In the following report, Hanover Research examines best practices followed by institutions of higher education when setting strategic goals and developing plans for implementation. In our review, we focus on strategies for building broad support, ensuring effective implementation, and budgeting and financial planning. In addition, we profile the strategic plans and procedures of five specific institutions, and identify common trends in their planning processes, goals and initiatives, and implementation and monitoring methods.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND KEY FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

This report examines best practices in strategic planning at higher education institutions and profiles the strategic plans and planning processes in place at five specific institutions. The discussion has been informed by three areas of concern common to many higher education institutions: the need to manage changing funding models, the need to seek more sustainable support from key constituents, and the need to improve student recruitment and retention.

The report comprises the following two sections:

- **Section 1** examines best practices in strategic planning for higher education institutions. We discuss common pitfalls and guiding principles for gaining buy-in, implementing the plan, and financial planning. In addition, we profile two successful strategic planning processes, including the timeline, participants, procedures, and lessons learned.
- **Section 2** profiles the strategic plans of five specific institutions and identifies common trends among them. We examine these institutions’ strategic planning processes and strategic goals and initiatives, as well as implementation and monitoring methods.

KEY FINDINGS

**PLANNING PROCESS**

- **Strategic planning involves 1) formulating goals, objectives, and action steps, and 2) monitoring implementation, tracking progress, and revising the plan.** During the initial planning process, conducting comprehensive institutional research is crucial to determine appropriate goals and objectives.
- **Involving stakeholders in the planning process can help build broad support among diverse constituents.** In particular, the planning committee benefits from members that represent a variety of institutional roles, demographic groups, and campus units. In addition to building buy-in, a diverse committee helps to anticipate the future cross-unit coordination necessary to carry out goals and objectives.
- **Planning committees include an average of 25 members** at the institutions profiled in this report. While this average is higher than the recommended 10-12 members, it allows for broad participation. The committees often consist of senior administrators, faculty, staff, one or two students, an alumni representative, and a representative of the institution’s foundation. Participating staff and administrators represent units such as academics, student affairs, facilities, operations, enrollment management, information technology, institutional research, alumni relations, athletics, and budgeting.
 IMPLEMENTATION

○ At Morgan State University, listening sessions, town hall meetings, and a regularly updated website promoted involvement from a wide swath of the campus community.

- The profiled institutions have strategic plan cycles that range from five to 11 years, based on planning processes that lasted eight to 16 months. Some consultants note that short plan cycles can better address unforeseen challenges. For instance, each year, the College of William & Mary (W&M) revises its five-year strategic framework, produces a budget that reflects strategic priorities, and outlines implementation steps for the coming year.

○ A short plan cycle may also mitigate the tendency to front-load or back-load goals during the planning process. These pitfalls can lead to unrealistic timelines and/or a loss of momentum.

- Aligning the budget with the strategic plan helps increase the plan’s impact. For instance, redesigning an institution’s budget request form to include strategic importance can ensure that key initiatives are implemented. W&M provides an example of such a budget process. By building wide-ranging support, establishing institutional priorities, and setting evidence-based metrics, the strategic planning process can also help support fundraising campaigns.

GOALS AND INITIATIVES

- Ensuring students’ academic success, diversifying financial resources, improving infrastructure and operations, promoting community engagement, and developing institutional branding emerged as common strategic goals among the five profiled institutions. Related initiatives include increasing enrollment and retention, improving alumni engagement, building sustainable facilities, establishing relationships with community organizations, and creating a marketing strategy.

- The strategic plans contain five to six goals, with 19 to 31 associated initiatives. The number of initiatives corresponding to each goal varies widely, from one to 11, depending on the scope of the goal. Additional initiatives include projects related to the internationalization of curricular offerings, campus safety, and experiential learning.

IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

- The plan should answer the question “How will we know if we reach this goal, and how will we prove it?” A comprehensive implementation plan describes, for each objective, action steps, anticipated outcomes, criteria of success, a timeline, benchmark indicator(s), assessment method, necessary resources, and the person or office accountable. Linking strategic accomplishments to administrators’ performance evaluations may also help to incentivize implementation.

- Reporting annually on the institution’s progress can sustain momentum after the plan has been approved. Indiana State University holds an annual stakeholders conference for this purpose. W&M and North Carolina A&T State University use
annual scorecards to report performance on 20-26 key metrics. Including a mix of short-, middle-, and long-term objectives in the plan also improves motivation by creating opportunities for measured success early on.

- **Benchmark indicators vary widely depending on the specific outcome desired.** The majority of benchmark indicators are items such as retention rates, number of students accessing services, *U.S. News* rankings, or the dollar amount of research grants. Additional assessment methods may involve reviewing policies and procedures, or analyzing the results of surveys and focus groups. In these cases, the indicators may be revised internal documents or improved survey ratings.

- **In addition to tracking institutional progress on benchmark indicators, it can be useful to monitor the status of individual implementation steps.** For instance, W&M groups all implementation steps into one of four possible categories: “not yet started, underway, completed, [or] adopted into continuing practice.” This method guarantees that no steps get “lost” in the implementation process.
SECTION I: BEST PRACTICES IN STRATEGIC PLANNING

INTRODUCTION

This section examines the best practices followed by institutions when setting strategic goals and developing appropriate plans for implementation. Our process-focused research considers how effective institutions formulate strategic plans, including which parties contribute to the process; how long the process takes; how key objectives are identified; how consensus is reached among groups representing diverse interests; how different parties are held accountable for compliance; and how decision-makers achieve broad support for the strategic plan.

COMMON PITFALLS

Experienced planners at Cleveland State University (CSU), profiled below, note several potential “landmines” that can arise during the strategic planning process. In particular, the planners outline the following seven obstacles they encountered which threatened to dismantle the strategic planning process:

- **Differing goals.** The mentality of some stakeholders that planning is something to be done and then be done with – that there is an endpoint and that, once the plan is written, everyone can get on with their normal activities – can lead to significant problems if not addressed.

- **Stagnation.** There are some who will initially view the process in largely positive terms, focusing on the idea that the process includes all the various stakeholders working together, perhaps for the first time in years. However, if these people do not see real results from the plan, then their positive thoughts may quickly turn negative. Thus, it is important that the plan provide a mechanism for reporting on progress in a timely fashion.

- **Parallel planning universes.** The committee may or may not be aware of the variety of activities underway during the planning process. For example, while CSU’s strategic plan was being developed, the university unveiled a separate plan for managing enrollment and a different committee was overhauling the general education requirements. Sometimes the left hand really does not know what the right hand is doing.

- **Lack of buy-in.** Failure to get buy-in from important constituencies will cause untold problems, not the least of which is the possibility that some individuals may choose to “poison the well” with other faculty members or administrators.

- **Loss of momentum.** Changes in campus administration or the composition of the planning committee can quickly lead to a loss of commitment and, consequently, a loss of momentum. Similarly, when committee members’ terms expire or members resign, problems can result. New committee members may not have the desired level of commitment to the process, or may not understand how the process was developed or what has been accomplished to date.
• **Lack of budget.** The planners note that if funds for items such as meeting costs, survey expenses, and summer support for faculty members had not continued throughout the entire planning process, then the committee would have faced a serious problem.

• **The unwilling participant.** While discussing how various administrative units might take “ownership” of parts of the strategic plan, one CSU administrator said, “I don’t have any money to spare nor any staff members to help implement any new programs, so I am not interested in anything in the strategic plan.” This incident points to the one of the biggest potential landmines – the disconnect between the idea and the money to implement the idea.¹

Among other concerns, the above list highlights the need for institutions to be aware of possible skepticism toward the strategic planning process. Some stakeholders may hold the view that strategic plans are largely for the benefit of leadership and may never result in substantive changes to the institution. **Vague plans, with little indication of how goals and objectives will be met, may be particularly likely to provoke doubt.**² Benjamin Ginsberg, a professor of political science at Johns Hopkins University, notes that serious strategic plans “[present] concrete objectives, a timetable for their realization, an outline of the tactics that will be employed, a precise assignment of staff responsibilities, and a budget.”³

In a 2009 executive brief, the higher education consulting firm Noel-Levitz identifies five common mistakes in cabinet-level strategic enrollment planning. Although these pitfalls were intended as guide for enrollment planning specifically, many of the underlying principles apply to strategic planning more generally. The five pitfalls are as follows:

• **Setting enrollment goals based solely on budget calculations.** Before setting goals, institutions should take into account the various relevant internal and external data that impact enrollment, such as price sensitivity studies, market share analysis, demographic projections, fiscal health projections, surveys of prospective and current student satisfaction, and student attrition analysis, among others.

• **Setting goals and objectives too early in the process.** Goals and objectives should be determined only after a comprehensive analysis of the institution’s and the surrounding environment’s current and projected situations. This initial process may take six to 12 months, but can prove invaluable in shaping future strategy (e.g., areas of growth, stagnation, etc.).

• **Failing to communicate among administrative units.** A comprehensive enrollment plan cannot be developed without input from various divisions, including academic affairs, budgeting, student affairs, and facilities. In addition, coordination among units helps ensure that the strategic plan is fully representative of the entire institution.

• **Establishing a planning committee without an action team.** Planning committees often strive to represent various university stakeholders in order to gain buy-in and provide

---


³ ibid.
feedback from across the community. However, their size and diversity can also result in slow, cumbersome decision making. An action team is a smaller, more nimble group that ensures that the planning process progresses at a reasonable pace and that the committee’s planning decisions are research-based.

- **Failing to monitor institutional progress and revise the plan as necessary.** The plan should contain measurement outcomes that allow for the monitoring and evaluation of the institution’s progress. In addition, there should be a standardized process for altering the plan based on continuous assessments and changes in institutional and external factors.4

The above list emphasizes the need to conduct thorough institutional research prior to setting goals and objectives. After the planning committee has a comprehensive understanding of the institution’s current state, it becomes easier to identify areas for improvement and establish appropriate benchmarks. In addition, Noel-Levitz highlights the importance of ensuring that the planning process progresses amid the necessary discussions and debates.

One additional concern involves the need to establish appropriate timelines for specific objectives. **Institutions must guard against the tendency to “front-load” or “back-load” the necessary action steps and deadlines.** Front-loading goals – when planners assume that goals can be achieved fairly quickly and with minimum effort – can occur for multiple reasons. For instance, planners may simply be used to thinking of deadlines in one- or two-year timeframes, overlooking the need to phase goals and objectives over the long term. In addition, planners may be influenced by an ambitious agenda and general enthusiasm for advancing the institution. Front-loading goals can not only cause frustration over unmet deadlines, but can result in shortcuts rather than systematic, long-lasting solutions. By contrast, back-loading goals may occur if planners remain uncertain of the desired outcomes or the necessary resources and actions needed to achieve the objective.5

Thomas Longin, an independent higher education consultant, echoes some of these warnings. In particular, he notes that institutions can fall prey to prioritizing short-term needs over a long-term, cohesive vision. Furthermore, some consultants contend that strategic plans are not “nimble” enough to address unexpected challenges.6 Longin and other planners argue that institutions should plan for four to six months, limit their strategic plan cycles to “no more than three to five years,” and revise the plans according to changing circumstances.7

---

7 Ibid.
GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Strategic planning gained popularity at U.S. colleges and universities in the mid-1990s to mid-2000s. During the mid-2000s, increased competition and reduced financial resources led to higher expectations of accountability from government and accrediting bodies, which shifted institutions’ focus to objective measures of performance and financial sustainability. While some institutions already had a long history of strategic planning, many other institutions saw strategic planning as an opportunity to adopt business management approaches to issues such as assessing the competitive environment, tracking progress toward goals, and resource allocation.

