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See prior updates  www.uga.edu/effectiveness/sp.html

See prior annual reports of institutional progress  www.uga.edu/effectiveness/ip.html
Topics Covered Today

- Progress towards “benchmarks” established in 2000
- Next stage in UGA’s planning process
  - Five-year program planning
- Key challenges in this planning process
## Building the New Learning Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010 goal</th>
<th>Latest available data (Fall 2003 Fact Book unless otherwise noted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>31,288/23% grad (includes law, vet, pharmacy)</td>
<td>32,500/25% grad</td>
<td>33,878/25% grad (32,808 Athens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Beds</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>6,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg SAT (incoming freshmen)</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1212 (1237 preliminary fall 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg GPA (transfers)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>6% students/5% faculty black</td>
<td>10% students/10% faculty black</td>
<td>5.8% students/5% faculty black (13.5% students/13% faculty-all minorities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Ok to poor</td>
<td>Top level support &amp; access</td>
<td>Significant progress including PAWS and Element K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 yr grad rate</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fall 1997 class)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 yr grad rate</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fall 1997 class)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>22/1 (corrected)17.5/1</td>
<td>20/1 (target to be corrected)</td>
<td>19.3/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Research Investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010 goal</th>
<th>Latest available data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Fall 2003 Fact Book unless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>otherwise noted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed Research Expend Rank</td>
<td>86th</td>
<td>50th</td>
<td>89th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed Research Expend</td>
<td>$54.7M</td>
<td>$100M</td>
<td>$78M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Research Expend</td>
<td>$217.9M</td>
<td>$300M</td>
<td>$284.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Research Expend Rank</td>
<td>35&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>40&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit rankings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(graduate programs; not all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs ranked ea yr)</td>
<td>1 A&amp;S in top 25; Law 29&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;; Terry 48th</td>
<td>6 A&amp;S in top 25; Law in top 20; Terry in top 25</td>
<td>2 A &amp;S in top 25; Law 31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;; Terry 42nd (Public Affairs 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;; Education 24&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrads engaged in</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>487 (2004 figure from Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq.ft.research space</td>
<td>1,079,398</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,218,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL Library Rank</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library volumes</td>
<td>3.7M</td>
<td>4.5M</td>
<td>3.95M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Students</td>
<td>5,540 (1,330 prof)</td>
<td>6,540 (1,585 prof)</td>
<td>6,922 (1,541 prof)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USN&WR Rankings (2005 editions)

- America’s Best Colleges
  - “Top 50 Public National Universities” – 19th
  - “Best National Universities” – 58th
  - “Great Schools, Great Prices” – 42nd among national universities
  - “Debt load, class of 2003” (least debt) – 23rd among national universities

USN&WR also recognizes schools for:
- diverse campuses
- undergraduate research
- first-year experiences
- learning communities
- study abroad
- service learning
- and other features of undergraduate experience

- America’s Best Graduate Schools
  - Law School 31st
  - Business 42nd
  - Education 24th
    - Counseling/Personnel Services 5th
    - Curriculum/Instruction 6th
    - Elementary 3rd
    - Secondary 3rd
    - Vocational/Technical 4th
  - Public Affairs 3rd
    - Public Management/Admin 2nd
    - Public Finance/Budgeting 3rd
  - Veterinary Medicine 9th
  - Social Work 28th
  - Clinical Psychology 32nd
  - Speech-Language Pathology 45th
  - Sciences
    - Biological 54th
  - Social Sciences and Humanities
    - Psychology 73th
  - Master of Fine Arts 21st
    - Printmaking 3rd
National Trend Toward Focus on Outcomes

• Examples:
  – Current debate in Congress over reauthorization of Higher Education Act
  – Central role of outcomes in accreditation standards of SACS (newly adopted *Principles of Accreditation*)
  – *Measuring Up 2004*, National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education
    • Note the focus on the benefits a state receives from having a more highly educated citizenry
    • Note the focus on measuring how well graduates can perform complex tasks and solve problems
## Competing in a Global Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010 goal</th>
<th>Latest available data (Fall 2003 Fact Book unless otherwise noted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Studying Abroad</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>4.5-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Graduating with International Experience</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># UGA Year-Round Academic Study Abroad Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Graduating with Language Competency</td>
<td>4-6% (original source needs to be verified)</td>
<td>25-30%</td>
<td>60% (defined as completing at least 2 semesters of foreign language)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fundraising

2000

- $48M – new private gifts and pledges
- 49,000 donors

2010 goal

- $100M
- 100,000 donors

2004

- $77.8M total
  ($55.3 instruction, research and outreach; $22.5 athletic-related)
- 53,919 donors
Questions Raised by These Data

• Do we need to adopt a more comprehensive set of measures in light of current scenario?
  – Sufficient guidance for internal decisions?
  – Adequate response to external accountability demands?
  – Sufficient focus on outcomes?

• We have made significant strides since 2000. How do we sustain momentum in light of current budget constraints?
Overall Purposes of the Five-Year Planning Process

• Internally useful process (operationalize)

• Integrated process (multi-year)
  – Planning
  – Assessment
  – Resource allocation

• Units create plans to move toward forefront of their disciplines in five-year cycles
University of Georgia
Strategic Planning, Five-Year Program Planning, Outcomes-based Assessment and Resource Allocation
Climate of Increasing Demands for Accountability at State and Federal Levels

Current Climate of Accountability

University
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Outcomes-based Assessment

Periodic
• specialized accreditation
Annual
• Assess undergrad. majors
• Assess graduate degree programs

Seven-Year Cycle
• program review
• support unit review

Resources

1989-2000: Self-Study
2001 - SACS Visit/Reaffirmation
2009-2010: Upcoming Self-Study
2011: Next Visitation
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Keys to Success in Planning at UGA in Future

• Clear message about importance of planning from this body to university community
  – Retain commitment to planning during tough times
• UGA units embrace the unique performance measures that drive the unit towards UGA’s goals and cutting-edge of own discipline
• Future resource allocation based on strategic priorities
• Focus on UGA’s strategic plan in preparing for 2009-2010 SACS accreditation
  – Data integration
  – Focus on outcomes
    • We need to be proactive in adopting methods uniquely suited to UGA—
      or face the reality of living with externally imposed standards that don’t fit.
  – Reduce administrative burden of assessment