Dear Campus Community,

What began last year as a way to align resources to Plan 2020, the University Strategic Alignment Process (USAP) started a long-term and forward-thinking process to guide how we address prioritization of our strategic initiatives and how we allocate our budgetary resources. This report provides an institutional analysis never before undertaken at IPFW, representing vast amounts of data and information that have been compiled, reviewed, and analyzed by members of our own campus community. I am proud of the efforts made to establish a new process that will drive us towards a common vision and keep us focused on our primary goal of student success as well as all other Plan 2020 goals.

This year, the strategic alignment process has provided two important things. First, we now know how every unit and department supports the goals and metrics established in Plan 2020. Second, seven important themes have emerged with resulting recommendations. These themes, which were common across many units and departments of the university, must be addressed if IPFW is to fully realize its Plan 2020 goals and thrive into the future. One hundred eighteen (118) individual reports prepared by units and departments form the basis of the themes and the recommendations contained in the report.

It is vital that we continue our progress as we now move from analysis to implementation. Strengthening this institution requires everyone’s participation and will not be accomplished without working together. I express my deepest appreciation to the twenty-four members of the USAP Task Force who, representing all aspects of our university operations, dedicated untold hours to the work and maintained a focused commitment to the process. A sincere thank you also, to those faculty, staff, department chairs, unit heads, deans, and other members of the campus community whose work and data have provided the information critical to producing this report.

Thank you,

Vicky
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of a year-long chancellor’s project to assess the state of the university and to improve alignment of our resources to our new strategic plan. The initial impetus behind the project was two years of significant budget reductions and the need to provide a structured approach for prioritizing programs and services.

As planning for this process progressed, it was determined that the university had limited ability to provide accurate and consistent performance data for all university units, could not sufficiently determine expenses and operational costs at the unit level, and lacked an articulated direction that could be operationalized for purposes of assessment. In light of these constraints, the prioritization process was modified to focus on strategically aligning our resources with our goals, creating the University Strategic Alignment Process (USAP).

Over the summer and early fall of 2014, a university-wide task force of 12 faculty and 12 staff members reviewed university systems and processes and developed the assessment process. Over a three-week period, the USAP team conducted 60 training sessions for more than 600 employees, resulting in a total of 118 unit-level reports submitted to the Task Force.

Reports such as this one emphasize what needs to change, so we would like to briefly mention that there is much about the university that demonstrates excellence, commitment, and a focus on the students we serve. Understandably, we heard dissatisfaction with frozen pay and anxiety about losing resources, programs, or jobs, but we also heard determination and grit that we can create a thriving university. We applaud the faculty and staff of IPFW who assist our students in all facets of their educational experience.

We understand that many readers are primarily interested in the findings and recommendations, but we encourage readers to review the unit reports on the USAP website and the multiple analyses of the data linked to this report.

Throughout the process, the USAP team pondered this question: If the university needed to improve in several ways in order to conduct a prioritization review, could not the same improvements lead to a healthy organization that learns and adapts in such a way that prioritization is not necessary? With this in mind, as the Task Force reviewed the information gathered, seven global themes for a more effective university emerged:

1. Academic Identity, Priorities, and Direction
2. Alignment with Regional Needs
3. Communication and Marketing
4. Leadership Development
5. Leveraging Technological Capacity
6. Planning, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement
7. Strategic Enrollment Management
Across these themes were recurring issues related to lack of coordination and planning. There is limited evidence of alignment of our goals and activities, both within and across divisions of the university. As an institution focused on discovery, we need to improve our ability to produce useful data about what we do and to use those data to inform our decision-making. The seven themes represent systemic problems that will only resolve by bridging our traditional silos of work. In several areas our organizational structure seems ineffective and should be reviewed. Finally, as a complex organization there is a need for increased coordination across the many parts of the university.

In developing the recommendations and action steps the Task Force wrestled with the level of specificity to provide. On one hand, specific recommendations would provide clarity, but on the other, they could also hinder those who develop responsive strategies. Therefore, in this report we provide high-level recommendations but also link to other documents that may be useful in the future.

The challenges presented in this document may seem daunting, but an indirect finding of USAP has been the power of combining expertise from across the campus. As we move forward, we must do so as an engaged campus where we harness our collective resources and abilities and use them to creatively address our challenges.

Instead of this report being an ending, it is a beginning—a call to action. When we first came together as the Task Force, some of us were excited, some overwhelmed, and some were skeptical. Over time, those positions may have traded back and forth, but in the end we came together and saw IPFW in its entirety. This is our campus, these are our students. Let’s get busy polishing and honing the excellence that is IPFW.
BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

For two decades, IPFW experienced nearly continuous growth in students and facilities. This growth brought new academic programs, student services, and beautiful spaces in which to learn, study, explore, and engage the community. In hindsight, this was an enchanted period, one where the zeitgeist could be simply summarized as “get big.” We moved to Division I athletics. We developed numerous international relationships to attract students. We became the fifth-largest public, 4-year university in Indiana.

In 2012 IPFW experienced an anomaly, a significant shortage in its ability to cover expenses. This shortage was due to a number of factors, including a perfect storm of state and federal policy changes, a loss of full-time, degree-seeking students, and a long-standing practice of budgeting that left many units chronically under-budgeted, but ultimately financially covered by large accounts housed in the central administration. Unlike universities that developed financial problems over an extended period of time, at IPFW the awareness of these issues felt like a nearly overnight experience, an awakening to the brutal realities facing higher education.

While our university had grown and developed in many important ways, it had one critical shortcoming: we lacked the structures, processes, and culture to handle a significant reduction of several million dollars. The initial response to the budget crisis was to freeze all open positions, followed later by budget cuts across all units, which in turn led to painful reductions-in-force (layoffs). These methods were effective at reducing expenses, but they came with significant negative effects in their disproportionate impacts on units as well as creating fear and uncertainty among the faculty and staff.

Adding to the challenges of addressing the financial crisis, since 2012, the university has experienced numerous changes in leadership, changing not only chancellors but also vice chancellors, deans, directors, and department heads across many critical divisions. On the positive side, these changes have brought new insights and ideas, but the sheer number of people in new leadership positions also brought confusion over roles and goals.

Moving into the second year of fiscal issues (academic year 2013-14), the university continued to experience enrollment declines. The changes in state performance funding metrics had brought to light IPFW’s low four-year, first-time student graduation rate, yet even in this second year of difficulties there appeared to be limited coordinated response by the university as a whole.

Facing further loss of tuition revenue Interim Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs Stan Davis formed the University Budget Committee (UBC) in the late fall of 2013 to help redistribute funding by making recommendations to the Chancellor based on a review of budget requests and presentations by each division. Initial reviews of the budget indicated wide discrepancies in budget formation and allocation making it nearly impossible to create or identify any consistent or reasonable context on which to base decision-making.
In March of 2014, IVC Davis formed an exploratory group to receive training in Robert Dickeson’s model of prioritizing academic and support programs. After the training, the exploratory group presented to the chancellor and vice chancellors a proposal for how the model could lead to resource distribution recommendations by May of the following year. Shortly thereafter, the chancellor accepted the proposal forming the exploratory group into a facilitation team and announced the initiative to the campus.

From Prioritization to Alignment
As soon as the Facilitation Team began planning and adapting the Dickeson model to IPFW, three significant problems became apparent.

