



*Office of*

**THE PROVOST**

---

**REGIS UNIVERSITY**

*“At Our Frontier”*

**Academic Plan 2024-2027**



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|                                                      |        |
|------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| INTRODUCTION                                         | PG. 3  |
| VISION STATEMENT                                     | PG. 4  |
| STRATEGIC PLAN                                       | PG. 5  |
| OPERATIONAL AND CULTURAL TRANSFORMATION              | PG. 6  |
| STUDENT EXPERIENCE AND ENGAGEMENT                    | PG. 10 |
| FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, DIVERSITY, AND SCHOLARSHIP      | PG. 16 |
| COMMUNITY IMPACT                                     | PG. 18 |
| SERVINGNESS AS A HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTION        | PG. 20 |
| APPENDICES                                           |        |
| APPENDIX 1: PROGRAM PORTFOLIO OPTIMIZATION           | PG. 22 |
| APPENDIX 2: COMMON BARRIERS TO TRANSFER FRIENDLINESS | PG. 29 |
| APPENDIX 3: FEEDBACK COMPANION DOCUMENT              | PG. 30 |



## **INTRODUCTION**

This is not a standard, templated strategic plan, because we are not at a standard place in our history. With the state of higher education and our own recent externally and internally inflicted circumstances, we are at a pivotal point – if not a reckoning – to shape our future. As a result, we cannot and will not be afraid to push our own boundaries in what has become an interconnected society, and in a boundaryless world of higher education that is redefining education and is opening new pathways.

Perhaps one of the non-standard aspects of this plan is that it sets priorities for the next three years, whereas most plans usually use a standard of at least five years. Our three-year vision recognizes both the rapidly changing and fluid circumstances in higher-education, while also giving us the opportunity to set a new plan in 2027 after we will have seen the first of potential impacts from the enrollment cliff.

The challenges and opportunities brought on by this changing higher education market is not limited to one discipline and their effects will be felt by our local, state, and national communities ([A Framing Pre-Read](#)). That is why we believe that exceptional teaching and student experience, faculty scholarship, community outreach, and intentional and extensive commitment to servingness and justice work, will fulfill our University's mission and ensure sustainability.

Laid out in the following pages is our guiding vision for the coming years and the attitude, aims and possible actions that will get us there. This plan documents the accountability of Academic Affairs, both direct accountability for the Provost Office as well as indirect accountability for the Colleges, Library, and other units as they interpret and pursue these priorities. The reader will find a consistent commitment to interdisciplinary efforts, anti-oppression and equity, a global mindset, and to delivering a diverse range of degree and non-degree programs, in diverse modalities, to diverse student populations. These listed commitments are part of our larger commitment to Regis' mission, its health and viability, our students, and our community.

Jake Bucher, PhD  
Provost and Chief Academic Officer  
Regis University



## **VISION STATEMENT**

### **Guiding Vision from Provost Office:**

The Regis academic community is first and foremost committed to transformative teaching and learning, and nurtures a culture of intellectual and scholarly engagement that makes significant contributions to disciplinary and professional knowledge and practice; and local, national, and global outcomes. We pursue our work in the service of a more just and humane world, with anti-oppressive practice, with a care for each other and each other's well-being, and with a commitment to Regis' values and a responsibility for its sustainability.

### **Underlying Attitudes:**

- Responsible and data-informed decision making
- Bold Innovation
- Disruptive Design Thinking
- Global Mindset
- Inter-Unit/Meta Collaboration
- Anti-oppression and equity-mindedness
- Jesuit Values, especially magis, cura personalis, cura apostolica, and assuming the best intention of the other.



## **STRATEGIC PLAN**

Typically, strategic plans are either developed based on data, or revised based on data, but in either case an effective and productive strategic plan has to be informed by data. Data included for the development of this plan include the recent Academic Excellence Plan<sup>1</sup>; various College SWOT analyses, climate surveys, and unit plans; Mindstream reports; financial data; conversations with leadership, faculty, and students across the colleges; analysis of best practices and market feasibility; the Enrollment Plan; and University philosophy, culture, and strategic plan. To the latter, each priority goal of this plan will be bolded, followed by parentheses that describe the Pillar and Objective that informed the priority (e.g. a priority informed by Pillar 1, Objective 2a will appear as (P1.2a) in this plan).

This section provides documentation of what the Academic Strategic Plan is, how it fits with the University plan, and priorities with suggested/possible action items. The items included in this document are not exhaustive as both the Provost Office and academic units will develop and achieve distinct efforts to accomplish the broader goals. To reiterate, the goal is not to prescribe concrete/absolute actions, but rather to provide firm guidance so that units have some direction with their autonomy in doing their part.

Additionally, while we have incorporated overarching goals related to the Enrollment Plan throughout each of the listed areas, the reader will see little reference to “headcount” goals. That is because we believe that the product and environment we create and steward will drive enrollment, and that our University’s identity and future depends much more on quality of programming and supports, as there will be no students to enroll without the ability to educate, retain, graduate, and transform them.

There are many individual goals, School/Department/Program goals, College/Library goals, and various other goals that will be assessed and reviewed in 2024 and beyond, all of these goals and efforts should support the following areas of the Academic Plan:

1. Operational and Cultural Transformation
2. Student Experience and Engagement
3. Faculty Development, Diversity, and Scholarship
4. Community Impact
5. Ensuring *Servingness* as a Hispanic-Serving Institution

---

<sup>1</sup> Developed by preceding Provost



## **OPERATIONAL AND CULTURAL TRANSFORMATION**

Like many parts of the institution, Academic Affairs is currently structured in a way to support a volume of students and a complexity of operation that no longer exists and is unlikely to return. Compounding this reality is the lack or loss of clear systems and processes that maximize resources to maximize support for faculty and students. Simply put, we have gotten in our own way and it is a vital part of our plan to establish a more efficient and effective model of “doing Academic Affairs”. This will remove some barriers, create opportunity, and allow for reallocation and investment of resources into needed areas and areas of growth that will enable us to fulfill the rest of the plan. *Cura personalis, cura apostolica, magis, and contemplatives in action*, are some of the Jesuit values/mission pursuit informing this section.

### *Rationale*

This portion of the strategic plan does not align directly with any one of the University Strategic Plan’s specific three pillars, but rather supports our ability to pursue each – as well as providing the infrastructure to fulfill the other parts of the Academic Plan.

### *Priorities and Action Items*

**1. Flatten Academic-Affairs Administration, creating more shared leadership and more efficient use of resources (P1.2d, P1.2e, P1.3a, P1.3e, P1.4c, P2.1c, P2.2c, P2.3a, P2.3b, P2.4a, P2.4c, P3.1c).**

- Action: Move from current model of one Provost and four Vice/Associate/Assistant Provosts to one Provost and one Vice Provost by August 1, 2024.

The Vice Provost will be the Chief Diversity Officer/Vice Provost of DEIE. This centers/elevates DEI work and provides the Provost a clear second in command to help lead and to provide clear continuity through future transitions.

- Action: Create “Communities” for key areas of Academic Affairs by August 1, 2024. Leadership will be shared by Provost and Executive Director<sup>2</sup> to be identified through equitable internal search.

#### *Create Community for Global Commitment*

- Move Service Learning from each College to Academic Affairs
- Move Study Abroad here, to include centralized oversight for faculty-led trips (needs at least an additional PT, if not FTE)
- International Student Support (needs at least 1 FTE, note 1 FTE was transferred to Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM))
- GLOBAL Inclusive Program
- Prison Education Programming

---

<sup>2</sup> Titles and workload (i.e. reassignment time/stipend) TBD



Create *Community for Cura Facultas*

- Teaching Excellence-type programming (efforts led by Director/Provost)
  - To include, but not limited to: Promotion and Tenure support, HSI and anti-racism training, Generative AI workshops, and changing student needs/preparation.
- Ensure Academic Affairs *staff* is included in these supports and services.
  - Include opportunities for an enrichment plan and professional development.
- Chair/Dean/Leadership Development
- ID&T
- Assessment Support (Can be PT, perhaps shared by IDS)
- Research/Grant position (minimum 1 FTE)
- Faculty Ombudsperson (perhaps Emerita faculty, pending consultation with faculty governance)
  - Work with Human Resources on Staff Ombudsperson

Create *Community for Student Success*

- Professional advising
- Family Liaison
- Student Support Services (to include Tutoring/Learning Commons)
- Career development (to include moving internships to Academic Affairs)
- URSC/URISE (pending University Senate committee designations)
- Orientation and Convocation/First Year Experience

Rename ODEIE to *Community for Belonging*<sup>3</sup>.

- Action: Work with Deans to investigate similar flattening/reorganization opportunities within the Colleges/Library.

**2. Establish Program Portfolio Optimization process to assess program vitality and inform continuous improvement (P1.2a, P1.4c).**

- Action: Approve a Program Optimization rubric<sup>4</sup> and timeline for initial Assessment and annual cycle of review by May 1, 2024.
- Action: Program responses to initial Assessment by October 1, 2024.
- Action: Ensure data accuracy/usability, to include among others, appropriate consideration of bill-by-program data and credit hour revenue data (i.e. tracking to offering program).

---

<sup>3</sup> Shift from “Office” to “Community” will happen, shift from “DEIE” to “Belonging” is pending discussion with Vice Provost and colleagues regarding navigating recent Supreme Court ruling and what resonates with students.

