
STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR VIRGINIA

Overview

2000 INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGIC PLAN PROGRESS REPORTS

SUBJECT

On November 21, 2000, the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) approved transmitting its summary of the 2000 Institutional Strategic Plan Progress Reports to the Governor and the General Assembly.

This document includes:

- Brief background information about the strategic planning process at Virginia's public colleges and universities.
- Executive Summary of SCHEV's 2000 Institutional Strategic Plan Progress reports
- SCHEV recommendations to improve the Commonwealth's strategic planning process.
- General observations by SCHEV on the institution's responses to quality, accessibility, accountability and affordability issues in the strategic plan.
- Detailed matrices on each of these issues, with institution's specific responses.

BACKGROUND

- Item 131 of the 2000 Appropriation Act states that “pursuant to the recommendations of the Governor’s Commission to Evaluate the Needs and Goals of Higher Education in Virginia in the 21st Century, it is the intent of the General Assembly that institutions develop strategic plans that promote and sustain the quality, access, accountability, and affordability of Virginia public institutions of higher education.” Pursuant to the Act’s requirements, Virginia public higher education institutions were asked to provide reports related to these principles no later than October 15, 2000.
- Since the mid-1990’s public higher education institutions in Virginia have submitted annual reports to the Council detailing their progress on issues of concern to the Commonwealth, such as Restructuring, Program Review, Technology Initiatives, etc.
- This year the focus of the reports was on the institution’s progress in achieving the goals identified in their institutional strategic plans.
- The report used a matrix format that requested specific information to be provided in relation to various aspects of their strategic plan strategies.
- Each institution submitted a series of five matrices related to various aspects of their strategic plan:
 - **Matrix 1:** “Efforts to Improve Quality of Instruction, Public Service, Research and Student Life;”
 - **Matrix 2:** “Efforts to Maximize Student Access and Minimize Cost to State and Students;”
 - **Matrix 3:** “Increase Administrative Efficiency and Productivity;”
 - **Matrix 4:** “Other Strategic Plan Initiatives;” and
 - **Matrix 5:** “Enhancing Institutional Performance.”
- The Institutions reported spending between 60 and 573 staff hours to complete the report. The average time (based on those institutions that provided this information) was 125 hours.

State Council of Higher Education for Virginia



Review of The Strategic Plan Progress Reports For Virginia's Public Colleges & Universities

Pursuant to Item 131 of Chapter 1073, 2000 Acts of Assembly

November 21, 2000

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since 1995, institutions of higher education have been submitting annual progress reports. Initially, between the periods 1995 through 1997, these reports focused on progress in restructuring efforts and were termed annual “Restructuring Reports.” In 1998, procedures changed to reflect broader efforts of restructuring, strategic planning, and assessment. In 1998 and 1999, these reports became known as the “Consolidated Reports;” – reports that demonstrate the progress institutions have made in each of these three planning and assessment activities.

As a result of the 2000 General Assembly session, the language was changed again to reflect efforts that tied strategic planning to resource allocation. This action was consistent with both budget guidelines required by the Department of Planning and Budget for submission of biennial budget requests and the recent initiative adopted by the Blue Ribbon Commission called the Institutional Performance Agreement. The new Appropriation Act language was revised to recognize that restructuring was an ongoing activity and was encompassed in agency strategic planning. Accordingly, the reports are now called Strategic Planning Progress Reports.

The current Appropriation Act language requires colleges and universities to report annually on the progress made in meeting strategic plan objectives. Working with the Office of the Secretary of Education and money committee staff, SCHEV staff developed a reporting structure of matrices based on statewide objectives in each of the following four areas: 1) Quality: instruction, public service, research and student life; 2) Accountability: administrative efficiency and productivity; 3) Affordability/Efficiency: maximize student access and minimize cost to students and the state; and 4) Other Strategic Plan Strategies. In addition, a matrix for Enhancing Managerial Autonomy and Streamlining Operations also was developed. To provide an indication of how much time this effort took, the institutions also were asked to report the numbers of person hours it took to complete the report.

It appears that the instructions for developing institutional strategic plans provided to the institutions in the winter of each even year do not follow the same emphasis that is given in the Appropriation Act. The Act specifically requires institutions to report progress on meeting the statewide goals of quality, access, accountability, and affordability. There are two inherent problems with the current process for strategic planning and assessing progress:

- 1) The Act language requires that the colleges and universities develop their strategic plans within the framework of the statewide goals of quality, access and accountability, and affordability. Unfortunately, this language was amended in 2000, after institutional strategic plans had been developed. Therefore, institutions did not have the benefit of this directive prior to developing their plans in 1999.
- 2) Even if the statewide goals had not been provided in the Act in advance of the development of the plans, the requirements for statewide goals are outlined in the Act in the Secretary of Education’s section. Because instructions for development of strategic plans are generic, and distributed by the Department of Planning and Budget (DPB), the requirements for meeting statewide goals is not readily communicated in DPB’s guidance. This has led to a “disconnect” between the two efforts. As a result, SCHEV has found it difficult to have colleges report on progress in meeting system-wide goals when they were not asked to respond to these goals in the development of their plans.