1. **Unreliable and Inconsistent Financial Information**: A critical component to prioritization is understanding the complete cost of running programs. Although the university had recorded budgets (what was expected to be spent in each unit), in actual practice, instead of modifying the recorded budgets to reflect actual expenses, the university used large, centralized “pots of money” to supplement recurring budget shortages. In some cases, the temporary funds were transferred to the accounts of the units spending the money, but in other cases the expenses were recorded to the large account, making the tracking of true expenses of units impossible. Another issue with the financial information related to indirect expenses; significant unit costs such as physical space and tuition waivers for scholarships or graduate assistants were allocated as centralized university overhead, not programmatic costs. A third issue was that income generated by tuition running through the Division of Continuing Studies (DCS) created two problems. First, the cost of running academic units was blurred by DCS “incentive” funds that over time became necessary operational funds. Second, as academic units moved more classes online (through DCS) to receive the incentive funds, upwards of $8 million of tuition a year that had previously cycled through the General Fund was redirected through DCS and into reserve accounts in the administration. This in turn was paying for many recurring operational expenses such as athletics. While these are not all of the challenges with determining true costs of programs, it became clear that extensive changes in business practices would need to take place before accurate costs could be assigned to units.

2. **Inconsistent, Inaccessible, and Unavailable Performance Measures**: Student enrollment data were difficult to define for many reasons, beginning with questions as simple as “Who is a student?” Should dual-credit high school students, part-time students, or students taking classes for license renewal be counted? Codes for majors, minors, and certificates are frequently changing, making interpretation of growth or decline difficult for those outside of the specific academic programs. Student information was inconsistent in accuracy and timeliness, such as tracking students who changed majors or stopped out. Some portions of the university lack defined metrics or standards for assessing performance. Without the ability to systematically track productivity over time, there was no way to demonstrate if resources were being well directed.
3. **Limited Consensus on IPFW’s Identity, Direction, and Priorities:** As a relatively young regional university comprised of two Big Ten universities, IPFW lacks a clear definition of who it actually is, or even who it wants to become. We have struggled with being a regional university that is also a large state university with international aspirations. We have struggled with the dual parentage of IU and Purdue, while like adolescents defining their autonomy, we have attempted to brand IPFW as its own university. We want to be a comprehensive university and we boast 200 academic programs. We have a quarter of the student population of Purdue and only a tenth of Purdue’s budget. We want to be an open-access institution while mandates from the Indiana Commission for Higher Education and federal financial aid make Ivy Tech a more viable alternative for students needing remediation and significant support services. We do not have a long-standing identity of being a liberal arts, or fine arts, or STEM, or health care campus, but instead we choose to be all of the above. Without a clearly defined direction, any project that attempts to redistribute the budget runs the risk of making financial decisions that destroy the coherence of the academic mission of the university.

The essence of how the Dickeson model of program prioritization works is that by looking through the lens of a university’s mission and strategic plan, you create a weighted set of criteria to evaluate the significance of cost, productivity, quality, history and other criteria for each program, resulting in a ranked list of programs. Such a list then becomes a tool for administrative decision-making regarding which programs might receive investment, be maintained, or be divested.

Therefore, without the institutional practices to support it, the Dickeson model, at this time, is clearly not appropriate for IPFW. In addition, the culture and morale of IPFW at that time were characterized by fear and suspicion, lacking the security needed to undergo a thorough and open analysis and discussion of our programs and services.

Without the ability to immediately implement the Dickeson model, the Facilitation Team worked to develop a process that would assist the campus in discovering what changes were necessary in order to conduct a prioritization review. However, in this development process, it became apparent that the institutional changes necessary to conduct prioritization would be the same changes that the university needed in order to avoid having to do prioritization. In other words, if the university developed the ability to define its goals, align its practices to those goals, track and assess its progress, provide resources to meet the goals, and use all of this information to adapt as necessary, then the function of establishing priorities would be an organic process built from the ground up.

Thus the task evolved into creating a system that aligns our work to our planning (mission and strategic plan), aligns our resources to our work (budget aligns with needs), and finally, aligns assessment of our work to planning and resources. The Facilitation Team received approval from the chancellor to pursue the idea of “strategic alignment” as a way to operationalize the soon-to-be-released strategic plan, Plan 2020.
As the process continued between spring 2014 and the present, the University Strategic Alignment Process (USAP) team has worked to communicate to the campus community how the focus and proposed outcomes have shifted. The process was initiated in response to a budget crisis, with planned outcomes focused on quickly improving IPFW’s fiscal health, but we have slowed the timeline and expanded the focus to emphasize the long-term health of the university as a whole. If the USAP process can shift the culture of IPFW to one of continuous improvement, with shared responsibility for and commitment to planning and assessing progress toward plans, then we will have made great headway toward solving the systemic problems of which the budget crisis was only a symptom.
PROCESS OVERVIEW

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
The University Strategic Alignment Process (USAP) has used a three-part organizational structure: a Steering Committee, a Facilitation Team, and a Task Force.

**Steering Committee**
As a chancellor’s project, the chancellor and vice chancellors serve as the Steering Committee, providing governance and defining expectations of the process. The Facilitation Team and Task Force reported to the chancellor and met regularly with her through the design and building phases of the project. In addition, the Facilitation Team and chairs of the Task Force met with the entire Steering Committee on a monthly basis throughout the project to receive input and clarifications regarding the direction of the process. Steering Committee members include:

- Vicky Carwein, Chancellor
- Carl Drummond, Vice Chancellor - Academic Affairs
- George McClellan, Vice Chancellor - Student Affairs
- David Wesse, Vice Chancellor - Financial Affairs

**Facilitation Team**
The Facilitation Team established the process and timeline and provided organizational support through the process. The team utilized a project management methodology to drive progress and ensure completion. In addition to having a spokesperson in the role of chair, the team used a full-time project manager, which proved critical in managing the complex processes and communications necessary for a project of this scale. The Facilitation Team developed the Task Force training, website, communications, and town hall meetings; scheduled meetings and events; and also provided technical assistance to the project, exploring methods used at other universities and reading widely about strategies for engaging in university change processes. Facilitation Team members include:

- James Burg, Dean, College of Education and Public Policy - *Chair*
- Stanley Davis, Special Assistant to the Chancellor and Professor Emeritus, Accounting
- Jennifer Oxtoby, Project Manager, Office of the Chancellor
- Carlos Pomalaza-Ráez, Professor, Electrical Engineering
- Robert Wilkinson, Associate Vice Chancellor, Institutional Effectiveness, Assessment and Accreditation

**Task Force**
The third branch of USAP is the Task Force of 24 members, comprised of 12 faculty and 12 staff members. To engage the campus community and to ensure the participation of a diverse group of faculty and staff, a campus-wide nomination process was used to solicit participation. The Steering Committee made the final determination of Task Force membership. The Task Force
was charged with developing the assessment methodology, analyzing the data, reporting on unit-level data, and finally creating recommendations based on their analysis. Initially, two Task Forces were established—one representing academic units and the other academic support units—but early on, they combined into one group. Task Force members include:

- Lynn Armstrong - Sergeant, University Police
- Marla Baden - Associate Librarian, Library
- Noor O'Neill Borbieva - Assistant Professor, Anthropology (COAS)
- Ashley Calderon - Director, Career Services
- Leslie Clark - Coordinator- Advising and Student Services, Department of Public Policy
- Cheryl Duncan - Clinical Assistant Professor, Radiography (HHS)
- Abdullah Eroglu - Professor, Electrical Engineering (ETCS)
- Ashley Calderon - Director, Career Services
- Leslie Clark - Coordinator- Advising and Student Services, Department of Public Policy
- Cheryl Duncan - Clinical Assistant Professor, Radiography (HHS)
- Abdullah Eroglu - Professor, Electrical Engineering (ETCS)
- Ashley Calderon - Director, Career Services
- Leslie Clark - Coordinator- Advising and Student Services, Department of Public Policy
- Cheryl Duncan - Clinical Assistant Professor, Radiography (HHS)
- Abdullah Eroglu - Professor, Electrical Engineering (ETCS)
- Dane Goodman - Professor, Fine Arts (VPA)
- Jim Hersberger - Professor, Mathematics (COAS)
- Rachel Hile - Associate Professor, English and Linguistics (COAS) – Co-Chair
- Christine Kuznar - Associate Athletic Director, Athletics
- Deborah Magsam - Administrative Assistant, Manufacturing and Constructions Engineering Technology
- Jospeter Mbuba - Associate Professor, Public Policy (EPP)
- Rhonda Meriwether – Director, Mastodon Advising Center
- Dan Miller - Associate Professor, Psychology (COAS)
- Gregory Miller - Supervisor, Physical Plant
- Robin Newman - Associate Dean of Students, Dean of Students
- John Niser - Associate Professor, Consumer and Family Sciences (HHS)
- Jack Patton - Executive Director, Marketing
- Kathy Pollock - Associate Professor, Accounting and Finance (DSB)
- Abraham P. Schwab - Associate Professor, Philosophy (COAS)
- Shawna Squibb - Associate Bursar, Bursar’s Office
- Angela Williams - Director, Online and Credit Programs
- Mandi Witkovsky - Manager, IT Services – Co-Chair

**TASK FORCE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

In July and August 2014, the Task Force members spent more than 40 hours in training and development of the process. During this process they reviewed:

- IPFW goals and metrics related to Plan 2020
- Budgeting process and expense reports
- IPFW funding sources
- Resource allocation and distribution processes
- Data collection across campus and how data are used (Registrar, HR, Financial Services, Institutional Research)
- Student information data and existing performance metrics
Understanding how IPFW operates was critical for the Task Force to be able to build the process. Initially, there was a clear distinction between the two groups both in understanding and perception of the university and their integration within the teams. The two groups learned from each other about different areas across the university and agreed it was essential to our students that we enhance the collaboration among all areas in order to achieve the specific goals set forth in Plan 2020, especially the clear metrics for increasing student success. For this reason, the two task forces united and chose to move forward as one team, implementing the same alignment process for both academic and academic support units, thus emphasizing the importance of integration and working across organizational boundaries.

**TIMELINE**

In establishing a timeline, we recognized that building an assessment system, gathering data, reviewing the data, and writing a report would take a minimum of a year to implement. With a May 1, 2015, target for producing a list of recommendations, this year’s USAP timeline was out of sync with the 2015-16 budget process, and future years will utilize a different schedule to better inform the budgeting process. The following provides an overview of the timeline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation &amp; Readiness</th>
<th>Training &amp; Development</th>
<th>Report Writing &amp; Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis &amp; Assessment</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Kick-Off</td>
<td>• Task Force Workshops</td>
<td>• Unit meetings</td>
<td>• Task Force review and analysis of each unit report</td>
<td>• Prepare final report and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communicate and share with campus community</td>
<td>• Select Criteria &amp; Identify Units</td>
<td>• Software training (Beginning Oct 20th)</td>
<td>• Follow-up with units to clarify or request more information</td>
<td>• Submit to Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish Task Force</td>
<td>• Training – Unit Level</td>
<td>• Units write and submit reports (Due Dec 31st)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Share with campus community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAMPUS TRAINING, REPORT WRITING, AND DATA COLLECTION**

To introduce the unit report structure and reinforce the bottom-up approach to implementing Plan 2020, in September and October 2014 the Task Force met with each unit of the university, conducting over 60 meetings with over 600 faculty and staff to present the process and engage the campus community in discussion. A common presentation was used for each meeting and was facilitated by various members of the Task Force. A consistent message was delivered that encouraged collaboration and transparency and stressed the importance of including all members of the unit in creating the report.

Software purchased specifically for the strategic alignment process was used to capture information from the unit report. Training was provided both face-to-face and online, and the
project manager was available for individual consultations. Units were asked to have their reports completed by December 31, 2014. The aggressive timeline challenged many units to complete the reports on schedule, but units completed the work, and 118 reports were submitted.

**COMMUNICATION**
Throughout the process, the Facilitation Team coordinated and managed communication, ensuring the campus community was kept informed of our progress and given the means to ask questions or discuss issues. Some of the communication strategies employed include:

- A dedicated [website](#) providing information on the process, announcements, contact information, and documentation
- “[Submit a question](#)” and “[share an idea](#)” tools on the website, so that questions and ideas could be submitted anonymously and responded to by the Facilitation Team
- Monthly [town hall meetings](#), where specific topics of interest were covered, such as the campus data systems and budgeting process
- Weekly updates in Inside IPFW
- Campus-wide communications by the chancellor at critical points in the process
METHODOLOGY

DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION
The Task Force used three primary sources of data in their analysis process.

**IR Profiles**
For academic units, the Office of Institutional Research refined the accuracy and consistency of institutional data and provided open-access, online profiles. These profiles include information on numbers of majors, minors, graduates, credit hours, and faculty. During this first year of USAP, an equivalent profile of data was not available for academic support units; therefore, the role of the profiles was not emphasized in this final report and recommendations.

**Budget**
During the training and development phase of the project, the Task Force was provided with both budget and expenditure reports for units across the university. As noted in the Background section, there were serious concerns about the accuracy of how these data demonstrated actual expenditures; therefore, the role of the budget data was not emphasized in the recommendations.

**Unit Reports**
At the beginning of the development process it was assumed that the IR profiles and the budget information would play prominent roles in the analysis process. However, with the challenges previously mentioned regarding these data sources, the Task Force developed a narrative unit report that became the focal point of assessment.

There was also much discussion about the large number of reports already required on campus and the seeming redundancy of the reported data. With this in mind, the Task Force created a template that might serve multiple purposes, such as program review and annual reporting.

The overarching goal that informed the creation of the unit report template was the need to bring strategic planning to the unit level in order to achieve the specific metrics of success tied to Plan 2020. Individual units had, of course, engaged in their own work of strategic planning, but they were not asked to consider or create connections between their own plans and college-level and university-level planning. The Task Force developed the unit report form with the aim of initiating progress toward two goals: First, the ideal of connecting planning initiatives horizontally across units and vertically within larger units of the university is the long-term goal. Second, the shorter-term goal that must be achieved in conjunction with this is to develop the habit of setting clear and measurable goals as part of the planning process within all units.

The benefits to IPFW of more careful and collaborative strategic planning at the unit level are clear. The benefits to individual units derive from the creation of a “bottom-up” approach to improvement, through plans being developed, implemented, and assessed for progress by the units themselves.
After much discussion in the development phase, the Task Force determined the components each unit would be asked to report on and created the unit report, which was beta-tested with two academic units and two academic support units. Based on the analysis of these beta-tests, further adaptations were made to the template, finalizing the unit report.

An important function of the unit report was to collect a common set of information that would create a baseline understanding of the following background information for each unit:

- Mission
- Significant accomplishments from the last three years
- Accreditations and mandates with constraints and benefits
- Inefficiencies as reported by the units
- Contextualization of responses to IR Profiles and 2014 budgets

Next, each unit was asked to create goals and provide the following information for each one:

- Unit goal
- How the goal align with IPFW goal(s)
- Priority level
- Action plan for achieving the goal
- Metrics for assessing progress
- Additional resources needed
- Challenges
- Timeline

Each unit could report up to 10 goals, and it was requested that no more than 3-5 goals be designated as high priority.