<sup>4</sup> Found in Appendix 1



**3. Build *University* academic community through shared supports, policies, systems, and engagement.**

- Action: Establish University Senate
- Action: Schedule of All-University Faculty meetings
- Action: Improved culture of assessment in all areas (HLC Quality Initiative)
  - This includes assessment of operations, assessments of non-degree programming (e.g. FYE, Bridge, etc.)
  - Establish consistent NSSE data gathering and review

**4. Establish academic policies related to workload and compensation (P2.1b, P2.1c, P2.2c, P2.3a, P2.4c).**

- Action: Faculty Roles and Responsibilities Document with each College and Library to clarify expectations for faculty workload by May 1, 2025.
- Action: University policy on course reassignments and stipends by May 1, 2024
- Action: University policy on course caps/minimums, fill-rates, and related compensation/other adjustments by May 1, 2024.
- Action: Consider other options within “Teaching Ecosystem” to improve our structural operations in Academic Affairs.

**5. Standardize hiring practices (P1.3e, P2.1e).**

- Action: Provost will work with Deans to develop required process and timeline for requesting lines by February 1, 2024.
- Action: Provost and Vice Provost will work with Deans to develop required process for posting and conducting searches by April 1, 2024.





**6. Work with SEM on recruitment and yield activities, and on scholarship planning (P1.2b, P1.3b, P1.3d, P3.1, P3.2, P3.3, P3.4, all Enrollment Plan Goals).**

- Action: Establish consultative/collaborative process (to include a calendar of decision points) that brings the expertise of SEM together with the expertise of Academic Affairs (particularly faculty) by March 1, 2024 (to ensure understanding of summer planning).
  - Financial scholarship strategy must be shared with the Provost and appropriate Dean and faculty a minimum of 4-months prior to implementation. This allows for necessary input/collaboration, as well as vital planning/adjustment to communication and practice.
- Action: SEM should regularly consult with Provost and appropriate Dean and faculty on marketing and recruitment strategies (reciprocal sharing of ideas and opportunities).
- Action: Work with Deans and faculty to identify for opportunities for faculty to meet with prospective students.
- Action: Engage SEM on retention goals. Retention is a University-wide effort with all offices holding accountability. As such, SEM should have both a voice in setting retention goals and an accountability for meeting them.



## **STUDENT EXPERIENCE AND ENGAGEMENT**

To be the “destination for Jesuit Catholic education in the Rocky Mountain region”, Regis must maintain a dynamic program portfolio, with a distinctive quality of programming, and robust student support covering the entirety of the student experience. Quality of instruction and programming certainly play a big part in the student experience, as does creating a supportive environment in which students can navigate University policy, communicate with staff, and be successful. The emphasis on rigorous and relevant programming has been maintained alongside an emphasis on reaching students in ways that maximize learning and maximize accessibility. For every priority in this section, we are committed to *all* students, meaning there is an expected explicit and increased commitment to online, graduate, and post-traditional undergraduate students to go along with our history of strong commitment to residential undergraduate students. Many of the metrics in this section would seem to point towards an enrollment strategy and while that is certainly an outcome, as mentioned, our belief is that quality instruction and programming drive enrollment. *Cura personalis*, *magis*, *men* and *women* for others, and contemplatives in action are some of the Jesuit values/mission pursuit informing this section.

### *Rationale*

This portion of the strategic plan aligns with University Pillars 1 and 3. Regis is above all else an institution of quality programming and instruction, and we need to ensure a quality education and support for student success and engagement, as getting students “in the door” cannot be more important than what we do with them after. Moving forward, Regis has to be able to hold students to our high academic standards, but more importantly has to be committed to helping them reach those standards.

### *Priorities and Action Items*

#### **7. Enhance support for international students by August, 2024<sup>5</sup> (P1.1a, P1.3a, P1.4a, Enrollment Plan Goal 4).**

- Action: Staff support in Community for Global Commitment. Include bridge ESL/ELL support/infrastructure.
- Action: Allocate faculty and advisor lines for programs with expected increases in international enrollment.
- Action: Continuous development of student exchange opportunities that bring international students to Regis, but sends Regis students to international field placements and academic experiences.

---

<sup>5</sup> This recognizes the needs of our current international students as well as supports the initiative to increase international enrollment.



**8. Increase support for career development and community networking by FY25 (P1.2c, P1.4a, P1.4b, P3.1, P3.3).**

- Action: Build out vocational discernment/career development programming in Community for Student Success – to include expanding internships opportunities, and imbedded learning outcomes.
- Action: Implement/imbed career-related university requirement (for all majors).
- Action: Expand forthcoming peer-mentoring program to include career-mentoring with Alumni as mentors (student support and alumni engagement in same initiative).

**9. Enhance experiential/field-based learning experience by FY25 (P1.1a, P1.1b, P1.1c, P1.2e, P1.4a, P3.1, P3.2, P3.3, P3.4).**

- Action: Expand URISE and support for faculty/student research collaboration
- Action: Establish and/or revise policies around field education across programs. Develop a clear communication plan (“mapping”) for students.
- Action: Develop and steward community and professional partnerships to create unique and impactful field experiences.

**10. Develop programming and/or learning outcomes related to Laudato Si<sup>6</sup>, evidence of action in each College and Library by FY 26 (P1.1a, P1.2e, P1.3e, P1.4a, P3.1, P3.2, P3.4, P3.5).**

- Action: Each program has a learning outcome related to Laudato Si
- Action: Expansion of our service learning and internship opportunities with organizations that support/align with Laudato Si elements.

**11. Increase non-degree programming to \$100,000 revenue in FY25, \$500,000 in FY26, and \$850,000 in FY27 (P1.1a, P1.2a, P1.2e, P3.3).**

- Action: Work with programs to identify opportunities (certificate options, professional development/continuing education, billable services, etc.
- Action: Work with Financial Affairs on budgetary models.

---

<sup>6</sup> Consider <https://catholicsocialthought.georgetown.edu/essays/resources-for-caring-for-the-environment-and-each-other-pope-francis-follow-up-to-laudato-si>



**12. Increased sense of belonging (measured in student satisfaction in FY25, and subsequently annually) (P1.1a, P1.3a, P1.4a).**

- Action: Establish feedback loop for Course Evaluation process, encourage midterm evaluations, and midterm stop-light survey for student support.
- Action: Upgrade technology to support student advising and support.
- Action: Develop an online Orientation module(s) for new students and continuous reference/support.
- Action: Track student complaints for continuous and annual review to identify patterns and ensure loop is closed. (immediately)
- Action: DML upgrades to physical space, and DML support for online and commuter students.
- Action: Establish peer-mentoring program (FY25)
- Action: Visits from advisors and enrollment staff during end of program courses and other events such as a Student Appreciation Week.
- Action: Increased communication of University events and information

**13. Expand reach and service of The Learning Commons.**

- Action: Build tutoring supports for graduate students
- Action: Build supports for specialized tutoring (e.g. Music, Nursing, etc.)

**14. Increase traditional UG retention rate to 84% by end of FY27, and undergraduate graduation rates to 60% (4-year), 72% (6-year), and 68% (6-year Pell) FY27 (P1.4a, P1.4c).**

- Action: Aforementioned efforts in Community for Student Success and other priorities.
- Action: Improve processes surrounding student requests for LOA, withdrawals.
- Action: Establish stop-light/early alert system
- Action: Organize data analytics for predictive modeling of retention threats



**15. Lower/eliminate equity gaps by race/ethnicity and income-status by FY27.**

- Action: Enhance student holistic advising and case management infrastructure, streamline first-generation supports.
- Action: Address digital divide to provide equitable access to technology tools and broadband resources.
- Action: Scale and support career development through curricular, co-curricular, and service delivery.

**16. Increase number of Regis undergraduates matriculating to graduate programs to a goal of every Regis UG department having a graduate “landing spot” by FY26 (P1.2a, P1.2c, P1.4a, Enrollment Plan Goal 2).**

- Action: Work with Colleges to establish “plus-1” and “plus-2” pathways for their undergraduates into graduate programs.
  - Revisit/revise/expand “Fast-Forward”
- Action: Work with Financial Affairs on pricing strategies
- Action: Work with SEM on direct-admit and other strategies.

**17. Increase number of articulations with partner institutions to 3 partners per program by FY26 (P1.2a, P3.1, Enrollment Plan Goals 1 and 2).**

- Action: Identify programs in area Community Colleges for articulations to include direct transfer agreements, 3+1, and direct enrollment.
- Action: Work with area/regional, AJCU, and other 4-year undergraduate programs to serve as “feeders” for our graduate programs.
- Action: Engage with graduate program partners for our UG majors.
- Action: Work with SEM and the Financial Affairs to identify possible discounting strategies to solidify partnership.
- Action: Work to be creative in modality and location (e.g. Creighton OT).



**18. Increase and improve international articulations to two international university partners per College by FY26 (P1.1a, P1.2a, Enrollment Plan Goal 4).**

- Action: Completion of 4+1 and 3+2 agreements
  - E.g. Anderson's work with the American College of Thessalonik
- Action: Continue efforts with short-term academic programming for international faculty, undergraduate and graduate students, and develop such programming for middle and high school students.
- Action: Establish branch-campus model with an international partner

**19. Imbed programming in the areas of mindfulness, trauma-informed skills, resiliency, etc. into curriculum and/or student support (P1.1a, P1.3e, P1.4a).**

- Action: Integration of U-Thrive into each College, or "on-demand" for Fall 2024.
- Action: Establish United Us resource to support students by January 2024.

