. Retrieved March 20, 2013 from http://www.ct.edu/images/uploads/BOR_092512_MINUTES.pdf#page=5.

Principles for Selection of Metrics

During the first meeting, the group reviewed principles for selection of metrics. These metrics are intended to serve as high level indicators for the BOR to monitor progress on established goals. These principles were that metrics should:

- Be meaningful – provide a limited number of high-level information points to decision makers
- Be indicative – show progress but not necessarily exhaustive; may not provide full diagnostics
- Be valid – measure what claimed to represent
- Be reliable – provide consistent results over time, have consistent definitions that allow for independent measurement or validation
- Have readily available comparative data
- Provide information for which the value is equal to or greater than the cost for collection
- Be sensitive to institutional actions – actions taken by institutions must be able to affect the metric

Process

The group met three times: November 19, December 12, and February 27. At the first meeting, the group reviewed 13 accountability measures approved by the Higher Education Coordinating Council in November 2012 because of their close alignment with the strategic plan. The group also proposed 81 additional indicators for consideration. These indicators were placed into an online survey tool, and group members were asked to rate each indicator. This list was ranked and returned to the group to focus discussion in the December and February meetings. The group arrived at three to five recommended metrics for goals 1-4 and six disaggregations for goal 5.

Recommended metrics

Goal 1: A Successful First Year

Increase the number of students who successfully complete a first year of college

- Percent of full-time, first-time degree- or certificate-seeking students retained one year
- Percent of part-time, first-time degree- or certificate-seeking students retained one year
- Number of first-time degree- or certificate-seeking students completing college-level English and math within one year
- Percent of first-time degree- or certificate-seeking students completing college-level English and math within one year

Goal 2: Student Success

Graduate more students with the knowledge and skills to achieve their life and career goal

- Undergraduate completions per 100 undergraduate degree-seeking FTE enrollment
- Graduate student completions per 100 FTE graduate enrollment
- Transfers from 2-year institutions to 4-year institutions per 100 FTE
- Graduation rate of full-time, first-time degree- or certificate-seeking students (150% normal time for 4-year institutions, 200% of normal time for 2-year institutions)
- Average time (years) to degree for students entering full-time (disaggregated by first-time / transfer)

Goal 3: Affordability and Sustainability

Maximize access to higher education by making attendance affordable and our institutions financially sustainable

- State and local appropriations per completion and per FTE enrollment
- Education and related expenses per completion and per FTE enrollment
- Instructional expenditures as a percent of Education & Related spending
- Percent of tuition & required fees not covered by grant aid for students receiving aid

Goal 4: Innovation and Economic Growth

Create educational environments that cultivate innovation and prepare students for successful careers in a fast changing world.

- Student performance/proficiency on all or selected TAP competencies
- Completions in fields with high workforce demand: STEM, health, education (high workforce demand may be informed by the environment and periodically adjusted)
- Total research expenditures per full-time faculty

Also considered but had problems with reliability, validity, or both:

- Number of students enrolled in Clinical, Internship, Service Learning, International and COOP programs
- Number of partnerships with business and industry
- Faculty and staff engagement in professional development and research (different criteria based on mission)
- Degrees and Certificates awarded in areas of regional economic need

Goal 5: Equity

Eliminate achievement disparities among different ethnic/racial, economic, and gender groups.

Disaggregate by:

Race/ethnicity

- Black or African American (14.8%)
- Hispanic (16.9%)
- White (62.7%)

(add note that data for other groups are collected but not presented on the dashboard because small cell sizes make them unreliable as metrics)

Gender

- Men (41.6%)
- Women (58.4%)

Socioeconomic Status

- Pell Recipients (36.1%, 2010-11, undergraduate only)

Characteristics for Consideration in Generating Comparison Groups

Student characteristics:

- Race/Ethnicity
- Socioeconomic status (percent of Pell recipients)
- Age (traditional vs. non-traditional)
- Residential/commuter mix
- Undergraduate/graduate mix
- Full-time/part-time mix

Institutional characteristics:

- Governance
- Location
- Cost
- Size
- Funding structure (state vs. local funding)
- Mission (comprehensive/technical)
- Carnegie Classification
- Urban/Suburban/Rural
- Level of degree offerings
- Multi-campus vs. single structure
- Full-time/part-time faculty mix

Recommended plan for communication

Metrics should be valid, reliable, and have benchmark data available.

