

Upper Iowa University
Strategic Planning

Other Comments
Public Comments & Response

Response by:
Jerry McCauley
Alan Walker
E.B. Wilson

STRATEGIC PLANNING TEAM REPORTS

OTHER COMMENTS

Comment 1: Definition of "Global Citizen"

Would you please share the definition/interpretation/perception of GLOBAL CITIZEN that the committee, campus constituents, and the Board of Trustees applied to develop and finalize UIU's vision statement?

I am asking so that I might better understand the overarching goal while reviewing the committees' recommendations.

Thanks much, Deena Serra

Comment 2: Confusion

I must admit to being somewhat confused after reading the reports on strategic planning. There is a definite lack of cohesion. I can grasp the ideas of producing global citizens and developing a seamless university. From there, I can follow the reports from the seamless subcommittee and the admissions subcommittee, and understand how they fit in with one of these goals. The other reports just do not seem to fit. Particularly the co-curricular report, which is more wish list than strategic plan. This leads to me my next point, which is why did some units produce a wish list, while others did not. I am sure all faculty will point out the fact that the strategic plan is asking for millions of dollars for athletics and student development, while there are zero resources devoted to faculty and academics. In fact, there are very few words, much less resources, devoted to producing global citizens. It is hard to view the strategic plan as flowing from the vision and mission, since most of the spending in the plan does not. I am willing to consider that the problem here is me. I had different expectations regarding the strategic planning process. If no one shares those same expectations then the problem is definitely me. I expected the strategic plan to produce specific goals, and then a strategy to achieve those goals. Producing a seamless university is one example. The reason I like that part of the plan is because it identifies a goal and then maps out a strategy to achieve that goal. That strikes me as being strategic. I can see where there would be problems in following this process with respect to producing global citizens, because I find that idea very nebulous. Perhaps if it included specific statements about exactly "what is a global citizen", then a strategy could be mapped out to meet that goal. Perhaps a part of strategic planning should have been devoted to developing a description of a global citizen that has some meat to it (maybe this has happened and I am not aware of it). Here is a specific example of what I expected the strategic plan to accomplish. Perhaps we have a goal to increase enrollment on the Fayette campus to 1200. The strategic plan then would provide a roadmap to achieve that goal. For example, how many faculty would we need? Would we need an additional academic building? What would we need as far as additional residence halls? What would we need with respect to dining facilities? Student development's requests would

make sense to me because they would be constructed to fit within the context of achieving this goal. I believe we do have a goal to increase enrollment on the Fayette campus. I am surprised that the strategic plan does not address achieving this goal. Likewise, I am literally shocked that the strategic plan says absolutely nothing about the mandate to add two new centers per year. This is very bold (some might argue so bold that it will not happen). It will certainly require resources. Where are those resources going to come from? I do not find a wish list to be strategic, particularly when it looks at one unit outside of the scope of the rest of the university. I can appreciate the concept of “dreaming big”. However, spending over \$40 million over the next five years is not dreaming big, it is hallucinating. I can not get past the idea that it is just absurd. And it is absurd not just because of the dollar amount. It is absurd because if the university received \$40 million dollars tomorrow, we would not spend it all on the items listed in the strategic plan. We would certainly spend some, but what percentage? Another aspect of a strategic plan (in my opinion) is that it should guide the investment of resources, and I do not believe we would use these reports as the guide to how we would spend this money. To reiterate, my expectations of a strategic plan are that it sets goals the university wants to achieve, and then develops a plan to achieve those goals. The allocation of resources would then be based on the strategic plan. I am willing to accept criticism that my expectations are either unreasonable or do not fit within the strategic planning process adopted by the university. I do think that the reports presented lack cohesiveness because while some clearly operate according to my expectation (such as producing a seamless university), others appear to me to be nothing more than a wish list. This last point begs the question – why did some units produce a wish list while other units did not? I find it difficult to avoid coming away with the impression that these are the units that will be favored with available resources.

Rick Klann

Comment 3: Some thoughts on the process

Anyone remember the movie Casablanca? The scene where the French police chief is pocketing his share of the take in Rick’s gambling parlor, as he says, loudly, “I’m shocked and appalled that there is gambling going on here.” Well, I’m shocked and appalled.” First, not only do I have to agree with Rick Klann’s long missive; I also have to agree with my wife. What next? The administration? I’m also shocked and appalled that Klann and I are shocked and appalled by a \$40 million dollar wish list, that doesn’t include academics. And \$40 million is not the price tag, there are “extra’s.” 1) Salaries: those are EVERY YEAR. Thus, for instance, Marcom’s new person is \$35,000; add benefits! That is another \$12,000, for a total of 47,000, plus the \$15,000 for expenses, for a total of \$64,000 a year. Over the three years of the discussion about branding, the cost is not \$137,500; it’s more like \$265,500, if you consider that new position over the final two years of the process. 2) Infrastructural extras: Salaries mean people; people need things, like office space, furniture, computers, phones, etc. Also there may be other hiddens. Take the football field, what events will we attract? They have to be in the daylight! HS games are at night! We’re not taking the final games away from the UNI-Dome! Is the next thing, lights? Or even for the baseball field (where we could get HS

games)? 3) Normal growth: I assume we want to grow. Well folks, we are at the enrollment when I first arrived here. We had 61 faculty!! That's right 61. Now hold on Nigel and Division Chairs, before you start calculating where to add, the next year we had 44. My point is, If we grow, it means growth in faculty; maybe not 61, but how close? Add that, the attendant expenses, and other needs of the infrastructure and you're 40 million may be more like 50-70 million. Could we be dreaming? That's not bad. However, who gets goods, and who gets zilch? And, how do we decide these things? Pistol Duel? (Hey, we once picked a Vice President of the US that way). What I see in this plan is not a plan; they are more like position papers. Put them together, and what we see is, WE NEED A PLAN! A plan has goals, objectives, strategies and tactics. There is a little of this in the position papers; but what we really have is a lot of wishes; and we can't get them all done. Which ones best fit into our plan? Which are objectives, which are strategies, which are tactics, and which ones do not fit the plan? We cannot tell these things because there really is no plan here. On a side note, I believe in global citizenship; I doubt it is a goal. Goals are concrete and measurable. What is a global citizen? Is it even definable? I say in classes that other cultures are different; not bad, just different. It may not be right, but the Arab terrorist truly believes he is a good global citizen because he is willing to die to make the globe a better place to live! And, you may remember, our center in Malaysia is in an Islamic state! "Shindler's List" was banned! There is also polygamy, and other practices we do not condone.

If global citizen means being able to understand and live with this, will we get in trouble with things like the Patriot Act, for instance? Be sued by extreme conservatives, Christians, etc? I think we need to prepare people for the idea it is a Global village. I'm not sure that is the same thing as a global citizen.

Mind you, I'm not disagreeing with the five principal components of the steering committee; however, how do we define and translate into goals?

Jerry (One step closer to retirement) Wadian

Comment 4: 03 October 2007

While I would like to "engage in a campus-wide dialog" as requested by Dr. Walker, I note that these pages are accessible to the general public.

Although we have nothing to hide, this dialogue may prove to be more dynamic and effective if taken off-line. While the general public can be privy to the process itself, would it not better serve the university to keep the content at this point within the university community?

I submit this comment with the utmost respect for our historic values and institutional heritage.

DSerra

Comment 5: Academic Standards

I understand why my academic colleagues are “shocked” and “confused” by the strategic planning reports. Several of the proposals appear to me to be solutions desperately in need of a problem. But it also might be that my expectations of academic standards are not appropriate for this planning process. In an academic model, it is common practice to identify problems, define terms, and establish goals and outcomes. This is the model we use for the AQIP process and this is the model we use for proposing new academic programs and new courses. The ‘Seamless Movement’ report makes sense to me because it follows this model. By contrast, part four (4) of the Enrollment report does not make sense to me. It states the following: “Fayette campus faculty are utilized as academic advisors. EU has Academic Advising positions.” It follows up with four recommendations: “We recommend advising training for all faculty advisors. Utilize the Jenzabar Advising module. Look at making the evaluation of advising as part of faculty tenure requirements. Hire full time academic advisor to handle students who are undecided.” The recommendations do not flow from the stated problem. I am left to assume there is a problem with faculty advising, but the problem has not been identified. It recommends advising training, but it does not state any goals or outcomes for that training. It recommends evaluating advising as a part of faculty tenure requirements, but it does not define a benchmark for excellence in advising. It recommends hiring full-time staff to advise students who are undecided, but it does not acknowledge the inequity of current faculty advising loads (some faculty have 30-40 advisees, other faculty have 3-4 advisees). I believe the faculty should be accountable for advising, but it is highly questionable whether faculty are in a position to accept a proposal that does not follow an academic model. Perhaps the strategic plan would be more cohesive if all the reports were to follow an academic model. It doesn’t cost us anything to better define who we are and what we want to do. But if we fail to take this opportunity, we are less likely to succeed. Don McComb

Comment 6: General comments

I am most impressed with the reports from the Strategic Plan teams; they show a deep appreciation for the need of Upper Iowa University to move forward aggressively into the future. I believe the Youtube video "Did You Know" was very appropriate in light of this overall discussion of the future of Upper Iowa University. We must be looking 5 and 10 years ahead in order to keep up with the rapid changes that are taking place, and the Global Citizen approach is going to be way that we take UIU into the future. I would urge the University to create an ongoing task force to identify trends that will be impacting us (and the world community that we are a part of) 5 and 10 years in the future so that we can adapt and create majors and processes and modalities that will keep us on the cutting edge rather than lagging behind other institutions. Having seen the AQIP and strategic planning processes at close range at another institution similar to UIU, I know the importance of such forwarding thinking. I suspect if we are not nimble enough to adapt quickly to emerging trends, we will be unable to meet the needs of the students of the future. I understand that some of the recommendations and observations of the teams may seem, at first glance, to be too aggressive or not realistic, however we need to engage as a

community in active discussion and analysis of these points in order to move forward with a strong consensus.

