Presentation of Work Group Papers

• Demographic and Labor Market Forces
• Competitive Forces
• Fiscal, Economic & Political Environment
• Institutional Trends & Vital Statistics
• Public Engagement Activities
• Technological Trends
- Who are our students and what is our market?
- Are our incoming students ready for college?
- What is the market demand for NKU graduates?
- What is the impact of non-traditional students?
Divided into three sub-groups

Each sub-group addressed one of the three primary questions and prepared a written report

An executive summary was written based on these sub-group reports
- **Typical Student**
  - An undergraduate 22 years of age, Caucasian, commuting to campus and on some form of financial aid.
  - 91% of students from Ohio and Kentucky, primarily from greater Cincinnati/NKY metro area

- **Traditional Students**
  - Population of high school graduates in NKU’s primary target area will decline over next 3 to 5 years

- **Non-Traditional Students**
  - Increasing percentage of college students
  - More veterans with military drawdown
  - Training and additional education for displaced workers

---

**Question 1**
Who are our students and what is our market?
- **Traditional readiness indicators**
  - Currently measured using ACT, SAT, COMPASS, and KYOTE scores, which are only moderately predictive of college success.

- **Non-traditional indicators**
  - Meta-cognitive skills such as study skills, time management, social-problem skills
  - Leadership skills such as effective communication, ability to establish and measure outcomes

- **Traditional graduation rates**
  - IPEDS methodology is the traditional indicator of student persistence
  - Just 44% of NKU’s 2011/2012 graduates were included in an IPEDS cohort
  - Measure is much too narrow!

---

**Question 2**

Are our incoming students ready for college?
Job growth projected
- 1.1% annual MSA job growth
- 33,900 annual MSA job openings

Post-secondary education demand
- 93% of high-paying jobs require combination of post-secondary credential, on-the-job training, and work experience beyond one year

Key talent shortages
- Industrial engineers, IT occupations, medical practitioners

Career success not just education
- Education positive ROI
- Employers looking for skills and attributes beyond the classroom

Students not taking advantage
- NKU offers a wide variety of opportunities, but few students take advantage!

Question 3
What is the market demand for NKU graduates?
Growing number nationally
- 20% in 2001; nearly 30% in 2012

Projected US increases thru 2020
- 18 to 24 years: 9%
- 25 to 34 years: 21%
- 35 years & over: 16%

Enhancing adult learning/success
- Part-time degree programs
- Year-round accelerated programs
- Facilitated degree mapping
- Pre-baccalaureate, career-related certificate programs which incorporate academic credit that can be counted toward a degree
- Credit for prior learning

Traditional readiness measures
- Likely do not apply to older students who graduated from high school some time ago (ACT or SAT scores and high school GPA)

Question 4
What is the impact of non-traditional students?
Demographics of NKU student body will change going forward

Current measurement systems required of NKU are more centered on traditional 18-22 year old students

Demand for graduates will continue, but employers want more than a degree in prospective employees

Conclusions
Nine Competitive Forces

Competition

1. ...in place
2. ...by shifting modes of education
3. ...from shifting perceptions of value of higher education
4. ...in cost
5. ...for transfers
6. ...for online students
7. ...for adult learners
8. ...in experiential learning
9. ...for philanthropic attention
1. Competition in Place

- Northern Kentucky is a highly desirable recruitment location
  - Schools with local recruiters include UK, UofL, WKU, Morehead, Alabama, & South Carolina
- Many of best local students won’t consider NKU due to lack of residential opportunities and competitive athletic program
- Competition for students of racial/ethnic minority is particularly steep
  - The composition of NKU faculty is a weakness that negatively impacts our ability to recruit students of color
- Pipeline of college-ready students from top local feeder schools is limited
- **Potential opportunity:** Purposefully grow international enrollment
2. Competition by shifting modes of education

• MOOCs represent the most frequently cited “disruptive” innovation facing institutions like NKU:
  – Literature indicates students will expect to transfer hours attained through MOOCs as they gain acceptance
  – Local institutions are exploring “try before you buy” courses such as UC’s “MOOC2Degree” program

