AQIP Category Eight: Planning Continuous Improvement

Processes (P)

8P1 – Key Planning Processes

The overarching plan that sets institutional direction and identifies strategies is the 2006-2011 Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan Coordinating Committee was comprised of 15 members, including the President and two Board of Trustees members. Aside from these latter three, all members were chosen for their institution-wide perspective, data analysis skills and understanding of consultative processes. Two members were faculty and the remainder were administrators from across the institution.

The process began with data input from internal and external environmental scans, trend analysis and other methods. Analysis of the data led to a review of the vision, goals and objectives of the 2004 – 2006 Strategic Plan. The new plan carried forward those imperatives that remained relevant, e.g., academic excellence, while incorporating emergent strategies and imperatives. The process which led to the approval of the vision and strategic goals and objectives is diagrammed in Figure 8.2.

Figure 8.2 Process for Developing Goals and Objectives

Implementation planning began in June, 2006, shortly after Trustee approval of the Strategic Plan Vision, Goals and Objectives, with the first of a series of feedback sessions hosted by the Advancement division to gather ideas for both strategic and campaign planning. These suggestions were collated and turned over to the Strategic Planning Coordinating Committee. All ideas were allocated to an individual, usually a committee chair or dean, or to an existing group for consideration. Those ideas that evolved into workable initiatives were presented in one-page proposal form to the Strategic Planning Committee in late September. Each proposal outlined the initiative and estimated resource needs required for implementation. The Strategic Planning Committee reviewed the proposals for consistency with the strategic goals and objectives and made recommendations to the appropriate governance body, department or planning group.

8P2 - Selecting Short and Long Term Strategies

Short and long term strategies emerged through the Strategic Planning process. As environmental data were collected and feedback solicited, consistent themes and imperatives emerged. These included focusing enrollment strategies, increasing diversity, ways of living the Catholic Franciscan identity, the necessity for partnerships, and fiscal health and stability. The
feedback process allowed for differences in opinion about the relative importance of strategies to emerge. For example, emphasizing servant leadership as an institutional ethos emerged as a possibility early in the process. However, when this appeared as a strategic goal, many were uncomfortable because it was a new idea, not well understood and never widely discussed. The idea did not disappear but was transformed from the strategic level to the implementation level.

At the implementation stage, budget recommendations from the Budget and Planning Committee along with Development Office fundraising efforts serve to allocate scarce resources to the highest priority efforts, deflecting others to later stages (see 8P6).

8P3 - Developing Key Action Plans to Support Institutional Strategies

The implementation of Strategic Plan 2004-2006 was carried out through specific projects monitored by the Strategic Plan Implementation Committee whose membership included project directors and vice presidents. Action steps for each project were set and the Committee met monthly to review progress toward project completion.

This process worked to keep the projects focused; but did not align planning processes, strategies and action plans across institutional levels nor did it provide for communication to the wider university community.

With Strategic Plan 2006 – 2011, each level of the University was required to develop a strategic plan that constituted that unit’s vision of its unique role in supporting and contributing to the overall Strategic Plan; the University-wide plan therefore provided a context within which college, divisional and departmental plans will nest.

The unit plans were communicated to the Strategic Planning Coordinating Committee which communicated the plans, and progress on the plans, to the University community through e-mail, continued feedback sessions, and periodic reports. Departments reviewed and discussed progress on their action steps; salient progress and successes were communicated to the University community by the Strategic Planning Coordinating Committee at the end of the fall and spring semesters. Department plans were updated over the summer, based on emerging needs, and the process was repeated. The annual action plan cycle is diagrammed in Figure 8.3

---

**Figure 8.3 Annual Cycle for Developing Unit level Action Plans**
The intended outcomes of vertical alignment include understanding of and involvement in the strategic plan throughout the university, as well as better communication of action steps and of University-wide progress toward strategic goals.

8P4 - Coordinating and Aligning Planning Processes, Organizational Strategies and Actions Plans

As of Spring 2009, the Vice-Presidents Council has assumed responsibility for monitoring progress on the strategic plan. Previously a separate Strategic Plan Committee had been charged with monitoring and communicating progress however there was a breakdown in follow through on many of the actions. Shifting the responsibility to the vice-presidents centralizes the strategic plan monitoring within a group whose members are all members of the Budget and Planning Committee and the AQIP teams. Since both of the latter groups have representation from across the University, the vice-presidents are in a position to coordinate and communicate without being the only voices being heard.