**20. Innovate ways to improve student navigability and time to completion.**

- Action: Unsequencing of program requirements where possible, being mindful of coordination with co-curricular alignments.
- Action: Consideration of 4-credit hour model
- Action: Consideration of intentional year-round academic calendar
- Action: Develop a co-curricular transcript
- Action: Increase use of Open Educational Resources (OER)

**21. Increase enrollment of transfer<sup>7</sup>, adult students, and other unique student populations (GLOBAL, Prison Education, Older-Adult, etc.) (P1.2a, Enrollment Plan Goal 1).**

- Action: Develop an Associates/Entry-to-BA pathway
- Action: Develop a transfer core
- Action: Develop dual-credit *and* dual-enrollment pathways
- Action: Maximize use of Bachelor of Liberal Arts (i.e. more department considering BLA pathways for their program)

---

<sup>7</sup> See Appendix 3 for common barriers to effective transfer enrollment



**22. Increase the utilization of multi-modal and online learning so that by FY27 every degree with determined market opportunity has a pathway for students that is entirely online or low-residency/hybrid (P1.1a, P1.2a, Enrollment Plan Goal 2).**

- Action: Continued and new integration/development of programming for post-traditional students in each College (e.g. the programs from the former School of Professional Advancement need to be clearly and genuinely integrated in Regis College).

**23. Develop cross-college programs (joint/dual degrees, single degrees with shared courses, etc.). New programs should maximize existing expertise/curriculum, using the new pathways to funnel more students into existing sections (P1.1a, P1.2a, Enrollment Plan).**

- Action: Packaging existing programs (e.g. MBA and MHSA)
- Action: Development of new programs (e.g. either a Bachelor of Social Work or Master of Social Work collaboration with Regis College and RHCHP).
- Action: Ensure revenue/cost tracking is accurate (that participating programs are properly budgeted and credited)



## **FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, DIVERSITY, AND SCHOLARSHIP**

Our faculty have long been, and need to be, effective teachers, scholars, and professionals. Our students expect our faculty to have professional insights, to be effective in the classroom, and committed to “accompanying” students on their academic path. Additionally, our faculty expect space and opportunity to pursue scholarly and professional interests for their own professional development, and with the intention of using such endeavors to inform and enhance their teaching. It is ultimately the responsibility of the University to support and resource the faculty in their fulfillment of their responsibilities. *Cura personalis*, *cura apostolica*, and *contemplatives in action* are some Jesuit values/mission pursuit informing this section.

### *Rationale*

This portion of the strategic plan arguably aligns with University Pillars 1 and 2. Supporting faculty development and scholarship, and committing to a diverse faculty and one that understands diversity, will help us reach multiple goals.

### *Priorities and Action Items*

#### **24. Development of support for faculty international engagement (P1.1d, P1.3e, P2.1c).**

- Action: Support for international research and collaboration, especially with international Jesuit partners.
- Action: Faculty exchange opportunities that bring international faculty to Regis (e.g. J1 scholars), and sends Regis faculty to international universities.

#### **25. Continuous opportunities for self-evaluation, peer assessment, and professional development via Community for Cura Facultas (P2.1b, P2.1c, P2.2c, P2.3a, P2.4c).**

- Action: Develop support for teaching excellence
- Action: Develop peer observation and workload allocation by FY26.
- Action: Create development and engagement opportunities for collaboration, sharing of work, etc.
- Action: Work with Advancement to fundraise for endowed chairs, faculty research, and graduate fellowships.
- Action: Develop full research & grant-writing support shop.
- Action: Programming/support for faculty well-being
- Action: Aforementioned Roles and Responsibilities/Workload Allocation process to expand definitions of scholarship, and increase rigor/competitiveness around course reassignments for scholarship and sabbaticals.





**26. Enhance commitment to diversity and cultural competence starting in FY25 (P1.1a, P1.1d, P1.2e, P1.3a, P1.3e, P2.1e).**

- Action: Promote inclusive excellence and diversity through programs and hires.
- Action: Hold workshops and opportunities for development and sharing in the areas of diversity, inclusion, and cultural competence – including training on how to integrate each into one's teaching.

**27. Increase part-time faculty engagement, support, and development starting in FY25 (P2.1c, P2.2c, P2.3a, P2.4c).**

- Action: Develop a thorough onboarding process for new affiliates.
- Action: Hold bi-annual meetings for affiliate faculty.
- Action: Increase communication of College/Library and University events, especially information about training and development opportunities.
- Action: Online discounts for bookstore (Regis gear) and discounted parking.
- Action: Cycle for reviews so that part-time faculty a) have feedback, and b) have an accounting of performance.
- Action: Develop a tiered system for part-time faculty rank and compensation.
- Action: Development of an Affiliate Council to organize/facilitate Affiliate voice and representation (could engage with potential University Senate)



## **COMMUNITY IMPACT**

Whether it is helping promote/connect our liberal arts programs with employers, connecting our industry-specific programs to employers, or connecting to our community for support and collaboration, it is a priority that we are accountable to a collaborative and substantial impact on and with our community. Building a more just and humane world, cura apostolica, magis, and men and women for others are some Jesuit values/mission pursuit informing this section.

### *Rationale*

This area aligns with all three University Pillars. Focusing on our community relationships and impacts will create persistence in students, create vocational and professional opportunities, increase intercultural competence and global citizenship, allow for innovative programming, and increase the reputation of our programs and the University.

### *Priorities and Action Items<sup>8</sup>*

#### **28. Develop at least 2 community/corporate/educational *enrollment* relationships per College by FY26 (P1.1a, P1.2a, P1.2e, P1.3e, P3, Enrollment Plan).**

- Action: Identify partners who are interested in degree *and* non-degree programming.
- Action: Work with community-based organizations on education needs, develop community-informed menu of non-degree certificates/courses that also have pathways to degrees.
- Action: Work with SEM and Financial Affairs for pricing and outreach strategies.

#### **29. (Re)Engage with Jesuit Worldwide Learning (JWL) and Jesuit Refugee Services (JRS).**

- Action: Work with JWL on providing degree and non-degree programming.
- Action: Work with JRS and faculty, students (RUSGA), etc. on collaborating on impactful supports and programming.

---

<sup>8</sup> Many of the priority goals in previous sections contribute to community impact



**30. Develop at least 3 community/corporate collaborative partnerships with academic initiatives per College by FY25 (beyond field placements) (P1.1a, P1.1b, P1.1c, P1.2a, P1.2d, P1.2e, P1.3e, P3, Enrollment Plan).**

- Action: Identify partners who have project needs, intern needs, etc. that would provide experiential learning and curricular support.
- Action: Consider a “Community Lab” in either Community for Global Commitment or Community for Student Success for RFP program utilized by faculty as course assignments.
- Action: Build more cross-institution programming like the Creighton-Regis Occupational Therapy program that both creates enrollment pathways while also serving community needs.
- Action: Expand support and reach of Thornton Campus to include more degree programming, interprofessional/interdisciplinary programming, and services provided (and billed) by Regis.



## **SERVINGNESS AND BEING A HSI**

The goals in this section could certainly have been placed under any of the previous four as servingness and attentiveness to DEI work is imbedded in each. Still, it is important to separate it and name the strategic priority to pursue and fulfill our accountability as a HSI. Doing so is important for our Latine students, faculty, staff, and community partners; helps us better support those with other racially minoritized identities in those groups; and informs how we work with those with privileged identities. Building a more just and humane world, cura personalis, magis, contemplatives in action, and men and women for others are some Jesuit values/mission pursuit informing this section.

### *Rationale*

This area aligns with all three University Pillars and supports/extends the HSI Strategic Plan. This priority needs to be the consistent question and have consistent presence in the pursuit of every other goal and action in this academic plan. All goals will be informed and pursued through a institutional equity audit.

### *Goals and Action Items*

#### **31. Ensure HSI status is visible in key identifiers of our work (P1.2d, P1.2e, P1.3a, P1.3e, P2.1e).**

- Action: Rework College/Library mission and identity statements, and program learning outcomes, to include commitment to being a HSI and specifically to liberating racially and economically minoritized students

#### **32. Adapt assessment strategies to more intentionally understand and serve our diverse student populations (P1.2d, P1.2e, P1.3a, P1.3e, P1.4c, P2.1e).**

- Action: Use data to understand/pursue equitable graduation, job placement, and post-baccalaureate opportunities for all students, but especially Latine and Black students
- Action: Invite and assess student voice regarding racial climate, to include students from other racial groups and their view of the HSI initiative

#### **33. Increase compositional diversity of all members of the University (P1.1d, P1.2d, P1.2e, P1.3a, P1.3e, P2.1e).**

- Action: Attention to recruitment of all students, especially graduate and doctoral Students
- Action: Intentional (equity-minded and focused) hiring processes for faculty, staff, administrators, and selection of trustees.
- Action: Intentional (and funded/supported) retention efforts for employees, to align with aforementioned student retention efforts.