The process of strategic planning involves two interrelated steps:

- **Formulating goals, objectives, and action steps based on institutional values and mission.** This step requires communicating with a wide swath of university stakeholders and developing a coherent set of institutional priorities. In order to be effective, the plan should not merely outline institutional needs, but must describe a reasonable and ambitious path that will advance the institution toward its desired state. This latter component is occasionally referred to as the implementation plan.

- **Monitoring implementation, tracking progress, and revising the strategic plan as necessary.** This step requires that the strategic plan include measurable criteria for success, assessment methods, and clear accountability. In addition, it is important for the institution to routinely report its progress toward achieving its goals to all stakeholders.

The majority of institutions rely on a five- or 10-year cycle for their strategic plans, and these timelines may be selected to align with reaccreditation schedules. Based on our review, the development of a strategic plan can take eight months to two years, depending on the kind of planning process selected and the length of the plan cycle.

On the following page, **Figure 1.1** presents the components of a typical strategic plan. Generally, strategic planning builds upon the institution’s mission statement, values, and vision to determine specific goals and objectives over the short, middle, and long term. The strategic plan includes not only the institution’s goals and objectives, but also a detailed articulation of how these goals and objectives will be achieved.

---

9 Ibid.
Karen Hinton, a higher education consultant, notes that a strategic planning committee runs most effectively with 10-12 people. Senior administrative staff typically serve as permanent members and the president may serve as chair of the committee. In addition, in a planning guide published by the Society for College and University Planning (SCUP), a membership organization for higher education senior administrators and planning professionals, Hinton notes that academic staff and students should be represented on the committee for terms of one or two years. These latter positions may be drawn from organizational leadership positions, such as the presidents of the Faculty Senate and the Student Government Association.

There are several general practices that are associated with successful strategic planning. The Office of Quality Improvement at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, commissioned a survey to help determine the most successful strategic planning strategies at other institutions. Kathleen Paris, a distinguished emeritus member of the Office, observes that some of the most important predictors of success were:

- Involving faculty, staff, and students in plan development
- Holding meetings to get input before planning
- Holding meetings to get input on draft strategic plans
- Collectively reviewing data to identify measures of success
- Setting short-term goals in “bite-size” pieces in addition to longer-term goals
- Monitoring progress through periodic checks

These predictors suggest that involving a wide variety of constituents in the planning process can help these parties better understand the purpose of the strategic plan. In addition, diverse participation in the planning process can help to avoid the finalization of a

---

11 Figure items taken verbatim from: Ibid., p. 9.
13 Ibid., p. 15.
plan that does not consider the various needs of different segments of the campus community.

In addition, Karen Hinton highlights the importance of the implementation plan within the entire strategic planning process. The implementation plan identifies the necessary resources (including “people, time, space, technology, and funding”) for each goal and objective. In addition, the implementation plan should detail “who is responsible for implementing an action, a date by which the action is expected to be completed, and what measures will be used to assess completion of the action.” 15 While an institution’s strategic goals and objectives are often widely distributed among the community, the implementation plan is generally not made public. The implementation plan is also subject to considerable changes based on internal and external factors at the institution. 16

Finally, Hinton remarks that the role of the board is not to manage the nuts and bolts of the strategic planning process or its implementation. While the board plays a crucial function in the vision and direction of the institution, its oversight should be limited to the following four functions:

- Recognize and promote the usefulness of planning in higher education and support its use
- Review and approve a planning process for the institution
- Hold the chief executive accountable for the planning function
- Use the institution’s plans to make decisions, especially those that involve setting priorities and allocating resources 17

**Participation, Communication, and Buy-In**

Involving stakeholders in the step-by-step process of developing the institution’s strategic plan can help the institution achieve broad support among diverse constituents. This practice ensures that a range of interests are present in the planning committee and subcommittees that draft the institution’s goals, objectives, necessary resources, timelines, and assessment methods. In addition to helping build broad support, relying on a community-driven process helps to anticipate the coordination among units that will be needed to in order to carry out certain goals and objectives. The two case profiles in this section provide examples of this kind of planning process. These institutions relied on events such as town halls and faculty and staff meetings to receive input throughout the planning process.

Once the plan has been approved, the plan’s goals and objectives should remain accessible and the institution’s progress should be regularly reported. Kathleen Paris notes that in addition to making the strategic plan available on the institutional website, colleges and universities may choose to “provide different versions for different audiences, have a one-page summary, limit the number of priorities so people can remember them, set annual and

---

16 Ibid., p. 13.
17 Bulleted items taken nearly verbatim from: Ibid., p. 30.
longer-term targets and periodically check the targets, and establish time to talk about the plan at regular meetings.”18 In Section II, we profile institutions that communicate institutional progress through an annual conference and/or an annual scorecard that contains key performance indicators.

Creating standardized implementation procedures and establishing training protocols for communication regarding the action steps can also prevent stagnation. Hinton observes that poor internal communications can be a serious hindrance during the implementation process. In particular, the lack of clearly defined procedures for staff members who are responsible for accomplishing certain tasks creates roadblocks. For instance, after a staff member has completed the necessary task, it should be clear whether he or she then needs to “follow up with other departments, log the action, or initiate dissemination of the information to someone.”19 Clarifying operational procedures can help avoid loss of momentum after the plan has been approved.

IMPLEMENTATION AND REFINEMENT

To move beyond being merely an expanded “vision statement,” the strategic plan should respond to question, “How will we know if we reach this goal, and how will we prove it?”20 To answer this question, planners must determine appropriate, data-based assessments, desired outcomes, metrics, and timelines. Common metrics might include “graduation rates, retention rates, and [percentage] of faculty with terminal degrees in appropriate disciplines.”21 Conducting initial institutional research during the development of the strategic plan can help to determine appropriate benchmark indicators.

While the institution will benefit from having a detailed implementation plan, flexibility regarding implementation can also be valuable. In Section II, we profile the College of William & Mary and Indiana State University, both of which annually revise their benchmark indicators and/or their implementation processes to account for changes in internal and external factors.

Methods of measuring progress will depend on the specific objectives. For instance, a strategic objective related to institutional improvements in technology may be measured by “the number of students who apply and register online, allowing a reduction in the number of staff in the registrar’s office, or the number of syllabi that include competency in the use of program-specific technology as a course outcome.”22 In contrast, a strategic objective related to the effectiveness of a particular student service may be measured by student surveys or focus groups.

---

20 Ibid., p. 18.
21 Ibid., p. 18.
22 Ibid., p. 18.
Assigning a “point person” or team to each strategic goal can help to ensure accountability. In a workshop held by Pennsylvania State University’s Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment, James Trainer, the director of planning and assessment at Villanova University, notes that the institution formed 12 teams to assess performance measures for each of its 12 strategic goals. Kathleen Paris notes that the University of Wisconsin, Madison, assigns a point person for each goal. While many other people may be responsible for collectively implementing the goal, the point person is charged with ensuring that progress continuously takes place.23

Setting short-, middle-, and long-terms goals for specific objectives sustains momentum by creating opportunities for timely reports on progress. Another possibility is to develop short-term projects in support of the long-term objectives. For instance, Monroe Community College in Rochester, New York, established a list of 100-day projects that would advance the objectives identified in the institution’s strategic plan. Monroe President Anna Kress describes the dilemma that this strategy aimed to resolve: “You have a strategic goal that says you need to improve institutional effectiveness and accountability. Everyone’s going to say that . . . But what does that mean, and how do you break that down to a micro level?”24 By developing 100-day projects, administrators gained familiarity with concrete institutional challenges and staff members participated in incremental improvements that were aligned with the strategic goal.25

**Budgeting and Financial Planning**

The strategic plan has an interconnected relationship with an institution’s budgeting and financial planning. On one hand, the goals and objectives of the strategic plan must be based on realistic financial planning. On the other hand, the strategic plan does not merely react to the institution’s budget, but rather drives future financial planning.

First, planners should have a realistic understanding of the financial resources available for and the financial consequences stemming from the plan’s goals and objectives, given the institution’s current and projected situation. Once the plan has reached the implementation stage, financial plans should include “not only a determination of financial requirements, but also the timing and source of funding.” In particular, all financial commitments should be recorded in a centralized document so that the allocation of resources is apparent to all parties. In cases where the strategic vision is clear but the necessary actions are less well defined, financial planners can assist in allocating the resources to initiatives that will support the vision.26

---

25 Ibid.
In addition to assisting at the institutional level, financial planning at the unit level can help faculty and staff determine the financial resources for and implications of their strategic initiatives. Effective financial planning should also involve documenting the commitments made to individual units so as to prevent any obstacles regarding the provision, nature, and timing of these financial commitments from central administration. Finally, prioritizing budget cycle requests related to the strategic plan ensures that strategic initiatives are implemented and builds good will among faculty and staff as they begin to see that the planning process reaps concrete rewards.27

Second, the strategic plan guides future resource allocation. Assuming comprehensive and diverse participation in the planning process, the resulting document is a representation of a collective decision regarding institutional priorities. In this sense, a budget cycle that reflects the priorities outlined in the strategic plan offers a decision-making rationale to the campus community.28 Eugene Trani, president of Virginia Commonwealth University, puts it this way: “At our university, the worst thing you can do is not participate in the strategic plan . . . Then you’re not going to get any resources.”29

In this vein, Karen Hinton refers to an important distinction between “budget-based decisions” and “plan-based budgeting.” In general, plan-based budgeting allows the institution to budget according to its academic, operational, and institutional goals, rather than allowing the budget to unilaterally determine institutional changes. The strategic plan integrates the budgets for various institutional initiatives, including those related to academics, technology, enrollment, student services, and facilities. This comprehensive overview of the institution’s resource allocation can help financial planners prioritize effectively.30

**Aligning the budget and planning cycles can help in determining appropriate resource allocations for different initiatives.** Depending on the institution’s conventions, this practice may be difficult to manage. For instance, Hinton notes that “the budget cycle often follows either the state or federal fiscal calendar . . . and the planning cycle tends to follow the academic calendar.”31 However, relying on the academic calendar to guide the planning process creates a disconnect with the institutional budget and can create scheduling difficulties over the summer term for faculty and students.32

---

27 Ibid., pp. 8-9.
31 Ibid., p. 16.
32 Ibid., pp. 15-16.
CASE PROFILES

In this subsection we examine the strategic planning processes of two four-year institutions, Widener University and Cleveland State University. Profiles include participants in the process, timeline, planning activities, implementation procedures, and lessons learned.

WIDENER UNIVERSITY

Widener University (WU) is a private, four-year institution whose main campus is located in Chester, Pennsylvania. WU has satellite campuses in Wilmington, Delaware and Exton and Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.33

In 2002, WU began developing a strategic plan, which it finalized, after a two-year process, in May 2004. This 10-year plan, “Vision 2015,” identified 13 goals, with multiple objectives associated with each goal, and specific actions steps associated with each objective.34 Currently nearing the end of the plan’s implementation, WU has now had the opportunity to assess its strategic planning process and evaluate its effectiveness.