**Unit of Analysis**

During the development phase of the process, much discussion focused on the appropriate unit of analysis. In the Dickeson model of prioritization, the unit of analysis is defined as individual programs, such as a major, minor, support program, or segment of a division, such as Grounds within the Physical Plant. This level of analysis could have easily provided several hundred units across campus.

As the focus had moved from program ranking to strategic alignment, the Task Force decided to use organizational units, as defined by the official university organization chart. Each unit was also given the opportunity to provide feedback to the Task Force, and in some cases units were merged or disaggregated to provide better clarity. In total 118 units were identified.
ANALYSIS PROCESS
Evaluation and analysis of the reports involved multiple phases:

1. **Task Force observations and input** – From the very beginning, members of the Task Force applied previous institutional knowledge and experience to this process, sharing their individual perspectives to help other members better understand the whole. Throughout summer training, the group collected observations and beliefs they had about the institution such as the belief that each college and division worked in silos, preventing the development of more collaborative partnerships.

2. **Unit Report Analysis – Goals** – The unit reports were analyzed individually by the Task Force. Divided into six groups, the Task Force worked in teams of four, each made up of two academic faculty and two academic support members. Each team was assigned to review and analyze an average of 20 reports. Teams were directed to evaluate unit goals and provide feedback on whether the goals were “SMART”:
   - Is the goal specific?
   - Is the goal measurable?
   - Is the goal achievable considering the department profile and budget data?
   - Is the goal realistic?
   - Is the goal timebound?

   Feedback to these questions are provided in the Prioritization Plus software for each unit report along with suggestions for addressing any issues of concern that emerged in the report. Each person identified as the “Unit Lead” received this report with feedback via email. Reports are also available on the [USAP website](https://usapwebsite.com).

3. **Unit Report Analysis – Institutional Findings** – The small groups analyzed and identified key information based on their knowledge of the institution and the strategic plan and reported out to the entire team:
   a. Potential areas for collaboration
   b. Opportunities for increased operational effectiveness
   c. Goals that have potential for strong impact on the institution or on student success

As each team reported on its analyses, notes were maintained and trends began to emerge that informed the university-level analysis. In addition, information was compiled and categorized that provided further areas of analysis such as goal alignment to Plan 2020, inefficiencies, and challenges.

A dialectical process emerged, in which the Task Force identified themes of concern, clustered similar themes of concern, and confirmed the importance of these clusters in the course of further reporting. Through this process, seven meta-themes emerged from the data; these are presented later in this report.
DATA AND RESULTS
The Task Force reviewed information from across the university and made many observations that may be useful as IPFW moves forward. The following information describes the data we collected.

1. **Index of individual unit goals to Plan 2020 goals, metrics, and outcomes** – The Information Analytics and Visualization (IAV) Center created a program to map each individual unit goal to Plan 2020. Starting with the coded strategic plan, this index lists every unit goal grouped with the IPFW goal, metric, or outcome that it aligns to as reported in unit USAP reports.

This index helps us understand how each goal in Plan 2020 will be achieved and supported by individual departments across the institution. Conversely, it identifies those university-level goals that may not have enough department-level support to succeed. Units can use the index to identify other departments aligning to the same goals and may identify opportunities to collaborate or share resources.

Represented in the table below is the distribution of goals across the four primary areas of Plan 2020 (I – Student Success, II – Research and Engagement, III – Regional Hub, IV – Metrics, Effectiveness and Philanthropy). Please note some unit goals chose N/A or had unclear alignment and are represented in the N/A & Other category. Also, please note the total goal distribution is significantly higher than the sum total of unit goals that have been established, which is 553. This is because unit goals often aligned to multiple Plan 2020 goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPFW Goal</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>N/A &amp; Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPFW</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor - Advancement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor - Financial and Administrative Affairs</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor - Student Affairs and Enrollment Management</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor - Academic Affairs</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard T. Doermer School of Business</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education and Public Policy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering, Technology, and Computer Science</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health And Human Services</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Visual And Performing Arts</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Index of unit goals aligned to seven themes** – This index aligns each individual unit goal to the seven themes. In some cases a goal aligns with multiple themes, and others have been identified as miscellaneous. This table reflects the total number of goals assigned to each theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMES</th>
<th># of Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Identity, Priorities, and Direction</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with Regional Needs</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Marketing</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging Technological Capacity</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Assessment, and Continuous</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Enrollment Management</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Index of inefficiencies** – This information came from the question on the USAP report – “On what activities, if any, do you spend resources (money, time, people, etc.) inefficiently or in ways that do not support the mission of your unit or the university?” Responses are compiled.

4. **Index of challenges** – This information came from the question on the unit report – “What challenges, other than financial resources, might affect your progress?” Responses are compiled.

5. **Resources needed to support goals** – This information came from the question on the unit report – “What additional resources do you need to accomplish this goal?” Responses are compiled.

6. **Potential areas for collaboration** – These were identified by the Task Force and represent opportunities to reach across divisions and departments to improve our services to students and the efficiency with which we do things.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Modern universities are extremely complex, combining in one entity educational programs, sophisticated research and development laboratories, cultural engagement centers for the arts and humanities, and community service organizations. Achieving quality in these functions requires significant investments in the buildings and support services, accounting, human resources, marketing, and many other functions. In short, doing any one of these functions well is a challenge; doing them all at the same time requires an extensive level of integration, communication, and strategic thinking.

Creating an organization that fosters student success requires us to distribute an enormous amount of work across 118 organizational units and 1,000 employees. The important task is to divide this work in a manner that is effective, efficient, and rational. At the same time, this division of work requires an equally robust method for staying coordinated.

The seven USAP recommendations stem from complications from these two basic concepts: the division of work (and associated resources to accomplish that work) and the ability to coordinate work and communicate throughout the system. In an attempt to clarify the distribution of work, universities created divisions with specific areas of responsibility, such as Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, yet both must be coordinated or we provide degrees and services that are not complementary. In other words, even if the university were granted all of the financial resources it wanted, these seven themes would continue to hamper our ability to be the university we aspire to become.

Creating a healthy university requires clarity of purpose, organizational precision, and a focus on the people who come here to learn and work. Success in each of the seven recommendations depends on successes in the other recommendations. For example, it is of limited advantage to develop strategic enrollment management if we don’t have a clear academic direction for the university, and neither of these will be accomplished without improved leadership skills throughout the university.

Achieving the strategic goals of Plan 2020 will require us to address these seven recommendations concurrently. Thus, we list the recommendations alphabetically, not in a priority order, as the USAP Task Force feels strongly they must all be addressed.

Recommendations fall under the following seven themes:

1. Academic Identity, Priorities, and Direction
2. Alignment with Regional Needs
3. Communication and Marketing
4. Leadership Development
5. Leveraging Technological Capacity
6. Planning, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement
7. Strategic Enrollment Management
Guiding Elements

The recommendations in the following pages do not so much solve problems as identify and describe large-scale, university-wide issues and provide recommended action steps for undertaking the process of improvement on multiple fronts simultaneously. In the initial development of the seven themes we conceptualized seven committees—the reflexive manner universities have for dealing with issues. But continued reflection clarified that for this effort to flourish as desired, its implementation requires the use of two seemingly competitive practices, the same two practices embraced throughout this process and evidenced in this report.