**34. Provide training, development, and other community building opportunities that help transform us from a predominately white institution in operations<sup>9</sup> (P1.1d, P1.2d, P1.2e, P1.3a, P1.3e, P1.4c, P2.1c, P2.1e).**

- Action: Train faculty and staff to work with and educate racially minoritized students using anti-oppressive/social justice lens, as opposed to diversity and inclusion
- Action: Transform the curricular and co-curricular structures in order to center the voices and experiences of Latine and other racially minoritized groups, and with the goal of liberation for these groups.
- Action: Develop faculty and staff affinity groups. Where there is not sufficient critical mass, provide resources for connection to regional/national groups.
- Action: Include students from other racial groups in HSI initiatives

**35. Establish a HSI Task-Force, led by Vice Provost, to pursue these goals and the goals in the HSI Strategic Plan (P1.1d, P1.2d, P1.2e, P1.3a, P1.3e, P1.4c, P2.1e).**

- Action: Consider establishing a role for HSI Director, or a collection of existing colleagues to help lead efforts, pending consultation with Faculty Governance.

---

<sup>9</sup> This is arguably the most important step for us to take as a HSI. The HSI is an enrollment-based designation, we need to change our operations and be mindful of the experiences we are creating.



## **APPENDIX 1: PROGRAM PORTFOLIO OPTIMIZATION**

We will establish an exercise to provide salient information to better inform the kinds of necessary, ongoing, reflective work that faculty, deans, and others have done over the years as they analyze our many academic programs, sometimes leading to adjustments to the overall roster of programs we offer.

These ongoing discussions have led in the past, and may lead in the future to:

- enrichment or expansion of a program
- maintaining a program
- reduction of a program, e.g. from a major to a minor
- consolidation or restructuring of programs
- eliminating a program
- adding a new program

While we have always analyzed our programs and made adjustments to our portfolio over the years, the current optimization model is an attempt to provide a more thorough and systematic analysis of all programs at once using some key points of information.

Of course, even as adjustments have been and always will be made, nothing we do, now or in the future, will detract from the mission of the university, nor will it alter our core identity as a diverse community rooted in a liberal arts and sciences education, offering rigorous, integrative, and innovative undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs.

### **The Model**

There are five key metrics for each program – and a program is defined as a **major, minor, certificate, or degree program**.

The first two metrics—margin amounts and margin percentage—relate to financial contribution in fiscal years 2020-2023.

Margin amounts will be calculated by subtracting salaries, benefits, and direct operating expenses by program from revenues by program. Revenues are either directly billed or represent an allocation of net tuition using credit hours. Margin percentage is that margin divided by net revenues. The amounts/methodology are the same as what is used in the annual college/library margin statements. In cases where programs are subsets of a larger, measured program, margin amounts will be allocated by credit hour size and the margin percentage is consistent.

The next three metrics – number in program, credit hours, and degree conferrals – relate to size and productivity over a three-year period.

- a. Number of students in the program.
- b. Credit hours: This metric will be based on total credit hours generated by course prefix, but not all programs are aligned to a distinct course prefix code. In most cases, the decision will be made to divide the credit hours generated per course prefix by the headcount in each program that utilizes the prefix.
- c. Degree conferrals.



In the current exercise, with these five metrics identified, information on all five metrics will be provided for each program. A scoring rubric (attached) will be employed, with programs assigned a score based on the rubric, and using averages for three previous years for each of the five key metrics. The rubric could result in a total score as high as 100 or as low as 20.

With each program now receiving scores based on each metric, as well as an overall score, this exercise should foster discussion about our many programs. In particular, it should lead to further focused study of those programs with additional information and context to be provided by chairs and directors, as well as faculty in the programs, deans and associate deans, and others as needed. Included in this narrative is an opportunity to articulate mission fit and service to the core curriculum and other programs, contribution to experiential and high impact practices, its career development activities, its advancement of institutional diversity goals, and other ways a program advances the priorities in the Academic Plan and the University's Strategic Plan.

The initial assessment will be an iterative process for evaluating programs. At each stage we will explore a diversity of situations and actively use data and insight to provide the most favorable perspective of each academic program. This rubric/process will then be used an annual cycle of assessment, with the outcomes used to inform line requests, budget allocation, and program status.

#### **First iteration in considering program status:**

The first iteration involves cleaning the data, checking data accuracy, and removing from consideration the programs that would not need further review because of their high levels of student interest, completion rates, and positive financial position (thresholds TBD). We will also remove from consideration programs that are either new and therefore do not have a sufficient number of academic years to demonstrate success or programs that are already being closed by the home department/College.

#### **Second Iteration:**

The second iteration involves the Provost sharing a list of flagged programs with the Deans, though Deans have discretion to identify additional programs, and all programs are encouraged to use this data in continuous improvement efforts. Deans will work with the leaders of the involved programs to verify data, describe significant relevant factors missing in the analysis thus far, and to develop a response with optimization efforts.

#### **Third Iteration:**

For the third iteration, we will ask subcommittees (or perhaps RUAC) to review the programs and proposed optimization strategies. The subcommittees/RUAC may seek additional information and communicate with the involved Dean to gather additional insight regarding the program. The subcommittee/RUAC will examine and discuss the additional information provided for each program. The subcommittee/RUAC will then vote to support the optimization efforts or recommend sunsetting the program. This recommendation is to the Provost, who has decision authority.

We have always analyzed our programs and it is our responsibility to do so as stewards of the university's mission and identity in ever-changing contexts. We hope to continue updating this information each year, so that we can continue to refine our portfolio of academic programs over time, in order to advance our mission and stay true to our identity in ways that demonstrate a high level of quality and contribute to the financial vitality of the institution.



## **Program Optimization**

1. **Expenses and Revenues**
  - a. **Expenses**
    - i. Personnel
      1. FT faculty, staff, Affiliate salaries and benefits
    - ii. Operating Margin as Percent of Net Revenue
      1. Space/infrastructure/equipment and its maintenance
      2. Accreditation costs (if applicable)
      3. Marketing/recruiting
      4. Library resource costs
  - b. **Revenues**
    - i. Direct
      1. Net instructional revenue *or* net revenue per credit
    - ii. Indirect
      1. Donor/endowment/philanthropic funds
      2. Grant funds
      3. Non-Credit revenue
2. **Demand for program**
  - a. **External**
    - i. Local and national needs/interest
      1. Enrollment trends and competition/market share
      2. New Freshmen and Transfer intended majors, New Graduate applications
  - b. **Internal**
    - i. Participation in Program
      1. Declared Minors and Majors
      2. Degree Conferrals
3. **Quality of program – inputs**
  - a. Faculty composition – Percent of Courses taught by FT Faculty
  - b. Student/Faculty Ratio
  - c. Average size of classes
  - d. Additional Admission Requirements (Yes/No)
  - e. Accreditation
  - f. Innovation/Diversity in Programming (new programs, integrative programs, online/hybrid)
4. **Quality of program – outcomes**
  - a. Pass rates for Licensure Exams
  - b. Graduation rates
  - c. Job placement and graduate program placement rates
  - d. Percentage of Students engaged in at least one HIP during program
  - e. Percentage of Faculty/Students engaged in scholarship (presentations, publications, etc.)
  - f. Student Experience Data
5. **Size of program**
  - a. Majors
  - b. Credit Hour Production
6. **Equity**
  - a. Gaps in pass rates, persistence, graduation rates, etc.
  - b. Description of program plan on contributions to inclusive learning environments.





### **Guiding Principles**

The above data will be reviewed based on the following guiding principles:

#### **Undergraduate Programs**

##### Undergraduate Guiding Principle 1

- We will retain programs that are essential to our mission. Optimization is still expected, but certain programs will not be considered for elimination.

##### Undergraduate Guiding Principle 2

- We will retain programs that attract an obviously sufficient number of students who matriculate. The Provost will seek confirmation of the data from Deans, Department Chairs, and other appropriate program leaders (i.e. Directors, Coordinators, etc.) prior to defining thresholds.

##### Undergraduate Guiding Principle 3

- We will retain programs that graduate an obviously sufficient number of students. The Provost will seek confirmation of the data from Deans, Department Chairs, and other appropriate program leaders (i.e. Directors, Coordinators, etc.) prior to defining thresholds.

##### Undergraduate Guiding Principle 4

- We will retain programs (e.g., minors, certificates, 2nd/3rd majors) that complement existing majors. The Provost will seek confirmation of the data from Deans, Department Chairs, and other appropriate program leaders (i.e. Directors, Coordinators, etc.) prior to defining thresholds.

#### **Graduate Programs**

##### Graduate Guiding Principle 1

- We will retain graduate programs that receive a large number of applicants (as these programs help to enhance our reputation regionally/nationally).

##### Graduate Guiding Principle 2

- We will retain graduate programs that generate sufficient net tuition revenue (NTR) per student per credit hour taken in the program (as these programs have a positive impact on the University's finances).