Marshall Whitlock

Comment 7: Reflections on the Strategic Planning Process

When I agreed to serve as a faculty representative on the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, I felt a need to champion two major issues that I perceived were important to include in the strategic planning process: (1) the need to increase the size of the university's endowment and to utilize it to attract the brightest and best students to UIU; and (2) the need to examine the workload of the faculty and to bring it in line with the workload of the faculty at comparable institutions. These weren't necessarily my ideas; rather, they were shamelessly acquired from numerous conversations that I have had with respected colleagues. I believe that they are absolutely essential to include in the strategic plan if we want to aspire to the vision statement that "Upper Iowa University will be recognized and respected as an exceptional and ascending institution of higher learning". I tried in numerous ways to incorporate these two issues as strategic goals in the plan. First, I had these listed as Strategic Responses in a white paper that I, and others, put together in June for the Steering Committee. However, these issues fell through the cracks as members of the Steering Committee winnowed through this paper and concluded that other objectives were more important. I continued to push, particularly for the faculty workload issue, in a memo to Steering Committee members as sub-groups were writing the first draft of the plan. I think it is safe to say that I was quite vocal during Steering Committee meetings, trying to stress that these issues not be neglected. As I view the current plan, it is obvious to me that I was not successful in my original mission. Having said that, I do want to acknowledge that many good things were incorporated into the plan. It was a privilege to work with dedicated members of this institution and discuss the future of Upper Iowa University. I am still trying to fathom what went awry with my efforts. Likely I am naive in my understanding of how a strategic planning process works. However, I've been told numerous times that this is an iterative process. So with this in mind, I will try to reiterate why I think these issues belong in the strategic plan.

In June, "The Chronicle of Higher Education" reported on the closing of the residential campus of Antioch College (which has profitable "extended university" centers similar to UIU). Reasons cited for the closure were "dwindling enrollment and expensive campus maintenance" and the fact that the campus "could lean on only a small endowment of \$36.2-million". The parallels to UIU are unnerving - except it is my understanding (and I could be wrong) that our endowment is smaller than this. When I asked why increasing the endowment at UIU was not being written into the plan, I was told that a Vice-President will be hired at UIU in the near future that will address this issue. However, I do not believe that is a reason to omit the endowment from the plan. Also, it appears that increases in enrollment will result in incoming cash flow. It appears that money now is available to build new buildings at new centers. I am curious as to whether any of this new money has been ear-marked for increasing the endowment. I truly feel that, if the

Strategic Plan gets passed by the Board without any reference in it regarding the endowment, that we may travel down the same path just taken by Antioch. The Extended University graciously helps to support our Residential University now, but we really need an RU nest egg to get us through the hard times that will likely come when high-school graduate numbers really start to take a nose-dive in the near future.

In the June white paper that I helped to write for the Steering Committee, we included a sensible strategic initiative with regard to faculty workload. Basically, the thought was that, in the first year, some group would identify colleges comparable to us and review/benchmark how we compared to them with regard to faculty depth (e.g. the number of faculty members per department or major) and job responsibilities (e.g. the number of credits taught per semester, number of committees, number of advisees, etc.). Then in future years, funding would be made available for new full-time and/or adjunct faculty positions, as well as for increased faculty compensation and/or release time. The goal would be to get us in line with comparable colleges for faculty size and workload. I am aware that the Cabinet has created a "benchmarking" committee, and it is assumed that they will help us move in this direction. However, this does not mean that the issue should not be included in the Strategic Plan. Many faculty members have gone "above and beyond" what is typically required of a faculty member, particularly during leaner times in this institution's recent history. I think it is important that the Board approve a plan that shows its commitment to support an overburdened faculty by relieving some of that burden as the university grows. Also, I believe that a similar benchmarking plan should be instituted for staff - the faculty likely aren't the only personnel that have heavy workloads at Upper Iowa.

Finally, I guess what worries me the most about the plan is that, if approved in its current form, it appears to set aside money for some items that appear to have only a marginal tie-in to the plan's overarching goals. It is easy to pay lip-service and say that, as new strategic objectives are identified after the plan is approved they will be funded in kind. However, it may be equally easy to say that we cannot afford new strategic initiatives that arise after the plan is approved, as our money will be committed to the wish lists in the current plan. I certainly want to give our administrators the benefit of the doubt and believe that they would fund important new initiatives as they are identified. However, I would be more comfortable with the plan if its initiatives demonstrated a more equitable allocation of funds to the various departments within the university community.

Scott Figdore

Comment 8: Comments from the Division of Science and Mathematics

DIVISION OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS RESPONSE TO STRATEGIC PLAN

The Division of Science and Mathematics is providing a unified response to the documents presented outlining the strategic plan developed for the campus community. The comments below represent the major issues raised upon reading the initiatives discussed in the plan. Specific division faculty members are also contributing individual

comments that fall outside the purview of the concerns expressed herein in response to the plan.

1. A major concern of the division is the lack of any mention at all of building an endowment to allow the university to withstand hard times that may occur in the future. The number of high school graduates in the state is declining and the very nature of education is likely to change significantly in the near future as computing technology fosters major innovations in the delivery of education to students. An endowment is necessary to give the university the capital to implement needed changes to meet future demands.
2. The strategic plan offers no real vision for the future. It consists mainly of several tactical maneuvers to be applied in the short term but doesn't really look ahead to the changing educational landscape, with increased emphasis on distance learning and the competition from for-profit institutions. There is no mention of any new educational initiatives. Thus there is no actual strategy in the strategic plan.
3. In addition to their normal duties of teaching, grading, advising, and university service, RU faculty are facing increasing demands on their time as new duties, such as assessment and the incorporation of the EU into a unified campus, come into being. The strategic plan as presented offers no plan to benchmark UIU RU faculty responsibilities by comparing them to faculty responsibilities at comparable institutions. In fact, the plan offers no support for faculty at all. The Seamless Movement and the Curriculum Subcommittee reports include \$0 in support of faculty personnel for implementation of their suggested initiatives.
4. The plan presents a tremendous disparity in requests for resource allocations. Plans for a new student center, a data center, and improvements to the athletics facilities are outlined in detail with projected costs in the millions of dollars, but no money at all is included to support new or existing faculty positions. In fact, the faculty as a whole is generally ignored in the strategic plan.
5. Nowhere in the plan is there any form of a cost/benefit analysis to gauge the financial impact of implementing the suggested proposals. The plan offers no projected return on investment for any of the proposed capital outlays. There is no integration of future university financial projections into the feasibility of any of the proposals delineated.
6. The plan does not describe any clear pathway by which the responses of each strategic plan team are contributing to the overall goals and mission of the university. It is unclear how any of this will promote global citizenship.
7. The plan as presented is lacking an investigation of how the very nature of education itself will change in the next twenty to thirty years and a strategy the university can use to position itself to meet these changes.

-- Division of Science and Mathematics

Comment 9: Thank You

Thank you Rick, Scott, Jerry and others who have taken the time to comment on the Strategic Planning Process! I find it refreshing to serve on a university board where we can have an open dialogue about the issues and opportunities we face going forward. We have so many positive things going for us at UIU and they are a President who has a passion for the universities customers both internal and external, a BOT's that are passionate about this university and are willing to make tough decisions (we are listening) and a faculty and staff that are the cornerstone of this university, just to name a few. Betty (my lovely wife) and I have held several discussions with students over the past year and the one common theme discussed is how much the faculty and staff cared about their well-being and education.

Betty and I have been involved in the planning process from the beginning and we have learned so much about our university because the students, faculty and staff were willing to share their thoughts and ideas. Keep in mind there is no strategic plan until one is finalized sometime in 2008. The comment period is exactly what it is named for and that is a comment period. With problems should come solutions? For example, there are universities that have hundreds of millions in their endowment but will probably not make it long term because they don't have a vision of how the landscape of learning will look like 5, 10 and 20 years from now. We all know it is changing but where will it go with regards to technology, housing and areas where our students will be working. I view the university as having two customers, one internal (faculty and staff) and the other external (students). As we develop this plan let's think about both customers and how they determine our future for this university. We targeted in on the \$40 million price tag and not what's best for this university (Just My Humble Opinion). Its human nature to think about costs before we determine what we really need to accomplished. (I'll agree some of the dollars may have been a "Wish List" but it made us all think, ponder and comment). Put the dollars to the side until we determine what we want to accomplish. Let's focus in on these issues; 1) How do we bring more students to the Fayette Campus? 2) How do we bring more faculty and staff to the Fayette Campus? 3) How do we increase the enrollment at our centers, external degree and on-line programs? 4) How do we increase our scholarship program? 5) How do we add more Academic Programs to our curriculum? 6) How do we use technology to increase efficiency? 7) How do we find grant and foundation dollars to fund our projects? 8) How do we increase our endowment? Ladies and gentlemen these are just starters.

I applaud and ask you to keep debating and discussing the issues because we have a chance to provide the vision and outcome for UIU over the next 150 years. This is my university; this is your university so let's make a great institution even better.

Go Peacocks!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Bob Firth (rfirth@aplmc.com)

Comment 10: General comments

Others who have commented above are correct: the strategic plan as presented provides no coherent vision for the future and consists mostly of a series of wish lists, which serve to make it much more tactical than strategic. The major issue that I see facing Upper Iowa is the lack of an endowment. Being tuition-driven, as everyone knows, leaves us vulnerable to the vagaries of the local and national economies, as an economic downturn leaves fewer students with the resources to attend Upper Iowa. We need an endowment more than anything else to help us weather not only hard economic times but also coming changes in the very nature of higher education. How education is delivered twenty years from now is anybody's guess, but I bet it will be quite different than it is today. Without an endowment, we may not be able to survive those changes intact. The plan needs to address ways to build the endowment substantially as its top priority.

