

1 **Compiled SWOT Analysis with**
2 **All Feedback from Steering Committee Members**
3 **from October 20th and 26th Strategic Planning Meeting**
4

5 **Threats, Weaknesses, and Roadblocks:**

6 ***KU's Reputation:***

- 7
- 8 • (6x)* Recruitment of faculty and students
 - 9 • (2x) There is a conflicting message between what we do internally and what we present
10 externally that we can mislead our students, faculty, and community – we don't always
11 communicate the challenges we face as an international public research university
 - 12 • (2x) Not acquiring enough grants
 - 13 • (1x) Potential of falling out of AAU standing, thereby losing our credibility and potentially
14 accreditation
 - 15 • (1x) We need a better PR campaign – how to really sell ourselves and explain what we offer and
16 why students should take advantage of those offerings
 - 17 • (1x) Many people on campus are not aware how dire our predicament is – our standings and
situation needs to be well known to promote urgency and action

18 ***Undergraduates:***

- 19
- 20 • (4x) No planned first year experience
 - 21 • (4x) Undergraduate student recruitment
 - 22 • (3x) The orientation experience is overwhelming
 - 23 • (3x) "Shrinking pie" – the population is declining so the fight for college students is increasing
24 and therefore our enrollment is getting lower
 - 25 • (3x) We do not effectively communicate with students – particularly in advising and helping
26 them through their general requirements. Many students do not realize they are missing a
component of their general education until they apply to graduate
 - 27 • (2x) Curriculum challenges
 - 28 • (2x) We lack qualified admissions at needed levels (though we recognize this is a political issue)
 - 29 • (1x) Inconsistent advising throughout undergraduate career – need attention to structural,
30 transition, and communication issues
 - 31 • (1x) No coherent general education program – we require too many hours
 - 32 • (1x) Too many enrollment holds that students don't find out about until they actually enroll
 - 33 • (1x) There is a real disincentive to take courses at Edwards because fees are double there what
34 they are in Lawrence

*(Nx) represents the number of times that a topic/issue was raised or voted on

G:\Planning\StrategicPlanning20102011\SteeringCommitteeMeetings\Nov1\CompiledFeedbackWithLineNumbersLL20101108.docx

- 35 • (1x) We are not transfer friendly – the process is long and difficult. Many times transfer
- 36 students need to retake courses because credits their credit hours do not transfer over
- 37 • (1x) Undergraduate class size in the 1st and 2nd years is too big
- 38 • (1x) Undergraduates are not exposed to the best research faculty
- 39 • (1x) Not enough KU scholarships to help us recruit top students

40 **Graduates:**

- 41 • (5x) Graduate student recruitment
- 42 • (3x) We rely on graduate students to teach too much – we give them authority on subjects
- 43 when they do not have it. This also impacts undergraduate experience.
- 44 • (2x) Inconsistent advising throughout graduate career
- 45 • (2x) There is little monetary support for graduate students especially beyond that available for
- 46 funding Graduate Teaching Assistants.
- 47 • (2x) We do not have a good mentoring program for our graduate students
- 48 • (1x) Time to degree in some grad programs – many of our PhD students take 7-10 years to
- 49 finish their degree, some never actually complete their degree
- 50 • (1x) There is a real disincentive to take courses at Edwards because fees are double there what
- 51 they are in Lawrence

52 **Faculty:**

- 53 • (4x) Faculty recruitment
- 54 • (4x) There are too many unengaged faculty (research and teaching) – perhaps this is a tenure
- 55 issue and the fact that we do not review tenured faculty in a meaningful way
- 56 • (3x) We permit too many excuses for faculty not to do research and conversely, we don't
- 57 provide enough incentives for faculty to do (good) research
- 58 • (3x) Faculty demographics
- 59 • (2x) Faculty evaluation process
- 60 • (1x) Large percent of long-term associate professors trying to get to full – in part because we
- 61 ask many associate professors to take on additional responsibilities that inhibit their ability to
- 62 effectively research and teach (like chair and director positions)

63 **Research:**

- 64 • (1x) Our lack of research metrics is a weakness
- 65 • (1x) Service teaching is an obstacle to research
- 66 • (1x) Need to thoroughly plan and vet large scale research initiatives and their potential broad
- 67 impact on the full program of research