Matrix of Goals and Metrics

Goal and Metrics	Main Metric	<i>Goal 5: Equity</i>					
		Eliminate achievement disparities among different ethnic/racial, economic, and gender groups.					
		Race/Ethnicity			Gender		Socioeconomic Status
		Black or African American	Hispanic	White	Men	Women	Pell Recipients
<i>Goal 1: A Successful First Year</i> Increase the number of students who successfully complete a first year of college							
Percent of full-time, first-time degree- or certificate-seeking students retained one year	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Percent of part-time, first-time degree- or certificate-seeking students retained one year	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Number of first-time degree- or certificate-seeking students completing college-level English and math within one year	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Percent of first-time degree- or certificate-seeking students completing college-level English and math within one year	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Goal 2: Student Success</i> Graduate more students with the knowledge and skills to achieve their life and career goal							
Undergraduate completions per 100 undergraduate degree-seeking FTE enrollment	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Graduate student completions per 100 FTE graduate enrollment	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Transfers from 2-year institutions to 4-year institutions per 100 FTE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Graduation rate of full-time, first-time degree- or certificate-seeking students (150% normal time for 4-year institutions, 200% of normal time for 2-year institutions)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Average time (years) to degree for students entering full-time (disaggregated by first-time / transfer)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Goal and Metrics	Main Metric	Goal 5: Equity					
		Eliminate achievement disparities among different ethnic/racial, economic, and gender groups.					
		Race/Ethnicity			Gender		Socioeconomic Status
		Black or African American	Hispanic	White	Men	Women	Pell Recipients
Goal 3: Affordability and Sustainability							
Maximize access to higher education by making attendance affordable and our institutions financially sustainable							
State and local appropriations per completion and per FTE enrollment	X						
Education and related expenses per completion and per FTE enrollment	X						
Instructional expenditures as a percent of Education & Related spending	X						
Percent of tuition & required fees not covered by grant aid for students with demonstrated need	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Goal 4: Innovation and Economic Growth							
Create educational environments that cultivate innovation and prepare students for successful careers in a fast changing world.							
Student performance/proficiency on all or selected TAP competencies	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Completions in fields with high workforce demand: STEM, health, education (high workforce demand may be informed by the environment and periodically adjusted)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Total research expenditures per full-time faculty	X						

BOR Strategic Plan Metrics Workgroup
Meeting Notes – November 19, 2012

Present: Peter Bachiochi (ECSU), Robert Baer (Norwalk CC), David England (Tunxis CC), Gena Glickman (Manchester CC), Oz Griebel (Metro Hartford Alliance), Braden Hosch (BOR), Ed Klonoski (Charter Oak State College), René Lerer (BOR), Barbara McCarthy (Asnuntuck CC), Jack Miller (CCSU), Jay Morris (Yale-New Haven Hospital), Dennis Murphy (BOR), Wilfredo Nieves (Capital CC), Michael Pascetta (Women's Health USA), Tom Phillips (Capital Workforce Partners), Paul Reis (WCSU), Leonora Valvo (eTouches)

Phone: Dorsey Kendrick (Gateway CC), and Brian Donohue-Lynch (Quinebaug Valley CC)

Unable to attend: Marianne Kennedy (SCSU), Ralph Tyler (Housatonic CC)

R. Lerer welcomed everyone. Introductions were made.

Opening Remarks

R. Lerer gave a brief explanation of the formation of the Strategic Planning Committee and how they were tasked to come up with a 5-year strategic plan based on the mission and vision of ConnSCU and the State. The BOR Strategic Planning Committee consists of Regents René Lerer (Chair), Nicholas Donofrio, Matt Fleury, Merle Harris, and Michael Pollard.

The goal of the workgroup is to gel as a group, identify key indicators to be measured, develop high level metrics, review and clean up the metrics, reconstruct/redistribute metrics, and then reconvene in December.

Background Information

B. Hosch provided background information via handouts and a PowerPoint presentation, which included information and charts regarding state trends, increase in student charges, CT high school grads, CSU grad student headcount/enrollment, ConnSCU fall headcounts 1993-2011, Charter Oak enrollment, and completion rates.