Successful implementation relies on the reciprocal practices of adding new thinking to familiar decision-making processes and enhancing familiar decision-making processes through the use of new thinking. Therefore, we recommend (1) that groups of people representing different knowledge and experiences from the regional community and from campus help to break through the homeostasis of existing practice by engaging in dialogue about each of the recommended action steps. Community involvement is genuine and beneficial only when community thinking is embedded into the fabric of university decision-making practice. Similarly, it is recommended (2) to use existing IPFW offices and personnel as much as possible in their roles, for they are the ones who will learn to assess, plan, and adapt to the new IPFW. Because open-mindedness to new thinking and creation of new knowledge is the cornerstone of a university education, IPFW has the opportunity to live these values as it moves into fulfillment of Plan 2020.

Through the collaborative experience of the Task Force and in reviewing every unit on campus, we want to emphasize that the following elements be kept in mind as the work on these recommendations moves forward:

1. **Structure**- effective division of work and responsibilities is vitally important. Some units have hardly changed in years (and may need to), while others have experienced a dizzying level of continuous change. Through budget cuts, frozen lines, layoffs, and program closures and openings, many units and employees have overloaded or disjointed portfolios of responsibility. We must rethink our structures throughout the entire organization.

2. **Process**- coordination of the work we do must be reviewed. As an example, why do certain forms need five levels of signatures? Who should communicate with whom when developing new initiatives? When changes happen, which other units need to be notified?

3. **People**- as we look at engaging change, we must do so with the greatest respect for the students and employees of this university. It is cliché that change is hard, but we must move forward with compassion and support, recognizing that IPFW employees have tremendous heart and grit and are willing to do the hard work of creating change.

4. **Cost**- many issues would be easier to address by applying more resources, but the reality is that all the changes that go into effect must help the university realign the expenses it already has and possibly even reduce costs if enrollment continues to decline.
5. **Project Management**- We want to emphasize the critical role of project management in the USAP process. Having a dedicated project manager allowed those involved in the development and analysis phases to focus on the task at hand, rather than attempting to coordinate meetings, communications, and resources. Additionally, the project manager brought skills to organize work processes, assist in planning and goal setting, and monitor (and encourage) the project’s progress. The university could greatly benefit from investing in dedicated project management for all high-level projects.

6. **Student Success**- We could develop an amazingly well-run university and still not improve student success. We exist for the sake of our students, and ultimately all changes should lead toward the success of our students.

This report is meant to represent the themes and recommendations that have come from the campus community in the unit level reports. We intend these themes and recommendations to be taken as the starting point of an ongoing conversation, a conversation that should be guided by the relevant individuals and units as well as the broader interests of the institution. We encourage all members of the campus to contribute to the ongoing conversation with corrections, criticisms, and suggestions.
THEME 1: Academic Identity, Priorities, and Direction

**Recommendation**
IPFW should work to develop a comprehensive academic plan that addresses and answers questions related to the core academic identity of the university.

**Identified Problems**
When we linked reported unit USAP goals with the seven themes, the academic identity theme had the largest number of affiliated goals. These goals represent individual units doing their part to contribute to the improvement of their units and of the larger organizational structures to which they belong. Considered in the aggregate, however, one can see competing visions for the academic identity of IPFW, both now and moving into the future, especially when considering the need to allocate resources. A large number of units proposed that their initiatives should be designated as signature programs, a topic highlighted in Plan 2020 that still has not received necessary clarification in regard to what the phrase “signature program” will mean at IPFW. Some other goals would require large investment of resources, and so a clearer and more collaboratively generated sense of who we are and who we want to be academically is needed to inform decisions of resource allocation.

**Recommended Action Steps**

1. Utilizing the guiding questions found in [Appendix 2](#), develop an operationalized strategic plan that outlines the academic mission, vision, direction, and priorities for academic programs and student success at IPFW (including clarification on IPFW's signature programs). Clearly articulate campus priorities, resource needs, and functions of the university.

2. Based on standards of meaningful transparency and inclusion, seek input from a wide range of constituents at IPFW and in the university’s service region.

3. Develop criteria for program viability, develop an ongoing review process for program viability, and conduct a review of all programs.

For specific recommendations that emerged from the unit reports, see [Appendix 1](#).
THEME 2: Alignment with Regional Needs

Recommendation
To actualize its mission statement, IPFW should work to strengthen its ability and coordinate its efforts to enhance the intellectual, social, economic, and cultural needs of Fort Wayne and the broader Northeast Indiana Region. This should include metrics for understanding demand for academic programming and service programming. In addition, we should improve our ability to tell our success stories to broader audiences on campus and to stakeholders (interwoven with Theme 3: Communication and Marketing).

Identified Problems
Plan 2020’s third goal is to “Serve as a regional intellectual, cultural, and economic hub for global competitiveness.” This theme recognizes the challenges we face as an organization in achieving this goal. As demonstrated in multiple unit reports, an important component missing in our university’s conversations about our regional mission is a systematic method for reviewing the needs of the region and for assessing the alignment of our programming to those needs. In order to have a meaningful and informed conversation about meeting regional needs, we must first build our capacities 1) to understand the needs, 2) to dialogue with the region about these needs, and 3) to address these needs. In the absence of this type of data collection and analysis about the actual needs of our actual region, it will continue to be difficult for individuals with different opinions about our regional mission to find common ground.

At present, IPFW does not have a clear, self-determined vision for itself as a regional campus. The Indiana Commission for Higher Education’s “Policy on Regional Campus Roles and Missions” provides top-down ideas about the role of regional campuses in Indiana. These directives focus more on what regional campuses are not supposed to do or will not be supported in doing rather than creating a vision of vibrant interactions between community and university. For example, faculty at regional campuses are directed to focus on “Scholarly activity related to faculty teaching responsibilities, research related to local and regional needs,” and campuses are told that “Regional Campuses do not offer doctorate programs.”

Without a coherent and shared plan for how we intend to “drive the intellectual, social, economic, and cultural advancement of . . . our region” (IPFW Mission Statement), efforts at IPFW to engage with the broader community and region lack coordination. For example, many units on campus are involved in engagement activities, but there is no centralized process to coordinate these efforts in a way that facilitates communication and cooperation (both between campus units and between campus units and entities in the community). Another example is that it is unclear how academic and academic support units are to be provided with information about which programs may be most needed. This leads to program development based on individual expertise of the faculty/department, or a “squeaky wheel” phenomenon of community feedback, but not necessarily alignment with regional need.

It should be noted that one potential point of consensus at IPFW is the change of designation from a Regional Campus to a Metropolitan Campus by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education. If this change were granted, it would give the university substantial reason to engage the community in discussion and explore its role in the region.
**Recommended Action Steps**

1. Develop the organizational structure and capacity to implement a community engagement/economic development plan
   
   a. Conduct and maintain an IPFW economic impact study.
   
   b. Link the impact study to the academic plan and identify/build degree programs that meet regional needs.

2. Provide incentives for faculty/discipline research on regional and city issues, and work to develop research-focused connections with the region and city.

3. Create processes for identifying, cultivating, and distributing success stories and testimonials through internal and external communication channels.

4. Develop processes and structures that assist in coordination and communication among the multiple IPFW units that regularly interact with the community (e.g., Office of Engagement; Career Services; the Office of Academic Internships, Cooperative Education, and Service Learning; the Community Research Institute; Continuing Studies’ Training Outreach). This would include heightened interaction with the campus Community Advisory Council.

5. Develop a method to invite and collect community feedback that is then incorporated into IPFW’s planning and continuous improvement processes.

For specific recommendations that emerged from the unit reports, see Appendix 1.
THEME 3: Communication and Marketing

Recommendation
IPFW should work to develop an integrated marketing plan for presenting the institution to both its internal and external publics, including a consistent image and a marketing plan that addresses enrollment, fundraising, institutional events and activities, as well as athletic events and other campus activities. In addition, we should improve our ability to tell our success stories to broader audiences on campus and to stakeholders.