##### Graduate Guiding Principle 3

- We will retain graduate programs that possess a high graduation rate (as these programs have a positive impact on matriculant students).



| Criteria                      | Rating                                                                                                                                                 | Quantitative equivalent |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Expenses                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Low</li><li>• Moderate</li><li>• High</li></ul>                                                                |                         |
| Revenues                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Low</li><li>• Moderate</li><li>• High</li></ul>                                                                |                         |
| External Demand for Program   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Low</li><li>• Moderate</li><li>• High</li></ul>                                                                |                         |
| Internal Demand for Program   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Low</li><li>• Moderate</li><li>• High</li></ul>                                                                |                         |
| Quality of program – inputs   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Emerging quality inputs</li><li>• Meeting quality inputs</li><li>• Exceeding quality inputs</li></ul>          |                         |
| Quality of program – outcomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Emerging quality outcomes</li><li>• Meeting quality outcomes</li><li>• Exceeding quality outcomes</li></ul>    |                         |
| Size of program               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Small (less than 15)</li><li>• Medium (15-30)</li><li>• Large (30-59)</li><li>• Very Large (over 60)</li></ul> |                         |
| Equity                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Low</li><li>• Moderate</li><li>• High</li></ul>                                                                |                         |



| Criteria                      | Data Source                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Expenses                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• College Margin Data (broken down by program)</li><li>• Finance Office</li></ul>                                                                                                                             |
| Revenues                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• College Margin Data (broken down by program)</li><li>• Finance Office</li><li>• IDS for fill rate, cost per credit, etc.</li><li>• University Advancement</li><li>• College</li></ul>                       |
| External Demand for Program   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Deans/Consultants</li><li>• IDS (SOAR Data, Registrations, etc.) for Intended Programs</li><li>• Lightcast</li></ul>                                                                                        |
| Internal Demand for Program   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• IDS</li></ul>                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Quality of program – inputs   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• IDS</li><li>• College</li></ul>                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Quality of program – outcomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• College/IDS for pass rates</li><li>• IDS for graduation rates by program</li><li>• IDS for status 6 months after graduation</li><li>• Course Evals, NSSE, Alumni Survey (any one, or combination)</li></ul> |
| Size of program               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• IDS</li></ul>                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Equity                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• IDS</li><li>• College</li></ul>                                                                                                                                                                             |



## **APPENDIX 2: COMMON BARRIERS TO TRANSFER FRIENDLINESS**

| <b>Challenge</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>Solution</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Transfer Credit Evaluation Process</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Time to completion/approval process</li><li>- Organization of website is not intuitive</li><li>- Notifications (how we share information)</li></ul>                                                                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Registrar authority to approve lower-division courses</li><li>- Publicly accessible database (course list) of approved courses</li><li>- Notification to students when evaluation is complete or delayed</li><li>- Include all AA and AS degrees from regionally accredited institutions in a core waiver policy</li><li>- Method to track/identify students who are in articulation agreements</li><li>- Guaranteed admission program</li><li>- Must be year-round, no program/College/Unit can dictate timing.</li></ul> |
| <b>Degree Evaluation</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Timing (inquiry, SOAR, etc.?)</li><li>- Students want to know at time of credit evaluation how it relates to degree</li></ul>                                                                                                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Timely degree audits that include if/then scenarios at time of admission</li><li>- Degree audit solution?</li><li>- Must be year-round, no program/College/Unit can dictate timing.</li></ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| <b>Onboarding/Orientation/Registration</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Orientations, assessments, and advising tied together</li><li>- Need to improve expectations across partner offices</li><li>- Deliver modes not transfer friendly</li></ul>                                                              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Frequent and earlier SOARs</li><li>- Separate orientation from advising</li><li>- Online assessments</li><li>- Ad hoc/contingency plan for late applicants and deposits, set schedule for course availability aligned with enrollment goals</li><li>- Expand deliver modality to include evening, online, and hybrid courses</li><li>- Must be year-round, no program/College/Unit can dictate timing.</li></ul>                                                                                                           |
| <b>Curriculum/Majors</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Core Curriculum limits number of credits a transfer student can apply to degree, too many come in as electives</li><li>- Majors – many aren't welcoming of transfers in terms of rigid sequencing, requirements, and modality.</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Create transferable core (e.g. mirrors associate degree plan)</li><li>- Review majors to see where course sequencing and requirements can be adjusted to be more transfer friendly.</li></ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |



### **APPENDIX 3: ACADEMIC PLAN FEEDBACK**

In early November 2023, the Provost shared a draft of the Academic Plan with the Academic Affairs community (faculty and staff in Academic Affairs). Over the next month, the Provost held six 90-minute listening/working sessions (three in person, three via Zoom), multiple individual conversations, two meetings with specific groups, received multiple emails, and provided an anonymous Qualtrics link where feedback could be submitted. In total, there were roughly 140 engagements, noting that there were likely some duplicates from colleagues who joined a session and submitted feedback via the link.

This appendix contains a summary of the feedback (via identified patterns), as well as the raw data. Please note that the raw data is not technically complete. There is some repetitive data, and some data I believe to have been intended for my view only. The data from the listening/working sessions are from my notes, and there may very well be some missing data absent triangulation. Additionally, data from 1:1 conversations, emails, and the Qualtrics link, all had any identifying information removed as submitters did not consent to this report, and thus the feedback has been edited.

The hope is that the reader will see/feel the feedback-informed changes in the current version, certain additions/edits have been highlighted to indicate this. For feedback that is not present in the revised document, I have tried to provide an explanation.

#### **Patterns**

There are multiple areas where the feedback was truly mixed. For example, many appreciated that the plan is not overly prescriptive, whereas others called for more specific directives. Similarly, for priorities that have been a part of Regis' history, some commented "good, we used to do that and never should have stopped", while others shared "we used to do that, why are we going back?" Even with these and others, there are areas where there appears to be a common reaction for certain areas of the plan.

The most common theme in the feedback was about the priority regarding **program optimization**. While there was some resistance for the notion of program review/optimization, most understand the need and value for us to have a process, and there are many questions and recommendations for that process. Much of the concern about the process has to do with a lack of trust in the data that will inform the instrument. As such, the reader will find a change to the timeline for program optimization. This will allow for continued collaboration on the rubric, the data, and overall process.

The next most common area of feedback was on the **reorganization in academic affairs**. There are concerns about whether this achieves any efficiencies in resource allocation, whether it hinders good progress for units housed in specific colleges, and whether it is actually feasible for the Provost Office to manage all of these areas. There was also feedback that expressed appreciation and excitement for these changes, with many ideas for how to organize units and what benefits can be achieved.

The final area of feedback that will be classified as a "theme" is around the items dealing with **Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM)**. Many expressed worry of the silo'ing that is happening with SEM, specifically that SEM is operating too independently (without collaboration) with Academic Affairs, and that SEM is not engaging in recruitment efforts that are informed with retention and academic integrity in mind.



### **Raw Feedback**

This section contains comments directly from the Qualtrics data, emails, and from notes from 1:1 and group/open discussions. For certain items, there is a brief response provided. The brevity is not out of curtness, but for time/space considerations and with a commitment to future elaboration/conversation<sup>10</sup>.

- For Priority 25: Since this is FY25, is the idea that the actions will become more specific as time and space is given to this goal/initiative?
  - o Yes, the priority is to start having measurable efforts in FY25 – efforts that will continue to take shape with ongoing work.
- In Program Optimization rubric, What consultants does this mean?
  - o Referring to potential use of external consultants. E.g. EAB provides good market feasibility data.
- In Appendix 2, This listing of programs to target seems undergraduate heavy. Does STEM include any RHCHP programs?
  - o The list is not meant to be exhaustive or final, merely providing examples.
- Physical space, particular in DML, should receive attention and investment to achieve various items in Student section of plan, including for Laudato Si programming.
- Regarding OER, considering where we are staff-wise, and budget-wise are you able to share your level of commitment to this action item? Will there be resources allocated to support this effort?
  - o This is a major commitment, though I don't want to conflate commitment with resources. I don't believe this priority requires resources, assessing/determining materials should be a part of all our existing work (i.e. it's not "extra" and should not require resources as incentives).
- What is the "Academic Excellence Plan" that was used to create the Strategic Plan?
  - o This was a plan developed by the former Provost
- We appreciate the "flattening" of the Academic Affairs administration, keeping VP of DEIE, and the structuring of different Communities.
- With the "flattening" of the structure of academic affairs and the movement of many of the offices reporting to the Dean of each college, what additional "flattening" is envisioned for the individual colleges? Are there new duties that each College is expected to pursue?
  - o At this time, there are no prescriptive changes for the colleges. The Provost will work with Deans to explore the viability/need/opportunities for similar efforts for efficiency.
- What is the rationale to move Service Learning from each college to academic affairs?
  - o Goal is to elevate Service Learning as a University experience and to ensure proper resourcing and delivery.

---

<sup>10</sup> If you do not see your feedback, or do not feel the response is sufficient – please reach out directly. Any omissions and incomplete responses are not intentional and will be addressed if made aware.



- Others are concerned about moving the Service Learning units out of their respective colleges. Unless there is an obvious cost-saving or point of efficiency to override this, these folks believe that the Center for Service Learning in Regis College is well-placed to continue working with faculty and serving students without additional bureaucracy.
  - o I have yet to hear any valid arguments to support this claim. There are many arguments for how elevating Service Learning to a University priority will create benefits, no real benefit to keeping it siloed in colleges.
- The recommendation of including an ombuds person is especially welcome and strong. Overall, we appreciate this consideration for faculty support.
- The combination of High Impact Practices and holistic student supports with academic advising is welcomed. Currently the siloed nature of these supports creates resources that meet the needs of a sub-population of our students rather than the wide diversity of students that we are serving.
- We currently do an EOY Report but have no guidelines for it. Is something like this comparable to the annual cycle of review mentioned here?
  - o Program Optimization is different from annual (or 5-year, 3-year) assessments of learning outcomes. We will develop a stronger assessment cycle, program optimization is a separate process.
- If annual program review means something more extensive than our EOY Reports, then we have concerns about the practicality of doing this for every program, every year. Rather, could we do staggered longer cycles of more in-depth reporting similar to our Academic Unit Review (AUR) process?
  - o Programs do not have to do anything for Program Optimization beyond reviewing their report, and responding if called upon to do so. The report will be generated for programs.
- We object to the possibility of the program optimization being completed by 2/1/24. If this date is imposed, it will no longer feel like a process guided by shared governance.
  - o Noted, and adjusted.
- If the program optimization process is rushed, we believe this will have further negative consequences for faculty and staff morale making section 1.3 "building university academic community" incredibly difficult. In particular, a university-wide senate is controversial within Regis College, and one of the most frequently voiced concerns about it is that it will not be shared governance in a meaningful way. A rushed program optimization process seems likely to be viewed as confirmation of this view.
  - o Noted, however Regis College does not dictate the operations of Regis University. There is the Library and there are two other Colleges, and a community of others, that are as committed and as vital as those in Regis College. Shared governance is not self-governance, we will arrive at a process for optimization through shared governance, and if/when we arrive at a University Senate – it too will be done through shared governance.