Questions/Comments

J. Miller stated that his CFO and others have had similar discussions about the tasks at hand for the workgroup. R. Lerer responded that in order to have a financial plan, one must have a strategic plan and that they need to link this strategy.

Via phone, B. Donohue-Lynch stated that there are certainly differences between the various institutions' goals and strategies which are unique to local economies and demographics. This will be a challenge for community colleges versus universities. R. Lerer responded that we are charged by the Governor and Legislature to have a successful program and we need a statewide approach.

Metrics Workgroup Goals

Identify metrics to arrive at established goals. What are we going to measure? We are orienting everyone to the process. We need to review strategy framework – mission, vision, goals. We need to determine the appropriateness of the metrics and indicators for ConnSCU. Propose others to the group.

B. Hosch went over the following:

Terminology

Definitions for the following were discussed - Vision, mission, goals/outcomes, measure, metrics, and targets.

Principles

Must be meaningful, indicative, valid, reliable, have comparative data, have valuable information, be sensitive.

Workgroup Guidelines

Sept. 15 – meeting of Strategic Planning Committee

November 19 – First meeting of Strategic Plan Workgroup

December xx – Define metrics

December/January – Redefine/Reconstruct

January 17 – Present to Board of Regents

Vision & Mission

O. Griebel emphasized that analytical skills are highly needed for Connecticut to be a globally competitive entity and workforce with a value to its students.

Initial Discussion of Metrics on Five Goals

Goal # 1 – A Successful First Year

- Identify what credits are – towards grad?
- Are transfer students being counted? Charter Oak is 100% transfer students. Perhaps remove the language “1st academic year”.
- For this indicator metric should disaggregate populations by entry status (first-time/transfer) and enrollment status (full-time/part-time)
- Where do we fall within all other states?
- Retention/# who completes first semester
- Pre-College characteristics
- Measures – attendance, mid-term grades, use these to get student from semester to semester

FLIP CHART NOTES – Goal #1

- Persistence rate (retention?)
- # who complete first semester
- What is definition of success? Grade? “Cs”? “Ds” aren’t transferrable. This is more an institution question.
- Should students declare a major at the end of their first year?

- Not getting into GRADES but emphasizing COMPETENCIES (see goal #2)
- We want students to pass successfully – Passing is a “D”. Should it be “C” or better to graduate?
- Quality of student success – will they be able to participate in a global unprecedented market?

Goal # 2 – Student Success

- Employable/Self-sufficient – Is employment/earnings after graduation measurable?
- Knowledge and skills – need something beyond just good grades. Need to graduate being job ready and able to hit the ground running. The TAP standard is fuzzier than just being workforce ready. Students train for jobs that don’t yet exist and/or they graduate into jobs which have obsolete technology for which they just learned.
- Distinction between a student with a focused track versus a less focused track

FLIP CHART NOTES – Goal #2

- Average time and average credits to credential – what is average time to reach goals? Is this helpful?
- Allow flexibility to students /offerings
- Competencies

Goal # 3 – Affordability and Sustainability

- “Bend the trend” to control costs
- Median household income differs from town to town
- State framework metrics of revenue and expenditures derive from Delta Cost Project
 - State and local appropriations per completion and per 100 FTE enrollment
 - Education and related expenses per completion and per FTE enrollment
 - Instructional expenditures as a percent of Education & Related spending

FLIP CHART NOTES – Goal #3

- % of student need not covered by grants
- Per capita debt on graduation
- Foundation support for tuition/cost
- Increase in Tuition/Fees versus inflation

Goal # 4 – Innovation and Economic Growth

- Who looks at/measures future trends, high-work demand?
- Business partnerships are a good measure
- Internships

FLIP CHART NOTES – Goal #4

- # of employer input opportunities of program development
- Move to straight competencies
- Alternate degree paths
- Measure placements in STEM, health, education

Goal # 5 – Equity

- Achievement gap -- Disaggregate on basis of race/ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status where possible.
- Life goals/Good citizen? No – Has to be quantifiable.

FLIP CHART NOTES – Goal #5

- % of enrollment of groups

A copy of what was discussed will be distributed. We would like to come up with ways to provide tools to students for workplace and life. Any comments/thoughts are to be sent to Braden Hosch (hoschb@ct.edu)

We will reconvene in December. Thank you to all who participated!