The concept of tying strategic planning to budgeting is a good one. However, it is also important to communicate statewide goals in the process. Therefore, an ideal system would allow for the integration of system-wide strategic planning and institutional strategic planning. Indeed, last

year the State Council endorsed a strategic plan development and reporting cycle that was designed to achieve this end.

The cycle proposed would connect the Virginia Plan (Virginia's statewide strategic plan for the system of higher education) with the development of the individual institutional strategic plans and the institutional progress reports. These reports would then tie into the development of the new Virginia Plan. This process would be cyclical over a two-year period. Simply put, each effort would inform the other. That is, the Virginia Plan would provide the institution with information about statewide goals so that the institution could develop strategies for achieving statewide goals as well as its own goals. Then the institution would report, one year later, on progress it has made in achieving its own goals as well as its role in achieving the statewide goals. Lastly, these progress reports would provide useful input into the development of the next statewide strategic plan. This iterative process seems to make most sense in achieving both institutional planning and statewide planning.

The process for the recent Institutional Strategic Plan Progress Reports (and the earlier Restructuring Reports and later Consolidated Reports) has been problematic from both the institutional as well as the Commonwealth perspective. The reports do not always provide meaningful data/information for evaluating institutional performance in relation to their strategic plans. Indeed, one institution recommended in their response to Matrix 5 that the Strategic Plan Progress Report be eliminated.

While the Reports of Institutional Effectiveness, which will be available on July 1, 2001, will provide some of the information that is of interest in terms of public accountability for higher education, identification of the progress that specific institutions are making on the implementation of their strategic plans remains of interest to policy makers in the Commonwealth. In addition, assessing progress made by institutions in implementing their strategic plans is an important effort for the institution as well. One would expect that Boards of Visitors and the administration of a college or university would find an annual assessment of progress made toward achieving its goals and objectives a useful effort. Therefore, SCHEV staff does not believe such an effort to be onerous. However, it does appear that a refinement to the existing process is necessary. Like the institutions, SCHEV staff has been frustrated by the recent reporting efforts. The SCHEV staff feels that the Institutional Strategic Plan Progress Reports should be providing important information about the individual higher education institutions to the Commonwealth. The staff believes that Commonwealth needs to implement a systemic and integrated approach, like the one described above, to achieve the development of meaningful reports that will benefit state policymakers, Boards of Visitors, and the institutions themselves.

In spite of the difficulties outlined above, SCHEV staff has completed an analysis of the materials sent by the institutions and have highlighted the strengths and weakness of the reports in each of the matrix areas. SCHEV staff has tried to capture some of the most important insights provided in the documents and to present them in the most succinct manner possible. For each matrix, a summary of general observations, common themes, and institution specific observations is provided.

SCHEV RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are provided for consideration to improve the strategic planning process and to make the Strategic Planning Progress Reports more useful to state policymakers, the Boards of Visitors, and the institution.

Recommendation 1. Provide training to institutions in development of their strategic plans and progress reports.

Terminology for development of strategic plans is outlined in the Department of Planning and Budget's "Handbook on Planning and Performance." The same person(s) who is primarily responsible for the development of the institutional strategic plan should: 1) attend DPB training sessions to ensure proper format of the strategic plan; 2) should also be the person completing the progress report to ensure consistency. In addition, SCHEV should conduct a training session in the Spring, when the instructions are distributed, to train persons at the institution in completion of the progress reports. This would help alleviate some of the problems encountered with terminology.

Recommendation 2. Develop an integrated system of system-wide strategic planning and institutional strategic planning.

The cycle proposed would connect the Virginia Plan (Virginia's statewide strategic plan for the system of higher education) with the development of the individual institutional strategic plans and the institutional progress reports. These reports would then tie into the development of the new Virginia Plan. This process would be cyclical and would occur over a two-year period. Simply put, each effort would inform the other. That is, the Virginia Plan would provide the institution with information about statewide goals so that the institution could develop strategies for achieving statewide goals as well as its own goals. Then the institution would report, one year later, on progress it has made in achieving its own goals as well as its role in achieving the statewide goals. Lastly, these progress reports would then provide useful input into the development of the next statewide strategic plan. This iterative process seems to make most sense in achieving both institutional planning and statewide planning.