68 **Broad Institution Issues:**

- 69 • (3x) Ambiguity of expectations across units

*(Nx) represents the number of times that a topic/issue was raised or voted on

- 70 • (2x) Lack of money for the University, in general
- 71 • (1x) Indirects tied up in buildings –paying off our mortgages means we do not have those funds
- 72 available for other research incentive
- 73 • (1x) Misconceptions about current policies (e.g., Graduate Teaching Assistants, matching
- 74 funds, etc.)
- 75 • (1x) It takes a lot of time to accomplish things (administratively, speaking) – papers need to go
- 76 through several hands before they are finalized and approved
- 77 • (1x) We have insufficient numbers of support staff
- 78 • (1x) Problems with KU’s infrastructure
- 79 • (1x) It is simply harder to do a good job education for the 21st century
- 80 • Hyper decentralization – there is not a cohesive way to disseminate knowledge, processes and
- 81 documents are often duplicated across the University causing inconsistencies and inefficiencies,
- 82 there is not a good way to share knowledge across departments, programs, schools, etc.
- 83 • (1x) We do not have a great way to compete with schools that have a lower tuition, smaller
- 84 classes, newer facilities, etc.
- 85 • (1x) It can be difficult to deal with issues that affect the whole University because different
- 86 disciplines have different needs and want the issues resolved in different ways
- 87 • (1x) Students and faculty think at the department level, not at the University level
- 88 • (1x) We do not have an articulated belief system
- 89 • (1x) We don’t effectively engage students or faculty
- 90 • (1x) There is a disconnect between our general education requirements and our research
- 91 policies
- 92 • (1x) We haven’t done a good job identifying our priorities and investing in them

93 **Strengths:**

- 94 • (3x) Triangle-Edwards Campus
- 95 • (2x) Three campuses
- 96 • (2x) Location of our campuses in a metro area and in Lawrence
- 97 • (2x) Multiple strong centers like the Hall Center and area study centers
- 98 • (2x) Libraries sharing knowledge
- 99 • (2x) Public Health Initiative
- 100 • (2x) West campus incubator
- 101 • (2x) Interdisciplinary team
- 102 • (2x) Research institutes and title VI centers
- 103 • (2x) Engaged scholarship is already under way
- 104 • Engaged intellectual communities and campus-wide conversations
- 105 • Study abroad program
- 106 • Faculty collegiality
- 107 • Opportunities for funding

*(Nx) represents the number of times that a topic/issue was raised or voted on

- 108 • Honors Program
- 109 • Mobility of faculty – ability to teach in multiple departments
- 110 • Strong cadre of good people
- 111 • Interest and support from the top down
- 112 • Balance of teaching and research
- 113 • Recognized strengths like global change/environment, future teachers, special education, public
- 114 administration, ranked programs, etc.
- 115 • Team teaching efforts
- 116 • Center for Teaching Excellence
- 117 • Collaborative deans
- 118 • KUCR
- 119 • Global outreach
- 120 • KU Endowment
- 121 • Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR)
- 122 • Faculty
- 123 • Outreach to our community via the classrooms
- 124 • Our museums being used as a door to the community
- 125 • “Science on tap” model
- 126 • Mini college
- 127 • Sharing lab and other equipment brings people together.
- 128 • KU inspires passion
- 129 • Junior faculty often entrepreneurial
- 130 • Senior faculty provide/promote national and international synergies and collaboration
- 131 • Bio authority
- 132 • Name and brand recognition
- 133 • We have loyal alumni
- 134 • Productive faculty – particularly exceptional in the last decade
- 135 • Visionary leadership
- 136 • We serve a full range of students well

137 **Opportunities**

- 138 • (3x) Change P&T structure/culture
- 139 • (2x) Welcome and reward risk: “failure is compost for success”
- 140 • (2x) Possibility for structured strategic clustered hires aimed at dealing with specific problems
- 141 which would leverage state money
- 142 • More collaboration
- 143 • National cancer center
- 144 • Take advantage of private foundations like HUD funding for baby boomers
- 145 • Buyers market in terms of hiring faculty