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Annie Davis
Executive Assistant
BOR – Office of Policy and Research

BOR Strategic Plan Metrics Workgroup
Meeting Notes – December 12, 2012

Present: Peter Bachiochi (ECSU), Robert Baer (Norwalk CC), David England (Tunxis CC), Gena Glickman (Manchester CC), Braden Hosch (BOR), Marianne Kennedy (SCSU), Ed Klonoski (Charter Oak State College), Rene Lerer (BOR), Barbara McCarthy (Asnuntuck CC), Jack Miller (CCSU), Jay Morris (Yale-New Haven Hospital), Wilfredo Nieves (Capital CC), Tom Phillips (Capital Workforce Partners), Paul Reis (WCSU)

Phone In: Dorsey Kendrick (Gateway CC), Brian Donohue Lynch (Quinebaug Valley CC), and Michael Pascetta (Women's Health USA)

Absent: Oz Griebel (Metro Hartford Alliance), Dennis Murphy (BOR), Lenora Valvo (eTouches)

Braden Hosch welcomed everyone. The meeting started at 9:02 a.m.

Review and Approve Meeting Notes

The meeting notes were approved unanimously.

Recap from November Meeting

R. Lerer welcomed everyone and thanked them for attending. He stated that he thought that the November meeting went well. He affirmed there are differences in each environment and these will be acknowledged, but the Board has some need to aggregate to a state level. With goals, we are accountable to the state and accountable to an overall budget. Today's goal is to reach a level of agreement in the key metrics. W. Nieves indicated that at least on metric should address non-credit programs. President Glickman stated that the metrics should be separated by segment and that some metrics weren't clear in their meaning.

Review of Metrics Survey – Identify Items to Shelve

B. Hosch gave an overview of the principles for metrics selection. The timeframe, generally speaking, is on an annual cycle. We need a way to report trends. For now we will identify metrics, and then we will determine the timeframe.

B. Hosch reviewed indicator ratings and goals. There was concern that perhaps the same question was asked three different ways. There should be three tiers – community colleges, state universities, and Charter Oak. R. Lerer reiterated that we must learn to “step out of the box” and ask does this benefit the system and the state.

J. Miller stated that he is already witnessing negativity from his faculty. There should be a limited set of metrics that the BOR deems appropriate and important, and then the institutions can pick the additional metrics that apply to them.

Discussion of Items to Forward to Strategic Planning Committee

Goals and Metrics Review in the order in which they were discussed:

Goal #5

Equity – Eliminate achievement disparities among different ethnic/racial, economic, and gender groups.

It was agreed to remove the disaggregation by age -- though interesting it shouldn't be a strategic focus. Both race/ethnicity and gender are critical measures. The low proportion of students identified as Asian (3.3%) and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders (0.2%) make disaggregation by these categories impracticable.

Decision:

Monitor equity by disaggregating metrics by the following breakdowns:

Race/ethnicity:

- Black or African American (14.8%)
- Hispanic (16.9%)
- White (62.7%)

(add note for why other groups are not included)

Gender:

- Men (41.6%)
- Women (58.4%)

Socioeconomic Status:

- Pell Recipients (36.1%, 2010-11, undergraduate only)

(percentages refer to fall 2012 headcount enrollment distribution across all 17 institutions to offer a general indication of proportions, although institutional proportions vary)

Goal #1

A Successful First Year – Increase the number of students who successfully complete a first year of college.

Discussion revolved around a number of questions:

- How does one define success?
- What is the "first year" of college?
- Should success be defined in reference to a student's goals?

R. Lerer reiterated that there has to be a metric for the system. We have to determine if we are successful as a state, this must be presentable to the state. B. Hosch stated that for today let's aim for 1 to 3 metrics per goal to build a framework. We can reaffirm what additional items can be added per institution. P. Bachiochi stated that the Faculty Advisory Committee wants to be involved in the metrics; however, they don't want to develop them. The BOR should

determine what they want to see for performance – the state has the right to determine what is right and what is important.

Decision:

Monitor first-year success through the following four metrics:

- Percent of full-time, first-time degree- or certificate-seeking students retained one year
- Percent of part-time, first-time degree- or certificate-seeking students retained one year
- Number of first-time degree- or certificate-seeking students completing college-level English and math within one year
- Percent of first-time degree- or certificate-seeking students completing college-level English and math within one year

Goal #3

Affordability and Sustainability – Maximize access to higher education by making attendance affordable and our institutions financially stable.