• Adult learners and their employers are gravitating toward “badge-based,” skills-focused education
3. Competition from perceptions about value of higher education

- Public increasingly seems to question the value of higher education
  - Threat to traditional liberal-arts programs as families seek “education for employment,” despite CPE forecast that 56% of all KY jobs will require some college by 2020

- Changes the list of the institutions with which NKU competes
  - May now include technical and trade schools

- **Potential opportunity:** Add degree programs with career pathways in occupational fields forecasted to grow
4. Competition in cost

- NKU is no longer the low-cost option as EKU, Morehead and Murray have lower tuition rates.
- Metro and non-resident rates particularly present recruitment challenges
- Many students must work to afford college
  - Many choose full-time employment over college
  - NKU students tend to work too many hours, which threatens persistence, academic success, and time to graduation
5. Competition for transfers

• Other KY institutions accept more credit hours and offer more services to transferring students, especially those from KCTCS
  – “2+2” agreements encourage students to pre-select their 4-year institution at time of KCTCS enrollment

• Change to semesters at Ohio schools has put NKU at a disadvantage (at least temporarily) in accepting transfer students from Cincinnati State and UC.

• UC now offers some bachelor degrees at regional campuses and more actively “courts” its own associate-degree graduates

• Potential opportunity: Improve NKU’s ability to accept “swirling” students who take classes at multiple institutions at once
6. Competition for online students nationwide

• Online programs from across the country and especially from proprietary and private institutions routinely market in Greater Cincinnati
  – Southern New Hampshire and Colorado Technical University are examples of schools now heavily marketing in Cincinnati

• Enforcement of state licensure laws regarding online programs complicates and increases the cost of marketing nationwide
  – Some KY public institutions have voiced an intention to gain licensure in all 50 states

• Potential opportunity: Increase number of undergraduate degree programs offered fully online
7. Competition for adult learners

• Enrollment forecasts predict continued enrollment from adult learners
  – NKY is highly desirable location for for-profit, online and private institutions

• Adult expectations differ from traditional students as has been highlighted throughout this presentation

• Potential opportunity: Increase programs and degree programs targeted to adult learners
8. Competition in experiential learning

• Local competitors are capitalizing on opportunities to offer co-ops and internships to students
  – UC has enhanced options in STEM and informatics fields in particular

• Public is increasingly expecting credit for prior learning
  – Institutions such as Western Governors now offer competency-based content with “learn on demand” approach
  – Adult students in particular expect opportunities to pursue credit for work experience via programs like portfolio development
9. Competition for philanthropic attention and faculty recruitment

- In addition to competing for students, our top competitors (UC, UK, Xavier) also compete for “high dollar” donors.
- Similarly, NKU competes with larger institutions for faculty talent, particularly faculty from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds.
- **Potential opportunity:** Identify unique features and programs of distinction to differentiate NKU in the minds of donors.
Conclusion

Two types of responses to competitive forces

Compete along these lines of force in the same general orientation (“mimic our competition”).

Work perpendicular to lines of force by developing or enhancing programs that take us in different, distinctive directions.
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Primary Drivers of Fiscal / Economic /Political Environmental Factors

- Structural
  - Federal Budget: Deficit / Debt
  - State Budget: Structural Deficit / Revenue Growth
  - Federal / State Educational Attainment Goals

- Economic Competitiveness (Labor Force)

- Social Welfare (Jobs)
Federal Budget Challenge

UNITED STATES DEBT AS A PERCENTAGE OF GDP (1940 - 2012 EST)

Measuring U.S. debt in numbers that haven’t been adjusted for inflation produces an alarming and somewhat misleading result. Measuring U.S. debt as a percentage of GDP gives us a much better idea of who our biggest borrowers have been.

Funds for investments?

State Budget Challenge

Adequacy & Elasticity: Simulated Kentucky Revenue

“Kentucky will have a structural deficit that could reach $1 billion by 2020.”