- If we move towards a university faculty senate, will we also move towards a university-wide faculty handbook? If we are moving towards a university-wide faculty handbook, how will policies of workload, promotion expectations, etc. be normalized across units?
  - o While the Provost has argued for the value of a University Handbook (with broad expectations, but that Colleges maintain their own Handbooks as appendices that have key specifics), the faculty working on the University Senate do not intend to have a University Handbook as part of the University Senate. It may be something a future Senate wishes to consider, but currently there is no intent to establish a University Handbook.
- What about contract length expectations? Will that also be analyzed? Contract length can impact workload and FTE. For example, there is some belief within Regis College that some faculty in other colleges are on 12 month contracts but only teach for 9 months. They are paid the other 3 months for doing research, is this true? If so, this could have implications for grant application.
  - o Certainly work on roles and responsibilities/workload will include consideration of contract length.
- Will this evaluation (of course minimum policies) also create university policies for teaching classes with more students than the cap?
  - o Many models include an acceptable overage (course cap at 25, expected faculty to accept up to 28/30) and then additional compensation beyond that overage. We will discuss various models/approaches.
- What say will individual departments, handbooks, colleges, etc. have in developing these policies and guidelines?
  - o There will be the opportunity to provide feedback on the policy itself, however most of the discretion will come in requests for exceptions.
- This type of one-size-fits-all university policy can't/doesn't leave space for the realities of different types of programs. For example, some programs have lower division courses that are only taken by students in that program. Course minima for lower division courses that are designed for core courses taken by students from many programs may not make sense for these more specialized, but still lower division, courses. For example, only math and physics majors typically take MT 360C Calculus 3, which has the same pre-requisite as many upper division mathematics courses. Thus, Calc 3's enrollment is more like the enrollment for an upper division math course than a 200-level mathematics course. But, it needs to be a lower division course for alignment with national norms and to allow transfer credit.
  - o Noted, but do faculty acknowledge how much of this self-inflicted? What other efforts have programs employed to reduce/manage these "realities"? How intentional have programs been in course design, program mapping, etc. to avoid these realities that ultimately hurt the program?





- We also have physical space restrictions and need some smaller class sizes in order to utilize our smaller classrooms. Our recent experience is that many will wait and/or take the course outside of Regis rather than take a 3:30 section. Even when we can get students to enroll in them, attendance in 3:30 sections is typically extremely poor.
  - o The arguments around space lack data support beyond anecdotal evidence, and the situation with space is self-inflicted. The majority (almost all) colleges and universities distribute their classes evenly throughout the day and the week (that is not a reason to do it, but it is evidence that it can be done). Our classroom usage is under 65% - complaints about access to space have no merit until programs are more intentional and accountable with distributing classes.
- We appreciate the standardization of the hiring practice and processes, especially the timeline.
- Do we have any data from our current international students about their RU experience and what additional support they need?
  - o Noted, will collect the data.
- We agree with all of this (international student support), and we hope the Provost's Office is not underestimating the amount of support our international students need.
  - o The Provost has extensive experience in supporting international students, it is why it is so prevalent throughout the Academic Plan.
- What would it look like to implement a career-related university requirement? What about programs that already require internships?
  - o Some examples include making an internship a graduation requirement, making career development part of the core, making each major/degree have a career-related learning outcome, etc.
- We support this (career development) in principle, but already lost one staff member in our Academic Internship Office. We are concerned we do not have enough staffing for growth in this area.
- What supports and expansions do you see to generate a culture of undergraduate-involved scholarship and creative works through URISE for students in *any* major?
  - o Building out URISE is a start, faculty/Deans will decide what expansions look like.
- How do you propose to expand the faculty supports to ensure there are enough mentors accepting students into their groups to fill the need for the numbers of students in URISE?
  - o Not understanding this question, seems dependent on the current structure of URISE – which can be revised.



- What changes to evaluation and promotion protocols do you propose to give credit to the faculty mentors who are engaging students in scholarly work through URISE?
  - o Not up to the Provost, would be part of the Roles and Responsibilities document.
- Can we have an example of the types of non-degree programming you are hoping to create to increase revenue?
  - o Certificate programming, professional development/continuing education, OLLI, JWLL, billable services, etc.
- We're generally in favor of these (Student Belonging) actions. However, we're also confused by this section because the actions seem to assume something other than "belongingness". It seems more like program satisfaction rather than campus culture and identity. We understand that academic affairs only impacts a portion of the students' experience at Regis but would like to see ways to use belongingness to build bridges between academic affairs and student affairs.
  - o They all impact belonging, the literature on student-belonging recommends these and others. Absolutely, bringing academic affairs and student affairs together on more efforts is necessary.
- We support what we believe is the intent of this Action (tracking student complaints). However, we are also concerned about the potential for faculty to be penalized due to student complaints dealing with class difficulty, workload, and expectations that are based within personal preference rather than pedagogical quality (e.g., the effectiveness of active learning is well supported with STEM fields, but there is also evidence that students feel like they learn less in active learning classes). We are particularly concerned about potential impacts to non-male faculty and faculty of color.
  - o Tracking and closing the loop on complaints is good and necessary practice that rarely leads to penalties. The kinds of complaints that lead to penalties are already being submitted, this effort is about a stronger system for tracking complaints for either response and/or especially for continuous improvements.
- We are concerned that a retention rate of 84% by FY25 is an unrealistic standard and doubly concerned if this rate is what our university budget will be based on. Our concerns about this are amplified by what we've heard about the expected retention rate for new students between Fall 2023 and Spring 2024.
  - o Very well may be lofty, we will not lower the bar out of fear. The budget is not based on a retention goal, it's based on predicted/projected retention.
- Who will do the research to identify areas for potential "plus 1" and "plus 2" pathways?
  - o There can be help via access to data, but this is what most faculty do. Being faculty is not just delivering a contracted teaching load.
- Will department chairs have to work with financial aid for pricing and SEM on recruitment?
  - o This is typically what Deans are expected to do, with Chair insight.



- Are we specifically considering graduate pathways at Regis or is this for graduate programs in general?
  - o Revised to acknowledge both the benefit in pathways within Regis, and those that connect our UG to external grad programs.
- It seems unethical to unilaterally push for matriculating students to immediately go into graduate programs. What about student financial concerns? Is graduate school the best path for all of our graduates to reach their vocational goals? For example, graduate school immediately after undergrad is not the right path for most students pursuing secondary teaching.
  - o Unclear where there is a “push”, the priority is to create pathways should students choose.
- Will we really be developing short-term academic programming for international middle and high school students?
  - o It is a possibility. This is an example of non-degree programming, and is a form that generates revenue as well as a recruitment pipeline. No department will be forced to engage, but is an option a department might choose to pursue.
- Who will decide “where possible”? (for unsequencing courses)
  - o Faculty
- We are concerned with how this (unsequencing) might impact our highly structured "Pre-" (pre-med, pre-HES, pre-OT) programs.
- How will having a separate transfer core impact our current core review?
  - o The hope is that it is part of it.
- Where will the BLA be housed?
  - o No College owns a degree, the B.S., B.A., M.S., etc. are University degrees. Certainly Colleges own programs within a degree, and such is the case for the BLA. Any program in any college can have a program in the BLA.
- Can you give any insight into how this can be maximized?
  - o There are many student populations that might desire a BLA, there are current programs that could consider a BLA track, and new programs that could be developed.
- Would this (multi-modal learning) include one degree for programs regardless of modality? For example, right now, there is a difference between the BA in Communications from SPA and RC. Should programs like Communications be focused on creating one shared program?
  - o From the Provost’s perspective, absolutely – there are gains to be had with a shared program. However faculty have the discretion on how to best approach the opportunity to serve multiple student populations.
- Who will research potential areas of overlap?
  - o Unclear what the potential overlap is. If Colleges are collaborating, they’re inherently considering overlap.