In a 2012 article, Jo Allen and Joseph Baker, two WU senior administrators during the strategic planning process, highlight the importance of treating the strategic plan as an evolving document during both the planning and the implementation stages. They observe:

Ultimately, we learned that planning the implementation of the plan as it evolves is as critical as planning its development, funding, assessment, and next steps – all leading to the culmination of declaring the victory of meeting goal after goal.35

Prior to 2002, when current WU president, Dr. James Harris, III, began his tenure, WU had never developed an integrated strategic plan with the participation of a wide range of stakeholders. Although senior administrators in the mid-1990s created a plan, they neither disseminated the plan to the university community nor monitored the institution’s progress toward the stated goals in subsequent years.36

During the initial stages, WU decided that a ten-year planning cycle was appropriate given the institution’s low enrollment numbers and “the overall general stagnation of the [previous] decade.”37 Furthermore, while developing a timetable for the planning process, WU administrators came to the realization that they wished to use the strategic plan as an opportunity “to institute the beginning of a culture change within the university community.”38 To achieve this culture change, administrators sought to develop a strategic planning process that fulfilled the following four characteristics:

33 “About Widener.’ Widener University. http://www.widener.edu/about/
36 Ibid., p. 49.
37 Ibid., p. 49.
38 Ibid., p. 49.
- Inclusive, collaborative, and transparent
- Communicated widely, encouraging both discourse and feedback
- Clear about accountability
- Directly aligned with the university’s budgeting process

Figure 1.2 presents the strategic planning process at Widener University, noting the timeframe and activities for the different stages of the process.

**Figure 1.2: Strategic Planning Process, Widener University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>STAGE OF PROCESS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2002</td>
<td>Formation of Strategic Planning Committee (SPC)</td>
<td>SPC consisted of 16 faculty, staff, and students tasked with identifying the goals of the process, a planning timetable, and the processes for engaging all constituencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept.-Dec. 2002</td>
<td>Planning of Process by SPC</td>
<td>The final planning process emphasized the need for long-term commitment from top leadership and a budget process aligned with the planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.-May 2003</td>
<td>Environmental Scans</td>
<td>For each of the 12 draft goals, a group of faculty, staff, and students assessed the university's current state, including a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis of internal and external factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept.-Oct. 2003</td>
<td>Community Input on Environmental Scans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 8, 2003</td>
<td>Visioning Conference</td>
<td>Participants included Board of Trustee members, alumni, faculty, staff, and students, as well as local business, community, and political leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct.-Nov. 2003</td>
<td>Community Input on Visioning Conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2003</td>
<td>Draft of Vision, Mission, and Goals</td>
<td>This draft was based on Environmental Scans and Visioning Conference, SPC drafted Strategic Vision, Mission, and Goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 11, 2003</td>
<td>Board Approval of Vision, Mission, and Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 2003-Feb. 2004</td>
<td>Formulation of Objectives and Strategies for Each Goal</td>
<td>For each of the 13 goals, a goal and objectives committee (“GO” Team) of 10-15 members was assigned to identify the gaps between the present state and the desired future state, and to create operational objectives and action steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb.-Mar. 2004</td>
<td>Community Input on “GO” Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 2004</td>
<td>Finalization of Plan by SPC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 13, 2004</td>
<td>Board Approval of Vision 2015 Strategic Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Widener University

39 Bulleted items taken verbatim from: Ibid., p. 49.
40 Table items adapted nearly verbatim from: Ibid., pp.49-50.
As can be seen above, the strategic planning process at WU highlights transparency and community involvement. After each stage of the process that produced a document (e.g., environmental scans; findings from visioning conference; drafts of vision, mission, and goals; and drafts of objectives and action steps), the planners sought out feedback from the community to help refine these drafts. Allen and Baker note that, as planners revised the documents based on community feedback, this system “started to establish a culture where feedback and discussion were valued, heard, and acted upon.”41 In the end, over 400 of WU’s 1,000 full-time employees directly participated by serving on one of the planning subcommittees. Hundreds more employees participated via “town hall meetings, faculty and staff meeting, plan walkthroughs, open mic meetings, and brown-bag lunches.”42

Furthermore, planners respected procedures for shared faculty governance. For instance, some planning committee meetings were held alongside faculty governance committees. To gain the support of the larger community and keep stakeholders informed, WU developed a dedicated website and newsletter that gave constituents timely access to the variety of documents produced over the course of the planning process.43

Figure 1.3 presents the strategic planning template that the goal and objectives (“GO”) teams used in outlining how each objective within the plan’s 13 goals would be achieved. Individual units also used this template when creating plans that aligned with the institution’s strategic plan, as discussed below. This template not only includes specific action steps, but requires committees to describe how success will be measured and determined, who will be accountable for progress, and what resources will be necessary. Allen and Baker note that in developing actions steps for the university plan and the unit plans alike, committee members had a tendency to front-load, which created “unrealistic time lines and resource requests that could not be met.”44

Figure 1.3: Strategic Planning Template, Widener University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION STEPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Widener University45

41 Ibid., p. 51.
42 Ibid., p. 50.
43 Ibid., pp. 50-51.
44 Ibid., p. 53.
45 Table items taken verbatim from: Ibid., p. 52.
The strategic planning process also assisted WU in developing and launching its $58 million comprehensive campaign. In particular, WU administrators found success in applying elements of the strategic planning model, “specifically by including the faculty and staff, as well as donors, board members, and alumni, in articulating messages and setting priorities and goals.” As a result, the priorities and goals of the comprehensive campaign correspond to the strategic plan and share wide-ranging support among a variety of stakeholders. In addition, the evidence-based models and assessment measures developed as part of the strategic plan help donors envision the impact of their gifts.

Allen and Baker describe the following five lessons learned from the strategic planning process at WU:

- **Be critical and conscientious in changing the inclusion of participants.** While WU had experienced participants involved in every phase, it also included some people from initial phases to work on the revision phase, some who were engaged in their unit’s planning to work on the reaccreditation documents, and so on. Other than the two co-chairs, only a small number of faculty and staff (probably fewer than five) served on every phase of the plan.

- **Be judicious and transparent about how and why participants are selected.** WU agreed on one central quality that every participant on a task force or team must possess: a stated and evidence-based commitment to the plan’s mission, vision, and goals. Beyond that, WU relied on the following criteria for participation:
  - A mix of institutional roles (i.e., faculty, staff, administration, student)
  - Diversity in gender and race
  - Representative senior contributors for institutional memory and commitment
  - Representative junior contributors for generational buy-in and fresh perspectives
  - Experience with planning and assessment to carry the message that planning is valued and that the plan’s activities and impact would be routinely measured
  - Leadership/followership to balance the planning and fulfillment of tasks in each phase
  - Personal/professional expertise to bring authentic review and analysis to various elements of the plan (e.g., including faculty from budgeting and accounting on the financial goals, staff from enrollment management on the enrollment goals, staff from leadership initiatives on the leadership goal)
  - Unit/school balance to ensure representation between the task forces and the campus
  - Campus home bases to avoid the development of a “main campus plan” rather than the university’s plan

- **Plan carefully timed retreats to assess where you are and report findings.** It is imperative to set meeting times as early in each phase as possible. WU found that announcing the date of the summer retreat when the teams themselves were announced was the best way to ensure as much participation in these “findings sessions” could be hoped for. Developing a clear agenda with precise meeting protocols to elicit useful feedback and information exchanges also helped to ensure that participants’ time and efforts were respected.

- **Keep the faculty at the core of the phases, if at all possible.** If faculty do not buy in to the process, then the strategic plan is likely to make very little difference in the culture of the institution. The faculty are also most likely to vocalize their suspicions of the plan and its

---

46 Ibid., p. 55.
47 Ibid., p. 55.
process, especially if they have not been included in prior planning efforts or have witnessed the dust accumulating on the last plan. Their participation is critical to a well-informed plan, so bringing them onboard in large numbers is often key to their buy-in.

- **Vary the sizes and time lines of the task forces by charge and phase.** The size of the task force should reflect the amount of input and review desired for each phase. Some of WU’s phases had well over 100 participants, while some had as few as 40. Mixing a short burst of activity for a tight corps of participants with a longer sustained activity of widely representative numbers helps to prevent plan fatigue while also ensuring deep analysis and transparency. The key is sending a message that not every phase is equal, since they rarely are—some are simply more critical than others, some require more time and effort, some require more voices and opportunities for expression, and some require more urgency and direction.\(^{48}\)

**Figure 1.4** presents the implementation stages of the strategic plan at WU. The implementation involved the development of unit plans, annual assessments of actions steps, formal revisions to the plan, and a midpoint review.

### Figure 1.4: Implementation Procedures, Widener University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE OF PROCESS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Assessment</strong></td>
<td>WU conducted annual assessments of actions steps and presented results to the Board using a color-coded system:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Green:</strong> steps that were in-process or ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Yellow:</strong> steps that were causes of some concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Red:</strong> steps that had not been addressed, had been re-prioritized as a result of current conditions, or that faced considerable and likely insurmountable obstacles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Blue:</strong> steps that were completed and did not need to be revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Purple:</strong> steps likely to be eliminated in the next iteration of the report and the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment of Unit Plans</strong></td>
<td>Schools, Colleges, and other operational units developed strategic plans aligned with the university plan. A steering committee of the co-chairs and reviewers from each unit examined unit plans for inconsistencies with the university plan. Recommendations were sent to the vice presidents of each unit, who worked with the dean or director to refine the plans. The relevant vice presidents approved all unit plans prior to implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Round of Revisions (Year Four)</strong></td>
<td>WU committed to not modifying any action steps in the first three years of implementation and assessment in order to avoid a quick determination that any step was too challenging to carry out. By the fourth year, revisions that still seemed appropriate were presented to and approved by the Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Midpoint Review</strong></td>
<td>After five years, teams for met over several months to summarize the attainability of each goal. Teams reviewed five years’ worth of assessments and requested other data (e.g., enrollment, budget, facilities operations) as needed to address two questions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Are we on track to succeed with this goal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- If so, what must we do to stay on track and what must we complete over the next five years? If not, what must we do to get back on track and what must be complete over the next five years?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Widener University\(^{49}\)

\(^{48}\) Bulleted items adapted nearly verbatim from: Ibid., pp. 55-57.

\(^{49}\) Table items adapted nearly verbatim from: Ibid., pp. 53-54.
WU’s commitment to community involvement and transparency was maintained during the implementation process. For instance, the results of the midpoint review determined that while WU was on track to meet its 13 goals, certain changes would have to be made “regarding efforts, resources, and desired outcomes.” In order to sustain community support, WU presented changes to the plan’s implementation through campus-wide town halls and faculty meetings, as well as team meetings among senior leadership. In addition, WU holds an annual Planning Day, which is designed to “[bring] together senior leaders and faculty from three key governance committees [from all four campuses] to set budget priorities for the upcoming year.” Planning Day gives WU employees the opportunity to openly discuss the progress of the plan and any necessary revisions.

Allen and Baker describe the following lessons learned regarding the implementation of the strategic plan:

- **Set the expectation that no matter the length of the plan cycle, there will be numerous phases of implementation, assessment, revision, and renewal.** WU designed a new phase for each year of the plan, although some phases had a full year of action while other had only a semester. Keeping that evolution of phases in front of the entire campus has clarified that the plan is a breathing, evolving document – not a report written, shelved, and forgotten.

- **Design (or redesign) the budgeting request and allocation processes to clearly align them with the strategic plan’s priorities in all its phases.** WU redesigned the university’s budget request form so that submissions had to address the relationship between the request and WU’s strategic initiatives. In the annual Planning Day, the strategic plan is used as a reference in articulating funding requests and making decisions. This alignment sends a message about the plan’s centrality to institutional decisions, and promotes a culture of planning. As a result, participants in each phase of the plan’s implementation and assessment see their work as valuable and central to the university’s progress.

