

Planning & Budgeting Council
April 29, 2009

Present: Brent Askvig, Rita Curl-Langager, Conrad Davidson, Andrew Figueira, David Fuller, Donna Harvey, Roger Kluck, Teresa Loftesnes, Cheryl Nilsen, Sarah Perry, and Deb Wentz

Absent: Kristi Berg, Mikhail Bobylev, Ken Johnson, Lisa Johnson, and Matt Schaefer

1. R. Kluck moved and R. C-Langager seconded to approve the minutes of the February 18, 2009 meeting as presented. Motion carried.
2. Dr. Fuller provided a brief background of the strategic planning for the benefit of any new members. At the February meeting a copy of the priority items was distributed to council members. A revised version was distributed which now includes responsible parties assigned to each of the priority items as well as allocated dollars over the next three years.

This report has been reviewed by the vice presidents and has been incorporated into their annual performance plan. The majority of money represented on the report will come from local funds.

Discussion included:

Is the salary of the responsible party included in the cost of the initiative?

No as this is not a budget for the program but what is estimated in monetary terms to see that the program/initiative becomes a reality.

The report suggests that there may have to be a lot of volunteerism on the part of campus constituents to see that these initiatives are met.

This is not necessarily the cast as contracts do include provision to also provide work for the institution – in particular for any area that for example would fall under a faculty review.

Are we sure we are allocating enough funds for these priorities?

This is something that we need to be careful of. We feel the allocated amounts listed for each of the priority items are reasonable.

Where is the oversight – who is responsible to see that these priorities happen?

The responsible party will need to see that the initiative is managed. They will provide a report back to President's staff as well as this council. Technically, this council serves as oversight for all priority items. When the annual report to campus is prepared, these items will be included in the report.

There is some discussion that the new CETL director will come from existing faculty. We must be mindful of the impact that this could have on an existing program.

3. Aspiration peers and MSU goals. All departments/units on campus had an opportunity to review the results of the aspiration peer key indicators as they and how Minot State

compares. All unit/department comments and suggestions were compiled and distributed to campus for their review.

While the campus for the most part agreed that the stated goals were obtainable in the timeline given, there were a few areas that drew some concern either that that proposed MSU goal was too aggressive or that we may not have to consider changing from where we currently are. Three open forums were held to discuss those indicators where there was some disagreement among campus members.

The following indicators were open to discussion at these forums:

Retention/Graduation Rates.

The retention rate goal of 75% for MSU appears to be obtainable and should remain as is.

The Graduation Rate of 51% was one where many in the campus discussions, believed to be too high and unobtainable to reach by 2013-2014. Their argument was that grad rates are based on a 6 year cohort which we would not be completing in that year.

PABC discussion resulted in leaving the goal at 51% stating that we would still have a year left on the cohort that would be included in this percentage.

% of Faculty with Terminal Degrees

The average of the aspiration peers is currently at 75%. Minot State is at 53%. Much of the campus felt that we do need to raise our percentage on this indicator and realize that doing so will not come without a cost as hiring at a Ph.D. status will require paying on a more competitive basis.

Although the PABC feels that 75% is a huge goal it does set a standard of quality. The goal of 75% was agreed upon, realizing that there are some departments that find it difficult to attract Ph.D. staff for a higher ed position when they could do much more salary-wise elsewhere (nursing).

ACT/Admission Standards

Our aspiration peers are currently at an average of 20.5 for a minimum ACT requirement. Minot State has a minimum ACT score of 17. The proposed goal was to raise it to 20 by 2013-2014. This generated much discussion from departmental meetings as well as the open forums.

The PABC agrees that we need to raise the score but before doing so, a thorough analysis of all admission standards will be studied during the 2009-2010 school year before any criteria is changed. Many suggestions (provisional/probationary period, tiered system based on ACT & GPA, etc) were discussed. All this will be included in the outcomes of the admissions criteria analysis.

There was a question raised on why we do not have a goal specified for the Acceptance Rate indicator. The council approved to keep the MSU goal at our current percentage of 80.4%.

B. Askvig also questioned why we list TBD under the average salaries. This was done as the average of the peer institutions will be changing on an annual basis due to increases. Askvig suggested that instead of putting TBD we list our 2013-2014 goal as “to exceed annual average by 101%” since that is our intent.

R. Kluck moved that the Planning and Budgeting Council support the revised benchmark goals in an effort to get these out to campus and move forward in meeting them. C. Nilsen seconded the motion. All members voted unanimously to approve the motion as stated.

4. Forum Comments

Comments with outcomes from the February 12, 2009 open forum were distributed. A more detailed report (specifically addressing each comment) will be forthcoming.

5. Legislative updates

The Higher Education funding request has not yet been approved by the ND legislature. Many of the priorities and initiative do rely on funding in order to move them forward.

6. Next Steps

The schedule from the unabridged version of the Vision 2013 was distributed. We are right on track as we have identified action plans for the first year of 2009-2011 biennium.

7. Next meeting

It was decided to convene another meeting before the end of this school year so we can review the final legislative funding and how this will impact what projects and initiatives we will be working on in the coming year. As state above, much of our work depends on obtaining the funding as requested.

It was determined to have another PABC meeting on Monday, May 11th at noon. The meeting will be held in the Westlie Room and a box lunch will be served.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Deb Wentz