There was general agreement on financial metrics, with the group selecting the top three rated items for institutional sustainability; these metrics derive from the Delta Cost Project. The group also endorsed construction of a metric for affordability about the percent of need not covered by grants.

Decision:

Monitor affordability and sustainability through the following metrics:

- State and local appropriations per completion and per FTE enrollment
- Education and related expenses per completion and per FTE enrollment
- Instructional expenditures as a percent of Education & Related spending
- Percent of tuition & required fees not covered by grant aid

Goal #4

Innovation and Economic Growth – Create educational environments that cultivate innovation and prepare students for successful careers in a fast changing world.

The group did not reach agreement about how to monitor progress on the goal for innovation and economic growth.

Questions considered:

- How do we measure innovative and creative students – the entrepreneurial and “thinking” students?
- Competencies should be included, but how?
- What is the number of high-level students involved in innovative/learning emporiums, involved in research?
- Because innovation is by definition new, how do we establish criteria for measuring it?

No Decision Was Reached:

The group will re-visit this goal in January. Metrics receiving the most attention:

- Number of students enrolled in high impact educational practices (e.g. Clinical, Internship, Service Learning, International, research with faculty, and COOP programs)
- Faculty and staff engagement in professional development and research (different criteria based on mission)
- Number of partnerships with business and industry
- Number of partnerships with K-12
- Total research expenditures per full-time faculty
- Number/percentage of students involved in research with faculty

Goal #2

Student Success – Graduate more students with the knowledge and skills to achieve their life and career goals.

There was no time to review metrics associated with this goal. The group will review this in January.

Characteristics for Consideration in Generating Comparison Groups

B. Hosch distributed a plan to identify comparison groups. This plan calls for identification of characteristics to be considered when selecting comparison institutions, weighting of the list by presidents and other groups, generation of initial lists from IPEDS data, review of lists, and approval of lists by the BOR strategic planning committee.

The group proposed consideration of the following characteristics:

- Student characteristics:
 - Race/Ethnicity
 - Socioeconomic status (percent of Pell recipients)
 - Age (traditional vs. non-traditional)
 - Residential/commuter mix
 - Undergraduate/graduate mix
 - Full-time/part-time mix
- Institutional characteristics
 - Governance
 - Location
 - Cost
 - Size
 - Funding structure (state vs. local funding)
 - Mission (comprehensive/technical)
 - Carnegie Classification
 - Urban/Suburban/Rural
 - Level of degree offerings
 - Multi-campus vs. single structure
 - Full-time/part-time faculty mix

We will rate these and finalize a list by the January meeting (TBD).

Wrap-Up

A process to present these should be developed. President Glickman offered that some facilitation of discussion should occur in breakout sessions in an open environment. Institutions should understand they are still independent, still have their own missions, strategic plans, and goals as well as their own corresponding metrics to monitor their success.

Nevertheless, there must be some common ground where the Board has established priorities, and the process going forward should preserve progress to date, while maintaining some flexibility around metrics. Even going forward, metrics may remain “tweakable.”

B. Hosch stated that we would be in touch to determine the date/time of the January meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Annie Davis

Annie Davis

BOR – Office of Policy and Research

BOR Strategic Plan Metrics Workgroup
Meeting Notes – February 27, 2013

Present: Peter Bachiochi (ECSU), David England (Tunxis CC), Gena Glickman (Manchester CC), Oz Griebel (Metro Hartford Alliance), Braden Hosch (BOR), Marianne Kennedy (SCSU), Ed Klonoski (Charter Oak State College), Brian Donohue Lynch (Quinebaug Valley CC), Barbara McCarthy (Asnuntuck CC), Jack Miller (CCSU), Jay Morris (Yale-New Haven Hospital), Wilfredo Nieves (Capital CC), Paul Reis (WCSU)

Phone In: Dorsey Kendrick (Gateway CC), Leonora Valvo (eTouches)

Absent: Robert Baer (Norwalk CC), René Lerer (BOR), Tom Phillips (Capital Workforce Partners)

The meeting started at 10:00 a.m. B. Hosch welcomed everyone and provided an overview of the meeting agenda: 1) review and approval of draft meeting notes, 2) identify metrics for Goals 4 and 2, and 3) discuss the roll out of our recommendations to the Board.