- **Include campus experts in key elements of the plan, its implementation, and its assessment.** However, it is crucial that these experts be included as resources, not as controllers. There is a bit of cynicism about “the fox guarding the henhouse,” for instance, when a strategic plan’s goal of managing enrollments is monitored exclusively by members of the enrollment services operation. Similarly, academic goals will benefit from the inclusion of students and staff members, as well as faculty. That said, experts with data in hand should overrule perception and supposition, bringing their data to the attention of the plan’s chairs or the president.

- **Be realistic about the support needed for completing each phase.** WU designed assignments so that no one could realistically assert a need for released time or secretarial support to complete his or her charge. WU does not provide additional compensation for this work, but conveys the message that planning is of singular value to the mission and work of the institution. While WU includes extraordinary participation in considerations of merit pay and public gratitude, each task force thus far has been able to complete its charge in extraordinary fashion with no additional compensation. WU made an exception for the faculty co-chairs managing all aspects of the institution’s reaccreditation report, who requested a single course reduction.  

---

50 Ibid., p. 54.
51 Ibid., pp. 54-55.
52 Bulleted items taken nearly verbatim from: Ibid., pp. 55-57.
CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Cleveland State University (CSU) is a public, four-year institution located in Cleveland, Ohio.53

In 2002, CSU began the process of developing a strategic plan. The initial committee was charged with developing a planning process that would meet the following criteria:

- Include broad involvement
- Be consistent with the university’s new vision
- Work in concert with the metropolitan community
- Link goals with budget and review processes
- Specify outcomes for each goal to measure progress
- Allow units to align their plans with the university plan
- Provide regular communication about the planning process54

In fall 2004, the Faculty Senate and the university president approved a three-year planning and implementation framework.55 The planning component of this framework lasted roughly 16 months, from the spring of 2005 until September 2006, when the planning committee submitted its plan for approval by the Faculty Senate, the administration, and the Board of Trustees. The final plan, “Vision Unlimited,” spanned five years and included six goals and 20 strategies. The plan included 147 specific tactics to accomplish these goals.56

On the following page, Figure 1.5 describes the stages of the strategic planning process at CSU, including the timeline. Compared to WU, CSU relied on a slightly different strategy regarding community involvement in the planning process. The planning committee at CSU is smaller, which may have helped speed up the decision-making process. While WU drew upon a diverse set of individuals to serve on planning subcommittees, CSU relied on surveys, interviews, and department/unit reports to collect information from these constituencies. In addition, CSU has established an iterative planning process that periodically reviews and updates its institutional goals, strategies, and tactics according to internal and external factors,57 led by the planning committee, which is a permanent committee with rotating membership.58

53 “About Us.” Cleveland State University. http://www.csuohio.edu/aboutcsu/
55 Ibid., p. 17.
### Table 1: Strategic Planning Process, Cleveland State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>STAGE OF PROCESS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring/Summer 2005</td>
<td>CSU forms the University Strategic Planning Committee (USPC)</td>
<td>USPC consisted of 10 voting members and two ex-officio members. Of the voting members, five were faculty selected by the Faculty Senate and five were senior university leaders appointed by the president. One ex-officio member was the vice provost of planning, assessment, and information resource management. The second ex-officio member was a student representative selected by student government. <strong>Tasks:</strong> Developed mission and operating principles. Developed planning process and timetable. Assigned liaison roles to facilitate communication with stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>USPC collects input and feedback from campus units</td>
<td>All units held strategic planning sessions to answer questions regarding their vision for the next five years and insights that the unit could offer the university. <strong>Tasks:</strong> Developed process for campus-wide strategic planning sessions at department/unit level and at college/division level. Qualitatively analyzed 75 department/unit reports and 16 college/division reports. Based on results, prepared preliminary report on suggested strategies and tactics. Planned and hosted strategic planning university review (SPUR) session of strategies and tactics (with student leaders, faculty senators, Board of Trustees officers, deans, senior administrators).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>USPC gathers more input and revises planning goals</td>
<td><strong>Tasks:</strong> Surveyed students, alumni, visiting committees, campus committees. Hosted community leader breakfast. Developed planning process procedures. Based on results, revised strategies and tactics based on feedback from stakeholders. Presented interim report to Faculty Senate and administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2006</td>
<td>USPC finalizes planning report</td>
<td><strong>Tasks:</strong> Integrated additional stakeholder data. Analyzed challenges and conflicts. Developed priorities and greatest opportunities. Assigned preliminary measures and metrics for evaluation. Finalized planning report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>USPC submits plan for ratification and begins implementation</td>
<td><strong>Tasks:</strong> Submitted planning report to Faculty Senate and administration for ratification. Developed planning process and second-year timetable. Initiated strategic planning at the department/unit level and college/division level by asking each to answer planning questions. Supervised creation of brochure describing strategic plan. Met with plan champions (vice presidents and deans) to determine areas of ownership and accountability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cleveland State University

---

**One innovation in CSU’s strategic planning process has been its strategic planning university review (SPUR) session.** The initial SPUR session, held in November 2005, was designed to update campus leadership on the planning progress and begin establishing

---

strategic priorities. In particular, participants provided input on four of the eight strategic areas listed in the draft report. Participants included “student government leaders, faculty senators, Board of Trustee officers, senior administrators, academic deans, USPC members, and other selected leaders.” To ensure that participants spoke with many fellow participants and discussed at least three of the strategic areas, organizers used a “speed dating” approach: “When attendees arrived, they each received a ‘dance card’ indicating the three tables they would visit and the times they would visit them.” The SPUR session received very positive feedback. As a result, in subsequent years, CSU has organized SPUR sessions in order to discuss issues related to institutional planning, such as expanded community involvement and creating Centers of Excellence.

In a 2009 article, Susan Kogler Hill, Edward Thomas, and Lawrence Keller, three of the original faculty members elected to the USPC, review numerous lessons learned during the planning process, including lessons in the areas of “buy-in and communication” and “operations and budget”: 

- **Buy-in and Communication**
  - Spend as much time as necessary to get everyone on board. At CSU, the process was designed by an ad hoc Faculty Senate committee, with participation by faculty members and appropriate administrators, and approved by both the Faculty Senate and the administration. Although this process took almost two years, it succeeded in part because it came “from the bottom up.” Furthermore, the planning process included mechanisms for getting input and feedback from a wide variety of constituents.
  - Set ground rules for committee operation up front. CSU did not allow committee members to send alternates or substitutes. If they could not attend a meeting, they had to catch up on what they missed. Another ground rule was sending copies of meeting minutes and subcommittee work products to everyone before the next meeting so they could prepare.
  - Take advantage of senior faculty members with experience in faculty governance and administration. Senior faculty members have both institutional memory and an understanding of the academic culture from the faculty viewpoint. Administrative members should also be relatively high-ranking individuals (e.g., vice presidents, deans) who bring a high status to the committee, have a fair amount of decision-making authority on their own, and have immediate and frequent access to top management.
  - Market the plan. In addition to producing a brochure to help with university fundraising, the committee should market the plan internally by making frequent reports to the Faculty Senate, the major standing committees of the Senate, and the Board of Trustees; sending updates to various on-campus publications; maintaining and updating a strategic plan web site; and making committee members available to attend meetings of campus units to provide updates on the plan and the planning process.

---

60 Ibid., p. 20.
61 Ibid., p. 20.
o **Communicate and collaborate.** The committee held annual meetings with president, the provost, the vice president for finance and budgeting, and the vice president for administration, as well as the major university committees, both academic and administrative. Major committees included those responsible for advising the administration on the budget, master planning, and capital planning.

### Operations and Budget

- **Elect or appoint for three years.** Committee members should have staggered three-year terms rather than two-year terms. Losing half of the committee membership each year is extremely costly in terms of institutional and committee memory. To mitigate this problem, CSU invited former members to subsequent SPUR sessions and used them to facilitate discussion groups to capitalize on their previously demonstrated interest in and commitment to the process.

- **Establish a dedicated budget for the planning committee.** The best approach is to give the committee chairperson the authority and responsibility for submitting and justifying an annual budget request based on the committee’s needs for the fiscal year, just as budgets are allocated for other important institutional functions.

- **“Seed money” is often needed to deal with the disconnect between the planning and funding of new projects.** In times of scarce resources, it is too easy for administrators to cite “the lack of funds” as a reason for not undertaking new ventures. Thus, CSU recommends establishing a separate fund, perhaps supplied from soft-money accounts or institutional fundraising, to provide start-up capital for promising new programs and initiatives.

- **Incentivize colleges and administrative units to implement appropriate parts of the plan.** For instance, part of an administrator’s performance evaluation could be based on his or her success in implementation. When college deans approach the provost for funding for new projects or programs, they should be required to demonstrate how that project or program contributes to the achievement of the goals or objectives spelled out in the strategic plan.\(^{63}\)

On the following page, Figure 1.6 describes the implementation process at CSU. While the planning and implementation process at CSU are closely linked due to the institution’s iterative planning structure, this figure provides details regarding the development of implementation protocols.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Stage of Process</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>USPC supervises plan implementation and develops key indicators</td>
<td>Each unit submitted answers to the following questions to their dean/vice president: Which goals, strategies, and tactics of the strategic plan are particularly relevant to your unit? What initiatives will your unit pursue to support the plan? How do these initiatives address the plan’s goals, strategies, and tactics? How will your unit know when it has been successful in regard to these initiatives?                                                                чета в верственный формат. Asked deans and vice presidents to integrate department/unit reports and prepare college/division planning reports. Collected and integrated the strategic planning reports into university-wide strategic planning document. Developed key indicators to annually assess progress on the six planning goals. Planned and hosted SPUR II session to obtain feedback from university leadership on metric, integration of master planning and strategic planning, development of collaborative/communication structures, and budget to support planning initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2007</td>
<td>USPC prepares planning report for ratification</td>
<td>USPC formed three subcommittees to work on a planning report to be submitted to the Faculty Senate and senior administration. Each subcommittee focused on one of these three areas: the strategic planning process, metrics/scorecard, and updating the planning process. 1. <strong>Tasks</strong>: Integrated data from planning reports, champion interviews, and SPUR II into strategies and tactics of university plan. Developed tracking system to show progress toward completion of strategies and tactics. Sent draft of overall planning document to relevant units and individuals for verification. Developed measures and provided a rationale for key indicators and annual scorecard to assess goals. Prepared third-year timetable. Proposed process for changing strategic plan. Introduced possible changes to strategic plan. Met with other key committees to ensure planning integration (e.g., master planning, capital planning, budget).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007/</td>
<td>USPC continues ongoing, bottom-up, collaborative planning process</td>
<td>USPC submitted a planning report to the administration and Faculty Senate. The report included unit reports, a tracking protocol, the proposed metrics and scorecard, the timetable, and recommendations for change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tasks</strong>: Presented annual planning report to Faculty Senate and administration for ratification. Monitored continued implementation of plan and approved changes to plan. Established a process for assessing progress of short- and long-term strategies and tactics. Supervised the collection of scorecard data. Sought stakeholder input to ensure continuous improvements in the planning process. Promoted university-wide collaboration. Communicated with campus community about planning process. Planned and hosted SPUR III. Facilitated the integration of key university activities (strategic planning, master planning, capital planning, budget, and program review).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cleveland State University

64 Table items adapted nearly verbatim from: Ibid., pp. 18-22.
To develop a system of metrics to assess progress toward institutional goals, the USPC formed subcommittees that outlined appropriate metrics and key performance indicators (KPIs). These KPIs would be used in preparing the institution’s annual report card. The USPC also interviewed the president, vice presidents, and academic deans to determine “which areas of the plan they would be willing to ‘champion.’”\(^6^5\) In addition to facilitating buy-in and accountability, this process helped the committee ascertain which areas of the plan were being carried out and which areas were not receiving adequate attention.

