

Strategic Planning Committee and Natural Sciences Division Meeting

May 1, 2013

Participants: Marvin Dodge, Melanie Jenkins, David Allred, Michelle Brown, Craig Mathie, Kari Arnoldsen, Danni Larsen, Sara Golding, and Greg Wright.

Members of the Strategic Planning Committee met with members of the Natural Sciences Division who had an opportunity to participate in a SWOT analysis where they could identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of both the college as a whole as well as their division. Below are suggestions and discussion topics generated from this exercise. Numbers in parentheses represent agreement with the suggestion listed.

Strengths

<i>College</i>	<i>Natural Sciences Division</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small student : teacher ratio 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, high quality faculty (2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low tuition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty interested in students (2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good facilities (except Science) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching decisions based on data
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcoming atmosphere – students leave with positive outlook 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science Olympiad, math contest, clubs, and other outreach efforts (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Top 6 in the nation; Top 10% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reputation for strong programs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No graduate student teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No graduate student teachers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students can do independent/creative work at sophomore level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developmental math
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biology faculty

Weaknesses

<i>College</i>	<i>Natural Sciences Division</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-line offerings are badly done -- inconsistent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-line offerings are badly done -- inconsistent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication with advising 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilities (oldest building), space in labs and equipment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “One-stop shop” advising doesn’t work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stodgy (stuck with same lecture notes)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising office should work more with faculty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role and responsibilities of department chairs not clearly defined
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some classes offered only once – too few offerings with small enrollment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resistance to change
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of shared governance policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students have changed over time and teaching methods need to change as well
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More duties pushed onto faculty (p-card, department chairs, TracDat, etc.) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GE not meaningful 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salary 	

Opportunities

College	Natural Sciences Division
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-line could help six-county area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sophomore research students (2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High touch online (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tutoring while freshman/sophomore
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being small (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student research opportunities with faculty
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-year degrees waiting to be found 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreating what science mans
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wasatch front for recruitment (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science Division seminar series
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More diversity (non-traditional, Hispanic, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GE could be introduction to broad range of ideas
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjust GE to be more meaningful/coherent 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More collaboration between departments and divisions (cross curriculum) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising office – role for pre-major students than hand-off to division to advise 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree Works is an online program used to advise students 	

Threats

College	Natural Sciences Division
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in mission Age 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attracting and retaining quality faculty (2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attacks on science education (why do you do labs, know content?) (2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency at cost of personal student/teacher interaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deterioration of faculty morale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GE in high school (or online at other schools) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Space at modern equipment (2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concurrent enrollment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost ratio vs. high touch; science not able to maintain low ratio
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rumors 	

Those in attendance were then asked to identify their “hopes and aspirations for Snow College five years from now.” The following suggestions were made:

- Destination – undergraduate research (1)
- Clear self-governance policy (3)
- More 4-year programs – find a niche & demand; diverse (1)
- Still be Snow College – high-touch (2)
- Snow’s niche today is science and music
- Attract better prepared students /faculty; need more scholarships in all areas (1)
- Defined workload policy – “non-teaching” activities (3)
- Integrated, vibrant GE courses (3)
- Raise faculty base pay; salary – compensation (including benefits) (2)

After considerable discussion of the above topics the following were identified as the top four priorities:

- Clear self-governance policy (3)
- Integrated, vibrant GE courses (3)
- Defined workload policy – “non-teaching” activities (3)
- Raise faculty base pay; salary – compensation (including benefits) (2)