- Could you say more about what you envision for an expanded definition of scholarship?
  - o Not for the Provost to decide, but encouragement for units to recognize work beyond peer-reviewed journals and books/book chapters. There are other forms of productivity, achievement, contribution, etc.
- How does STEPP choice relate to your vision for Scholarship? Is this a push to limit the course releases without scholarly output or do you see separate evaluation criteria for those who choose a scholarship STEPP vs those who choose a different STEPP?
  - o STEPP is problematic on multiple levels and needs to be reviewed for revision or termination.
- What will the rubric for sabbaticals look like? What will happen when someone is denied sabbatical? For example, will they have preference the next year? Are there goals for how many people can be granted sabbatical each year?
  - o Colleges should still maintain their rubrics for eligibility, the Provost Office needs to add University budget implications and a final review.
- We love the support for our affiliate faculty, but they may not want to do meetings.
  - o They may not, but it is our responsibility to create opportunities.
- There is some concern that this (anti-oppressive lens) sounds more ideologically driven than inclusive, especially given how some of our more conservative students can feel alienated. We don't want politicized language to get in the way of the needed actions.
  - o Agreed that language is important, but is this suggesting that conservatism equals oppression? Being anti-oppression is not being anti-conservative, if students who support oppression feel alienated, being at an institution that values walking with the marginalized is not a good fit. Key DEI and HSI literature specifically calls for institutions to not dilute anti-oppressive language to placate privileged fragility.
- Will we be working to create more areas of study, i.e. Latinx Study program, to further enhance this practice?
  - o Up to the Colleges, certainly that is a goal.
- How will courses that are not department based be counted? Designations such as RCC/Honors/WGS/PC/URC are taught by faculty across the college. In these cases, will FTE follow the faculty member to their home departments?
  - o Yes on following the faculty.
- How do we account for fulfillment of student learning objectives and pedagogical effectiveness other than graduation rates and job placements? Education itself seems to be displaced in this evaluation of our programs.
  - o Consideration of program assessment can and will be included.
- In Guiding Principle 1, how will what is "essential" to the mission be determined?
  - o Fluid conversation



- In Guiding Principle 4, how do we decide what complements other programs?
  - o Pre-reqs and required courses, among other possible measures.
- We have major concerns about how the data for this will be gathered and scrubbed. Data that we have previously received from IDS was found to have several flaws. This concern was voiced strongest by our faculty with expertise in data collection and analysis.
  - o Agreed, data integrity is a key point before any action is taken.
- Some feel that the Program Optimization rubric does not make sense for a college as integrated as Regis College. For instance, 1) many of our courses are designed for majors in other colleges or are used as core classes in other departments so while our major numbers may be small, we offer a great deal of courses (this is especially true for small/medium sized programs); 2) faculty teach all over the college in the Foundational and Integrative Core, Honors, URISE, WGS, MDP, Center for War Experience, SPA and it is difficult to determine the value of any one program without looking at the college as a whole.
  - o Respectfully disagree, RC faculty make the above argument and simultaneously argue for the need to maintain all majors/programs. If RC truly wanted to be integrated, there are models of this where there are no majors (maybe tracks/packages), and a very different model for staffing. If we are going to have specific programs (as opposed to an open multi-disciplinary experience), and if there are expectations to staff those programs, then we need to assess those programs to ensure we have an appropriate portfolio of programs and that they are appropriately resourced.
- There is no qualitative data being used to assess the "Quality of Programs" for both the inputs and outputs. How can the quality of our programs be assessed when only basing it on quantitative data?
  - o There is qualitative data listed, as well as the opportunity for additional qualitative data in the narrative/response stage.
- We need quality faculty to teach our distributive core classes and we are concerned that if we don't offer major classes in programs considered too small, it will be very difficult for us to hire quality faculty for these positions.
  - o Respectfully disagree, this is an anecdotal argument – there is no data to support the claim that “quality” faculty will only come to Regis if they can teach in a major.
- If data is being collected from the past 3-year period, this will include AY20-21 when we were in the midst of COVID. Is there another timeframe which data could also be collected to base projections for potential (re)growth?
  - o It is noted that a current 3-year history would bring data from the cyber-attack and COVID periods, and thus may not be helpful. That will be taken into consideration in review of the data, but the cyber-attack/COVID may not be a blip and may be a rubicon we have crossed – thus making the last three years very useful data. Regardless, a 3-year history is a good practice moving forward.
- Sharing leadership is so needed (regarding flattening of administration).



- Such importance in naming the commitment to DEIE.
- A nice model (academic affairs reorganization); will it be dismissed as it doesn't lower admin bloat?
  - o It does lower bloat, it brings the Provost directly into the work, removing additional administrators.
- Fr. Fitzgibbons said, three colleges, one mission, one university. It excited me then but has yet to feel realized.
- We operate on a trickle down model. It results in a passivity by many people.
- At some point, extending hours in the day and the semesters for our traditional Undergrads needs to be a serious consideration.
  - o We are working on a scheduling policy to maximize our space usage and options for students.
- There is movement from 'homes' such as library and SA to AA. In some sense, I can understand the resourcing issue. We can also recognize that this document is saying something about what we can do better/haven't done completely well previously.
- I wonder if the faculty/colleges can see the future in terms of our offerings? Where are we going? Or is it just defending?
- How do we acknowledge the elephant in the room that everyone will need to work a little harder for a little longer for Regis to succeed?
- Succession and career development planning conversations rather than current models of faculty development plans and reviews
- Share the philosophy of addition of new programs as well (regarding Program Optimization).
  - o Agreed, the data/approach in Optimization can be used to consider development of new programs.
- Make as much data as possible public (we cannot see most data at the program level; I have spoken with Justin about this and he is willing to give data at request but answering questions like how many students we have has an 'it depends' answer often. Can we have a corporate approach here to level set?
  - o Goal of optimization is to have this data readily available to programs.
- Change the AUR structures and perhaps annual reporting (both giving to and getting from programs).
  - o We will investigate and establish a stronger culture of assessment.
- There should be established All University Faculty meetings once in a while.
- Not sure where it belongs but we should check out Podium Education's immersion programs.



- Coach each college to create this as a shared revenue model. If the VB team holds a camp, they raise money for their season. I assume they share some. How can we mimic?
  - o Senior Leadership is supportive of this in spirit, however we have a long way to go in strengthening our budget before we can consider such models.
- I fully support these efforts! I appreciate this very thorough approach to academic affairs strategic planning.
- The attitudes are great. I might add “Jesuit Values”, not just *cura personalis*, as well as *cura apostolica* (care for the university) and the Jesuit “presupposition”(assuming the best intention of the other)
- **Good Stuff:** *Flattening academic leadership, Co-curricular transcript, Cleaning up and tracking how student complaints are handled* (especially with an eye to patterns), *Making course evaluations more formative* (including mid-term course evaluations), *Regular evaluations for part-time faculty*, and that there is no "magic bullet" revenue-generating program that will save us (another fine departure from past planning)
- **Maybes:** *Four communities in Provost's office.* On the surface this looks like an administrative efficiency (big thumbs up), but it's all about the execution, given that the staffing looks mostly like a part-time person (i.e. a full-time faculty member who has part of their workload leading these efforts). Since all four centers will reach across all colleges (good idea), stakes for good execution are a bit higher (people doing part-time leadership will need to be pretty good at reaching across aisles).
- I'm not sure how much heavy lifting and management needs to happen on the *assessment* front. We at RC were the slowest at getting on the assessment train (to our everlasting shame), but my impression was that assessment has continuously happened. So this feels like a place where there may not be so much need to center administration.
  - o Would strongly disagree, the biggest threat to our reaccreditation in 2028 is not budget but assessment. We have significant work to do.
- **Concerns/Questions:** *Service Learning office centralization.* This used to be the model for service learning (all offices were housed in Mission), and it was fine, but in my view, the ways in which the colleges do service learning differ significantly based on their programs. RHCHP has a more straightforward model (trips for vaccinations, e.g.), which is great. RC has developed some pretty innovative programs that reflect our liberal arts orientation (En Route, the Engaged Scholar Activist Program, Study Abroad in the Neighborhood, Small Grants Program within En Route), and I think it's not accidental that these programs are so healthy in part because of the close working environment with the faculty. Literally, being co-located in a building where so many faculty teach and have offices means that the SL staff and student workers are just regularly and easily in contact with faculty. It just feels like a very generative environment.
  - o Addressed earlier in this section, to reiterate – there is not data/valid argument for why it is necessary or good to keep service learning siloed. Elevating this work to the Provost Office maintains everything that's been mentioned as a benefit to the current structure, while adding additional benefits.





- *Academic Program Optimization.* To be clear, the description of APO as presented in the strategic plan sounds reasonable. But I read the Mindstream report that I think informs the need for optimization, and I'm more than a bit concerned about their data and conclusions. First, the mission is completely absent in their analysis, which gives me pause. But second, they say that RC is overloaded with programs and majors. I question this analysis; when Regis College began its (successful!) growth plan in 2008, we had 30 majors (not many fewer than 40), and our assessment of peer institutions showed that this was wildly low (my memory is that 40 - 50 majors was pretty common). Too few major opportunities for liberal arts colleges just leads to a cycle of disinvestment and disenrollment; students interested in a liberal arts education are typically not wedded to a single discipline, and often change majors or add a double major.
  - o Curious what was included as “peer institution”, and rest assured Mindstream is not influencing our model or outcomes.
- In particular, most of our liberal arts majors are actually pretty cheap to run. We have a lot of cross-listed courses, and our departments share administrative assistants. (Philosophy, Languages, Communication, History/Politics/Political Economy share ONE full-time assistant, for instance!) The softer side of the College operates no labs, so things like equipment costs are nonexistent (other than for FAVA/FAM, obviously). I just worry that this is an illusory cost savings that could cost us more in the long run in terms of recruitment and retention. (Christopher Newfield's work bears this argument out.)
  - o Agreed in part, does ignore some of the peripheral costs to maintain majors.
- If it comes to asking colleges to make similar changes (flattening), I think the push back will be if the flattening is really the same roles and responsibilities but more business titles instead of academic titles. Will there be cost savings?
  - o There will be!
- SEM and Student Affairs have used academic titles “Dean of Students” and “Dean of Enrollment,” will AA be more limited in their participation in university-level leadership because of diminished titles?
  - o The hope is that the rest of the University will consider both a flattening/removal of bloat as well as a departure from superfluous titles that have damaging outcomes.
- The devil is in the details in bringing operations that have been decentralized – such as service learning, to a more centralized operation. There are efficiencies to be gained through centralization – but I also don't want to lose distinctiveness. RHCHP has a very robust, data informed and outcomes-based service learning program, which engages all students interprofessionally with objectives and outcomes embedded in the curriculum. My hope would be that we could keep the important transformational nature of service learning, which has been a cornerstone of RHCHP student experience.
  - o Agreed, and that is the plan.
- I would love to see career services and enhanced internship (and alumni mentorship) opportunities under AA. Under the community for student success, we need to attend to the needs of non-traditional students. We have more non-traditional students than traditional students, yet most of our attention and resources (especially in Student Affairs) seem to focus on traditional, residential students.
  - o Agreed, and is discussed in the plan.





