Purpose of Academic Plan

- Meet the expectations of the students and state for a world-class university
- Provide an educational experience that is unrivalled in its cost-benefit ratio
- Accelerate Connecticut’s ‘Brain Gain’
- Enhance the quality of the state’s workforce
- Strengthen the scientific/technological infrastructure of Connecticut’s economy
Purpose of Metrics

- Ability to compare UConn with peer institutions in a clear and concise fashion
- Identification of factors which characterize the University’s success in meeting its academic goals
- Provides the basis for a consistent resource allocation model
- Serves as a guide for reallocation and hiring decisions at all levels
Implementation of Focused Metrics

- **Undergraduate Education**
  - Freshmen Average SAT
  - 6 Year Graduation Rate
  - Student/Faculty Ratio

- **Research & Graduate/Professional Education**
  - Doctoral Degrees Awarded
  - Post Doctoral Appointees
  - External Research Expenditures

- **Diversity**
  - Minority 6 Year Graduation Rate
  - Faculty: % Underrepresented

- **Resources**
  - Endowment Assets Market Value
  - Alumni Giving Rate

- **Reputation: Public National University Rank**
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6 Year Graduation Rate
Fall 2003 (Storrs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UConn</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer Average: 66%
Student / Faculty Ratio
Fall 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UConn</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer Average: 15
Doctoral Degrees Awarded
FY 2003

Peer Average

Doctoral Degrees Awarded / 100 Faculty
Post Doctoral Appointees
Fall 2001

Post Doctoral Appointees / 100 Faculty
6 Year Minority Graduation Rate
Fall 2002 (Storrs)

Peer Average: 56%

- UConn: 65%
- Iowa State: 48%
- Ohio State: 50%
- Purdue: 60%
- Rutgers: 68%
- Georgia: 63%
- Iowa: 54%
- Minnesota: 43%
- Missouri: 59%
Faculty: % Underrepresented
Fall 2003 (Storrs)

- UConn: 7%
- Iowa State: 4%
- Ohio State: 6%
- Purdue: 4%
- Rutgers: 5%
- Georgia: 7%
- Iowa: 4%
- Minnesota: 4%
- Missouri: 4%

Peer Average: 5%
## Endowment Assets Market Value
### FY 2003 ($M)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>FY 2003 ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UConn</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>$1,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>$502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>$361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Average</td>
<td>$434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Available

![Graph showing endowment assets market value for FY 2003 ($M)](image-url)
Alumni Giving Rate
FY 2002-2003 (Storrs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UConn</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer Average: 15%
Rank Among Top 50 Public National Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UConn</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Year Goals

- Freshmen Average SAT - Rank 3rd
- 6 Year Grad Rate - Rank 2nd
- Doctoral Degrees - @ Peer Average
- Post Docs – Rank 2nd
- Research Expenditures - @ Peer Average
- Minority 6 Year Grad Rate – Rank 1st
- % Underrepresented Faculty – Rank 1st
- Endowment Assets – 30% Increase
- Alumni Giving – Rank 1st
- America’s Best College Rank – Top 20
5 Year Goals

劳务派遣

Rank 1st or 2nd in all categories (except Endowment Assets)

Modify peer group
Provost’s Grant Competition

⇒ 48 pre-proposals submitted in short timeframe

⇒ 7 invited to present full proposals

⇒ Decisions will be announced by November 1, 2004
Provost’s Grant Competition

- Collaboratory for Rehabilitation Research
- The Emergence of Humanitarianism: A Program for Research and Teaching
- Enhancing the Global Perspectives of Innovative Science and Technology
- Creation of CIDRIS - Center for Internet Data and Research Intelligence Services to support Multi-disciplinary Internet Research
- A Partnership for Excellence in Structural Biology
- Institute for Biodiversity and Evolutionary Biology
- Forensic-Related Research, Education and Innovation
Strategic Focus Areas

- Life Science / Technology / Environment
  - College of Agriculture & Natural Resources
  - CLAS-Biological Sciences
  - School of Engineering
  - School of Pharmacy
  - CLAS-Physical Sciences
  - CLAS-Psychology