8P5 – Defining Objectives, Selecting Measures and Setting Performance Targets for Organizational Strategies and Action Plans

As Strategic Plan 2006 – 2011 was developed, ways of measuring each objective were sought. Since the University was beginning to use Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) (see 5P4) for internal decision making and for communication to the Board of Trustees, those KPIs which related to strategic plan objectives were selected and samples are found in Table 8.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.4 Example Dashboard and KPI Measurements of Strategic Plan Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL I: Develop and maintain excellence in academic programs.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Retain and attract the best full-time and adjunct faculty who are committed to collaboration and student development. | ○ Traditional Classes Taught by Full-time Faculty   ○ Traditional Undergraduate Placement   ○ Average On-Campus Traditional Undergraduate Class Size   ○ On-Campus Student: Faculty Ratio
| 5. Integrate service learning within the curriculum. | ○ Majors and Courses with Service Learning |
| **GOAL II: Affirm and communicate our Catholic and Franciscan values.** |
| 3. Develop an integrated environmental stewardship and campus sustainability program to improve environmental literacy, to reduce the negative impact of our operations, and to serve as a role model for the community. | ○ Environmental Usage   ○ Student spirituality
| 6. Expand University Ministry activities and resources to involve the majority of our students on the Joliet campus. | ○ Ministry Resources per Student and Resident |
| **GOAL III: Create and nurture a student centered environment, focused on student needs.** |
| 1. Create and provide opportunities for students to augment their academic skills through support programs. | ○ Campus Life and Student Centeredness   ○ Residence Hall Retention   ○ Freshman Retention and Graduation Rate   ○ Number of Campus Events / Student Participation   ○ Number of Students Participating in
| 2. Nurture student personal growth through out-of-classroom activities. | N/A |
### Athletics

#### GOAL IV: Increase the quality, quantity and diversity of the student body.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Increase enrollment in traditional, adult degree completion and graduate programs.</th>
<th>○ New Student Enrollment</th>
<th>○ Applicants / Admits / Registrants to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○ Total Student Enrollment</td>
<td>○ Distance student enrollment</td>
<td>○ Number of Off-campus Sites / Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Increase academic quality of entering undergraduate students.</td>
<td>○ Freshman High School GPA</td>
<td>○ Transfer Student GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Freshman ACT Score</td>
<td>○ Freshmen in Top 25% of High School Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GOAL VI: Strengthen stewardship and fiscal stability to achieve institutional goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Increase philanthropic giving in support of the university vision, mission and strategic plan.</th>
<th>○ Philanthropic Giving</th>
<th>○ Cost per Dollar Raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○ Dollars Raised To-Date</td>
<td>○ Special Donor Contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enhance effective and efficient management of university resources to improve fiscal stability.</td>
<td>○ Composite Financial Index</td>
<td>○ Institutional Unfunded Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Decrease USF Discount Rate</td>
<td>○ Average Aid to an Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 8P6 – Linking Strategy Selection and Action Plans, taking into account levels of current resources and future needs

Estimated resource needs were presented with Implementation Proposals. If a project moves forward, it is subject to consideration for funding within the annual operating budget by the Budget and Planning Committee. This committee is composed of the following members: Vice Presidents of the University, a faculty member representing the Faculty Compensation Committee, a faculty member appointed (by the Dean(s) after consultation with the Chief Academic Officer) from whatever college or colleges are not represented on the Budget and Planning Committee, Chairperson of the Administrators & Staff Council, an Administrator Representative of the Administrators & Staff Council, a Staff Representative of the Administrators & Staff Council, Controller, Chairperson of the Academic Assembly, Academic Deans, Chief Student Services Officer, Director of Human Resources. The Budget and Planning Committee recommends funding on the basis of priorities shaped by the Strategic Plan. Increased use of technology has allowed the Budget and Planning Committee to increasingly focus on planning rather than budgeting.

The Advancement Division also considers requests for grants or Capital Campaign funds and prepares fund-raising strategies for those projects it evaluates as fundable. Implementation of these projects occurs when funding is received.

#### 8P7 - Assessing and addressing risk in planning processes

USF does not have a formal risk assessment process in place at this time for planning. In all planning exercises, the potential for risk is discussed. One key example of this risk assessment would be our FY10 Budget Planning Process. During this exercise several models were developed to address the uncertainty of the economy and all iterations of the budget are poised and ready for enactment based on future developments.
USF is also expanding the addition of At Risk Indicators to the Board of Trustees Dashboard. The following indicators have already been added:

- Tuition discounting
- % of alumni giving
- Student retention

Others being considered include some of the 20 At Risk Indicators listed in *Turnaround: Leading Stressed Colleges and Universities to Excellence* by James Martin and James E. Samels.