Kogler Hill, Thomas, and Keller outline the following lessons learned regarding CSU’s implementation process:

- **Track progress diligently.** CSU designed a system that identified what units were working on which parts of the plan and what the status was of each activity involved (e.g., in-process, modified, completed, eliminated). The committee updated this tracking document annually based on reports from the various academic and administrative units on campus. Such a tracking process is necessary in order to report to the various constituencies on a timely basis and to provide documented evidence to "naysayers" and skeptics that the strategic planning process is indeed working.

- **Ensure that each aspect of the plan has a “champion.”** The plan’s implementation truly began when the deans and vice presidents embraced parts of it during the champion interviews. The challenge was then to find parents to take responsibility for those tactics that remained orphans. If no adopters could be found, then the plan would have to be adjusted to eliminate or modify those tactics.

- **Provide administrative assistance.** Since the planning committee members will all have regular jobs to attend to, it is necessary that someone take care of all of the background details, including finding meeting rooms, ordering food and beverages, sending out meeting announcements and agendas, taking minutes, arranging for special meetings, and a myriad of other such items.

- **“SPUR” wide participation to keep the plan alive.** The planners had anticipated that the first SPUR session would be the only one of its kind, but then a large number of participants suggested that there should be such a meeting on an annual basis. An annual SPUR session helps keep the process alive and the faculty and administrators actively involved.

- **Understand that it doesn’t get any easier.** The CSU planners learned that the process gets harder as it goes along. The fun stuff (gathering the input and creating the plan) comes up front, and the grunt work (figuring out how to implement and evaluate the plan) comes later. Committee members naturally suffer a certain amount of burn out, and, because of turnover, feelings of group cohesion and dedication dissipate to a certain extent. In addition, as the environment in which planning takes place changes, new challenges typically emerge. However, having an ongoing strategic planning process in place provides the mechanism for coping with such challenges.\(^6^6\)

---

\(^6^5\) Ibid., p. 21.

\(^6^6\) Bulleted items taken nearly verbatim from: Ibid., p. 25.
SECTION II: INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES

INTRODUCTION

This section profiles the strategic plans of five specific institutions. We also discuss common trends across the profiled institutions. These institutions were selected in part because of the availability of information regarding their strategic planning processes. The five institutions profiled in this section are as follows:

- Morgan State University
- College of William & Mary
- North Carolina A&T State University
- Indiana State University
- Norfolk State University

In the profiles, we discuss the length of the plan cycle, the planning process, the plan’s goals and initiatives, implementation steps, and details regarding accountability and benchmark indicators.

COMMON TRENDS

PLANNING PROCESS

Figure 2.1 presents the length of the plan cycles and planning processes at each of the profiled institutions. As can be seen below, the plan cycles range from five to 11 years, while the length of the planning process ranges from eight to 16 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>LENGTH OF PLAN CYCLE</th>
<th>LENGTH OF PLANNING PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State University</td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>16 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State University</td>
<td>5 years, extended to 8 years</td>
<td>over 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>~8 months, ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk State University</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>11 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC A&amp;T State University</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>~9 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Institutional documents

Notably, the College of William & Mary (W&M) treats its strategic plan as a living document. For instance, at W&M, the Planning Steering Committee annually reviews the institution’s progress toward its goals and recommends incremental changes to the five-year strategic framework. Each April, W&M produces an updated plan, a budget that reflects strategic priorities, and specific implementation steps for the coming year. Every
five years, the Committee undertakes a more substantial review of the plan and recommends larger-scale revisions.

In addition, Indiana State University (ISU) regularly revises its benchmark indicators and discusses institutional progress during an annual Strategic Plan Stakeholders Conference in April. During this conference, a wide variety of constituents discuss and assess the institution’s progress toward its goals. This conference is similar to Widener University’s Planning Day or Cleveland State University’s SPUR session, presented in Section I.

The number of members in the strategic planning committees at the profiled institutions ranges from 21-35, with an average of 25 members. While it may be challenging to coordinate schedules and perspectives among such a large group, this number allows for wide-ranging representation across different units and institutional roles.

Typically, the committees consist of senior administrators from different divisions, faculty, directors of programs, one or two student representatives (undergraduate and sometimes graduate), an alumni representative, and a representative of the institution’s foundation. Participating staff and administrators generally represent various campus units, such as student affairs, facilities, operations, information technology, institutional research, alumni relations, enrollment management, athletics, and budgeting. At Morgan State University, the planning committee included four members of the Board of Regents and a representative from the local business community, but these practices were not common. ISU appears to be the only institution where the president serves as chair of the planning committee.

GOALS AND INITIATIVES

The right number of strategic goals to include in a plan appears to be around five or six: all of the institutions profiled here list six strategic goals in their plan, except for MSU, which lists five. The initiatives supporting these goals will necessarily be more numerous, and the total number of initiatives included in the strategic plans examined here ranges from 19 to 31. The number of initiatives associated with each goal varies widely, from one to 11, depending on the scope of the goal.

All of the strategic plans include a goal related to students’ academic success. The specific initiatives associated with this goal include increasing student enrollment and retention, strengthening the institution’s curriculum, enhancing the quality of faculty and staff, as well as supporting extra- and/or co-curricular activities.

Two other common goals are diversifying the institution’s financial resources as well as improving infrastructure and operations. Initiatives associated with diversifying revenue include improving alumni engagement and increasing grants and contracts activity. Initiatives associated with improving infrastructure and operations include enhancing the institution’s network capacity and building environmentally sustainable campus facilities.
In addition, three of the institutions (MSU, ISU, and North Carolina A&T State University) identify **community or civic engagement** as one of their strategic goals. Initiatives associated with this goal include creating or supporting the institution’s community development programs, establishing relationships with community organizations, encouraging student participation in outreach programs, and leveraging the institution’s intellectual resources to improve local communities.

Furthermore, W&M and Norfolk State University (NSU) both identify **improving institutional branding** as one of their strategic goals. At W&M, this goal is intended to enhance the institution’s national reputation and involves developing a standardized communications strategy. Other initiatives at W&M include expanding the admissions programs and outreach, as well as launching a national media and video studio. At NSU, this goal involves creating and implementing a comprehensive marketing plan to increase the institution’s visibility and student enrollment.

Additional noteworthy initiatives that appear in the strategic plans include projects related to the internationalization of curricular offerings (North Carolina A&T State University), campus safety (W&M, NSU), experiential learning (ISU), and improving support for human resources (MSU, NSU).

**Implementation and Monitoring**

The institutions vary widely in their implementation and monitoring practices, as well as the public availability of this information. Here we identify some of the notable implementation and monitoring practices among the profiled institutions.

MSU’s strategic plan includes two to seven specific objectives for each of the 31 initiatives associated with its five strategic goals. **For each of these objectives, MSU outlines the anticipated outcome, the measure or benchmark, the assessment method, and the person or office responsible for achieving the objective.** This level of detail assists MSU in ensuring that no implementation steps are “lost” or unaccounted for in the process.

In tracking progress and communicating to stakeholders, it can be helpful to monitor the status of each implementation or action step listed in the strategic plan. For instance, W&M tracks progress by placing implementation steps in one of four possible categories: “not yet started, underway, completed, [or] adopted into continuing practice.” Since 2008, W&M’s strategic planning process has yielded 231 individual implementation steps, 188 of which have now been completed or adopted into continuing practice.

The benchmark indicators also vary widely depending on the specific outcome desired. The vast majority of benchmark indicators are items such as retention rates, number of students accessing services, percentage of graduates participating in a program, **U.S. News** rankings, or the dollar amount of research grants. However, additional assessment methods may involve reviewing policies and procedures, or analyzing the results of surveys and focus
groups. In these cases, the benchmark indicators may be items such as revised internal documents or improved survey ratings.

A scorecard or a dashboard can provide high-level tracking of the key indicators for each goal, especially if the plan contains a high total number of metrics. For instance, each strategic goal at ISU has eight to 49 indicators, resulting in a total of 159 relevant metrics. ISU maintains a dashboard that reports 33 key indicators for the entire plan. At W&M, a dashboard includes 20 key benchmark indicators related to each of the institution’s six strategic challenges. North Carolina A&T State University also relies on a scorecard with 26 key metrics to communicate progress.

MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

The 16-month strategic planning process at MSU resulted in an 11-year strategic plan, entitled “Growing the Future, Leading the World: The Strategic Plan for Morgan State University, 2011-2021.” This plan outlines five institutional goals and 31 strategic initiatives. MSU’s previous strategic plan had relied on a five-year plan cycle.

PLANNING PROCESS

MSU sought to develop an “open, inclusive, and transparent strategic planning process” in order to arrive at a “comprehensive and substantive strategic plan.” As part of its planning process, MSU reviewed institutional strengths and opportunities. MSU worked with the consulting firm Ayers and Associates, Inc. in developing its strategic plan.

Figure 2.2 presents the timeline of the 16-month strategic planning process at MSU. This process demonstrates the use of listening sessions and town hall meetings in order to involve and represent a wide variety of constituents in the planning process. In addition to the events listed below, the Steering Committee developed a website that disseminated information about the strategic planning draft, activities, and relevant updates.

---

70 Ibid., pp. 21-27.
71 Ibid., p. 58.
72 Ibid., p. 8.
The Steering Committee at MSU included 21 members. The Committee was composed of four members of the Board of Regents, five faculty members, two undergraduate students, one graduate student, one dean, one senior administrator, three staff members, one alumna, one community member, and one member of the business community. The vice president for university operations served as the chair of the Committee.

In January 2011, at the listening session for the faculty, the deans of each college and school asked faculty to review the prospective plan and to respond in writing to a series of planning questions. The following four questions provide insight into the kind of input that the Committee sought from faculty:

---

- From the perspective of your college/school, do these five broad goals reflect the right focus of the university over the next 10 years?
- Are there broad goals of issues that should be added or amended?
- From the perspective of your college/school, are these the correct issues that should be addressed within the strategic plan’s broad goals over the next 10 years?
- Given the goals and issues identified from the perspective of your college/school, what should be the university’s focus in planning a multi-year capital campaign?76

**Goals and Initiatives**

Figure 2.3 presents the five goals and 31 strategic initiatives identified in MSU’s strategic plan. Each goal is associated with 5-8 initiatives.