Identified Problems
Numerous unit reports mentioned concerns related to communication and marketing. Communication and marketing at IPFW have become decentralized and many units on campus, faced with the necessity of communicating with others about their programs and initiatives, noted that they did not have the financial resources or the marketing expertise to excel in these endeavors. These communication and marketing efforts, challenging for individual units to undertake, become in the aggregate a university-wide problem: (1) it is an inefficient use of human resources to have people without background or expertise in communications and marketing developing marketing materials; (2) from a professional marketing standpoint, having so many units designing their own marketing materials leads to brand confusion. Recent changes to Inside IPFW and From the Desk of the Chancellor are good models for improving our ability to tell our story, but unfortunately, the resources and processes to produce similar products around the university are lacking. As some units attempt to improve their communication through e-mail newsletters, the collective congestion of inboxes grows.

In the age of electronic communication and information, our campus website is considerably under-resourced. The website architecture is maintained by a small work group, and few on campus are tasked with driving high-quality website messaging. Most of the campus webpages are maintained by secretaries with already full portfolios of responsibility and limited time for learning about appealing web design, let alone the constant updates necessary for modern websites.

Recommended Action Steps
1. IPFW has not devoted sufficient resources to marketing at either the institutional or the program level. An increase in resources would be desirable in the next budget cycle, but such an increase should be a response to a specific plan that creates a prioritized schedule for how increased financial resources would be applied strategically.
2. The recommended institutional marketing plan should include information about costs and priorities and should be completed in time to inform the next cycle of budget decisions.

For specific recommendations that emerged from the unit reports, see Appendix 1.
THEME 4: Leadership Development

Recommendation
IPFW should work to implement a comprehensive leadership development program that covers all levels of the institution, from students to staff to faculty to administrators. The program should provide education, mentoring, and employment pathways to support the development of leadership skills and practices.

Identified Problems
The decision to emphasize leadership development as a theme arose during the Fall 2014 training and report-writing period, from our meta-analysis of the unit reports and from our observations of evidence of interpersonal friction and lack of empowerment. Questions asked repeatedly during the informational unit meetings indicated an atmosphere of fear and disempowerment. Some of the fears expressed included concerns that USAP reports would be turned against units to punish them, that administrators at higher levels would alter the reports after submission, that units would not actually be allowed by their superiors to pursue the goals that they set in their reports, and the like.

IPFW has experienced large-scale administrative turnover in a short amount of time, and these changes in leadership, combined with the tumultuous budget situation of the past several years, have created extra challenges for everyone. Employees at all levels need to gain or regain a sense of empowerment and autonomy with regard to the work they do for IPFW. The Plan 2020 goal to “decentralize resource distribution and control to lowest level, mission-focused administrative units” implicitly endorses the value of shared planning and decision-making authority.

For campus leaders and administrators, the extra challenges created by the current campus climate make the process of creating and managing change even harder than it would otherwise be. Administrative processes in the past were centralized, with limited communication or input from below. For this reason, conscious effort to decentralize authority and increase both one-way and two-way communication is advisable as a way of changing the direction not only of the university, but also of the campus climate.

In order to shift the morale and climate at IPFW and to realize the other USAP recommendations, IPFW will need leaders who are well trained and mentored. Additionally, leadership development at all employee levels can be viewed as a resource multiplier. Working toward a goal where staff and faculty feel empowered to engage in change and have the skills to organize that change will mean that the university as a whole can adapt rather than simply wait for administrative declarations.
**Recommended Action Steps**

1. Create a leadership development strategy that makes explicit the skills, behaviors, and competencies that are desired from those in a designated leadership position. Ensure that all employees in a leadership role receive training and development opportunities to support skill enhancement in this area.

2. Enhance our culture of leadership to encourage collaboration across organizational boundaries, engagement of employees, the creation of opportunities for others to lead, and development of new leaders.
   a. Provide mentoring and learning opportunities for those currently in a designated leadership role and those desiring that career path.
   b. Implement feedback and review processes to ensure leaders are developing and demonstrating desired skills and behaviors.

For specific recommendations that emerged from the unit reports, see Appendix 1.
THEME 5: Leveraging Technological Capacity

Recommendation
IPFW should work to build, enhance, and promote a technology-driven environment. It should provide support for the technology needed to enhance student learning, increase the quality of instruction, improve business processes, and remain current with student expectations.

Identified Problems
The USAP process identified multiple issues related to the campus’s ability to leverage technology. While some issues are specifically under the control of Information Technology Services, the majority of the issues identified are much more systemic in nature, and this theme should not be seen as the sole responsibility of ITS.

One major roadblock to the effective use of technology is the capacity to meet the demand. As the campus’s need for technology grows, it does not appear that we have the capacity to satisfy the needs. Students expect to have access to certain technologies, and IPFW is not keeping up with those expectations.

Another issue identified is the ineffective implementation or use of technology. There is a desperate need for meaningful data, but either the data do not exist or we do not have an efficient way to obtain and synthesize the data.

A final issue is the lack of utilization of existing technologies. This may be due to poor promotion of the availability or benefits of certain technologies, or it may be due to a lack of people with the expertise needed to effectively implement their use in the classroom or office.

Recommended Action Steps
1. Resources need to be invested to keep up with technology demands. Campus priorities need to be established to ensure resources are applied strategically.
2. Determine where improvements can be made in our implementation or use of the technology we have and develop a plan to make corrections to implement necessary changes.
3. Where IPFW already has IT resources to accomplish key functions, promote the benefits and use of these resources in a consistent way.
4. Identify where and how we can enhance learning spaces across campus in both classrooms and other collaborative spaces where students gather to study and learn.

For specific recommendations that emerged from the unit reports, see Appendix 1.
THEME 6: Planning, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement

**Recommendation**
IPFW should work to create a culture of continuous improvement through ongoing measurement of institutional performance for all aspects of the university including academic, administrative, and support services. This should include the capacity to develop better data and the processes to use those data to make better-informed decisions. This should include assessment of student learning.

**Identified Problems**
A critical decision factor in not implementing Dickeson’s model of prioritization was the inconsistent, inaccessible, and unavailable performance measures for understanding unit productivity. This problem has been known for some time. In IPFW’s last Higher Learning Commission (HLC) accreditation report, the HLC noted that IPFW does not have a culture of assessment. This phrase does not simply mean that we lack student assessments, but that we lack the practices and process of assessing, planning, implementing change, and starting the cycle over with assessment of the changes.

Common sense suggests that to the extent that we lack access to reliable data, consideration of data will not inform decision-making. Multiple units reported experiencing problems accessing needed data, caused by inadequate staffing and resource allocation. These problems included delays in receiving reports on student and program data and delays in receiving help from other units on campus to access or analyze data. As an institution, we have voted with our dollars against data-informed decision-making, and this connects directly to our weaknesses in tying assessment to planning and budgeting.

Units were also clear that existing reporting demands feel onerous and wasteful of time and resources. They noted that reports often require similar information, and there was the perception that some reports merely landed on a shelf, never to be seen again. University data systems seem clunky to users and do not appear to communicate with each other.

Ideally, if the university could create an effective set of processes for planning, budgeting, and assessment, then the process of prioritization, or the alignment of resources and goals, would become an ongoing institutional habit, not the work of a special committee. This habit of continuous improvement will be most powerful when it not only takes root within individual departments and units, but also serves to connect individual units vertically and horizontally with other units.
**Recommended Action Steps**

1. Develop and implement an institution-wide assessment plan that addresses all aspects of the student experience as well as operational effectiveness.