**8P8 - Ensuring Faculty, Staff And Administrator Development To Meet Changing Requirements Demanded by Organizational Strategies and Action Plans**

A variety of means are used to train faculty, staff and administrators including technology training, customer service training and faculty development activities (4P4). Specific professional development goals, tied to personal, department or University needs, are identified through the personnel appraisal and tenure processes and evaluated during the next appraisal cycle (4P6). A policy and process that encourages pursuit of a terminal degree for selected administrators by funding tuition was implemented Spring 2009.

Recently online training in Sexual Harassment, Incident Command, and AQIP processes has been implemented by Human Resources.

In addition to the individual goals setting, recognition and reward systems are institution wide mechanisms to value development of skills and abilities to meet institutional needs.

**Results (R)**

**8R1 – Measuring the Effectiveness of Planning Processes**

Each of the current four AQIP Action projects incorporates annual evaluation and planning cycles and all establish quantitative or qualitative targets for improvement. Samples of these are presented in Table 8.5

**Table 8.5 AQIP Project Target and Data for Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Evaluation Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement Performance Appraisal for Non-Faculty Employees</td>
<td>Increasing participation rate</td>
<td>Number of appraisals completed and filed in human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continued increase in participation in 360-degree evaluations</td>
<td>Number participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing paper required by the process</td>
<td>Increased use of electronic transmission and storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved development of employee goals</td>
<td>Goals more specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved admission processes</td>
<td>Improved communication with prospective students</td>
<td>% student complete check-in process by third week of semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate with inquirers within 10 days of inquiry</td>
<td>% student receiving phone call within 10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Evaluate University achievement of general education outcomes</td>
<td>Benchmark against peers with national evaluation tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate program-level achievement</td>
<td>Internal program assessment data used for program revision and improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8R2 – Performance Results for Accomplishing Strategies and Action Plans

The University of St. Francis in 2006 could have been compared to a runner just out of the starting blocks, leaning forward, picking up speed, and slightly off balance. Strategic Plan 2004 – 2006 was developed by a new administration in its first year in order to give impetus to changing the University from an insecure and fragile institution with little sense of its strengths, challenges and capabilities to a self-confident, continuously improving university with a clear sense of direction, an understanding of the characteristics of institutional quality and the desire to achieve both. The Vital Focus process was used as part of the means to develop the plan and as a part of our effort to qualify for AQIP and to identify and select action projects.

Strategic Plan 2004 – 2006 action steps were developed by implementation teams who developed detailed action steps, with milestones at approximately quarterly intervals. A Strategic Plan Implementation Committee, comprised of the project directors, met monthly to review progress. Progress on each project was reported annually. Concrete results from the 2004 – 2006 Strategic Plan include development and implementation of tenure, Campus Master Plan, assessment process, non-faculty Performance Appraisal, development of the Administrator and Staff Council to give non-faculty a voice in decision-making, development and improvement of retention processes and analysis and revision of admission processes.

Strategic Plan 2006 – 2011 was approached more systematically, by using internal and external environmental scans, benchmarking where possible and insisting that the measurement of achievement be kept clearly in mind throughout the process. As a result, Strategic Plan 2006 – 2011 is more specific in actions and clearer about knowing when the desired result is achieved, or at least when improvement occurs. The planning process was discussed in greater detail in Sections 8P1 – 8P3.

Accomplishment of strategies and action steps in Strategic Plan 2006 – 2011 were much easier to evaluate because metrics were built in as it was developed. In addition, the Strategic Plan has been reviewed annually against external and internal trends.

8R3 - Projections of Performance or Targets of Strategies and Action Plans over the Next 1-3 Years

In Spring 2007 the University began to require that performance measurements must, where possible, be evaluated by setting targets. Some, such as retention (below) use external benchmarks as reference points or to set expectations. Others, such as then percent of general education courses taught by full-time faculty, use internal benchmarks or baseline points.

Several examples are given below:

Retention: Improving retention was a strategic issue in the 2004-2006 Strategic Plan and continues to be a strategic issue in the 2006 – 2011 plan. USF has tracked retention data for over a decade using the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange as a source for external benchmarking (Table 8.6). The data shows improvement in retention from first to second year
and in the six year graduation rate over time. Based on the improvement and on comparisons with national averages, the retention goals for 2011 are:

First to second year: 80% consistently
Six year graduation rate: 60% consistently

These goals were set two years ago and the results are approaching the goal. If the rates continue on consistently, a review of the goals and benchmarks will be conducted.

Table 8.6 Retention Data and Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>to 2nd Year</th>
<th>to 3rd Year</th>
<th>in 4 Years</th>
<th>in 5 Years</th>
<th>in 6 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USF</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately Selective Priv. Inst.</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goals for student engagement and satisfaction are also tracked as part of the University’s plans to improve retention rates. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is used every two to three years to assess student involvement. Results are compared to national averages, similar Carnegie groups, and a consortium of Catholic institutions. Table 8.7 gives the most recent results compared to national averages (National and Carnegie results were similar).