“if spending, above or below current levels, is to be relatively stable as a share of income, we do not have the tax structure to support it.”

Source: Presentation “Governor Beshear’s Blue Ribbon Commission on Tax Reform”, Jerry Abramson, Lt. Governor, Chairman and Mary Lassiter, Secretary, Governor's Executive Cabinet, to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and Revenue and House Committee on Appropriations and Revenue on February 5, 2013
State Budget Challenge

General Fund Revenue Growth by Decade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Average Percentage GF Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945-1950</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1960</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-1970</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1980</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1990</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-2000</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2010</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Presentation “Governor Beshear’s Blue Ribbon Commission on Tax Reform”, Jerry Abramson, Lt. Governor, Chairman and Mary Lassiter, Secretary, Governor’s Executive Cabinet, to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and Revenue and House Committee on Appropriations and Revenue on February 5, 2013
Kentucky Total State Tax Collections (% Income), 1970-2011

Source: Presentation “Governor Beshear’s Blue Ribbon Commission on Tax Reform”, Jerry Abramson, Lt. Governor, Chairman and Mary Lassiter, Secretary, Governor’s Executive Cabinet, to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and Revenue and House Committee on Appropriations and Revenue on February 5, 2013
State Budget Impact

State Revenues and Spending Have Not Grown with the Economy Over the Last 15 Years

Source: Presentation “Governor Beshear’s Blue Ribbon Commission on Tax Reform”, Jerry Abramson, Lt. Governor, Chairman and Mary Lassiter, Secretary, Governor's Executive Cabinet, to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and Revenue and House Committee on Appropriations and Revenue on February 5, 2013
# State Budget Impact

**Kentucky Budget of the Commonwealth**  
Enacted General Fund Appropriations by Major Budget Category  
Fiscal Years 1999 and 2014  
(Nominal Dollars in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>1998-99 Enacted General Fund</th>
<th>2013-14 Enacted General Fund</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$2,734</td>
<td>$4,254</td>
<td>$1,520</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Education (1)</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions &amp; CPE</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Aid</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>522%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>136%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Appropriations</strong></td>
<td>$6,180</td>
<td>$9,780</td>
<td>$3,599</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The shaded area provides Postsecondary Education detail and is not double-counted in Total Appropriations.

(1) Includes Kentucky’s public postsecondary institutions, state-funded student financial aid (KHEAA), and the Council on Postsecondary Education.

Source: Kentucky Enacted Budgets of the Commonwealth.

Source: Kentucky Council for Postsecondary Education
Federal and State Budgetary Impacts

* State Appropriations
  - Decline in state support
  - Tuition rate increases

* Federal and State Financial Aid Programs
  - Unable to keep pace with enrollment growth and tuition rate increases
  - Affordability concerns / increasing student loan debt

* Increasing student loan debt
  - Next bubble? Bailouts?
  - Financial risk
Policymakers challenge:
How do we increase educational attainment without a large investment of funds?
Fed/State Policymaker Responses: New Policies and Regulation

* Performance-based and outcomes-based funding
* Tuition caps without additional state investments
* Accountability measures (performance scorecards, develop new measurements)
* Federal financial aid as a lever:
  * Transparency for students (College Scorecard, net price calculator, job placement rates, graduation rates, student loan debt)
  * Accountability for costs (top 5% tuition / net price, increases)
Fed/State Policymaker Responses: New Policies and Regulations

* Drive changes in higher education (innovation, productivity and efficiencies)
  * 2+2 programs / transfers
  * School based scholars
  * Online education
  * System-wide efficiencies such as consolidation of back office functions
* Adult learners / non-traditional students / first generation
Other NKU Considerations

**Institutional Budget**
- Very tuition dependent
- Current financial model and cost structure does not support investment

**Regional Considerations**
- Well regarded
- Economic driver
- Competition for state capital investments

**Institutional Finances**
- Moody’s (relative to like institutions)
  - Financially stable
  - Solid financial resources and liquidity
- Diversify revenue
- Additional debt beyond CRC and housing acquisition / renovation
Primary Drivers of Fiscal / Economic /Political Environmental Factors

- Federal Budget: Deficit / Debt
- State Budget: Structural Deficit / Revenue Growth
- Federal / State Educational Attainment Goals
- Economic Competitiveness (Labor Force)
- Social Welfare (Jobs)

Structural
Questions?