The other major concern I see with the plan as presented is the huge disparity of resource requests for athletics, OSD, and IT when compared to requests to aid our curriculum. Practically speaking, no mention is made of any monetary support for existing or new faculty positions. Neither is there any indication of support for existing or new academic programs. I believe that the faculty and the curriculum are the lifeblood of this institution; without either, there would be no reason for students to enroll. As a specific example of curricular needs that affect me directly, the science and mathematics division suffers from a serious dearth of instrumentation for students to use in their lab courses and research projects. The \$850,000 proposed for artificial turf in Eischeid Stadium could enhance the science curriculum beyond belief by providing funds to purchase enough scientific instrumentation to make us the envy of our peers. Better instrumentation means more opportunities for student research, which is now recognized nationally as the single most important aspect of an undergraduate science education.

Millions of dollars are slated to be allocated to many perceived needs on campus if everything in the strategic plan is implemented. I submit that the money involved could be spent much more productively than for the items currently described in the plan.

Interestingly, there is also no mention of resources for a bookstore on the Fayette campus. I am tired of having students add my course on the first day of the term and then have to wait a week or ten days for their books to arrive. By then, they have missed much of the reading for the first exam and they suffer as a result. We need a bookstore on campus so that students can buy or rent books right away for their classes. The current situation of ordering online does not work for students who need to add courses during the first three days of the term.

I am not trying to whine about inadequate facilities and low curricular support for my program. I simply accept it as a fact and make do the best I can. I am, however, very concerned that the reports from each subcommittee include no mention of support for faculty or curriculum. Am I to assume that most people on campus think this issue is unimportant? I love working at Upper Iowa; it's why I drive 61 miles every day just to get here. But we need to focus on providing the best educational opportunities we can for

students in support of our academic mission and I do not see that articulated in the current version of the strategic plan.

-- Erik Olson

Comment 11: Online Students

Thank you allowing us to comment on the Strategic Planning for UIU. My wife and I are online students pursuing degrees through UIU. This program allows both of us to obtain our degrees completely online; it would not be possible for us to do this without the UIU online program. The professors and course ware are excellent. The student advisors are top notch. We very much encourage you to keep the sixth term in the online program.

Some of the discussion in the strategic plan is on branding. May I suggest that the best way to brand the university is through your current students, faculty, and alumni. These are the people who live and breathe your mission. A huge plus for my wife recently securing a position at Mayo Clinic in Rochester, MN was the fact that she has UIU on her resume and that she continues online in pursuit of her BA and eventually her MBA. This is branding at its best. The comments by the management staff at Mayo were favorable of the UIU programs. I found out about the strategic plan comment by browsing the main UIU website. An easy and effective way to reach people for comment would have been to send an email via UIU emails to students and alumni. This would have allowed for more discussion in a cost effective manner. With UIU's experience in the external degree program and online courses, would you not agree that they are in position to lead the world in online academic training? This would truly enhance the university's goal of creating global citizens.

Martin and Mickey Souhrada - Grand Meadow, MN

Comment 12: Agreement with many comments already made

I have to second (and third and fourth, etc.) many of the comments made here by other faculty members.

Specifically:

1. There is little cohesion in the current version of the strategic plan. I see some strategy that derives from the mission of the college, but it's difficult to see how many of the sections contribute to achieving that strategy. There are also several aspects that should be addressed in the plan that appear to be missing.

2. There is little, if any, planning that relates to the academic side of our future, which seems like it should be a driving force. Faculty loads (both in the classroom and administrative) are a major issue right now and should be addressed in the plan, regardless of any current work that might be in progress in that area. In particular, plans to increase enrollment should be tied to plans to increase tenure-track faculty

appropriately. I would be very disappointed if this institution decides that the way to accommodate more students is by use of adjunct or part-time faculty.

3. The endowment, or lack thereof, has been an issue as long as I've been here (and long before that I suspect). Just hiring a Vice President of Development is not sufficient to ensure that this valuable resource will grow. The plan should provide a strategy that will give some direction to the person hired into that position in order to ensure that the goals are understood and that they are achieved in a way that is consistent with the mission of the college.

4. While athletics programs and facilities provide students for the residential university, they should not drive the plan nor should they consume the lion's share of resources.

I hope that the end result of the strategic planning process will be a truly strategic plan that is balanced and reflects the priorities of the entire university.

Lynn Isvik

END OF OTHER COMMENTS

Other and General Comments

Response to Public Comments

From the subcommittee composed of: Alan Walker, EB Wilson, Jerry McCauley

Response to the public comment found repeated in sections:

Branding/Communications: Comment 2: 03 October 2007

Co-Curricular: Comment 2: 03 October 2007

Curricular Team: Comment 3: 03 October 2007

Enrollment Team: Comment 1: 03 October 2007

Information Technology: Comment 3: 03 October 2007

Seamless Movement: Comment 2: 03 October 2007

Financial Modeling Team: Comment 2: 03 October 2007

Other Comments: Comment 4: 03 October 2007

Comment: While I would like to “engage in a campus-wide dialog” as requested by Dr. Walker, I note that these pages are accessible to the general public.

Although we have nothing to hide, this dialogue may prove to be more dynamic and effective if taken off-line. While the general public can be privy to the process itself, would it not better serve the university to keep the content at this point within the university community?

I submit this comment with the utmost respect for our historic values and institutional heritage.

DSerra

***Response to Comment:** This point is well-taken and was considered prior to the public comment period on the website. However, it was the subcommittee’s wish to provide an opportunity for the entire academic community to participate (alums and others), not just those with password protected access to a location on UIU’s website. Taking the discussion “off-line” would have required setting up an access system that would have made it impractical for all in our academic community to participate. The committee also wished to preserve the highest level of transparency in this process/dialogue.*

Response to Public Comments Under “Other Comments”

Comment 1: Definition of "Global Citizen"

Would you please share the definition/interpretation/perception of GLOBAL CITIZEN that the committee, campus constituents, and the Board of Trustees applied to develop and finalize UIU's vision statement?

I am asking so that I might better understand the overarching goal while reviewing the committees' recommendations.

Thanks much, Deena Serra

Response to Comment: *The intent and use of this term in general terms refers to the preparation of graduates who can be successful in an increasingly complex, competitive, and interdependent world. Considerable energies are being devoted to understanding the dynamics of the external environment and to the translation of those findings into educational outcomes. A number of source documents are being used by the strategic planning steering committee to factually inform their environmental dialogue, including Thomas L. Friedman's book *The World Is Flat* and a wide variety of publications that examine general population and social trends, the implications of the external environment to professional and career performance, and the changing expectations for the education of 21st century students.*

Among the principal findings, these are some of the most noteworthy:

- *Political barriers are disappearing as the world evolves toward efficient markets that reward quality and service at the lowest price;*
- *World population is aging and there is a growing and significant shortage of knowledge workers;*
- *Career opportunities are being created but students are being educated for "obsolete" jobs;*
- *Technology literacy is fast becoming a career competitive advantage;*
- *Multicultural skills including language proficiency will be in high demand;*
- *Written and oral communication skills will be critical ingredients of success;*
- *Creative problem solving and leadership skills will be highly sought attributes;*
- *Continuing education and lifelong learning will be essential to personal well being and professional success;*
- *Collaboration, networking and team building are replacing hierarchical, top down leadership qualities.*

In higher education there is a proliferation of news that has accelerated during 2007 that describes how colleges and universities, large and small, public and private, comprehensive research and liberal arts teaching, are developing strategies and making resource commitments to meet the educational demands of globalization.

The subcommittee recognizes that as part of this ongoing, iterative strategic planning process, it will be important to develop over time a UIU definition that is made unique and distinctive by the character of its student outcomes. These outcomes will be determined by the excellence and orientation of the curricular and co-curricular

experiences that prepare UIU students for their professional and personal futures (see related responses).

This subcommittee welcomes any specific suggestions/input the author may have related to defining what it means to be a “global citizen”.

Comment 2: Confusion

I must admit to being somewhat confused after reading the reports on strategic planning. There is a definite lack of cohesion. I can grasp the ideas of producing global citizens and developing a seamless university. From there, I can follow the reports from the seamless subcommittee and the admissions subcommittee, and understand how they fit in with one of these goals. The other reports just do not seem to fit. Particularly the co-curricular report, which is more wish list than strategic plan. This leads to me my next point, which is why did some units produce a wish list, while others did not. I am sure all faculty will point out the fact that the strategic plan is asking for millions of dollars for athletics and student development, while there are zero resources devoted to faculty and academics. In fact, there are very few words, much less resources, devoted to producing global citizens. It is hard to view the strategic plan as flowing from the vision and mission, since most of the spending in the plan does not. I am willing to consider that the problem here is me. I had different expectations regarding the strategic planning process. If no one shares those same expectations then the problem is definitely me. I expected the strategic plan to produce specific goals, and then a strategy to achieve those goals. Producing a seamless university is one example. The reason I like that part of the plan is because it identifies a goal and then maps out a strategy to achieve that goal. That strikes me as being strategic. I can see where there would be problems in following this process with respect to producing global citizens, because I find that idea very nebulous. Perhaps if it included specific statements about exactly “what is a global citizen”, then a strategy could be mapped out to meet that goal. Perhaps a part of strategic planning should have been devoted to developing a description of a global citizen that has some meat to it (maybe this has happened and I am not aware of it). Here is a specific example of what I expected the strategic plan to accomplish. Perhaps we have a goal to increase enrollment on the Fayette campus to 1200. The strategic plan then would provide a roadmap to achieve that goal. For example, how many faculty would we need? Would we need an additional academic building? What would we need as far as additional residence halls? What would we need with respect to dining facilities? Student development's requests would make sense to me because they would be constructed to fit within the context of achieving this goal. I believe we do have a goal to increase enrollment on the Fayette campus. I am surprised that the strategic plan does not address achieving this goal. Likewise, I am literally shocked that the strategic plan says absolutely nothing about the mandate to add two new centers per year. This is very bold (some might argue so bold that it will not happen). It will certainly require resources. Where are those resources going to come from? I do not find a wish list to be strategic, particularly when it looks at one unit outside of the scope of the rest of the university. I can appreciate the concept of “dreaming big”. However, spending over \$40 million over the next five years is not

