Compiled SWOT Analysis with All Feedback from Steering Committee Members from October 20\textsuperscript{th} and 26\textsuperscript{th} Strategic Planning Meeting

Threats, Weaknesses, and Roadblocks:

\textbf{KU's Reputation:}

- (6x)* Recruitment of faculty and students
- (2x) There is a conflicting message between what we do internally and what we present externally that we can mislead our students, faculty, and community – we don’t always communicate the challenges we face as an international public research university
- (2x) Not acquiring enough grants
- (1x) Potential of falling out of AAU standing, thereby losing our credibility and potentially accreditation
- (1x) We need a better PR campaign – how to really sell ourselves and explain what we offer and why students should take advantage of those offerings
- (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

\textbf{Undergraduates:}

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

*(Nx) represents the number of times that a topic/issue was raised or voted on
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• (1x) We are not transfer friendly – the process is long and difficult. Many times transfer
students need to retake courses because credits their credit hours do not transfer over
• (1x) Undergraduate class size in the 1st and 2nd years is too big
• (1x) Undergraduates are not exposed to the best research faculty
• (1x) Not enough KU scholarships to help us recruit top students

Graduates:

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

Faculty:

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

Research:

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

Broad Institution Issues:

• (3x) Ambiguity of expectations across units

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

Strengths:

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

*(N)x represents the number of times that a topic/issue was raised or voted on
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- Honors Program
- Mobility of faculty – ability to teach in multiple departments
- Strong cadre of good people
- Interest and support from the top down
- Balance of teaching and research
- Recognized strengths like global change/environment, future teachers, special education, public administration, ranked programs, etc.
- Team teaching efforts
- Center for Teaching Excellence
- Collaborative deans
- KUCR
- Global outreach
- KU Endowment
- Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR)
- Faculty
- Outreach to our community via the classrooms
- Our museums being used as a door to the community
- “Science on tap” model
- Mini college
- Sharing lab and other equipment brings people together.
- KU inspires passion
- Junior faculty often entrepreneurial
- Senior faculty provide/promote national and international synergies and collaboration
- Bio authority
- Name and brand recognition
- We have loyal alumni
- Productive faculty – particularly exceptional in the last decade
- Visionary leadership
- We serve a full range of students well

**Opportunities**

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

*(N) represents the number of times that a topic/issue was raised or voted on*
• Strengthen PR by more clearly stating our vision and message
• Move mid-level programs higher
• Case studies: models exist of units that changed culture
• Build synergy via process for collaborative hires
• Longitudinal institutional support using existing campus programs aligned with themes of strategic hires, both to expand research collaboration and teaching/research
• Develop models for joint appointments
• Meld KUMC & KU Lawrence
• New administration can help funding mechanism match our vision
• Explore new ways to get research to the public (by blending sciences, humanities, arts, etc.) and develop reward systems for starting these initiatives
• Use our existing engaged scholarship as raw material for models and to publicize
• We create the rules and rewards by putting value on collaborative research
• Explore new directions with internet-based knowledge
• Use the Center for Digitized Humanities as a way to explore the use and evaluation of new technologies
• Capital Campaign
• Energize graduate students by having them teach outside their disciplines
• Utilizing available role models
• Redefining “load”
• Leverage existing interdisciplinary programs
• Create innovative curriculum that is tailored to student and societal needs
• Include undergraduates in research
• Expand “science on tap” ideas to other areas
• TV/web broadcasts to use new media or non-traditional methods
• Opportunity for a university cultural shift propelled by administration and new faculty
• Change graduate education to establish entrepreneurialism
• KU Center for Research or other organization should act as a clearinghouse/portal to initiate collaborations and conversations between researchers
• Create physical spaces to encourage collaboration and move faculty out of the silo of their department
• Reimagine undergraduate experiences, particularly first year experiences and make programs modeled after the Honors tutorial more widely available
• Share best practices in team teaching and collaboration
• One University – School of Public Health and National Cancer Institute
• Redesign institutional functions for optimization and flexibility
• IERPS [Note: No one can remember what this means]
• Changing Kansas demographic
• 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
• Many good initiatives are not fully recognized or understood
• Increased infrastructure and money for research for interdisciplinary work
• Better mentoring of junior faculty
• Recognition of programs on the cusp through program review
• Student communication that is lateral and timely
• Mentor leadership and institute transition plans
• Maximize skills and knowledge
• Move us out of our comfort zones
• Community open to providing more service, internships, and integrated learning opportunities

**Ramifications:**

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

**What We Need to Know:**

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

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