Committee Members
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* Erik Pederson
* Ryan Salzman
* Leah Stewart
* Joseph Wind
* Karen Zerhusen Kruer
Institutional Trends and Vital Statistics
Introduction

• Work group was asked to look at the data available around important issues that impact student success.

• Broke the group into four smaller work groups each addressing a different topic area.

• Topic areas included: Retention, Enrollment, College Adjustment and Faculty and Curriculum.
Retention

• Fall to Fall Retention
• Fall to Spring Retention
• Retention rates of student with deficiencies
• Minority student retention rates
• Effect of financial aid on retention
• Gen ed course impact on retention
Graduation Rate

- Six year Federal graduation rate
- Minority student graduation rate
- Alternative measurements to graduation rate
- Effect of financial aid on graduation rate
Additional Research Needed

- First Generation retention rates
- Academic standing of non returners
- Impact of living distance from campus
- DWFI rates for GenEd and 100 level courses
College Adjustment/ Academic

• Study Habits
• Active and collaborative learning
• Student faculty interaction
College Adjustment/ Social

• Networking
• Co-Curricular involvement
• Work Habits
College Adjustment / Maturity

- Emotional growth
- Mental health
- Stress
Enrollment

- High School graduate numbers will continue decline through 2020.
- Top 50 high demand occupations by 2020
- Undeclared, Undeclared in College, and Pre-Major
- “Sweet Spot” for academic programs
- Advising
- Current admissions criteria
- Admissions selectivity level
- Effective pricing strategy
- Graduate Programs and their role in the enrollment puzzle
Faculty/Curriculum

- Competitive salaries
- Demographics of our faculty
- Online courses
- Average class size
- Student Credit Hour/Full Time Equivalent
Thank you

• If you have questions please contact Pat Moynahan or Katie Bontrager.
Public Engagement Working Group
Group’s Process:

1. Establish a Working Definition of Public Engagement
2. Inventory a Sampling of Public Engagement Activities across Campus
3. Complete a SPOT (Strengths, Problems, Opportunities, Threats) Analysis
4. Determine Action-oriented Recommendations
5. Consider the ‘Big’ Question——
   ”What should be the scope of public engagement at NKU”
Working Definition of Public Engagement

Key Criteria for Public Engagement include:

* A **partnership** between the University and community

* A mutually beneficial, two-way, **reciprocal relationship** between University expertise and a community need

* A direct contribution to **stewardship of place** (public good)

* An **academic component** as the centerpiece (course curricula, student, faculty or staff research & expertise)

* A **direct benefit to student** learning, research experience and professional development

Public engagement goes beyond community service by an individual or university group.
SPOT Analysis

**STRENGTHS**

- National Model
- Receptive region
- In our mission statement, institutional commitment & culture
- Embedded in RPT
- Opportunities for students
- Extensive service learning courses
- Entrepreneurial spirit
- Funding – local, state, national
- Partnership with 2015
- Positive impact on student retention
- Cross-disciplinary commitment

**OPPORTUNITIES**

- Foster compliance with tracking tools
- Establish a Public Engagement Council
- Professional development (Scholarship of Engagement, etc.)
- Include engagement in staff performance review
- Align regional needs with NKU capabilities and strengths
- Redo “Community and Business” web links to facilitate navigation
- Endorse and implement vetting criteria linked to institutional support
- Revisit the SHAPE report and implementation

**PROBLEMS**

- Workload pressures
- Time to cultivate partner relations
- Uneven application of policies, MOU’s, etc.
- Need for better internal communication and tracking of activities
- Need to clarify how public engagement fits into staff expectations
- Spotty use of impact evaluation across activities and initiatives