Review and Approve Meeting Notes of 12/12/12

- The group agreed to remove the disaggregation by age.
- The group discussed feedback about a preliminary decision not to include Asian as a disaggregation. Discussion indicated that the number remained too small to meet the criterion for reliability but the group recommended adding a note that these figures are tracked.
- The group confirmed that metrics for a successful first-year should be limited to first-time students and so would not apply to Charter Oak.
- A discussion ensued regarding college readiness and how it differs from success. Is there a difference between 1st time and transfer students as it applies to success/career path?
- Because cost of attendance budgets are not calculated in a uniform way, the group modified an affordability indicator under Goal #3 to replace need covered by financial aid to Percent of tuition and fees not covered by grant aid for students receiving aid

On a motion made by Ed Klonoski, seconded by David England, the meeting notes were approved unanimously.

Discussion of High-Level Metrics

Goal #4 – Innovation and Economic Growth – *Create educational environments that cultivate innovation and prepare students for successful careers in a fast changing world. Maximize access to higher education by making attendance affordable and our institutions financially sustainable.*

Group discussion identified disparate interpretations of innovation and the difficulties of measuring this. O. Griebel stated that, from a business perspective, innovation should be based on the job, job growth, projections. B. Lynch stated that, from a community college perspective, that innovation is hard to define – while there is value at the academic level it is difficult to fund “pioneering” programs. D. Kendrick concurred. She adamantly encourages entrepreneurship, innovation, and creativity. Collaboration and partnerships are key. It would be beneficial to have our institutions meet with the business sector to allow them to define their needs. We need to create and promote an environment that will allow us to work collectively with the business sector and other institutions. What is the skill set for a “fast changing world”? Ensuing discussion coalesced around the notion that student abilities and competencies were the foundation of cultivating innovation and that the competencies identified in the Transfer and Articulation Framework should serve as the basis for measuring this. These competencies are also closely aligned with student success.

Recommended indicators:

- Student performance/proficiency on all or selected TAP competencies
- Completions in fields with high workforce demand: STEM, health, education (high workforce demand may be informed by the environment and periodically adjusted)
- Total research expenditures per full-time faculty

Also considered but had problems with reliability, validity, or both:

- Number of students enrolled in Clinical, Internship, Service Learning, International and COOP programs
- Number of partnerships with business and industry
- Faculty and staff engagement in professional development and research (different criteria based on mission)
- Degrees and Certificates awarded in areas of regional economic need

Goal #2 – Student Success – *Graduate more students with the knowledge and skills to achieve their life and career goal.*

After much discussion regarding quantitative/qualitative measures, TAP competencies, the counting of transfer students, completion rates, measuring outstanding debt, the inclusion of non-credit activity, the inclusion of certified learning, the inclusion of grad students, internships, the following was agreed upon:

Recommended indicators:

- Undergraduate completions per 100 undergraduate degree-seeking FTE enrollment
- Graduate student completions per 100 FTE graduate enrollment
- Transfers from 2-year institutions to 4-year institutions per 100 FTE
- Graduation rate of full-time, first-time degree- or certificate-seeking students (150% normal time for 4-year institutions, 200% of normal time for 2-year institutions)

- Average time (years) to degree for students entering full-time (disaggregated by first-time / transfer)

Other changes to goals include:

*Goal #3 – **Affordability and Sustainability** – Maximize access to higher education by making attendance affordable and our institutions financially sustainable.*

Adding: Percent of tuition & required fees not covered by grant aid for students with demonstrated need.

B. Hosch stated to the group how pleased he was of the progress made at today's meeting. The goals and metrics developed are very reasonable. He thanked the group for their efforts and input. The plan for presenting this to the BOR is to draft a final report, have the workgroup review, forward to the Strategic Plan Committee, BOR will make decision to adopt.

Recommended plan for communication – the draft metrics should be circulated for feedback with specific instructions. Draft metrics represent a selected 3-5 high-level indicators per goal; they suggest progress but do not intend to capture the totality of activity. For people who want to make suggestions, they should identify a metric to remove (with a justification) and then propose a well-defined specific replacement, including the data source. Metrics should be valid, reliable, and have benchmark data available.