This would mean that SCHEV would have to have the Virginia Plan completed by Spring in each even year, which would require a Code change. In addition, this recommendation would require that the Department of Planning and Budget write separate guidelines for development of strategic plans for the institutions of higher education or delegate the development of supplemental guidelines for higher education institutions to SCHEV.

Recommendation 3. Require performance measures in strategic plans.

In the guidelines for development of institutional strategic plans, there should be a requirement that performance measures related to each major goal/objective be included. This would make assessing annual progress reports easier. It would also provide a tool for the institution, Board, and policymakers to use in assessing their own progress.

Matrix 1 Efforts to improve quality of instruction, public service, research and student life

General Observations On Quality Initiatives

- Many colleges have failed to define measurable objectives, so there's little or no data in the reports. The reports appear to be more action plans than outcome reports. Baseline data, if provided, are 1999-2000 figures, and results are promised in the future but few are currently available.
- Without an historical context and baseline data, progress cannot be assessed, so the reports generally describe process, strategies, and resource needs rather than progress in achieving targeted outcomes.
- The plans are focused more on the quantity and quality of inputs to instruction, research, public service and student life than on outputs. More evidence of specific plans to enhance student or faculty performance would have improved the reports.
- Distinctions are not always made between mission, goals, objectives, and strategies. Examples of each of these appear across all columns. Many items do not appear to relate to quality of instruction, research, service or student life, and measures oftentimes are not clearly related to objectives (example: an objective to improve student mastery of content knowledge, and the measure is student retention rates)
- It's difficult to get a sense of where the institutions are going and what they are trying to achieve. The objectives are either so broad that they sound like mission statements, or so detailed that the larger picture of what the college is trying to achieve is lost.
- Colleges sometimes left the resource column blank or used it in many cases to attribute the inability to achieve objectives to the lack of resources. Resource requests were overwhelmingly for capital improvements—buildings, technology, and personnel although in many cases they did list “staff time” of existing personnel as the mechanism for achieving the stated goals.

Consistent Themes Across Institutions

Reading through the reports, several themes emerged in each of the matrices that were common across most, if not all, of the institutions. These themes can be viewed as reflecting the current priorities of the higher education system in Virginia.

- Public service and partnerships with business & industry, K-12, and other institutions
- Learning communities –enhancing the academic culture and strengthening the first year experience
- Technology –enhancing capabilities of infrastructure, support, and integrating technology with instruction
- Research –increasing dollars in sponsored research and increasing undergraduate student involvement in research
- Global issues –internationalizing the curriculum, increasing study abroad
- Capital budgets –inadequacies of state level support for higher education

Selected Institutional Observations

Christopher Newport University

Although baseline data were sometimes not provided, not available, or not clearly defined, the college's progress report outlined in some detail strategies focusing on increasing selectivity in admissions, strengthening academic advising, and fostering a richer academic culture and environment. The college has targeted specific academic programs for enhancement—programs consistent with its mission as a selective liberal arts undergraduate institution. The strategic plan also highlighted the college's commitment to fully implement the master site plan.

College of William and Mary

The College's plan included goals and objectives aimed at enhancing the use of technology in teaching and learning, maintaining high retention and graduation rates for undergraduate students, and enhancing faculty-student interaction for undergraduates. Baseline data were often not provided, not available, or not clearly defined, but the plan described progress toward broadening faculty involvement in programs and partnerships with K-12 education and other higher education institutions.

George Mason University

Baseline data were often not provided, not available, or not clearly defined, but the University appears to be maintaining target outcomes for reducing class size, increasing faculty numbers and research dollars, and revising the general education curriculum.

James Madison University

Operating and capital budgets were the focus of the college's progress report. JMU presented evidence that resources are inadequate to address enrollment growth or to implement strategies to improve performance measures. Baseline data were sometimes not provided, not available, or not clearly defined. Improvements related to instructional technology infrastructure and support were highlighted in the report, and the University appears to have made progress in expanding honors programs and experiential learning opportunities for students.

Longwood College

Baseline data were often not provided, not available, or not clearly defined, but the college reported that they are moving forward with plans to improve career services, increase service learning opportunities, increase the number of faculty and staff, and upgrade the campus network for instructional technology. Progress is being made in identifying competencies for graduates, particularly in the area of technology. Plans for capital improvements also were addressed.

Mary Washington College

Goals and objectives for the College are focused on instruction, and results exceed baseline data in almost all areas. The college is making progress in reducing student to faculty ratios, maintaining faculty salaries at the 60th percentile, and recognizing and rewarding good teaching. A computer competency requirement for graduates was implemented, and the number of faculty and students involved in undergraduate research has increased. Program offerings at the James Monroe Center also have been expanded and efforts are being made to better tie program reviews to resource allocation decisions.