dreaming big, it is hallucinating. I can not get past the idea that it is just absurd. And it is absurd not just because of the dollar amount. It is absurd because if the university received \$40 million dollars tomorrow, we would not spend it all on the items listed in the strategic plan. We would certainly spend some, but what percentage? Another aspect of a strategic plan (in my opinion) is that it should guide the investment of resources, and I do not believe we would use these reports as the guide to how we would spend this money. To reiterate, my expectations of a strategic plan are that it sets goals the university wants to achieve, and then develops a plan to achieve those goals. The allocation of resources would then be based on the strategic plan. I am willing to accept criticism that my expectations are either unreasonable or do not fit within the strategic planning process adopted by the university. I do think that the reports presented lack cohesiveness because while some clearly operate according to my expectation (such as producing a seamless university), others appear to me to be nothing more than a wish list. This last point begs the question – why did some units produce a wish list while other units did not? I find it difficult to avoid coming away with the impression that these are the units that will be favored with available resources.

Rick Klann

Response to Comment: *The subcommittee agrees with the major points raised by the author of this comment. The subcommittee agrees that work still needs to be done to assure that the intended actions/activities in support of various strategies are appropriate and applicable. We further agree that the various strategies should share an appropriate relationship to each other so that the plan represents a coherent, single body of work. Concurrently, it is the subcommittee's impression that some have viewed what was presented for public comment along a continuum far closer to a completed draft than it was intended to represent. Instead, this first public comment period was intended provide an opportunity for comment and participation during a more formative stage of strategic thinking (albeit, perhaps this point was not sufficiently emphasized). Accordingly, the subcommittee acknowledges the degree to which certain intentions and ideas contained herein need to be further detailed, articulated, and evaluated.*

Clearly, once the primary strategies have been identified, a strategic plan must be supported by the development of more detailed annual operational plans that identify specific actions to be undertaken (objectives), performance indicators, baseline data, identification of individuals responsible for carrying out the activities, etc. within the major operating units of the University. The University actually began using this process in support of the most recent strategic plan developed in 2004. The development of annual operating plans as described here has been a practice in place at the Vice President's level for the last two years.

As pointed out by the author of this comment, some committees produced anticipated resource needs while others did not. All committees were encouraged to do so, but at the time of this public comment period, not all may have progressed in their dialogue to the point where they were prepared to do so, or they determined that minimal

additional resources would be needed. It should not be interpreted that those subcommittees that have presented resource needs thus far, will be ultimately favored with available resources (see additional related response to this issue, below).

As most of the resource concerns expressed in the public comments are related to growth, support, and quality enhancement of academics, it has occurred to this subcommittee that perhaps there was an assumption that these needs would be addressed by the Strategic Planning Curricular subcommittee. This needs to be clarified and this subcommittee accepts responsibility for doing so. A commitment has been, and remains in place to increase tenure track faculty on the Fayette campus commensurate with increased enrollment. For example, over the last three years, six net new FTEs have been added (not including five that are teaching through the EU) and there are plans to add at least two or three more this year for the Fayette campus. There is also been a standing commitment to maintain a Fayette campus student-to-(full-time) faculty ratio within a range consistent with what it has been over time. As such, the committee agrees the resources needed to add additional faculty contingent on enrollment growth need to be included in the strategic plan

This subcommittee believes this should either become recognized as part of the charge of the Strategic Planning Curricular subcommittee (if it is not already), or that it should be an additional stand-alone Strategic Planning subcommittee. In either case, this subcommittee urges the author of this comment and any individual representing other divisions, to submit a list of current and/or future specific resource needs known at this time, related to, and in support of, this strategic planning effort and the growth, support, and quality enhancement of academic programs, to this subcommittee at the earliest opportunity. This subcommittee will accept responsibility for ensuring that these requests are forwarded to an appropriate destination in the planning process.

The subcommittee wishes to refer the author of this comment regarding the concept of developing “global citizens” to its response to public Comment 1, above.

The author is correct that up to this point in the strategic planning process, as it relates to setting a specific enrollment target for the Fayette campus (although the most often heard figure recently is probably 1200 – 1500 over an as-yet unidentified period of time), there has been no definitive threshold identified, but as discussion continues, some kind of target may be helpful as a means to an end rather than the reverse. Accordingly, this subcommittee believes there should be scalability in the plan as it relates to providing resources and infrastructure.

Regarding the author’s comments on the addition and funding of new centers, It has been the intent of the Board of Trustees to add two new centers each year. The planning for the new centers in Cedar Rapids and Rockford began about the same time as this latest strategic planning process. Funding for the construction of these centers came from the University cash reserve (as did some of the funding for the construction of the Andres Center, renovation of the Alexander-Dickman, Edgar Fine

Arts, the acquisition and installation of the new Jenzabar portal system, and other capital improvements of a one-time nature). Operation of the centers (like other operating units that make up the EU) is part of the EU annual operating budget. Having completed the construction and opening of these two new centers, I am certain the Board of Trustees will undertake a review of the level of time, commitment, and investment involved, as well as the relationship a commitment to continue to add two centers each year has to the current strategic thinking.

As the comment's author points out, there are many perceived needs surfacing as part of this strategic planning process that represents millions of dollars worth of expenditures. The subcommittee wishes to point out that this is not a conclusive list, nor has there been any prioritization done to ensure the most strategic and productive use of resources. The process has not gotten that far yet. It is clear that not all additional resources needed in support of some of the strategies identified thus far have been quantified and articulated in written form. Nor are needed resources accounted for that represent strategies that have not been included thus far (see related response to Comment 10 and 12). Finally, once most of the needed resources have been accounted for, these needs will have to be prioritized within categories representing most likely sources of funding (i.e., annual operating budgets, fundraising efforts, cash reserves, grants, borrowing, etc.). The subcommittee strongly agrees that the allocation of resources should be tied to a strategic plan (as they generally have been over the last several years).

Comment 3: Some thoughts on the process

Anyone remember the movie Casablanca? The scene where the French police chief is pocketing his share of the take in Rick's gambling parlor, as he says, loudly, "I'm shocked and appalled that there is gambling going on here." Well, I'm shocked and appalled." First, not only do I have to agree with Rick Klann's long missive; I also have to agree with my wife. What next? The administration? I'm also shocked and appalled that Klann and I are shocked and appalled by a \$40 million dollar wish list, that doesn't include academics. And \$40 million is not the price tag, there are "extra's." 1) Salaries: those are EVERY YEAR. Thus, for instance, Marcom's new person is \$35,000; add benefits! That is another \$12,000, for a total of 47,000, plus the \$15,000 for expenses, for a total of \$64,000 a year. Over the three years of the discussion about branding, the cost is not \$137,500; it's more like \$265,500, if you consider that new position over the final two years of the process. 2) Infrastructural extras: Salaries mean people; people need things, like office space, furniture, computers, phones, etc. Also there may be other hiddens. Take the football field, what events will we attract? They have to be in the daylight! HS games are at night! We're not taking the final games away from the UNI-Dome! Is the next thing, lights? Or even for the baseball field (where we could get HS games)? 3) Normal growth: I assume we want to grow. Well folks, we are at the enrollment when I first arrived here. We had 61 faculty!! That's right 61. Now hold on Nigel and Division Chairs, before you start calculating where to add, the next year we

had 44. My point is, If we grow, it means growth in faculty; maybe not 61, but how close? Add that, the attendant expenses, and other needs of the infrastructure and you're 40 million may be more like 50-70 million. Could we be dreaming? That's not bad. However, who gets goods, and who gets zilch? And, how do we decide these things? Pistol Duel? (Hey, we once picked a Vice President of the US that way). What I see in this plan is not a plan; they are more like position papers. Put them together, and what we see is, WE NEED A PLAN! A plan has goals, objectives, strategies and tactics. There is a little of this in the position papers; but what we really have is a lot of wishes; and we can't get them all done. Which ones best fit into our plan? Which are objectives, which are strategies, which are tactics, and which ones do not fit the plan? We cannot tell these things because there really is no plan here. On a side note, I believe in global citizenship; I doubt it is a goal. Goals are concrete and measurable. What is a global citizen? Is it even definable? I say in classes that other cultures are different; not bad, just different. It may not be right, but the Arab terrorist truly believes he is a good global citizen because he is willing to die to make the globe a better place to live! And, you may remember, our center in Malaysia is in an Islamic state! "Shindler's List" was banned! There is also polygamy, and other practices we do not condone.

If global citizen means being able to understand and live with this, will we get in trouble with things like the Patriot Act, for instance? Be sued by extreme conservatives, Christians, etc? I think we need to prepare people for the idea it is a Global village. I'm not sure that is the same thing as a global citizen.

Mind you, I'm not disagreeing with the five principal components of the steering committee; however, how do we define and translate into goals?