*(Nx) represents the number of times that a topic/issue was raised or voted on

- 146 • Strengthen PR by more clearly stating our vision and message
- 147 • Move mid-level programs higher
- 148 • Case studies: models exist of units that changed culture
- 149 • Build synergy via process for collaborative hires
- 150 • Longitudinal institutional support using existing campus programs aligned with themes of strategic
- 151 hires, both to expand research collaboration and teaching/research
- 152 • Develop models for joint appointments
- 153 • Meld KUMC & KU Lawrence
- 154 • New administration can help funding mechanism match our vision
- 155 • Explore new ways to get research to the public (by blending sciences, humanities, arts, etc.) and
- 156 develop reward systems for starting these initiatives
- 157 • Use our existing engaged scholarship as raw material for models and to publicize
- 158 • We create the rules and rewards by putting value on collaborative research
- 159 • Explore new directions with internet-based knowledge
- 160 • Use the Center for Digitized Humanities as a way to explore the use and evaluation of new
- 161 technologies
- 162 • Capital Campaign
- 163 • Energize graduate students by having them teach outside their disciplines
- 164 • Utilizing available role models
- 165 • Redefining “load”
- 166 • Leverage existing interdisciplinary programs
- 167 • Create innovative curriculum that is tailored to student and societal needs
- 168 • Include undergraduates in research
- 169 • Expand “science on tap” ideas to other areas
- 170 • TV/web broadcasts to use new media or non-traditional methods
- 171 • Opportunity for a university cultural shift propelled by administration and new faculty
- 172 • Change graduate education to establish entrepreneurialism
- 173 • KU Center for Research or other organization should act as a clearinghouse/portal to initiate
- 174 collaborations and conversations between researchers
- 175 • Create physical spaces to encourage collaboration and move faculty out of the silo of their
- 176 department
- 177 • Reimagine undergraduate experiences, particularly first year experiences and make programs
- 178 modeled after the Honors tutorial more widely available
- 179 • Share best practices in team teaching and collaboration
- 180 • One University – School of Public Health and National Cancer Institute
- 181 • Redesign institutional functions for optimization and flexibility
- 182 • IERPS [Note: No one can remember what this means]
- 183 • Changing Kansas demographic
- 184 • Grow and mentor faculty even though we have underfunded resources

*(Nx) represents the number of times that a topic/issue was raised or voted on

G:\Planning\StrategicPlanning20102011\SteeringCommitteeMeetings\Nov1\CompiledFeedbackWithLineNumbersLL20101108.docx

- 185 • Many good initiatives are not fully recognized or understood
- 186 • Increased infrastructure and money for research for interdisciplinary work
- 187 • Better mentoring of junior faculty
- 188 • Recognition of programs on the cusp through program review
- 189 • Student communication that is lateral and timely
- 190 • Mentor leadership and institute transition plans
- 191 • Maximize skills and knowledge
- 192 • Move us out of our comfort zones
- 193 • Community open to providing more service, internships, and integrated learning opportunities

194 **Ramifications:**

- 195 • (3x) Lower quality and enrollment of students at both the graduate and undergraduate levels due
- 196 to increased competition for students
- 197 • (2x) Lose standing with AAU, our credibility, and potentially our accreditation
- 198 • (1x) Increased problems with faculty retention and recruitment
- 199 • (1x) Lose our sense of community
- 200 • (1x) We need to transform the University, not simply “get better”
- 201 • (1x) Increased budgetary pressure

202 **What We Need to Know:**

- 203 • What do we mean by excellence? Is there a common definition we can all rally behind and support?
- 204 • We need a better grasp of our data – can we use it to find out the reasons for enrollment and
- 205 retention problems?
- 206 • What factors are involved in students deciding to leave KU?
- 207 • What kind of money is available or what funds can we free up to help fund change?
- 208 • At what rate do transfer students graduate? How does that compare to the graduation rate of
- 209 students who are at KU the whole time?
- 210 • How do retention rates and factors of leaving KU compare to students in the Honors Program?
- 211 • How does the level of support received by non-athletic students and faculty compare to those in
- 212 athletics?
- 213 • If KU didn’t exist, what would it matter?
- 214 • Are new faculty research engaged?
- 215 • What is the ratio of faculty to administrators now? What was it 5, 10, 15, 20 years ago?
- 216 • What do enrollment, retention rates, 1st year experiences, etc. look like at AAU public universities
- 217 with selective admission standards?
- 218 • What do teaching and research loads look like at our peer and aspirational peer institutions?
- 219 • What is the faculty to student ratio now? What was it 5, 10, 15, 20 years ago?
- 220 • What is the prevalence of large lectures at our peer and aspirational peer institutions?

*(Nx) represents the number of times that a topic/issue was raised or voted on