**Figure 2.3: Goals and Strategic Initiatives, Morgan State University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>STRATEGIC INITIATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improving retention and degree completion, especially among undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increasing student enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Building a transformative educational environment enriched by diverse cultural and socio-economic perspectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Recruiting, retaining, and supporting excellent faculty who value diversity, excel in scholarly activities, are committed to the success of at-risk students, and are prepared to mentor graduate students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enhancing students’ education by expanding curriculum to include more internships, international programs, and interdisciplinary programs, and by enhancing library resources and student services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Enhancing the facilities, technological infrastructure, and the administrative operations of the School of Graduate Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supporting extracurricular programs in the arts and athletics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enhancing Student Success**

**Enhancing Status as a Doctoral Research University**

1. Achieving Carnegie classification of Research University with higher research activity (i.e., RU/H)
2. Implementing living learning communities in residential life to help integrate curricular and co-curricular initiatives
3. Providing expertise and leadership in national, state, and local policies and practices related to educational reform
4. Developing policies, guidelines, and organizational structures consistent with the vision of MSU as a premier urban doctoral research university that assures accountability for research and grants management while facilitating collaborations with government, non-governmental, nonprofit, and business organizations
5. Ensuring that policies for enhancing doctoral achievement in non-STEM disciplines for underrepresented people of color receive adequate attention
6. Supporting research infrastructure and exploring faculty arrangements that enhance overall research capacity

76 Bulleted items taken verbatim from: Ibid., p. 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving and Sustaining MSU’s Infrastructure and Operational Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing MSU’s Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging with the Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC INITIATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conducting a full and thorough campus-wide self-assessment and action plan using the Malcolm Baldrige organizational profile for educational institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Engaging in continuous improvement, renovation, and construction of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Becoming a national leader in providing an environmentally sustainable urban campus, and providing leadership in environmental literacy for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Constructing environmentally sustainable and technologically advanced facilities that house MSU’s developing academic programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Exploring public/private collaborations with developers, contractors, and other commercial entities to develop new environmentally sustainable and technologically advanced administrative and student residential facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase the alumni-giving rate such that alumni donations will account for a significant portion of funds collected annually by the MSU Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Seeking the support of the Maryland legislature, local and national officials, and business and civic leaders to increase support for operations and capital projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Creating the appropriate organizational structure, technological efficiencies, and economic incentives to garner more and larger grants and contracts from various entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Enhancing the capacity of the Office of Institutional Advancement and the MSU Foundation to actively raise funds in support of MSU’s vision and mission by recruiting and retaining highly qualified human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Developing the fundraising capacity for each college/school to double the amount of annual funding awarded for contracts and grants and increase private donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Launching a multi-year capital campaign to raise funds for endowed faculty chairs, student scholarships, operations, and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supporting innovation in business and commercialization of intellectual property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Supporting research by revising policies related to the distribution of indirect costs from contracts and grants and encouraging applications for grants and contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Implementing a Morgan Mile program to serve as a social laboratory in which MSU research, creative activities, and public service serve a defined radius around MSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Integrating research and public service activities into public policies and practices in Baltimore’s metropolitan communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Internationalizing MSU’s curriculum, programs, and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Establishing collaborative relationships with libraries, public officials, as well as community and civic organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Applying research, instruction, and public service to improve the cultural and social quality of life for residents of local communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Morgan State University

---

Table items condensed nearly verbatim from: Ibid., pp. 14-20
IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

Figure 2.4 presents the assessment template used by MSU to measure progress on its strategic plan. For each of the 31 strategic initiatives listed in Figure 2.3, MSU lists 2-7 specific objectives. In turn, for each objective the plan specifies anticipated outcome(s), benchmark(s), assessment method(s), and the individual(s), unit(s), or office(s) responsible for the objective.

Figure 2.4: Assessment Template for Strategic Plan Goals, Morgan State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE (WHAT?)</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE (HOW?)</th>
<th>ANTICIPATED OUTCOME (WHAT WILL WE SEE?)</th>
<th>MEASURE OR BENCHMARK (HOW WILL WE KNOW?)</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT METHOD (HOW WILL WE FIND OUT?)</th>
<th>SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITY (WHO?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Morgan State University

For instance, the fourth initiative associated with the second strategic goal, “Enhancing MSU’s Status as a Doctoral Research University,” involves improving MSU’s status as a doctoral research university through a variety of methods. In the assessment table, MSU lists three specific objectives associated with this initiative. One objective is the “review and revision of existing policies and guidelines for research and grants management.” The anticipated outcome is “updated policies and guidelines, [and] demonstrated process improvements in research and grants management.” The benchmarks for this objective are policy and guideline completion (assessed via the institutional database) and process evaluation (assessed via evaluations and feedback). This objective is the responsibility of the Office of Sponsored Programs, which will monitor guideline completion, and the Center for Performance Assessment, which will monitor the process evaluation.

Other examples of benchmarks include retention rates, publication of best practices, number of students accessing services, student feedback on services, and student competency in writing and critical thinking skills. Other examples of assessment methods include institutional research, annual and periodic reports, surveys and focus groups, GPA analysis, and nationally normed tests and surveys.

---

78 Table headers taken nearly verbatim from: Ibid., pp. 29-52.
79 Ibid., p. 37.
80 Ibid., pp. 29-52.
INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Indiana State University’s current plan, “The Pathway to Success,” was published in October 2009 and was originally envisioned as a five-year plan that would apply to academic years 2010-2014. The initial planning process took over one year and involved “hundreds of faculty and staff, together with dozens of students and community members.”81 Because of the plan’s success, the Board of Trustees asked central administration to extend the plan to 2017.82 In order to maintain consistency, this section presents information found in the original 2010-2014 plan, which includes six goals and 23 initiatives.

PLANNING PROCESS

The Strategic Planning Advisory Committee includes 22 members. The Committee is composed of the president, three faculty members, seven deans and vice presidents, directors of programs, a payroll manager, a representative from the ISU Foundation, two student representatives (one undergraduate and one graduate), and one alumni representative. Represented units include academics, student affairs, enrollment management, payroll, operations, and facilities.83

Since the implementation of the plan in 2010, ISU has held an annual Strategic Planning Stakeholder Conference. These conferences include presentations of progress on each initiative, as well as an audit each initiative.84 The audit discusses the status of the initiative and any relevant concerns. Each year, an audit team is assigned to each goal. Depending on the scope of the goal, audit teams consist of one to three individuals.85

GOALS AND INITIATIVES

On the following page, Figure 2.5 presents the six goals and 29 initiatives (including “Partnering for Success”) in ISU’s original plan. Each goal includes two to nine initiatives.

82 “Pathway to Success 2012.” Indiana State University. http://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/index.cfm/sp/index
### Figure 2.5: Goals and Initiatives, Indiana State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GOAL</strong></th>
<th><strong>INITIATIVES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Increase Enrollment and Student Success** | 1. Develop a first-year student residential village  
2. Further develop cooperative programs with Ivy Tech to provide multiple points of entry to ISU  
3. Create a unified undergraduate student success program  
4. Create Sycamore Express one-stop centers  
5. Develop programs for the parents and families of students  
6. Increase early outreach to students in region  
7. Achieve greater impact on student success through residential life  
8. Enhance graduate education at ISU  
9. Enhance the gathering and use of information to advance ISU’s strategic priorities |
| **Advance Experiential Learning** | 1. Infuse experiential learning as a core component in all academic programs  
2. Apply the science of learning to the learning of science  
3. Coordinate and elevate leadership studies |
| **Enhance Community Engagement** | 1. Create a coordinated community engagement program  
2. Expand distance education offerings to meet the needs of students and to support economic development  
3. Enhance the visibility of ISU in Indianapolis |
| **Strengthen and Leverage Programs of Distinction and Promise** | 1. Strengthen Programs of Distinction and Promise  
2. Create a Center for Rural Life |
| **Diversify Revenue through Philanthropy, Contracts, and Grants** | 1. Enhance contract and grant activity  
2. Strengthen the engagement of alumni in the life of ISU |
| **Recruit and Retain Great Faculty and Staff** | 1. Enhance the quality of life for faculty and staff  
2. Enhance the development of faculty  
3. Enhance the development of staff  
4. Expand the diversity found in the composition of the faculty and staff at ISU |

Source: Indiana State University

In addition to the six goals listed above, ISU’s strategic plan includes a commitment to “Partnering for Success.” This goal includes the following five initiatives:

- Energize downtown to create a great college town
- Realize the full potential of the Rural Health Innovation Collaborative
- Developing the neighborhoods around ISU
- Create a gateway to ISU and a bridge to the Riverscape
- Improve student housing to meet expectations and needs of today’s students

---

86 Table items taken nearly verbatim from: “The Pathway to Success.” Indiana State University, pp. 10, 14, 18, 22, 26.  
http://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/assets/splan/stratplan.pdf

87 Bulleted items taken verbatim from: Ibid., p. 32.
IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

At ISU, an implementation team oversees each initiative. Depending on the scope of the initiative, these teams may include one team member or over a dozen. Each implementation team is chaired by one to three individuals. Furthermore, one to three implementation chairs oversee progress on initiatives toward each overarching goal.88

ISU has developed a total of 159 benchmark indicators across all of the strategic goals.89 Depending on the goal, the number of associated benchmark indicators ranges from eight to 49.90 At ISU, the benchmark indicators are living documents and may evolve from year to year based on feedback.91 In addition to tracking progress on all 159 of the benchmark indicators, ISU maintains a dashboard that provides an overview of progress on a select list of indicators. This dashboard reports on 33 key indicators, including 5 indicators that apply to “Partnering for Success.”92

On the following page, Figure 2.6 presents the 34 benchmark indicators included in the original strategic plan. Unless otherwise noted, indicators were intended to be achieved by 2014. In creating these indicators, ISU relied on a combination of short-, middle- and long-term timelines by setting goals for 2010 and 2012, as well as 2014.

90 See “Strategic Planning Benchmarks – Goals 2 & 3” and “Strategic Planning Benchmarks – Goal 1.”
### Figure 2.6: Benchmark Indicators, Indiana State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>BENCHMARK INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Increase Enrollment and Student Success** | 1. Increase headcount enrollment to 12,000 students  
2. Increase first-year retention to 74%, with long-range goal of 80%  
3. Increase four-year graduation rate to 26%, with long-range goal of 30%  
4. Increase transfer student headcount enrollment by 48%  
5. Double transfer student headcount enrollment from Ivy Tech  
6. Increase transfer student six-year graduation rate to 51%  
7. Increase first-year retention rate for transfer students to 74%  
8. Narrow the difference between the retention and graduate rates of all students and Pell Grant eligible, African American, and 21st Century Scholar students by a minimum of 50%, with long-range goal of equalizing these rates |
| **Advance Experiential Learning** | 1. Increase the percentage of students who participate in internships, practicums, and field experiences before graduation to 100%  
2. Increase the percentage of degree programs with a required significant experiential learning component to 100%  
3. Increase the participation in experiential learning each year, until 100% of ISU students engage in at least one significant field experience within their major before graduation  
4. More than double the percentage of students who participate in international (non-credit and for-credit) experiences before graduation |
| **Enhance Community Engagement** | 1. Increase student participation in outreach activities each year, until, by fall 2014, 100% of ISU students have at least one community engagement experience before graduation  
2. Increase number of leadership positions faculty and staff have in community, social, and economic development groups  
3. Increase amount of direct and indirect financial support provided to the community, social, cultural, and economic development groups  
4. Increase number of businesses served by ISU (e.g., Small Business Development Center, Innovation Alliance)  
5. Increase number of jobs created by the businesses in the incubator to 300 by 2014 |
| **Strengthen and Leverage Programs of Distinction and Promise** | By 2010, ISU will:  
1. Define the methodology and criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of programs of national and regional distinction or promise  
2. Define an ongoing system to enable new programs of distinction to be identified and supported  
3. Develop strategic plans for programs currently identified as programs of strength and promise  
By 2014, ISU will:  
1. Increase resources provided to programs of strength and promise  
2. Complete an evaluation of all programs of strength and promise based upon the criteria and methodology established in 2010  
3. Document that 75% of programs of strength and promise will be meeting or exceeding expectations as defined by the 2010 criteria and methodology |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>BENCHMARK INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Diversify Revenue through Philanthropy, Contracts, and Grants** | By 2012, ISU will:  
1. Have met or exceeded the goals of March On: The Campaign for ISU  
By 2014, ISU will:  
1. Increase gross revenue from grants and contracts by 50%, adjusted for inflation  
2. Increase indirect cost recovery from grants and contracts by 50%  
3. Increase gross tuition and fee revenue by 34% by increasing enrollment and limiting increases in tuition to the Consumer Price indexes  
4. Increase revenue transferred to ISU from the ISU Foundation by 50%, adjusted for inflation  
5. Increase non-institutional revenue generated for athletics to the average amount raised by the Missouri Valley Conference teams  
6. Increase the number of donors who annually give to the ISU Foundation by 32%  
7. Double the number of alumni who participate in alumni-related events |
| **Recruit and Retain Great Faculty and Staff** | 1. Narrow the gap between the percentage of African-American faculty and the percentage of African Americans in our student body by 50%  
2. Recruit more minorities and women in executive and professional staff positions so that the gap in composition of these employee groups and the diversity of our student body is narrowed by 50%  
3. Increase the number of newly hired faculty achieving tenure to 65%  
4. Increase the six-year retention rate for staff to 60%  
5. Increase the compensation for faculty and staff to the average of our statistical peer group  
6. Complete the salary equity study for staff and begin implementation |

Source: Indiana State University

COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

The current strategic plan at the College of William and Mary applies to fiscal years 2013-2017 and is the result of a strategic management process that was initiated in 2008. This process involves annual revisions to “an evolving five-year plan.”94 The initial strategic planning process, which produced the first approved plan in April 2009, took an estimated eight months.95 The FY13-FY17 strategic plan consists of six challenges and 19 goals.