Jerry (One step closer to retirement) Wadian

Response to Comment: *The subcommittee agrees that work still needs to be done to assure that the intended actions/activities in support of various strategies are appropriate and applicable. We further agree that the various strategies should share an appropriate relationship to each other so that the plan represents a coherent, single body of work. Concurrently, it is the subcommittee's impression that some have viewed what was presented for public comment along a continuum far closer to a completed draft than it was intended to represent. Instead, this first public comment period was intended provide an opportunity for comment and participation during a more formative stage of strategic thinking (albeit, perhaps this point was not sufficiently emphasized). Accordingly, the subcommittee acknowledges the degree to which certain intentions and ideas contained herein need to be further detailed, articulated, and evaluated.*

In addition, once the primary strategies have been identified, a strategic plan must be supported by the development of more detailed annual operational plans that identify specific actions to be undertaken (objectives), performance indicators, baseline data, identification of individuals responsible for carrying out the activities, etc. within the major operating units of the University. The University actually began using this

process in support of the most recent strategic plan developed in 2004. The development of annual operating plans as described here has been a practice in place at the Vice President's level for the last two years.

In addition to the response of the subcommittee to Comment 2, the subcommittee acknowledges that some types of reoccurring expenses (found an annual operating budgets) are incremental. This is especially true for personnel as it relates to salaries and benefits. Over the last three years base salaries for faculty and staff positions have been increased by 14%, this represents somewhere in the neighborhood of a \$750,000.00 to the expenditure bottom line on RU positions only. The subcommittee agrees that such costs must be built into planning efforts. Towards this end, the University has an appropriate financial planning instrument that will provide these projections.

As the comment's author points out, there are many perceived needs surfacing as part of this strategic planning process that represents millions of dollars worth of expenditures. The subcommittee wishes to point out that this is not a conclusive list, nor has there been any prioritization done to ensure the most strategic and productive use of resources. The process has not gotten that far yet. It is clear that not all additional resources needed in support of some of the strategies identified thus far have been quantified and articulated in written form. Nor are needed resources accounted for that represent strategies that have not been included thus far (see related response to Comment 10 and 12). Finally, once most of the needed resources have been accounted for, these needs will have to be prioritized within categories representing most likely sources of funding (i.e., annual operating budgets, fundraising efforts, cash reserves, grants, borrowing, etc.). The subcommittee strongly agrees that the allocation of resources should be tied to a strategic plan (as they generally have been over the last several years). Finally, the subcommittee acknowledges that there may be a number of reasons as this planning process continues that there may not be enough resources to fund all initiatives, needs, and/or wants.

This subcommittee wishes to refer the author of this comment to its response to Comment 1 regarding the meaning of "global citizens".

Comment 4: 03 October 2007

While I would like to "engage in a campus-wide dialog" as requested by Dr. Walker, I note that these pages are accessible to the general public.

Although we have nothing to hide, this dialogue may prove to be more dynamic and effective if taken off-line. While the general public can be privy to the process itself, would it not better serve the university to keep the content at this point within the university community?

I submit this comment with the utmost respect for our historic values and institutional heritage.

DSerra

Response to Comment: (See above)

Comment 5: Academic Standards

I understand why my academic colleagues are “shocked” and “confused” by the strategic planning reports. Several of the proposals appear to me to be solutions desperately in need of a problem. But it also might be that my expectations of academic standards are not appropriate for this planning process. In an academic model, it is common practice to identify problems, define terms, and establish goals and outcomes. This is the model we use for the AQIP process and this is the model we use for proposing new academic programs and new courses. The ‘Seamless Movement’ report makes sense to me because it follows this model. By contrast, part four (4) of the Enrollment report does not make sense to me. It states the following: “Fayette campus faculty are utilized as academic advisors. EU has Academic Advising positions.” It follows up with four recommendations: “We recommend advising training for all faculty advisors. Utilize the Jenzabar Advising module. Look at making the evaluation of advising as part of faculty tenure requirements. Hire full time academic advisor to handle students who are undecided.” The recommendations do not flow from the stated problem. I am left to assume there is a problem with faculty advising, but the problem has not been identified. It recommends advising training, but it does not state any goals or outcomes for that training. It recommends evaluating advising as a part of faculty tenure requirements, but it does not define a benchmark for excellence in advising. It recommends hiring full-time staff to advise students who are undecided, but it does not acknowledge the inequity of current faculty advising loads (some faculty have 30-40 advisees, other faculty have 3-4 advisees). I believe the faculty should be accountable for advising, but it is highly questionable whether faculty are in a position to accept a proposal that does not follow an academic model. Perhaps the strategic plan would be more cohesive if all the reports were to follow an academic model. It doesn’t cost us anything to better define who we are and what we want to do. But if we fail to take this opportunity, we are less likely to succeed. Don McComb

Response to Comment: *The subcommittee agrees that work still needs to be done to assure that the intended actions/activities in support of various strategies are appropriate and applicable. We further agree that the various strategies should share an appropriate relationship to each other so that the plan represents a coherent, single body of work. Concurrently, it is the subcommittee’s impression that some have viewed what was presented for public comment along a continuum far closer to a completed draft than it was intended to represent. Instead, this first public comment period was intended provide an opportunity for comment and participation*

during a more formative stage of strategic thinking (albeit, perhaps this point was not sufficiently emphasized). Accordingly, the subcommittee acknowledges the degree to which certain intentions and ideas contained herein need to be further detailed, articulated, and evaluated.

In addition, once the primary strategies have been identified, a strategic plan must be supported by the development of more detailed annual operational plans that identify specific actions to be undertaken (objectives), performance indicators, baseline data, identification of individuals responsible for carrying out the activities, etc. within the major operating units of the University. The University actually began using this process in support of the most recent strategic plan developed in 2004. The development of annual operating plans as described here has been a practice in place at the Vice President's level for the last two years.

The author's points are well-taken regarding part four (section on Enrollment) related to advising. The subcommittee recommends further review and consideration of this by the subcommittee on Enrollment. The subcommittee also accepts the suggestion that as the final representation of a strategic plan be consistent in form and content to the greatest extent possible.

Comment 6: General comments

I am most impressed with the reports from the Strategic Plan teams; they show a deep appreciation for the need of Upper Iowa University to move forward aggressively into the future. I believe the Youtube video "Did You Know" was very appropriate in light of this overall discussion of the future of Upper Iowa University. We must be looking 5 and 10 years ahead in order to keep up with the rapid changes that are taking place, and the Global Citizen approach is going to be way that we take UIU into the future. I would urge the University to create an ongoing task force to identify trends that will be impacting us (and the world community that we are a part of) 5 and 10 years in the future so that we can adapt and create majors and processes and modalities that will keep us on the cutting edge rather than lagging behind other institutions. Having seen the AQIP and strategic planning processes at close range at another institution similar to UIU, I know the importance of such forwarding thinking. I suspect if we are not nimble enough to adapt quickly to emerging trends, we will be unable to meet the needs of the students of the future. I understand that some of the recommendations and observations of the teams may seem, at first glance, to be too aggressive or not realistic, however we need to engage as a community in active discussion and analysis of these points in order to move forward with a strong consensus.

Marshall Whitlock

Response to Comment: *The subcommittee agrees with the major points made in this comment, in particular, the need to recognize that strategic planning is an on-going*

and iterative process. The document resulting from this initial effort will always, to some extent, be a work in progress and we agree that efforts will need to remain ongoing to continue to identify trends that will likely impact the University. Further, the comment author's point about this "first glance" view of the work done to date is well-taken. It is the subcommittee's impression that some have viewed what was presented for public comment along a continuum far closer to a completed draft than it was intended to represent. Instead, this first public comment period was intended provide an opportunity for comment and participation during a more formative stage of strategic thinking. Accordingly, the subcommittee acknowledges the degree to which certain intentions and ideas contained herein need to be further detailed, articulated, and evaluated.

Comment 7: Reflections on the Strategic Planning Process

When I agreed to serve as a faculty representative on the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, I felt a need to champion two major issues that I perceived were important to include in the strategic planning process: (1) the need to increase the size of the university's endowment and to utilize it to attract the brightest and best students to UIU; and (2) the need to examine the workload of the faculty and to bring it in line with the workload of the faculty at comparable institutions. These weren't necessarily my ideas; rather, they were shamelessly acquired from numerous conversations that I have had with respected colleagues. I believe that they are absolutely essential to include in the strategic plan if we want to aspire to the vision statement that "Upper Iowa University will be recognized and respected as an exceptional and ascending institution of higher learning". I tried in numerous ways to incorporate these two issues as strategic goals in the plan. First, I had these listed as Strategic Responses in a white paper that I, and others, put together in June for the Steering Committee. However, these issues fell through the cracks as members of the Steering Committee winnowed through this paper and concluded that other objectives were more important. I continued to push, particularly for the faculty workload issue, in a memo to Steering Committee members as sub-groups were writing the first draft of the plan. I think it is safe to say that I was quite vocal during Steering Committee meetings, trying to stress that these issues not be neglected. As I view the current plan, it is obvious to me that I was not successful in my original mission. Having said that, I do want to acknowledge that many good things were incorporated into the plan. It was a privilege to work with dedicated members of this institution and discuss the future of Upper Iowa University. I am still trying to fathom what went awry with my efforts. Likely I am naive in my understanding of how a strategic planning process works. However, I've been told numerous times that this is an iterative process. So with this in mind, I will try to reiterate why I think these issues belong in the strategic plan.

In June, "The Chronicle of Higher Education" reported on the closing of the residential campus of Antioch College (which has profitable "extended university" centers similar to UIU). Reasons cited for the closure were "dwindling enrollment and expensive campus

maintenance" and the fact that the campus "could lean on only a small endowment of \$36.2-million". The parallels to UIU are unnerving - except it is my understanding (and I could be wrong) that our endowment is smaller than this. When I asked why increasing the endowment at UIU was not being written into the plan, I was told that a Vice-President will be hired at UIU in the near future that will address this issue. However, I do not believe that is a reason to omit the endowment from the plan. Also, it appears that increases in enrollment will result in incoming cash flow. It appears that money now is available to build new buildings at new centers. I am curious as to whether any of this new money has been ear-marked for increasing the endowment. I truly feel that, if the Strategic Plan gets passed by the Board without any reference in it regarding the endowment, that we may travel down the same path just taken by Antioch. The Extended University graciously helps to support our Residential University now, but we really need an RU nest egg to get us through the hard times that will likely come when high-school graduate numbers really start to take a nose-dive in the near future.