2. Develop and implement performance measures for all units on campus. Measures should be aligned with both internal and external requirements.

3. Develop institutional dashboards and standard reports that guide institutional and programmatic decision-making.

4. Develop the university’s capacity for offering professional development in the skills of planning, metric development, and project management.

5. Prioritize the resources and processes necessary for maintaining Higher Learning Commission (HLC) accreditation. Define and prioritize resources necessary for maintaining discipline-specific accreditations.

6. Develop a systematic review and consolidation of campus reports, reporting processes, and data systems.

7. Develop the habits of planning, goal setting, and assessment as an important step toward changing our culture to one of continuous improvement. For example, embedding goals and data from assessments in proposals for funding, staffing, and new programming would lead toward more data-informed decisions.

For specific recommendations that emerged from the unit reports, see Appendix 1.
THEME 7: Strategic Enrollment Management

Recommendation
IPFW should work to develop and implement a university-wide strategic enrollment plan that integrates the University’s programs, practices, policies, and planning related to Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM). IPFW should work to make student recruitment, retention, and graduation core academic foci, and to create capacity for the understanding that student success is a shared responsibility of all IPFW programs.

Identified Problems
With full-time student enrollments continuing to decline, IPFW needs to directly address enrollment management. As with the other recommendations, we emphasize that solutions to this issue must involve the entire university and not simply be viewed as dictates to select offices.

Through the USAP analysis process, it became clear that a large number of units are working on projects that are connected to the broad theme of enrollment management. The overall picture of enrollment management that emerged revealed the following problems that need to be addressed:

- IPFW does not have a widely understood SEM plan to manage enrollment in alignment with its strategic and academic plans.
- IPFW does not have an integrated system to manage enrollment from prospect to graduation.
- Many systems related to enrollment management are not up-to-date technologically.
- There appears to be no clear mechanism for coordinating, assessing, planning, or intervening as a campus to improve student retention and success.

During the analysis period, the decision was made to move the traditional functions associated with enrollment management (i.e., Admissions, Financial Aid, and the Registrar’s office) to the Office of Academic Affairs, effective July 1, 2015. Also during the analysis period, a VCAA committee was formed with the charge of developing a strategic enrollment plan. Thus, plans for enrollment management are clearly in flux, and some plans may already be underway to address some of the concerns raised in USAP unit reports. It is to be expected that the move to the Office of Academic Affairs will lead to closer alignment between those units and IPFW’s academic units.
**Recommended Action Steps**

Utilizing the questions found in [Appendix 3]:

1. Develop effective strategic enrollment management practices that serve students in all stages of their IPFW careers.
2. Develop the resources, processes, and structures necessary to direct, assess, and review strategic enrollment management practices.
3. Create processes for coordinating and communicating enrollment management needs and activities across programs to more effectively share responsibility for student success.
4. Develop the capacity for accurate predictive analytics and the ability to use the information to inform decision-making.

For specific recommendations that emerged from the Unit Reports, see [Appendix 1].
INSTITUTIONALIZING THE UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT PROCESS - YEAR 2

Position on Campus
For the past year, there has been much discussion about the second year of USAP. As a prioritization project, USAP would have terminated with this report. As a process to aid alignment of planning and resources, it will continue to evolve as the campus builds the capacity to assess, align, and adapt.

One major debate has centered on where USAP should be housed in the institution. Because the process addresses every function at the university, we feel the logical home for the Task Force remains the Office of the Chancellor.

Modification to the Assessment
In the first year, the focus of USAP was on establishing a baseline of campus activities and capturing an understanding of the issues facing the university. In the second year, USAP will work with university offices to establish metrics for understanding performance. In addition, it will assess progress toward the goals listed in this first year.

Technical Assistance in Goal Writing
In reviewing the unit reports, it was apparent that the campus would benefit from professional development in goal writing, as well as project planning and assessment. USAP will work with other offices on campus to develop training in these areas.

Integration of Planning Across Levels
USAP frequently found that the goals and planning between different areas within the same division of the university were not well coordinated. The university must continue to refine planning processes to increase alignment. For example, faculty and chairs must work more closely in developing department goals. At the same time, chairs and deans must also communicate about how those goals align with goals of the college. Likewise, deans must communicate with each other and the VCAA. We encourage units to resist confining themselves to collaborations within traditional silos, such as an academic unit pairing with an academic support office to address specific issues they are having with student success.

Integration of Planning and Resources
The USAP process provided the Task Force members with detailed contextual knowledge of all aspects of the university, but with limited information on the budget and resource needs. The University Budget Committee (UBC) reviews every budget request of the university, but with limited context. We recommend discussions on how these two processes might better align or possibly merge, so that the report of unit goals, productivity, and resources requests are combined.
**Ongoing Monitoring of Recommendations**

To monitor and track progress on recommendations that are undertaken by the Steering Committee, we request implementation of ongoing progress reporting for each of the themes. We also request that USAP recommendations be incorporated into the appropriate vice chancellors’ USAP report for next year.
APPENDICES
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APPENDIX 1: Specific Recommendations by Theme

The Task Force offers additional, specific recommendations that emerged in our reading of the unit reports. We have organized these recommendations around the seven themes. Many of these align with priorities articulated in Plan 2020 and go further to address concerns discussed in the recommendation section.

THEME 1: Academic Identity, Priorities, and Direction

1. Increase student engagement through promoting high-impact learning activities:
   a. Decide whether the promotion of high-impact learning activities should be centralized or left to discipline-specific units.
   b. Develop a plan to create and support experiential learning opportunities.
   c. Increase incentives to students and faculty to collaborate on research, particularly student-initiated research. For example, develop an undergraduate research journal.

2. Advising:
   a. Identify successful advising programs and model others after them.
   b. Dedicate more financial resources to advising.
   c. Expand the assessment of academic advising. Questions to explore: How should advising responsibilities be divided between faculty and professional advisors? Are students satisfied with the advising they receive? Are students receiving consistent and accurate advice from the various advisors they work with on campus?
   d. If indicated in the assessment, expand training to faculty and professional advisors. Trainings could include: Information about student success resources on campus, information about academic programs, changes to General Education requirements, and financial aid policies.

3. Student Tutoring and Mentoring: Change the institutional placement of the Centers for Academic Success and Achievement to facilitate cooperation with other units that support academic success.

4. Curriculum:
   a. Explore ways the curriculum could be revised to better meet the needs of first-generation and working-class students.
   b. Solicit student input when assessing and revising curricula.

5. Internationalization of Curriculum
   a. Encourage cooperation between the International Studies Certificate Program and other units that work on internationalization.
   b. Consider supplementing the International Studies Certificate with an International Studies Major that would include a study abroad component.
   c. Develop a data-driven plan to recruit and retain international students.
THEME 2: Alignment with Regional Needs

1. Develop more sophisticated ways to identify current and predict future regional needs, possibly with the help of the Community Research Institute (CRI).
2. Incorporate knowledge about regional needs into academic and strategic enrollment management planning.
3. Promote the development of connections between university units and relevant organizations and individuals in Northeast Indiana. This could include:
   a. Drawing on CRI’s knowledge of the region to identify organizations and individuals in the region.
   b. Encouraging other units that collaborate with organizations and individuals in Northeast Indiana to share information and collaborate with interested units.
   c. Involving the Community Advisory Council in connecting campus units with individuals and organizations in Northeast Indiana.
   d. Encouraging those Centers of Excellence that address regional needs to develop closer connections with organizations and individuals in Northeast Indiana and help other units to do so.
4. Consider combining the Office of Academic Internships, Cooperative Education, and Service Learning with the Office of Career Services. Invest in a renovation of the unit (or a possible relocation) to make the unit more welcoming to representatives from the northeast Indiana community.