- RHCHP Faculty are very familiar with extensive and ongoing reviews of their workload, course releases and overload.
- I am so grateful to see that we are paying more attention to student feedback and course evaluations and establishing more of a feedback loop. In the past, student feedback has been disregarded or discounted as “biased” – and while that can happen, I think we have missed important student feedback that could be informing our way forward.
- LOVE the goal to attract and retain students that want to continue into graduate programs. I am supportive of international partnerships, and hope Regis will deepen ties to international Jesuit universities.
- Imbedding mindfulness and trauma-informed skills and resiliency into the curriculum is essential. We need to start with training faculty – back to the Community for Cura Facultas. We have counseling faculty that are experts in this area, let's utilize the faculty resources we have. Can trauma-informed pedagogy become one of our non-degree revenue streams if we want to offer outside Regis.
  - o Fantastic idea, manifesting this priority across areas.
- The community lab idea is interesting. What is “RFP” program? Again I wonder about the place for global health pathway in RHCHP – could there be collaboration with the MNM or Master of Development practice?
  - o RFP is Request for Proposals, inviting organizations to share needs/ideas that could lead to student engagement and could be monetized. There could be opportunity for MNM/MDP.
- Will we expect a significant number of students coming from non-English speaking countries? If so, Regis might consider offering both no-credit and credit-bearing ESL support. Will support staff have additional training in issues specific to international students (e.g., visa support, OPT, etc.)?
- Could university assessment efforts be leveraged to ensure improvement in students’ sense of belonging? Are there specific interventions (e.g., learning communities, peer-mentoring, etc.) that are particularly effective in improving students’ sense of belonging? Should some of these be action items? Should there be a mention of NSSE here or should we have a substitute/supplement to NSSE? More generally, with regard to assessment, is there work that needs to be done as a university to improve the quality of assessment data as well as the degree to which we are closing the loop? It might be helpful to have some goals/action items specifically related to this, especially since the timeline for this plan will lead us into reaccreditation. Are there other things we need to be doing to prepare for reaccreditation?
  - o Yes to all of this, it will be part of our building a culture of assessment.
- Is creating a separate department within RC for formally SPA programs an option that should be entertained? The option may be popular within RC, but would isolate these programs making them easier to eliminate and would slow the departmental culture changes necessary to develop the multi-modal/online programming the objective envisions.
  - o It is not a desirable option as it works counter to some other priorities and inhibits growth in various areas. Additionally, another department would be appropriately resourced, taking resources from existing departments.



- Should there be a goal(s) or action item(s) aimed specifically at increasing the quality and quantity of peer-reviewed scholarship/creative work produced by faculty (e.g., goals for external grants/fellowships, external reviews for promotion/tenure, competitive course releases for scholarship/creative activity)?
  - o Not from the Provost, no. Increasing quality/quantity of scholarship does little to help in the ways that Regis needs. There are arguments about increasing grant opportunities, but we need capacity-building grants and system/operation grants, not research grants. There should be a higher standard for course releases, sabbaticals, etc. – but that doesn't necessarily mean "more".
- Will there be a way of measuring credit hour production both in terms of bill-by-program and sched-type credit hours? How will the university distinguish between them for purposes of program revenue? Will double-majors be counted? If so, how?
  - o Yes to tracking sched-type hours, double majors will be counted and indicated as such.
- I agree that flattening academic affairs administration may be a good goal, but I think that the goal of the Vice Provost as the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) is short-sighted. The current VP will not always be in this role, and the replacement will not necessarily be the best fit for CDO. It is nice to have both a VP and CDO in one person, but this is not always going to be possible.
  - o Disagree with this as the point of this designation is about the role, not the person. Designating the CDO as the clear next in command solidifies the importance and access of that role. Future hiring should absolutely be intentional in hiring someone appropriate for CDO work and senior leadership.
- Student support services should go beyond academic support to include daycare, transportation, etc. We have more and more non-traditional students and they need a different kind of support.
  - o Very supportive of this, will share with Student Affairs.
- Not all programs are alike (regarding workload). A one size fits all program portfolio will be a challenge and will require more time than just January 2024. Teaching a semester long chemistry course with very specific credit hours is much different than teaching to expertise in a cohort model seen in graduate programs.
- Our Catholic identity makes us unique in Colorado and this should be incorporated in the academic plan as it relates to students, faculty, staff, community partners, etc. If we don't have our own Jesuit Catholic identity throughout our academic plan, I do not see how we can be the destination for Jesuit Catholic education.
  - o Efforts have been made for those values to be felt in the plan, admittedly not always explicitly named. Revised version has more efforts at being explicit, however this is not the Mission Plan.
- I have heard how difficult it is to be an international student when they cannot work while here on a student visa. Denver is expensive, so creating campus-based jobs for these students will be needed.
- Can we incorporate strategies for celebrating our accomplishments? One way we can instill excitement is to celebrate our accomplishments and make that part of our plan!



- One thing I think we need to incorporate into this plan is space for rest. Rest is how we restore in order to re-evaluate, re-grow, or grow a-new.
- I am tired of all the restructuring. I don't think we need that as much as we need a bigger endowment and funding to support our programs.
  - o Would love a bigger endowment and more funding! Until then, we need to better utilize/maximize the resources we have.
- I am so excited to see the Laudato Si action item #10 under Student Experience and Engagement! I think Regis has an opportunity to grow here across all colleges and the library. I look forward to seeing how this develops.
- Could University policies on course caps/minima/etc. have several tiers depending on the level of the course? Currently, the Regis College Faculty Handbook has different tiers for lower division (defined as 200- and 300-level courses) and upper division (400-level courses). My suggestion is that university policies have (at least) 4 tiers: 200-level courses, 300-level courses, 400-level courses, and graduate courses. In my department, at least, 200- and 300-level courses are meaningfully different in ways that impact reasonable enrollment expectations. Faculty workload/course releases are sometimes discussed in terms of credit hours and sometimes in terms of number of courses.
- Could workload discussions include recognition of the additional prep time needed by faculty who teach a larger number of distinct courses? Workload discussions sometimes include recognition through compensation or workload adjustments for faculty who teach larger classes due to the additional grading load. I've never understood why these discussions don't include similar recognition of the additional time involved in constantly prepping new courses and/or a larger number of distinct courses.
  - o Slippery-slope as it assumes "new preps" require more work when many faculty commit the same work to courses they've taught in the past as they do for new preps. Additionally, the notion of "prep" is part of the faculty contract, faculty are already compensated to prep and deliver courses (not just deliver).
- Item 13 should also focus on the Pope's recent message (<https://catholicsocialthought.georgetown.edu/essays/resources-for-caring-for-the-environment-and-each-other-pope-francis-follow-up-to-laudato-si>) sharing his thoughts since Laudato Si.
- Regarding International Articulation Agreements, Anderson College is close to finalizing an articulation with the American College of Thessaloniki.
- Item 22 - cross college collaboration is an important goal, however, the barriers to it being successful include the revenue tracking system does not motivate this.
  - o Will address revenue tracking.
- Metrics look good and objective. How will certificates that are a subset of a degree program be addressed.
  - o Certificates that do not utilize unique courses will be exempt, but will have the opportunity to use data in continuous improvement.



- Include academic affairs staff in plan, not just faculty
- Include affiliates in governance
- Increase concurrent credit
- Prioritize people over programs
- Ensure Jesuit values are clear in plan
- “Transformative Teaching and Learning” over “Teaching and Learning Excellence”
- Note that this is all done in the “service of a more just and humane world”
- Cura Facultas as a space to address changing student needs (help faculty adapt to them)
- Where are alumni in this plan?
  - o Admittedly this is limited in our plan (outside of engagement in possible mentoring programming for career development). Will work with Advancement/Alumni Relations to expand a connection between alumni and AA.
- International student support: help faculty adjust/develop, engage current international students in support identification and development, utilize international faculty who have insights and skills to offer.
- Name Promotion and Tenure support in the Cura Facultas section.
- Partner with SEM on retention. Who are we enrolling? What role does AA have in shaping recruitment strategy and what accountability does SEM have for who we are enrolling?
- Higher-level (and more) tutoring for graduate students. Tutoring for specialized (e.g. Music) students.
- Utilize faculty in meeting prospective students.
- Would staff get an ombuds?
  - o Will work with HR on building this out.
- Consider 3+1 agreements with community colleges.
- Guard against/plan for disruption to co-curricular impacts on unsequencing.