In the June white paper that I helped to write for the Steering Committee, we included a sensible strategic initiative with regard to faculty workload. Basically, the thought was that, in the first year, some group would identify colleges comparable to us and review/benchmark how we compared to them with regard to faculty depth (e.g. the number of faculty members per department or major) and job responsibilities (e.g. the number of credits taught per semester, number of committees, number of advisees, etc.). Then in future years, funding would be made available for new full-time and/or adjunct faculty positions, as well as for increased faculty compensation and/or release time. The goal would be to get us in line with comparable colleges for faculty size and workload. I am aware that the Cabinet has created a "benchmarking" committee, and it is assumed that they will help us move in this direction. However, this does not mean that the issue should not be included in the Strategic Plan. Many faculty members have gone "above and beyond" what is typically required of a faculty member, particularly during leaner times in this institution's recent history. I think it is important that the Board approve a plan that shows its commitment to support an overburdened faculty by relieving some of that burden as the university grows. Also, I believe that a similar benchmarking plan should be instituted for staff - the faculty likely aren't the only personnel that have heavy workloads at Upper Iowa.

Finally, I guess what worries me the most about the plan is that, if approved in its current form, it appears to set aside money for some items that appear to have only a marginal tie-in to the plan's overarching goals. It is easy to pay lip-service and say that, as new strategic objectives are identified after the plan is approved they will be funded in kind. However, it may be equally easy to say that we cannot afford new strategic initiatives that arise after the plan is approved, as our money will be committed to the wish lists in the current plan. I certainly want to give our administrators the benefit of the doubt and believe that they would fund important new initiatives as they are identified. However, I would be more comfortable with the plan if its initiatives demonstrated a more equitable allocation of funds to the various departments within the university community.

Scott Figdore

Response to Comment: *The subcommittee acknowledges the point made by the author regarding the role of growing the endowment as part of the strategic plan (see related responses regarding advancement/development in Comments 10 and 12). The subcommittee believes that growing the endowment for purposes as exemplified in this comment (providing greater scholarship opportunities) should be a priority. Indeed, such a priority already exists as the University, through new and innovative initiatives in the last several years, has doubled the amount of endowed scholarship money awarded annually through its internal awards programs. The subcommittee feels strongly this should continue. The subcommittee also believes there is some potential for endowing faculty positions. In support of this, in addition to continuing to improve existing fundraising efforts, the addition of a Vice President for Advancement charged with growing this capacity, will further support these efforts. It is the subcommittee's view that as the entire scope of resource needs become known, categorized and prioritized (see related response to Comments 2, 3, and 10), these will inform additional areas of strategic emphasis that must be included in a plan.*

The subcommittee wishes to refer to its response to Comment 2 regarding funding for new centers. In addition, the reason more of the cash reserve which has been generated over time from tuition revenue has not gone into the endowment is because of the belief that the rate of return on investment (ROI) from strategic investments into the expansion of certain parts of the Fayette campus (improved facilities and services) and the Extended University is greater than investing in a traditional endowment. The existence of the EU by way of the revenue it generates in support of the rest of the University has been viewed in lieu of a traditional endowment. The four million a year in revenue produced by the EU in support of the University is the equivalent of an endowment of \$ _____ (at % return).

The subcommittee agrees with the point made by the author regarding faculty workloads (see related responses to this topic in for Comments 2, 3, 10, and 12). A subcommittee of the President's Cabinet was commissioned last year to identify institutions against whom this University can benchmark. It is the hope of this subcommittee that this benchmarking effort will be completed soon, as it is understood that this information will be valuable.

This subcommittee is sympathetic to the point made by the author regarding the impression that perhaps the issue of faculty workload "fell through the cracks" during the strategic planning process. This subcommittee wishes to point out that although the addition of new faculty was not explicitly mentioned in the last strategic plan, an additional net new 6 FTEs has been added to the Fayette campus in support of Strategy Five of that plan (involving the addition of new majors) as well as in response to growing enrollment. Additional net new FTE faculty are planned for in the coming year. This would suggest an existing attentiveness to this need that is unlikely to be lost in any strategic planning process.

As pointed out by this subcommittee in its responses to similar concerns from other public comments, some committees produced anticipated resource needs while others

did not. All committees were encouraged to do so, but at the time of this public comment period, not all may have progressed in their dialogue to the point where they were prepared to do so, or they determined that minimal additional resources would be needed, or they did not understand it to be their charge. It should not be interpreted that those subcommittees that have presented resource needs thus far, will be ultimately favored with available resources.

It has occurred to this subcommittee that perhaps there was an assumption that needs specifically related to faculty workload would be addressed by the Strategic Planning Curricular subcommittee (an assumption perhaps not held by the Curricular subcommittee). This should be clarified and this subcommittee accepts responsibility for doing so. A commitment has been, and remains in place to increase tenure track faculty on the Fayette campus commensurate with increased enrollment. There is also been a standing commitment to maintain a Fayette campus student-to-(full-time) faculty ratio within a range consistent with what it has been over time. As such, the committee agrees the resources needed to add additional faculty contingent on enrollment growth need to be included in the strategic plan

This subcommittee believes this should either become recognized as part of the charge of the Strategic Planning Curricular subcommittee (if it is not already), or that it should be an additional stand-alone Strategic Planning subcommittee. In either case, this subcommittee urges the author of this comment and any individual representing other divisions, to submit a list of current and/or future specific resource needs known at this time, related to, and in support of, this strategic planning effort and the growth, support, and quality enhancement of academic programs, to this subcommittee at the earliest opportunity. This subcommittee will accept responsibility for ensuring that these requests are forwarded to an appropriate destination in the planning process.

As the comment's author points out, presently it appears there is money being set aside for some items that appear to have only marginal tie-in to overarching goals. The subcommittee wishes to point out that this is not a conclusive list, nor has there been any prioritization done to ensure the most strategic and productive use of resources. The process has not gotten that far yet. It is clear that not all additional resources needed in support of some of the strategies identified thus far have been quantified and articulated in written form. Nor are needed resources accounted for that represent strategies that have not been included thus far (see related response to Comment 10 and 12). Finally, once most of the needed resources have been accounted for, these needs will have to be prioritized within categories representing most likely sources of funding (i.e., annual operating budgets, fundraising efforts, cash reserves, grants, borrowing, etc.). The subcommittee strongly agrees that the allocation of resources should be tied to a strategic plan (as they generally have been over the last several years). This subcommittee strongly agrees with the authors point about unforeseeable initiatives and opportunities that could surface at any time following the initial commitment of strategic direction and resources. This is a very real phenomena. The subcommittee believes that it is an error for organizations to

become so focused on following a plan that they become blind to changing circumstances and fail to make important adjustments. This subcommittee believes that, for this reason, strategic planning should be ongoing and the document itself, a living one. Notwithstanding this, the subcommittee also recognizes that the process of ongoing assessment of the plan and changes to it may be characterized by some as capricious and arbitrary; perhaps even disingenuous.

An example of how a strategic plan must always be a work in progress and adaptable to new initiatives and needs occurred with the most recent strategic plan. Originally developed in 2004, the plan did not include Strategy Nine (regarding the reactivation of a formal alumni association). This major strategy towards growing and strengthening the University, and its attendant resources, was not added until 2006.

Comment 8: Comments from the Division of Science and Mathematics

DIVISION OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS RESPONSE TO STRATEGIC PLAN

The Division of Science and Mathematics is providing a unified response to the documents presented outlining the strategic plan developed for the campus community. The comments below represent the major issues raised upon reading the initiatives discussed in the plan. Specific division faculty members are also contributing individual comments that fall outside the purview of the concerns expressed herein in response to the plan.

1. A major concern of the division is the lack of any mention at all of building an endowment to allow the university to withstand hard times that may occur in the future. The number of high school graduates in the state is declining and the very nature of education is likely to change significantly in the near future as computing technology fosters major innovations in the delivery of education to students. An endowment is necessary to give the university the capital to implement needed changes to meet future demands.
2. The strategic plan offers no real vision for the future. It consists mainly of several tactical maneuvers to be applied in the short term but doesn't really look ahead to the changing educational landscape, with increased emphasis on distance learning and the competition from for-profit institutions. There is no mention of any new educational initiatives. Thus there is no actual strategy in the strategic plan.
3. In addition to their normal duties of teaching, grading, advising, and university service, RU faculty are facing increasing demands on their time as new duties, such as assessment and the incorporation of the EU into a unified campus, come into being. The strategic plan as presented offers no plan to benchmark UIU RU faculty responsibilities by comparing them to faculty responsibilities at comparable institutions. In fact, the plan offers no support for faculty at all. The Seamless Movement and the Curriculum

Subcommittee reports include \$0 in support of faculty personnel for implementation of their suggested initiatives.

4. The plan presents a tremendous disparity in requests for resource allocations. Plans for a new student center, a data center, and improvements to the athletics facilities are outlined in detail with projected costs in the millions of dollars, but no money at all is included to support new or existing faculty positions. In fact, the faculty as a whole is generally ignored in the strategic plan.

5. Nowhere in the plan is there any form of a cost/benefit analysis to gauge the financial impact of implementing the suggested proposals. The plan offers no projected return on investment for any of the proposed capital outlays. There is no integration of future university financial projections into the feasibility of any of the proposals delineated.