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Annie Davis

Annie Davis

BOR – Office of Policy and Research

The Components of the Strategic Plan

- Vision for the state as a whole
- Vision and Mission for ConnSCU
- Five Goals

Our Vision for Connecticut

- A continually increasing share of Connecticut's population will have a high quality post-secondary education that enables them to achieve their life and career goals and makes Connecticut a place of engaged, globally competitive communities

Our Vision for ConnSCU

- Connecticut State Colleges and Universities will continually increase the number of students completing personally and professionally rewarding academic programs

ConnSCU's Mission

Connecticut State Colleges and Universities provide affordable, innovative and rigorous programs in settings that permit an ever increasing number of students to achieve their personal and career goals as well as contribute to the economic growth of the state of Connecticut

Why this Vision and Mission?

- ConnSCU institutions have long been the affordable provider of high quality post-secondary education for the largest segment of college-going Connecticut residents.
- ConnSCU has the mission, resources and scale to meet the increasing demand for post-secondary education.
- Almost all ConnSCU students come from Connecticut and stay here after graduation.
- Life and career challenges are continually increasing the demands on Connecticut residents for rigorous and relevant knowledge and skills. Completion alone is not enough; continual improvement in the quality and relevance of education programs must go hand-in-hand.
- Increasing the number of our graduates will have an economic multiplier effect that creates a significant benefit to our state as a whole.

ConnSCU Mission and Goals

MISSION

Provide affordable, innovative and rigorous programs in settings that permit an ever-increasing number of students to achieve their personal and career goals as well as contribute to economic growth of the state of CT

A Successful First Year

Increase the number of students who successfully complete a first year of college

Student Success

Graduate more students with the knowledge and skills to achieve their life and career goals

Affordability and Sustainability

Maximize access to higher education by making attendance affordable and our institutions financially sustainable

Innovation and Economic Growth

Create educational environments that cultivate innovation and prepare students for successful careers in a fast changing world

Equity

Eliminate achievement disparities among different ethnic/racial, economic, and gender groups

Goal #1: *A Successful First Year*

- Increase the number of students who successfully complete a first year of college
- Why?
 - Students are more likely to succeed if they complete the broad curriculum of a first year of college in a timely fashion.
 - We are much more efficient in educating students who have completed a first year of courses distributed across core disciplines.
 - At risk students will be more likely to succeed in an integrated educational pathway from K-12 to college that maintains educational momentum through the transition to college.
 - The college readiness of incoming students and our low success rates in remedial education impose a major limit on our ability to increase rigor, relevance and completions.
 - Our role as the primary educator of new K-12 teachers binds us to a role of shared responsibility for the readiness of high school graduates.

Goal #2: *Student Success*

- Graduate more students with the knowledge and skills to achieve their life and career goals
- Why?
 - Same purpose that underlies the vision statement: the unrivaled benefits to successful students and to the entire community/region/state.
 - We need to be explicit about completion given the longstanding emphasis on access (enrollment) over success (completion).
 - Research shows that limited credit accumulation (< 30 credits) does not improve economic benefits to students.

Goal #3: *Affordability and Sustainability*

- Maximize access to higher education by making attendance affordable and our institutions financially sustainable
- Why?
 - Increasing total enrollment and completions will require significant growth in success measures for students from lower income households.
 - Household income in Connecticut has not kept pace with inflation for the past decade and that trend is likely to continue.
 - Primary revenue sources (federal aid, state support, and household income of our students) will not keep pace with inflation and may decrease.

Goal #4: *Innovation and Economic Growth*

- Create educational environments that cultivate innovation and prepare students for successful careers in a fast changing world
- Why?
 - Education that prepares graduates for increasingly competitive environments is the only strategy that lifts individuals and communities out of a subsistence career or economy.
 - ConnSCU graduates who complete rigorous and innovative professional and occupational programs do very well in employment and earnings.
 - The demand for innovation penetrates all levels of organizations and is not confined to specific units or leadership levels.
 - Participation in faculty research and external internships provide students with exposure to innovative thinking.

Goal #5: *Equity*

- Eliminate achievement disparities among different ethnic/racial, economic, and gender groups
- Why?
 - CT's population is growing increasingly diverse
 - Educational success measures are lower for African-American and Latino students
 - Males have significantly lower rates of college enrollment and completion