

Enrollment Management Council

March 27, 2015

Present: Shahida Dar, Jen DeWeerth, Matthew Fikes, Rich Haubert, Lew Kahler, Heather Kesterson, Bill McDonald, Jake Mihevc

Excused: Dan Ianno, Tia Lock

Summary Points

Nano recommendation draft

“Enrollment Management Council received many responses from our College community survey about enrollment that touched upon “Nano.” Faculty and staff wonder if we are maximizing the opportunity of Nano for enrollment growth and whether we are ready to meet the need to prepare the community to fill new jobs that are headed our way. In general, they are also unsure of what “Nano” means in terms of programs and careers and are even more certain that prospective MVCC students and other community members are uncertain as well. In order to address these concerns and take a lead role in educating the community about Nano, EMC urges that the following questions be addressed and that work begun on the topic by STEM and other areas of the College be seen as urgent and high priority:

What does “nano tech” mean at MVCC?

What programs/pathways fall under that heading “nano?”

How can those degrees be named and presented from a marketing point of view?”

- This is a start but needs to be grounded more explicitly in data and show how we got to nano from analyzing our survey data.
- Those three items are step 1, and step 2 is to educating the community, pulling in EDGE and others.
- Update from Shahida on three faculty who offered a teacher workshop on designing curriculum to prepare students for STEM/nano. How do we help them align with our parhtways? Is this collaborative effort a ground floor thought leader opportunity?
- Is our fourth question: How can MVCC establish a position as a “thought leader” on Nano pathways among our educational and economic/industry partners?

Case Study: Cybersecurity (Jake)

Jake presented an overview of how cybersecurity developed from a non-credit effort to the program it is now (95 students), highlighting accelerators (such as a number of grants) and challenges. The case study was complex and rich with information; people need some time to review more carefully and absorb. At our next meeting we will discuss:

What worked well?

What needs work?

How could the new program development process be made more efficient?

What are the accelerators and decelerators involved?

What is our next step—a subgroup? Conversations with other parties on campus? Or?

At that point we can determine what we want to do based on learning from the case study.

Next Steps:

Lew will revise and develop the Nano recommendations with more contextualization per the discussion today.

Matt will send some basic info regarding the response rate on the survey.

Jen is preparing a one page summary of EMCs work this year for Steph to share with Cabinet.