Table 8.7 NSSE Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Yr 2004</th>
<th>Yr 2006</th>
<th>Projection 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Academic Achievement</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active and Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enriching Educational Experiences</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive campus Environment</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ significantly higher -- significantly lower ^ no significant difference

The series of student satisfaction surveys from Noel Levitz are used to assess students’ satisfaction with services and learning. Goals are to maintain a significant statistical positive advantage in the scale of Academic Advising and improve two other scales, Student Centeredness and Campus Life, to meet national averages. Other scales are to continue to at
least meet national means. Additionally, the University plans to reduce performance gaps in satisfaction for university’s services with no survey gap larger than 1.0.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs): Table 8.8 shows those KPIs that have had projections of goals set for the year 2011 (the end of the current strategic plan). Some benchmark data has not yet been gathered.

Table 8.8 Example Dashboard and Key Performance Indicators and Projected Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL I: QUALITY</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Classes Taught by Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average On-Campus Traditional Class Size</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Campus Student: Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL IV: GROWTH AND SHAPE OF STUDENT BODY</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman High School GPA</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman ACT Score</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen in Top 25% of High School Class</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Cohort 2005 Cohort 2006 Cohort 2007 Cohort 2008 Cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Retention (to 2nd Year)</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Cohort 2001 Cohort 2002 Cohort 2003 Cohort 2004 Cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Graduation (in 6 Years)</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8R4 –Results for the performance of processes for planning continuous improvement compared with the performance results of other higher education institutions and, if appropriate, of organizations outside of higher education?

This information is contained in 8R3, above.

8R5 - Evidence Of Effectiveness Of System For Planning Continuous Quality Improvement. Measuring and Evaluating Planning Processes and Activities

The AQIP Action Project on Admissions Processes provides an example of evidence for the effectiveness of continuous quality improvement. Admission Processes served as a catalyst not only for admissions but also for other units within the university by revising or developing new processes that supported recruitment strategy and service to prospective students. As a result, personnel from various departments, including student life, financial aid and academic areas, became more engaged in the recruitment process with personalized and timely communications and processes. As a result, on-going relationships were established with students. The most dramatic evidence realized from this project was with the traditional undergraduate Fall 2005 freshmen and transfer entering classes with an increase from 157 to 192 freshmen and 177 to 197 transfers. While the third year of the Action Project focused on Degree Completion and Graduate Admissions, comparative data is unavailable at this time due to phasing out of a program and implementing a new program.
Improvements (I)

8I1 - Improving Processes and Systems for Planning Continuous Improvement

In order to integrate institutional quality improvement with the AQIP accreditation process, Bruce Foote, Executive Director of Financial Aid, developed the team structure shown in Fig. 8.9. These teams are organized by the AQIP categories and have the role of assessing the processes in their category on an on-going basis. These teams undertake annual environmental scans including reviewing best practices, propose quality improvement initiatives and are responsible for up-dating their category section in the Systems Portfolio. Some of these quality improvement initiatives are selected to be AQIP action projects.

Figure 8.9 Quality Improvement and AQIP Category Teams

In order to improve institutional understanding of how various planning processes are integrated, Dr. Jerry Kickul, Vice-President of Information Technology, diagrammed the relationships (Fig. 8.10). This diagram has been used to demonstrate how strategic planning, quality initiatives (including AQIP action Plans), budgeting and planning, and assessment are linked. This linkage is included in a mandatory AQIP presentation to all USF employees.
8.12 - Selecting Processes For Improvement and Targets for Improved Performance

In general, each planning body at the University of St Francis is expected to develop target or benchmarks that will be used in the assessment of progress being made toward each specific goal. This process began in 2004 with the development of the Campus Master Plan. This master plan based the future campus size and expansion on enrollment targets. Subsequently, we have monitored university enrollments and have made comparisons against the targets (see Table 8.9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.9 Campus Master Plan Projections versus Actual Enrollments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP Forecast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the institution begins the action planning for phase 2 of the campus master plan the planning committee is assessing the original enrollment target by comparing the actual enrollment numbers and the targeted figures from the campus master plan. During the phase 2 planning the updated enrollment data will be used to determine what will happen during the second phase planning.

This process of developing targets and that assessing progress towards specific goals is being incorporated in the institution’s new strategic plan implementation. The new strategic plan report form will include areas for Goals/Objectives, Measurement/Indicator, Baseline, Benchmark, Aspirational Target and Responsible Party to make clear the guidelines and responsibilities for the successful accomplishment of each action plan.