PLANNING PROCESS

Figure 2.7 presents the ongoing strategic planning process at W&M. Following the initial approval of the strategic plan in April 2009, W&M has annually approved revisions to the plan’s implementation steps. Each year, the Planning Steering Committee reviews the institution’s progress toward its goals and recommends incremental changes to the five-year strategic framework.96 Every April, W&M produces “an updated strategic plan, a budget that reflects strategic priorities, and a set of specific implementation steps for the coming year.”97 Every five years, the Committee undertakes a more substantial review of the plan and recommends larger-scale revisions.98

Figure 2.7: Ongoing Strategic Planning Process, College of William & Mary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>STAGE OF PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>▪ First year of the strategic planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ First strategic framework for FY10-FY14 approved by Board in April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ President and Planning Steering Committee developed implementation plan for FY10-FY14 in summer 200999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>▪ First year of five-year framework and implementation steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ FY10-FY14 framework included over 100 implementation steps for FY10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>▪ FY11-FY15 framework adopted in April 2010 and included about 80 implementation steps for FY11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>▪ FY11-FY16 framework adopted in April 2011 and included about 80 steps for FY 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: College of William & Mary100

---

94 “About Strategic Planning.” College of William & Mary.  
http://www.wm.edu/about/administration/strategicplanning/about/index.php
95 To arrive at this estimate, we use the beginning of the academic year (late August) as its start date. See: “A Plan for William & Mary.” College of William & Mary, Apr. 2009, p. 1.  
http://www.wm.edu/about/administration/strategicplanning/documents/Strategic_Framework_Summary_0526_09.pdf
96 Ibid., p. 19.  
97 “Overview of the Process.” College of William & Mary.  
http://www.wm.edu/about/administration/strategicplanning/about/overview/index.php
98 Ibid.  
100 Table items adapted nearly verbatim from: “Archives for W&M Strategic Planning.” College of William & Mary.  
http://www.wm.edu/about/administration/strategicplanning/about/archives/index.php
The Planning Steering Committee “guides the planning process, tracks progress using a university-level dashboard, reviews budget requests for their strategic importance, recommends annual updates, and tracks implementation.”\textsuperscript{101} In 2012-2013, the Committee includes 25 members. The Committee is composed of deans and vice presidents, faculty, and directors, as well as a William and Mary Foundation trustee, the president of the student assembly, the president of the graduate council, and a staff assembly representative. The provost and the vice president of strategic initiatives serve as co-chairs. Represented units include student affairs, academics, athletics, development, finance, and community initiatives.\textsuperscript{102}

Six planning subcommittees are charged with each of the six challenges. The number of members on these subcommittees ranges from 10 to 17. In addition, W&M has established an “evaluation” subcommittee, which consists of the associate provost for institutional analysis and effectiveness and the assistant to the vice president of student affairs. The evaluation subcommittee has two faculty advisors.\textsuperscript{103}

**GOALS AND INITIATIVES**

Figure 2.8 presents the six challenges and 19 goals outlined in W&M’s strategic plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHALLENGE</th>
<th>GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be a leader among liberal arts universities</td>
<td>1. Embed the core values of liberal arts education in all parts of the university – undergraduate, graduate, and professional 2. Provide more robust support for teaching, research, scholarship, and creative activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support a more fully diverse W&amp;M community</td>
<td>1. Communicate W&amp;M’s commitment to diversity 2. Ensure a welcoming and supportive campus 3. Increase the diversity of the student body, faculty, and staff 4. Provide more diverse curricular offerings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an ever more engaging campus experiences that inspires a lifelong commitment to W&amp;M</td>
<td>1. Forge lifelong relationships with W&amp;M 2. Create a community that values life in balance 3. Improve the campus residential experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{102} “Planning Steering Committee 2012-2013.” College of William & Mary.  
http://www.wm.edu/about/administration/strategicplanning/psc/index.php  
\textsuperscript{103} “Planning Steering Subcommittees 2012-2013.” College of William & Mary.  
http://www.wm.edu/about/administration/strategicplanning/psc/subcommittees/index.php
**CHALLENGE** | **GOALS**
--- | ---
Develop and implement a business plan that maximizes revenue sources and ensures transparent resource allocation in support of college priorities and needs | 1. Increase revenue and allocate resources consistent with institutional needs and priorities
  2. Enhance efficiency and effectiveness of operations and identify opportunities for revenue generation or cost savings across the institutions. Improve transparency of college revenue and expenditures across all sources and types of expenditures

Provide the administrative resources and infrastructure required for a university in the 21st century | 1. Engage, support, and retain a highly regarded workforce
  2. Provide robust and dynamic infrastructure for campus-wide IT system needs to support the academic program and administrative functions
  3. Ensure that the college has the type and quality of facilities needed to explore, teach, and learn in the 21st century and which present the college in a competitive light for prospective faculty, students, and staff
  4. Provide a safe and secure environment
  5. Become a model of sustainable operations

Explain and promote W&M through a more effective communications structure and strategy | 1. Distill and promote a common identity
  2. Enhance W&M’s position as one of the nation’s leading universities
  3. Develop an integrated, appropriate communications capability

Source: College of William & Mary

**IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING**

The ongoing planning process allows the Committee to determine implementation steps to be carried out in the upcoming year, while also outlining proposals for consideration in years two to five, as funding allows. For instance, the five top priorities for FY13 are as follows:

- Salary increases for faculty and staff
- Continued strategic investment in fundraising and development opportunities
- Increases in maintenance and operations funding
- Additional resources for the research enterprise
- A new Creative Adaptation Fund for academic initiatives

Implementation at W&M “includes assignment of responsibility for each goal and implementation step, and periodic reports to track progress.” Figure 2.9 presents the status of all implementation steps at W&M from April 2009 to April 2012. Since 2008, 231

---

105 Ibid., 30.
106 Bulleted items taken nearly verbatim from: Ibid., p. 18.
107 Ibid., p. 28.
implementation steps have been included in W&M’s strategic plan. Of these, 85 steps have been completed and 103 adopted into continuing practice.

**Figure 2.9: Status of Implementation Steps, College of William & Mary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR INITIATED</th>
<th>NOT YET STARTED</th>
<th>UNDERWAY</th>
<th>COMPLETED</th>
<th>INTO CONTINUING PRACTICE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>231</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: College of William & Mary

A top-level dashboard reports on 20 key benchmark indicators related to each of the six challenges. Key benchmark indicators include undergraduate acceptance rate, *U.S. News* financial resources rank, number of students who are non-resident aliens, and endowment per student, among others.

The FY13-FY17 plan includes about 45 implementation steps for the upcoming year. The number of implementation steps in previous plans has ranged from approximately 70 to 100. On the following page, **Figure 2.10** presents select implementation steps for FY13 at W&M.

---

108 Ibid., p. 28
## Figure 2.10: Select Implementation Steps, FY13, College of William & Mary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHALLENGE</th>
<th>SELECT IMPLEMENTATION STEPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be a leader among liberal arts universities</td>
<td>▪ Begin implementation of recommendations from the review of the undergraduate curricula in Arts and Sciences, Business, and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Seek to implement the raises of 5% for faculty and 4% for staff envisioned in the six-year plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Expand graduate support as a base investment to maintain competitiveness as a university. Ensure graduate and professional stipends are competitive with peer programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support a more fully diverse W&amp;M community</td>
<td>▪ Continue work in conjunction with Assistant to the President and HR Training Director to develop ongoing workshops for faculty/staff on working with diverse populations (i.e., religious diversity, freedom of speech, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Develop a working plan that identifies W&amp;M hiring needs for faculty and staff, and identify key areas for opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Review progress on the diversity of curricular offerings emerging from the undergraduate curriculum review and make recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an ever more engaging campus experiences that inspires lifelong commitment to W&amp;M</td>
<td>▪ Continue to expand the goal of engaging alumni at Homecoming by offering academic opportunities such as attending classes and faculty student panel presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Promote a “Frenzy Free Finals” experience for students by implementing strategies for reducing stress and promoting healthy behaviors during reading days and final exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a business plan that maximizes revenue sources and ensures transparent resource allocation in support of college priorities and needs</td>
<td>▪ Provide planned expanded funding for development operations. Build momentum for a future campaign through increased gift levels, refinement of messages and communication platforms, and activation of a volunteer network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Provide additional staff to meet state and college demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Provide $200,000 per year in a Creative Adaptation Fund for three years to improve the quality of educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide the administrative resources and infrastructure required for a university in the 21st century</td>
<td>▪ Free up maintenance and operations funds through innovation and greater efficiency initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Deploy software systems to enhance business practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Add one law enforcement position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Continue sustainability fellowships to support sustainability programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain and promote W&amp;M through a more effective communications structure and strategy</td>
<td>▪ Continue implementation of the oversight process recommended by the Visual Identity Committee with specific alignment goals, timelines, and projected costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Expand admissions programs and outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Launch a national media and video studio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: College of William & Mary

---

NORFOLK STATE UNIVERSITY

Norfolk State University’s (NSU’s) current strategic plan is entitled “Building a Legacy of Excellence” and applies to academic years 2012-2018.\textsuperscript{112} This seven-year plan is the result of an 11-month planning process. The plan lists six strategic goals and 28 operational goals.

PLANNING PROCESS

NSU’s president appointed members of the Strategic Committee in November 2011. In December 2011, NSU hired MGT of America, Inc., a national consulting firm, to assist in the strategic planning process.\textsuperscript{113} The plan was published in October 2012.\textsuperscript{114}

NSU’s Strategic Committee consisted of 24 individuals. The provost/vice president for academic affairs and the executive vice president/chief operation officer served as co-chairs. Other members included deans and vice presidents, an NSU Foundation representative, directors of programs, and a student government representative. Units represented included finance and administration, alumni relations, operations, recruitment, information technology, legislative affairs, and professional development.\textsuperscript{115}

NSU’s strategic planning process also included three subcommittees of five to 10 members each. These subcommittees were dedicated to the following aspects of the strategic plan: mission, vision, and core values; academic areas; and non-academic areas.\textsuperscript{116}

GOALS AND INITIATIVES

On the following page, Figure 2.11 presents NSU’s six strategic goals and 28 operational goals. Each strategic goal is associated with one to 11 operational goals.