6. The plan does not describe any clear pathway by which the responses of each strategic plan team are contributing to the overall goals and mission of the university. It is unclear how any of this will promote global citizenship.

7. The plan as presented is lacking an investigation of how the very nature of education itself will change in the next twenty to thirty years and a strategy the university can use to position itself to meet these changes.

-- Division of Science and Mathematics

Response to Comment: *Item 1: The subcommittee's responses related to comments regarding endowment can be found for Comments 7, 10, and 12. Item 2: In addition to the responses for Comment 10, the subcommittee acknowledges the need to have the work of the subcommittee on Curriculum inform future educational initiatives related to curriculum. Item 3: the subcommittee's responses to this item can be found for Comments 2, 7, 10, and 12. Item 4: the subcommittee's responses to this item can be found for Comments 2, 3, 7, 10, and 12. Item 5: the subcommittee agrees that in addition to other considerations used to categorize and prioritize resource needs against the strategic plan, as described in responses to several other comments (2, 3, 7, 10, and 12), a cost/benefit and ROI analysis would be useful. In addition, per the response to Comment 5, the University has recently acquired an instrument to use for using financial projections to assess the feasibility of the proposed initiatives. Item 6: the subcommittee agrees this aspect of the plan needs development and will be operationalized to a great extent through the annual development of more detailed operational plans as described in the subcommittee's response to Comments 2, 3, and 7. Item 7: The board of trustees at their 2007 winter retreat and the early work of the steering committee devoted considerable energies to understanding the dynamics of the external environment and to an understanding of the need to translate those findings into educational outcomes. A number of source documents have been used to factually inform the dialogue, (including what it means to be a "global citizen", including Thomas L. Friedman's book *The World Is Flat* and a wide variety of publications that examine general population and social trends, the implications of*

the external environment to professional and career performance, and the changing expectations for the education of 21st century students.

Among the principal findings, these are some of the most noteworthy:

- *Political barriers are disappearing as the world evolves toward efficient markets that reward quality and service at the lowest price;*
- *World population is aging and there is a growing and significant shortage of knowledge workers;*
- *Career opportunities are being created but students are being educated for “obsolete” jobs;*
- *Technology literacy is fast becoming a career competitive advantage;*
- *Multicultural skills including language proficiency will be in high demand;*
- *Written and oral communication skills will be critical ingredients of success;*
- *Creative problem solving and leadership skills will be highly sought attributes;*
- *Continuing education and lifelong learning will be essential to personal well being and professional success;*
- *Collaboration, networking and team building are replacing hierarchical, top down leadership qualities.*

In higher education there is a proliferation of news that has accelerated during 2007 that describes how colleges and universities, large and small, public and private, comprehensive research and liberal arts teaching, are developing strategies and making resource commitments to meet the educational demands of globalization. Some of this information was also widely distributed among those who have been involved with the strategic planning process thus far.

Comment 9: Thank You

Thank you Rick, Scott, Jerry and others who have taken the time to comment on the Strategic Planning Process! I find it refreshing to serve on a university board where we can have an open dialogue about the issues and opportunities we face going forward. We have so many positive things going for us at UIU and they are a President who has a passion for the universities customers both internal and external, a BOT's that are passionate about this university and are willing to make tough decisions (we are listening) and a faculty and staff that are the cornerstone of this university, just to name a few. Betty (my lovely wife) and I have held several discussions with students over the past year and the one common theme discussed is how much the faculty and staff cared about their well-being and education.

Betty and I have been involved in the planning process from the beginning and we have learned so much about our university because the students, faculty and staff were willing to share their thoughts and ideas. Keep in mind there is no strategic plan until one is

finalized sometime in 2008. The comment period is exactly what it is named for and that is a comment period. With problems should come solutions? For example, there are universities that have hundreds of millions in their endowment but will probably not make it long term because they don't have a vision of how the landscape of learning will look like 5, 10 and 20 years from now. We all know it is changing but where will it go with regards to technology, housing and areas where our students will be working. I view the university as having two customers, one internal (faculty and staff) and the other external (students). As we develop this plan let's think about both customers and how they determine our future for this university. We targeted in on the \$40 million price tag and not what's best for this university (Just My Humble Opinion). Its human nature to think about costs before we determine what we really need to accomplished. (I'll agree some of the dollars may have been a "Wish List" but it made us all think, ponder and comment). Put the dollars to the side until we determine what we want to accomplish. Let's focus in on these issues; 1) How do we bring more students to the Fayette Campus? 2) How do we bring more faculty and staff to the Fayette Campus? 3) How do we increase the enrollment at our centers, external degree and on-line programs? 4) How do we increase our scholarship program? 5) How do we add more Academic Programs to our curriculum? 6) How do we use technology to increase efficiency? 7) How do we find grant and foundation dollars to fund our projects? 8) How do we increase our endowment? Ladies and gentlemen these are just starters.

I applaud and ask you to keep debating and discussing the issues because we have a chance to provide the vision and outcome for UIU over the next 150 years. This is my university; this is your university so let's make a great institution even better.

Go Peacocks!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Bob Firth (rfirth@aplmc.com)

***Response to Comment:** The subcommittee agrees with the spirit and intent of this comment and the points made therein.*

Comment 10: General comments

Others who have commented above are correct: the strategic plan as presented provides no coherent vision for the future and consists mostly of a series of wish lists, which serve to make it much more tactical than strategic. The major issue that I see facing Upper Iowa is the lack of an endowment. Being tuition-driven, as everyone knows, leaves us vulnerable to the vagaries of the local and national economies, as an economic downturn leaves fewer students with the resources to attend Upper Iowa. We need an endowment more than anything else to help us weather not only hard economic times but also coming changes in the very nature of higher education. How education is delivered twenty years from now is anybody's guess, but I bet it will be quite different than it is today. Without

an endowment, we may not be able to survive those changes intact. The plan needs to address ways to build the endowment substantially as its top priority.

The other major concern I see with the plan as presented is the huge disparity of resource requests for athletics, OSD, and IT when compared to requests to aid our curriculum. Practically speaking, no mention is made of any monetary support for existing or new faculty positions. Neither is there any indication of support for existing or new academic programs. I believe that the faculty and the curriculum are the lifeblood of this institution; without either, there would be no reason for students to enroll. As a specific example of curricular needs that affect me directly, the science and mathematics division suffers from a serious dearth of instrumentation for students to use in their lab courses and research projects. The \$850,000 proposed for artificial turf in Eischeid Stadium could enhance the science curriculum beyond belief by providing funds to purchase enough scientific instrumentation to make us the envy of our peers. Better instrumentation means more opportunities for student research, which is now recognized nationally as the single most important aspect of an undergraduate science education.

Millions of dollars are slated to be allocated to many perceived needs on campus if everything in the strategic plan is implemented. I submit that the money involved could be spent much more productively than for the items currently described in the plan.

Interestingly, there is also no mention of resources for a bookstore on the Fayette campus. I am tired of having students add my course on the first day of the term and then have to wait a week or ten days for their books to arrive. By then, they have missed much of the reading for the first exam and they suffer as a result. We need a bookstore on campus so that students can buy or rent books right away for their classes. The current situation of ordering online does not work for students who need to add courses during the first three days of the term.

I am not trying to whine about inadequate facilities and low curricular support for my program. I simply accept it as a fact and make do the best I can. I am, however, very concerned that the reports from each subcommittee include no mention of support for faculty or curriculum. Am I to assume that most people on campus think this issue is unimportant? I love working at Upper Iowa; it's why I drive 61 miles every day just to get here. But we need to focus on providing the best educational opportunities we can for students in support of our academic mission and I do not see that articulated in the current version of the strategic plan.

-- Erik Olson

Response to Comment: *The subcommittee acknowledges and agrees with the major points made by this comment's author. Concurrently, it is the subcommittee's impression that some have viewed what was presented for public comment along a continuum far closer to a completed draft than it was intended to represent. Instead, this first public comment period was intended provide an opportunity for comment and participation during a more formative stage of strategic thinking (albeit, perhaps*

this point was not sufficiently emphasized). Accordingly, the subcommittee acknowledges the degree to which certain intentions and ideas contained herein need to be further detailed, articulated, and evaluated. Notwithstanding this, the subcommittee believes there are six elements to the strategic thinking at this point which can be identified, all of which, the subcommittee believes, support the University's mission and vision (but, as acknowledged in a previous response, may not represent all of the strategies that should be considered at this time):

INTRODUCE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS THAT CREATE THE SEAMLESS MOVEMENT OF STUDENTS AND FACULTY. *Remove or minimize internal and external barriers and align policies to create a UIU academic and administrative structure that permits and promotes the seamless movement of students and faculty across the university.*

CHALLENGE THE CURRICULUM & PEDAGOGY TO ACHIEVE THE VISION OBJECTIVE OF "DEVELOPING GLOBAL CITIZENS" *(to include growth and enhancement of academic programs). Develop an academic road map to serve as a guide for the allocation of resources. Develop a supporting multi-year plan to address additional resources needed for enrollment growth as it relates to the need for additional faculty, academic support, equipment, facilities, etc.*

CONTRIBUTE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF "GLOBAL CITIZENS" BY PROVIDING LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES THAT COMPLEMENT THE FORMAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM. *Develop leadership, social and recreational life-skills that extend the learning outcomes of the core curriculum.*

RECOMMEND POLICIES AND PROGRAMS THAT STRENGTHEN THE ENROLLMENT, FINANCIAL AID, REGISTRATION AND ADVISING SERVICES. *Focus on attracting the "right" students (seriousness of purpose) in the "right" number (build the revenue base) and the alignment and re-design of admissions, registration and advising capacities to serve that objective.*