- Arts & Culture
  - School of Fine Arts
  - CLAS-Humanities
  - School of Law

- Health & Human Services
  - School of Allied Health
  - School of Business
  - College of Continuing Studies
  - Neag School of Education
  - School of Family Studies
  - School of Nursing
  - CLAS-Social Sciences
  - School of Social Work
Strategic Focus Areas

5 Year Hiring Plan: 150 Faculty

- Life Science/Technology/Environment: 75
- Arts & Culture: 26
- Health & Human Services: 49
Strategic Focus Areas

1st Year Plan: 30 Faculty

- **Life Science/Technology/Environment: 17**
  - Biology (4), Engineering (4), Physical Sciences (4), Psychology (3), Agriculture (1), Pharmaceutical Science (1)

- **Arts & Culture: 4**
  - Fine Arts (1), Humanities (1), Law (1), Avery Point (1)

- **Health & Human Services: 9**
  - Business (2), Education (2), Family Studies (1), Nursing (1), Political Science (1), Stamford (1), Tri-Campus (1)
Achieving Success in Undergraduate Education

- SAT Scores
  - Continue market-sensitive recruiting
- Enhance Honors program
- Build Scholarship Endowment
- Increase instructional capacity in science/technology to meet needs of high profile students
Achieving Success in Undergraduate Education

Graduation Rate
- Program to increase # of 4 year graduates
- Keep parents informed/involved
- Set 4 year graduation as an advising goal
- Use summer school effectively
- Change language and culture
Research & Graduate Education

- To increase research expenditures, hires should be focused in: Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences & Engineering and Psychology

- or

- In other words: Life Science/Technology/Environment sections of the Academic Plan

- but

- “Start ups” will be more costly in lab sciences

- Research awards will lag 2-3 years behind hires, especially with assistant professors
Neag School of Education
Strategic Plan

_changes 1997 to present_
- Endowment, annual grant expenditures, annual fund, alumni involvement, ranking and reputation

Strategic Planning

Guiding Principles
- Top twenty schools in the country
- Meet needs of Connecticut and national school reform
- Needs infinite, resources finite
- School-wide focus
- Specific actions with benchmarks

Resource Allocation
- Strategic investments to increase reputation and resources
- Program changes/closings
- Administrative restructuring
- New revenue streams
Program Changes

➡️ **Strategic Investments**
- Literacy/Reading, Teacher Education
- Measurement & Assessment, School Counseling, School Psych, Special Ed, Gifted
- Exercise Science, Athletic Training, Sports Management
- Educational Policy, Administrator Prep, Adult Education

➡️ **Closed / Restructured Programs**
- Sports Sociology, Sports Psychology, Therapeutic Recreation, Fitness Management, Tourism
- Higher Education PhD
- Counseling Psychology, Bureau of Educational Research
Mission statements from each Dean are in the handout. Statements provide:

- Mission
- Areas of emphasis
- Priorities

Note that each school / college has a distinct mission and a specific approach to achieving excellence.

The underlying theme is improvement of research, teaching and outreach over time.
Academic Support Services

- Enrollment Management
- Graduate School
- Libraries
- Multicultural & International Affairs
- Research Administration & Compliance
- Student Affairs
- Undergraduate Education & Instruction
Metrics for Academic Support Services

- Metrics against which these units will be measured are in the handout.

- The goals of the Academic Support areas vary widely as do the means by which their performance is measured.

- The common factor is continued improvement over time.
Methodology for Resource Allocation

-The challenge – translate the numbers into a resource allocation plan.

-We have initiated conversations with Dr. William Massy, President, Jackson Hole Higher Education Group, Inc., Professor Emeritus, and former CFO Stanford University to create a methodology which guides resource allocation.
Conclusion

⇒ University must move to the next level to fulfill expectations

⇒ Investment in faculty is essential

⇒ Hire faculty in areas of highest payoff / greatest demand

⇒ Use existing resources wisely