In the plan, each operational goal is further differentiated into specific objectives and action steps. For instance, the first operational goal below, improving measures of accountability and quality, is associated with three objectives to be achieved by fall 2018: “[increasing] retention rate from 73 percent to 80 percent, [increasing] six-year graduation rate from 34 percent to 42 percent, [and increasing] enrollment from 7,100 to 8,000.”\textsuperscript{117} Each of these objectives then includes detailed action steps. For instance, the first objective involves developing a retention plan, establishing a student success system, and examining the possibility of elevating admissions standards.\textsuperscript{118}

\textsuperscript{116} ibid., p. 25.
\textsuperscript{117} ibid., p. 6.
\textsuperscript{118} ibid., p. 6.
### Figure 2.11: Strategic and Operational Goals, Norfolk State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Goal</th>
<th>Operational Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create and sustain a culture of academic excellence and success</strong></td>
<td>1. Improve performance on key accountability measures and indicators of quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Promote excellence in teaching, scholarship, research, and service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Strengthen and strategically realign NSU’s curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Establish three new Centers of Academic Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Expand opportunities to augment internationalization at NSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Develop a comprehensive, integrated co-curriculum to promote holistic student development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Operationalize Spartan Crusade for Academic Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Implement Success Beyond Measure Life Skills Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous improvement of operations and systems</strong></td>
<td>1. Review and improve the effectiveness and efficiency of NSU operations to sustain the transformation of the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Optimize NSU’s human capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Use technology to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of university systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modernization of infrastructure and facilities</strong></td>
<td>1. Review and revise NSU’s IT administrative structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Increase Office of IT staffing to meet NSU’s technology support needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Expand and enhance access to network resources, services, and applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Enhance the telecommunications infrastructure for cost effective and efficient communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Enhance NSU’s web presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Partner with the academic units and the School of Extended Learning to expand, enhance, and improve maintenance of instructional technology platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Continue enhancement of NSU’s network security and privacy regimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Further enhance network capacity to accommodate the growing needs of instructional and business operations of the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Review and adapt the Comprehensive Master Plan to improve and maintain the physical facilities in order to enrich the teaching and learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Expand the campus footprint to increase capacity, promote economic development, and further maximize NSU’s standing in the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Provide strategic leadership in addressing sustainability challenges through curricular and service innovations and green facilities and operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expanding the resource base</strong></td>
<td>1. Cultivate, develop, and maintain relationships with key constituents that lead to increased financial support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Expand comprehensive fundraising program to support NSU’s goals and initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Improve the effectiveness and impact of the NSU Annual Giving Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Identify and utilize NSU’s physical assets and resources to generate additional streams of revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Create revenue by maximizing the intellectual assets of the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximizing the Norfolk State University brand</strong></td>
<td>1. Develop and implement an integrated marketing plan to transform the university’s brand, increase visibility, support student enrollment, and effectively communicate to key constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhance campus security to ensure a safe living and learning environment</strong></td>
<td>1. Enhance campus safety and security operations to support the university’s initiatives, ongoing programs, and living and learning environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Norfolk State University

---

119 Table items condensed nearly verbatim from: Ibid., pp. 5-20.
IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

The Strategic Committee developed specific metrics for the strategic plan’s goals in conjunction with the appropriate vice presidential division at NSU. Every summer, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning measures performance on each objective and reports the institution’s progress toward each of its operational goals in an annual progress report. The appropriate vice president is accountable for the achievement of operational goals and objectives.¹²⁰

Figure 2.12 presents select implementation metrics used at NSU to track achievement toward its strategic goals.

Figure 2.12: Select Implementation Metrics, Norfolk State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC GOAL</th>
<th>SELECT METRICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Create and sustain a culture of academic excellence and success | - Retention rates  
- Graduation rates  
- Percentage of online credit hours generated  
- Faculty Scholarly Productivity (Index)  
- Annual Assessment reports to include evaluation of outcomes, attainment, and statement of program impact |
| Continuous improvement of operations and systems        | - Comprehensive organizational assessment conducted  
- Customer Satisfaction Survey developed and distributed  
- Policies and procedures for Human Resources, Procurement, Information Technology, and Student Affairs updated and disseminated  
- Publish document denoting changes to internal contracts and workflow management practices |
| Modernization of infrastructure and facilities          | - Voice over internet protocol installed in all campus buildings  
- Percentage of WiFi coverage on campus  
- Grade on Sustainability Report Card  
- Campus Beautification Plan developed and executed |
| Expanding the resource base                             | - Percentage of financial support generated  
- Physical Facilities Usage Study completed |
| Maximizing the Norfolk State University brand          | - Electronic repository operational  
- Repository information updated quarterly  
- Marketing Plan published and implemented |
| Enhance campus security to ensure a safe living and learning environment | - Updated Emergency Preparedness Plan published and distributed  
- Campus Police Department accreditation achieved  
- Uniform Monitoring System developed |

Source: Norfolk State University¹²¹

¹²⁰ Ibid., p. 22.
North Carolina A&T State University (NC A&T) has a 10-year strategic plan entitled “A&T Preeminence 2020: Embracing Our Past, Creating Our Future.” The plan applies to academic years 2011-2020 and is the result of an approximately nine-month-long planning process. The plan outlines six goals and 22 strategies.

**Planning Process**

NC A&T’s chancellor initiated the planning process in fall 2010 by assembling a Strategic Planning Resource Council. The Council consisted of 35 members, including “administrators, faculty, staff, students, and external stakeholders.” The Council relied on “SWOT analysis, benchmarking, internal and external focus groups, and surveys” in the development of the strategic plan’s goals. In summer 2011, NC A&T’s Board of Trustees revised and then approved the plan.

Figure 2.13 presents the various entities that participated in or were responsible for different aspects of the strategic planning process. The academic deans and division vice chancellors are responsible for developing division-level plans that align with the university plan.

![Figure 2.13: Participation in Planning Processes, NC A&T](image)

Source: NC A&T

---


123 Ibid., p. 4.

124 Ibid., p. 4

125 Ibid., p. 18.

126 Table items taken verbatim from: Ibid., p. 18.
**GOALS AND INITIATIVES**

Figure 2.14 presents the six goals and 22 strategies included in NC A&T’s strategic plan. Each goal is associated with 5-7 strategies.

**Figure 2.14: Goals and Strategies, NC A&T**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Intellectual Climate | 1. Instill a passion for academic excellence and lifelong learning by creating a learning-centered environment with dynamic intellectual exchange  
2. Enhance the quality of the faculty and staff through aggressive recruitment and continuing support of talented leaders in their disciplines  
3. Enhance the student experience through faculty-student interaction, distinctive co-curricular activities, engaging undergraduates in research activities, and expanding high quality living-learning communities through the use of effective instructional technologies  
4. Create a stimulating, discovery-driven academic environment that provides financial support to attract graduate students who are competitive at leading research institutions  
5. Maintain an environment that upholds ethical values, honor, respect, and integrity  
6. Recruit and retain gifted students by providing an academically challenging environment  
7. Enhance intellectual environment through creative use of physical and virtual space |
| Excellence in Teaching, Research, and Engagement | 1. Create and sustain a culture that supports teaching excellence across all academic units  
2. Increase recognition of institutional quality and distinction among top research universities  
3. Provide greater support for faculty development opportunities to enhance innovative instructional methods, course design, and curricular development  
4. Develop university-wide systems to encourage and promote nationally recognized faculty achievements in teaching, research, and public service  
5. Enhance faculty use of systems to effectively monitor student progress and facilitate early interventions to improve academic excellence  
6. Strengthen the educational impact of international opportunities and experiences for university students, faculty, and staff |
| Premier Research-, Science-, and Technology-Focused Institution | 1. Enhance and develop new relationships with research funding entities to broaden the university’s research portfolio and increase related funding  
2. Expand the breadth of faculty and student involvement in funded research  
3. Enhance and leverage the active engagement of faculty technology transfer and translational research  
4. Promote a vigorous STEM-oriented academic environment and increase the number of students entering STEM careers  
5. Strengthen the capacity and quality of STEM-oriented graduate/professional degree programs and the number of overall graduate student enrollment |
## GOAL

### Entrepreneurial Spirit and Civic Engagement

1. Become a driver of regional revitalization in economic development, health, education, culture, and civic quality
2. Actively participate and leverage the intellectual portfolio of the university to facilitate capacity building within local communities, and to create replicable models for long-term growth
3. Become a recognized regional leader to support critical clusters related to biological, life, and environmental sciences in the Piedmont Triad technology corridor
4. Create programs that support educational credentialing of adult workers
5. Engage in research, teaching, and community outreach activities that strengthen programs for K-12 education in the region
6. Strengthen strategic relationships with community colleges and other educational partners
7. Encourage, support, and recognize the high quality, interdisciplinary entrepreneurial endeavors of students, faculty, staff, and administrators

### Diverse and Inclusive Campus Community

1. Encourage the development of programs that demonstrate the value of varied global perspectives and supports international collaborations, research alliances, and partnerships
2. Graduate out students with global credentials through experiences abroad, international studies, and domestic and international internships
3. Develop curricula that imparts global relevance in a manner that increases knowledge of people, cultures, and nations
4. Exhibit and enhance educational and workplace practices that exemplify an acceptance of differences in the heritage and beliefs of others, and supports opportunities to achieve professional and personal goals

### Academic and Operational Excellence

1. Enhance institutional research to facilitate effective data-driven decisions, with dashboard measurements for tracking performance
2. Enhance and expand the performance-based management system for faculty, staff, and student employees
3. Utilize best practices and technological enhancements to improve program effectiveness and efficiency
4. Develop and implement transparent and consistent policies to enhance the recruitment, retention, and graduation of students
5. Improve front-line capabilities to fulfill the university’s commitment to quality service and responsiveness
6. Enact processes to create an environment that is accessible and welcoming to students, staff, faculty, retirees, alumni, and the greater community

Source: North Carolina A&T State University

---

127 Table items taken nearly verbatim from: Ibid., pp. 6-16.
IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

Figure 2.15 presents the 26 scorecard metrics developed by NC A&T to measure achievement toward the above strategic goals. For each metric, the scorecard reports NC A&T’s current score, the mean of two sets of NC A&T peers, and the 2020 goal. NC A&T also relies on an institutional dashboard to track performance indicators that are not included on the scorecard.128

Figure 2.15: Scorecard, NC A&T

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION AREAS</th>
<th>METRICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>1. Fall Enrollment (headcount): undergraduate, graduate, master’s, doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. New freshmen – average SAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. New freshmen – average ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. New freshmen – average high school GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. New transfer enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development</td>
<td>1. Contract and grants award dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Number of new U.S. patents and licenses based on NC A&amp;T’s research per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Royalties per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success</td>
<td>1. First-year retention rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Four-year graduation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Six-year graduation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Number of renowned scholars (Marshall, Fulbright, Rhodes, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Number of national fellowships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Degrees awarded by fiscal year (bachelor’s, master’s, doctorates, STEM disciplines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Success</td>
<td>1. Number of MEAC Champion in a number of sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Graduation success rate for athletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
<td>1. Endowment market value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Alumni participation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital (Faculty and Staff Recognition)</td>
<td>1. Number of members in national academies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Number of members receiving national and international awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Number of endowed professorships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Highly cited staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking and Recognition</td>
<td>1. U.S. News Best College – Overall Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. U.S. News Best College – HBCU Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>1. Student demographic – percentage African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Student demographic – percentage non-African American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NC A&T129

128 Ibid., p. 20.
129 Ibid., p. 21.
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