STRENGTHEN THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE TO PROVIDE SECURITY AND THE COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITIES FOR A SEAMLESS GLOBAL CAMPUS. *Upgrade and enhance the UIU data-center to achieve state of the art security for data retention and disaster protection and install voice and video conferencing and other communications assets that tie together the UIU global campus.*

DEVELOP THE PRACTICES AND PROGRAMS TO EFFECTIVELY COMMUNICATE THE UIU MISSION AND VISION TO ALL CONSTITUENT STAKEHOLDERS. *Introduce a program of educational services to advance the internal understandings of branding, marketing and communications; develop a comprehensive branding strategy that generates UIU awareness and effectively communicates the content and outcome benefits of this strategic plan.*

SUPPLEMENTAL STRATEGIES NOT INCLUDED IN THE WORK OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE TO DATE

1. Discussion: UIU's SWOT analysis and the subsequent definition of strategic responses leave a gap of two requirements for added internal and external strength.
2. UIU Advancement: UIU does not have a strong history of sustained philanthropic support either to enhance operating revenues or to fund capital projects. This strategic plan will require the development of a comprehensive fund-raising program that uses the mission, vision and goals and objectives of the plan as a case statement to attract incremental financial support from alumni, parents, corporations, foundations and governmental entities.
3. Greater-Fayette Vitality: The strategic plan places the Fayette campus at the center of UIU's global enterprise. The success of the plan will require attracting students, faculty, administrators and a wide variety of guests to Fayette. UIU must lead a long-term strategy that attracts economic and cultural strengths to the greater-Fayette community to enhance its presence as a desirable location to live and work.
4. Growth and Quality Enhancement of Academic Programs (to be included either as par of the Curriculum component or as a stand-alone strategy/committee (see above and response to Comment 2))

The subcommittee agrees with the point made regarding the need for an endowment. Obviously, it would have been preferable to build such a capacity gradually over the course of the institution's 150 year history, but instead the institution finds itself in a position to try as best possible to make up for lost time (as it has had to do in other areas). Many feel this frustration. Efforts are underway to provide more emphasis on advancement/development efforts (i.e., the hiring of a Vice President for Advancement). It should be noted that much of the financial pressure felt by the institution is on its annual operating budget. Endowment growth (especially in UIU's case) will provide minimal relief to annual operating budgets (meanwhile, such efforts are typically funded from operating budgets). Much of typical endowments contain restricted funds that have limited uses. The subcommittee does believe, however, that immediate benefits could incur related to increasing scholarship endowments, perhaps certain faculty positions, as well as specific projects (see related responses to Comments 2, 7, and 12).

Other comments have pointed out the need for further planning as it relates to needed resources in support of academic growth and enhancement (see response to Comment 2) as it relates to additional full-time faculty commensurate with enrollment growth, additional equipment/facility needs, etc. Meanwhile, this subcommittee was unaware of the extent to which there are pressing equipment needs in the science and mathematics division and urges the author of this comment and any individual representing other divisions, to submit a list of current and/or future specific resource needs known at this time, related to, and in support of, this strategic planning effort and the growth, support, and quality enhancement of academic programs, to this subcommittee at the earliest opportunity.

As the comment's author points out, there are many perceived needs surfacing as part of this strategic planning process that represents millions of dollars worth of expenditures (see related response to Comment 2). The subcommittee wishes to point out that this is not a conclusive list, nor has there been any prioritization done to ensure the most strategic and productive use of resources. The process has not gotten that far yet. It is clear that not all additional resources needed in support of some of the strategies identified thus far have been quantified and articulated in written form. Nor are needed resources accounted for that represent strategies that have not been included thus far (see earlier related response to comment). Finally, once most of the needed resources have been accounted for, these needs will have to be prioritized within categories representing most likely sources of funding (i.e., annual operating budgets, fundraising efforts, cash reserves, grants, borrowing, etc.).

The subcommittee understands that efforts are already underway to address the need for ensuring that students have the books needed for classes in a timely fashion. The subcommittee looks forward to the recommendations to come from such efforts.

The subcommittee does not believe there is a feeling on campus or elsewhere across the University community that faculty and/or curriculum is unimportant. It is assumed that most are expecting this will be addressed and, once again, towards this end, this subcommittee urges the author of this comment and any individual representing other divisions, to submit a list of current and/or future specific resource needs known at this time, related to, and in support of, this strategic planning effort and the growth, support, and quality enhancement of academic programs, to this subcommittee at the earliest opportunity. This subcommittee will accept responsibility for ensuring that these requests are forwarded to an appropriate destination in the planning process.

Comment 11: Online Students

Thank you allowing us to comment on the Strategic Planning for UIU. My wife and I are online students pursuing degrees through UIU. This program allows both of us to obtain our degrees completely online; it would not be possible for us to do this without the UIU online program. The professors and course ware are excellent. The student advisors are top notch. We very much encourage you to keep the sixth term in the online program.

Some of the discussion in the strategic plan is on branding. May I suggest that the best way to brand the university is through your current students, faculty, and alumni. These are the people who live and breathe your mission. A huge plus for my wife recently securing a position at Mayo Clinic in Rochester, MN was the fact that she has UIU on her resume and that she continues online in pursuit of her BA and eventually her MBA. This is branding at its best. The comments by the management staff at Mayo were favorable of the UIU programs. I found out about the strategic plan comment by browsing the main

UIU website. An easy and effective way to reach people for comment would have been to send an email via UIU emails to students and alumni. This would have allowed for more discussion in a cost effective manner. With UIU's experience in the external degree program and online courses, would you not agree that they are in position to lead the world in online academic training? This would truly enhance the university's goal of creating global citizens.

Martin and Mickey Souhrada - Grand Meadow, MN

Response to Comment: *The subcommittee agrees that students, faculty and staff can play an important role in promoting and strengthening the reputation and image (branding) of a University. One can see examples of this everywhere on behalf of other institutions. The need to improve the branding and marketing efforts of the University was the motive behind the establishment of the University's first marketing and communications department in January of 2006 (as part of the strategic plan that was in existence at the time). Since then, many improvements have been made to strengthen marketing efforts and the level of visibility of the University (through various promotions, advertising and improvements to the University website. It is believed that these improvements have played a role in the significant enrollment growth on the Fayette campus over the last two years.*

The subcommittee will forward your comments on branding efforts to the subcommittee on branding for further consideration.

Comment 12: Agreement with many comments already made

I have to second (and third and fourth, etc.) many of the comments made here by other faculty members.

Specifically:

1. There is little cohesion in the current version of the strategic plan. I see some strategy that derives from the mission of the college, but it's difficult to see how many of the sections contribute to achieving that strategy. There are also several aspects that should be addressed in the plan that appear to be missing.
2. There is little, if any, planning that relates to the academic side of our future, which seems like it should be a driving force. Faculty loads (both in the classroom and administrative) are a major issue right now and should be addressed in the plan, regardless of any current work that might be in progress in that area. In particular, plans to increase enrollment should be tied to plans to increase tenure-track faculty appropriately. I would be very disappointed if this institution decides that the way to accommodate more students is by use of adjunct or part-time faculty.
3. The endowment, or lack thereof, has been an issue as long as I've been here (and long before that I suspect). Just hiring a Vice President of Development is not sufficient to

ensure that this valuable resource will grow. The plan should provide a strategy that will give some direction to the person hired into that position in order to ensure that the goals are understood and that they are achieved in a way that is consistent with the mission of the college.

4. While athletics programs and facilities provide students for the residential university, they should not drive the plan nor should they consume the lion's share of resources.

I hope that the end result of the strategic planning process will be a truly strategic plan that is balanced and reflects the priorities of the entire university.

Lynn Isvik

Response to Comment: *The subcommittee agrees that work still needs to be done to assure that the intended actions/activities in support of various strategies are appropriate and applicable. We further agree that the various strategies should share an appropriate relationship to each other so that the plan represents a coherent, single body of work. The committee agrees as well that there are indeed aspects of the current planning dialogue that are missing, but represent significant strategic issues that need to be presented in the planning process. For example, the University's role in local economic development. This topic has a significant impact upon recruiting faculty, staff, and students. In the last year or so, the University has started to address this issue with several related initiatives/developments and will need to build upon its current (incipient) efforts, and yet, there is no mention of this in the current planning discussions.*

The subcommittee also agrees that much more planning needs to take place regarding the resources needed to support the curriculum (faculty quality enhancement, equipment, facilities, etc - see related responses to Comments 2 and 10). A commitment has been, and remains, in place to increase tenure track faculty on the Fayette campus commensurate with increased enrollment. For example, over the last three years, six net new FTEs have been added (not including five that are teaching through the EU) and there are plans to add at least two or three more this year for the Fayette campus. There is a commitment to maintain a student-to-(full-time) faculty ratio within a range consistent with what it has been over time. As such, the committee agrees the resources needed to add additional faculty contingent on enrollment growth need to be included in the strategic plan. This subcommittee urges the author of this comment and any individual representing other divisions, to submit a list of current and/or future specific resource needs known at this time, related to, and in support of, this strategic planning effort and the growth, support, and quality enhancement of academic programs, to this subcommittee at the earliest opportunity. This subcommittee will accept responsibility for ensuring that these requests are forwarded to an appropriate destination in the planning process.

There has been no discussion of using increased numbers of adjunct or part-time faculty on the Fayette campus in a major strategic sense as a way of accommodating

enrollment growth in any significant way. It would be impractical to do so on a large scale anyway, because there is simply no local population of qualified individuals from which to draw.

The subcommittee agrees with the comment regarding University Advancement efforts. The intent is that the strategic plan inform priorities for the Office of Advancement and that the new Vice President will have the experience and expertise to successfully formulate operational plans that will achieve results in support of University goals and objectives (see related response to Comment 10).

The subcommittee agrees with the comment regarding the appropriate role of athletics programs and facilities in a strategic plan.