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Overview

- FEC and others were tasked to monitor “growth indicators” as college enrollment increased
  - Resources
  - Workload
  - Student Experience
- “Canary in a coal mine” vs. Proactive Leadership
Methodology

- Regular/Annual reporting by various faculty committees
- Managed by the Assessment and Accreditation Committee
- Data analyzed and reported to FEC
- Summary report for President’s Cabinet January 23
- Report to Board of Trustees

Note that FEC is based solely on interpretation of growth indicators, while DCC has explored other related factors independently.
Findings

- AAC and FEC found:
  - There are some areas where there is no evidence of concern regarding growth
  - We also identified some areas that may warrant further monitoring and attention
  - There are some areas where the indicators do not provide a clear assessment of the status

- There is some risk of “moving the goal posts” unless we approach these in a larger context
Areas Where Growth Appears Well-Managed

- Student-Faculty Ratio:
  - Through AY 17-18 SFR was at or below 8:1
- Average Class Size:
  - Remains at approximately 21 students per section
- Students report no decline or negative drop in connection and satisfaction with HMC
- Diversity along many axes seems to be increasing and highly supported by entire community
Areas with Evidence of Concern

- Specific matters related to individual committees:
  - SSC petitions tripled since AY 11-12, dramatically increasing workload and need for administrative changes.
  - RPT Committee has significantly increased workload that will continue into the future (but this is a consequence of additional faculty positions).

- Some indications of stress in student-facing support systems:
  - Academic Excellence tutoring up 40% from AY11-12 to AY 16-17.
  - Students reported decreasing satisfaction in access to psychological support.
  - Number of students with diagnosed disability or impairment is up sharply.
Areas Where Indicators Are not Clear

- Many indicators show modest change but not enough for any conclusion
- Use of average class sizes may mask impacts on Core, which should perhaps be examined separately
- Impacts across departments seem to vary greatly:
  - Departments with small number of majors
  - Departments with large Core footprint
  - HSA advising impacts and methods
Questions Moving Forward

- Are faculty/staff/students acting as “shock absorbers”? (E.g., CS grutors)
- Which effects are being coupled to non-growth factors, such as increase of off-campus students?
- Are methods of collecting data masking slower accumulation of risk?
- What are the hidden pressure points within departments, the Core, and student services?
Recommendations

- Continued monitoring by Faculty Committees, working in concert with DCC
- Faculty undertake a review to streamline committee structure, revise the curriculum as appropriate, and understand and alleviate impacts of off-campus majors
- Faculty and Administration work together to increase staff support for students