THEME 3: Communication and Marketing

1. Assess the value of increasing the centralization of marketing. Questions to ask: Would particular marketing campaigns, currently run by units, be better run by the Marketing unit? Should particular campaigns remain the responsibility of individual units? How could the Marketing unit serve those units that retain control over their own marketing?
2. Create brand awareness on campus.
   a. Define key, data-driven messages and images that appeal to students, donors, and alumni.
   b. Make sure all individuals on campus who are responsible for marketing and communication know the current brand standards.
3. Offer marketing training for faculty and staff. Pair individual Marketing staff with specific colleges/schools/units, similar to the way librarians serve particular departments.
4. Increase Marketing’s capacity to perform market analyses on individual programs.
5. Encourage Marketing to “cluster” similar programs in order to create marketing plans that are integrated at the college/division level.
6. Modernize ipfw.edu’s technology in order to overcome technological constraints on web-based marketing and reduce security risks. Problems to address: Ensure that system templates, widgets, and applications meet accessibility requirements; provide web publishers with greater support and higher accountability for meeting requirements to achieve consistent standards across the ipfw.edu domain; and implement mobile-optimized content throughout ipfw.edu, integrating into the new mobile application.
**THEME 4: Leadership Development**
1. Explore strategies to restore trust in leadership from the chair to the chancellor levels.
2. Provide training in supervision, leadership, planning, assessment, and performance management where needed.
3. Invite faculty, staff, and students to identify where leadership needs to be improved.
4. Increase faculty and staff knowledge of the contribution every unit makes to the university’s success.
5. Develop succession plans.
6. Identify high-turnover units. Explore ways to increase our ability to compete for top talent and reduce turnover in these units, such as by increasing compensation.

**THEME 5: Leveraging Technological Capacity**
1. Prioritize the capability and security of our long-term informational infrastructure.
2. Consolidate and centralize data into an electronic warehouse type environment.
3. Integrate IT hardware, wireless, and software capabilities, especially in the areas of student information, student assessment, and campus assessment.
4. Invest in instructional technology.
5. Phase out paper-based advising as soon as possible.
6. Maximize our use of software already licensed to us (such as Banner and dotCMS). Systems such as Banner are being underutilized across campus. Banner has the capability to do more, but we have not dedicated the resources to reap the benefits from this system.
7. Support technology-related professional development.
8. Use technology to streamline and automate processes and enhance sharing of information (e.g., better university shared calendars, more efficient scheduling of rooms and events, etc.).
9. Explore possible collaborations within the Purdue system that would increase our technological capabilities.

**THEME 6: Planning, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement**

**Performance Metrics**
1. With the help of all interested members of the campus community, identify a common set of institutional and program/unit-level performance indicators to be tracked and presented regularly.
2. Encourage schools/divisions to develop strategic plans so component units have a shared focus.
3. Develop clearly articulated expectations for every position and committee. Hold individuals and groups accountable for meeting these expectations.
4. Ensure all units are complying with the Purdue policy that every employee shall receive an annual review with clearly articulated goals and a development plan.
5. Provide funding for professional development to all employee groups but particularly where assessments reveal training is needed.
Assessment and Accreditation
1. Support the University Assessment Council’s efforts to create a comprehensive assessment plan.
2. Provide training in assessment methods to relevant individuals and groups.
3. Dedicate increased resources to assessment and develop incentives to increase participation and buy-in.
4. Identify assessment software options.
5. Improve campus assessment and data management for HLC accreditation. Build Assurance Argument and supporting documentation and then monitor on an annual basis.
6. Monitor discipline-specific accreditation issues and provide support for assessment related to discipline-specific accreditation.

Availability and Presentation of Data
1. Develop department profiles for academic support units.
2. Present IR data in a variety of forms, not just as spreadsheets.
3. Standardize the data available across units.

**THEME 7: Strategic Enrollment Management**

Integration and Communication
1. Improve communication among the following units: Admissions, Registrar, Financial Aid, and academic/academic support units.
2. Develop web resources in order to provide students with centralized access to the resources and information they need to succeed.

Developing Prospects
1. Develop more sophisticated methods of forecasting enrollments.
2. Invest in efforts to increase the percentage of dual-credit students who matriculate at IPFW.
3. Train academic and academic support units in strategic enrollment management best practices.
4. Encourage units that work with high school students to collaborate with the Office of Admissions.

Student Success Initiatives
1. Improve success in Gen Ed courses with high DFW rates through targeted, data-driven interventions.
2. Identify and support students who are most likely to struggle in required, high-DFW courses (e.g., conditional admits, first-generation students, and returning adults).
3. Support academic units involved in intensive recruitment and retention activities.
APPENDIX 2: GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR ACADEMIC PLANNING

Based on a review of academic plans from other institutions, the following questions are fairly standard questions used when working to build a strategic academic plan. Most institutional academic plans address most, if not all, of the following:

1. What is the IPFW academic experience?
2. What academic programs should IPFW enhance, maintain, or close?
3. What new programs should IPFW initiate?
4. What defines a signature program and how does that apply to IPFW?
5. What are the programmatic needs of the region?
6. What role does the General Education program play in developing the academic identity of IPFW?
7. What applied doctorates should IPFW offer?
8. What is the appropriate academic organizational structure for IPFW? Should some units be moved to different administrative units? Where is the most appropriate academic home for the General Studies Program? Would “one-stop services” for enrollment be feasible and advantageous for IPFW?
9. What academic support services need to be offered to ensure student success?
10. How do we improve the degree completion rates of new freshmen, new transfer students, and new juniors?
11. What role does Academic Affairs play in regional economic development, and what is IPFW’s economic impact on Fort Wayne, the region, and the state?
12. Our mission states that our programs will drive the advancement of our region. What is the balance between serving the current needs of the region and driving the progress of the region?
13. What accreditations are important to IPFW and how do we maintain them?
14. How do we integrate the assessment of learning into enhancing student success?
15. What are the appropriate performance measures and how do we monitor them?
16. Do we align to the Indiana Commission of Higher Education (ICHE) Performance Funding Measures?
APPENDIX 3: GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR STRATEGIC ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

As one studies the development and implementation of Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) at institutions across the country, one finds there are a set of assumed questions, assumptions, and practices that serve to guide the development and implementation of an institutional SEM plan. While not all institutions address all of these questions, assumptions, and practices, they still serve as guides in the SEM planning process.

1. Do we know the academic and nonacademic needs of our students and those we are recruiting?
2. Are we offering the appropriate array of programs and courses in the modality, location, and times that meet the needs of students and potential students?
3. Are we marketing to our various “learners” in appropriate ways?
4. Are we providing professional development opportunities for faculty and staff to be able to serve various learning styles?
5. Do we conduct routine needs assessments of all constituent groups?
6. Do we continually adjust curriculum based on needs and best practices?
7. Do we continually monitor student satisfaction and use the data to improve the student experience?
8. Do we use all forms of marketing to reach the various learner models?
9. Do we know our primary, secondary, and tertiary recruiting areas and the needs of each?
10. Do we have a reactive or strategic recruitment and marketing strategy?
11. Do we strategically use Customer Relationship Management (CRM) software?
12. Do we use analytics and predictive modeling to help recruit and shape?
13. Do we appropriately leverage financial aid to provide appropriate benefit while growing the enrollment?
14. Do we provide the appropriate academic support services to ensure student success?
15. Do we provide the appropriate nonacademic support to ensure student success?
16. Who is responsible for retention and student success?
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