**THREATS**

- Trying to be all things to all people
- Partner expectations exceeding our ability to deliver
- Limited sources for funding (departmental, college, university, region, state)
Key Recommendations

1. Establish key criteria for vetting, resourcing & developing public engagement
2. Determine how to best strengthen the tracking of public engagement
3. Establish a Public Engagement Council
4. Implement professional development in support of public engagement
5. Clarify for staff the role and importance of public engagement
6. Implement a process of continuous improvement
7. Evaluate the feasibility of a graduation certificate or recognition
8. Support partner evaluation of impact
Key Recommendations

9. Feature public engagement on the home page & as an institutional brand and student recruitment tool

10. Consider more deeply involving alumni

The Big Question

What is the Appropriate Scope & Extent of Public Engagement?

Models of Scope----Advantages & Disadvantages
Models of the Scope of Public Engagement Activities

Model I. Disbursed
Many unique efforts across disciplines, touching multiple external sectors and purposes

Features: Across campus / many faculty, staff, students / limited funding

Model II. Unified
Designation and resourcing of selected engagement targets

Features: Alignment of regional needs with NKU’s key intellectual & capital assets / dedicated funding and capacity building

Model III. Hybrid

Features: A set of key areas that incorporate dispersed assets that leveraged for direct benefits to the students, faculty, and community
Life in the year 2000 as depicted by Villemard in 1910. A teacher feeds books into a meat grinder to be served up to the class in the form of digital knowledge – thus envisioning the podcast.
21st Century Skills

21st Century Student Outcomes and Support Systems

Learning and Innovation Skills – 4Cs
Critical thinking • Communication
Collaboration • Creativity

Core Subjects – 3Rs and 21st Century Themes

Information, Media, and Technology Skills

Life and Career Skills

Standards and Assessments

Curriculum and Instruction

Professional Development

Learning Environments

NKU NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
21st Century Skills

Critical thinking, Communication, Collaboration, & Creativity
Digital University
Digital University

• **Resourcefulness** - efficient and effective use of resources

• **Technology in Academia** – supporting student success

• **Innovation** – fostering a spirit of innovation and creativity moving into the 21st century
Anytime, Anywhere

ePrinting

Virtual Lab

Courses

Streaming

Mobile

iNKU

Northern Kentucky University
Document Imaging

- Automated workflow
- Reliable backups if disaster strikes
- Less printing, saves trees
- Available anytime, anywhere
- Better information security

E-File

NKU Northern Kentucky University
Analytics, Big Data, Data Mining...
Communication

- Across Devices
- E-mail
- Across Networks
- Team Workspaces
- Identity and Presence
- Calendaring
- Instant Messaging and VoIP
- Application Integration
- Web and Video Conferencing

NKU
Northern Kentucky University
Mobile Technology/BYOD
Social • Mobile • Web • Media
Learning Analytics

is the use of intelligent data, learner-produced data, and analysis models to discover information and social connections, and to predict and advise on learning.
Labs – Virtual & Physical

Give your students the freedom to learn anywhere with NKU Virtual Lab solution.
Alternative Delivery Methods

MOOC
Differential Instruction
Competency-based

Flipped
Synchronous
Personalized

Hybrid
Asynchronous
Quality Assurance

Buy-in
Individualized

Blended
Support
Online
Consistency • Integration • Accessibility

- Access to Technology
- Systems and Support
- Professional Development
- Technology Integration

Diagram:

- Gear 1: Access to Technology
- Gear 2: Systems and Support
- Gear 3: Professional Development
- Gear 4: Technology Integration

Arrows indicate the flow and integration between the gears.
"Hello, technical support? Which one is the 'any key'?"
Innovation
Final Thoughts

• Technology must serve pedagogy.
• Technology must enable students, faculty and staff to research, create, communication, and collaborate.
• Learning can – and must– be networked
Questions?
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