Norfolk State University

Baseline data were often not provided, not available, or not clearly defined, but the University has made progress in defining student outcomes and increasing the number of course offerings and internships available to students. Strategies are in place to encourage more faculty/student research, and the university exceeded its goal in reducing the student loan default rate by 10%.

Old Dominion University

Baseline data were sometimes not provided, not available, or not clearly defined, but the plan provided a broad list of strategies to improve assessment of general education outcomes (writing and technology) and strengthen undergraduate advising and the first-year experience. Quality improvement of distance education was a focus of the report in terms of enhancing technology and improving student learning. Increasing graduate admission standards, funded research, and the number of internship placements were also addressed. A number of strategies were described to internationalize the curriculum, diversify the student body, and strengthen partnerships with the military and other higher education providers.

Radford University

Although baseline data were not provided, not available, or not clearly defined, the report indicated increases in student satisfaction with the campus environment and the general education program. Instructional formats have been broadened to include distance learning, study abroad, flexible scheduling, and student involvement in research. Outreach programs have been strengthened and the number of partnerships with other education providers has been expanded.

University of Virginia

The University's strategic plan focused heavily on operating and capital budgets to support a comprehensive plan for strengthening programs in science and technology, integrating research with teaching, and increasing partnerships with business and other education providers. Opportunities for involvement of undergraduates in research and distance education and technology-assisted learning offerings have increased. Funding required to retain and hire top-quality faculty, provide indigent care through the medical college, and improve student residence halls also was addressed.

University of Virginia's College at Wise

Baseline data were sometimes not provided, not available, or not clearly defined, but the plan describes strategies focused on improving support for student and faculty research, ensuring student computer competencies, increasing opportunities for service learning and internships, and piloting learning communities to strengthen the first year experience.

Virginia Commonwealth University

Baseline data were not provided, not available, or not clearly defined, but targeted outcomes were set for retention rates, research rankings, accredited programs, service learning course enrollments, and student to faculty ratios for the years 2001-2005. Additional information available in the University's draft IPA was frequently referenced.

Virginia Military Institute

For the most part, baseline data were not provided or not available, but targets in many areas were clearly defined. Strategies were described for recruiting, developing, and retaining top-quality faculty; assessing and enhancing student performance in general education and the majors; increasing international opportunities; strengthening technology infrastructure and support; building a strong co-curriculum; and modernizing facilities.

Virginia Tech

Baseline data sometimes were not provided, not available, or not clearly defined, but the University is collecting data and setting targets for increasing outreach services and partnerships, funded research, and opportunities for study abroad, and enhancing programs in computing, information and communications technology. Data indicated that learning communities resulted in improved grade performance, more credits completed, and higher level of student involvement in campus life. The University has completed a number of resource gap analyses to be used in biennial budget preparation.

Virginia State University

Baseline data were not always provided, or available, or not clearly defined, but the University is setting target outcomes for strengthening teacher education and other selected programs, developing and implementing degree programs in high demand technology areas, increasing and diversifying opportunities for sponsored research and cooperative extension, and increasing student persistence and graduation rates.

Richard Bland College

Baseline data were not provided, not available, or not clearly defined, but the college described strategies for increasing the number of re-certification courses offered for area teachers, strengthening quality control for off-campus programs, improving articulation with four-year colleges, expanding art offerings, and systematically reviewing assessment results.

Virginia Community College System

Although baseline data were not provided, not available, and not clearly defined, the VCCS progress report outlined in detail accomplishments and strategies for strengthening workforce development programs, expanding partnerships with business and industry and other education providers, increasing internship opportunities, enhancing technology infrastructure and support, and expanding distance education opportunities for students.

Matrix 2
Efforts to maximize student access
and minimize cost to students and the state

General Observations on Access and Affordability

- Matrix 2 provides a look at a broad number of issues. The institutions had a number of different interpretations of what constituted student access. While the objectives given for access were creative and resourceful, there was a lack of focus on minimizing costs.
- There were several recurring themes related to student access. Raising funds, increasing student recruitment activities, and goals for improving student persistence/graduation were the most common among the objectives listed. Also included were objectives to increase access via technology, additional building space, and community involvement on the campus.
- The institutions presented evidence that they had reached, or were making significant progress towards reaching the majority of their goals. However, the institutions can do more to either create objectives or identify on-going efforts in all of the following areas at each of the campuses.
- Many of the institutions focused narrowly on only one or two themes for this Matrix. Too little was documented about efforts to minimize costs, make use of technology, and achieve a diverse student body. The presentation of the objectives needs to be improved by providing better constructed objectives, identifying targets and results, and listing the changes planned.

Consistent Themes Across Institutions

- **Raising funds for student grants and scholarships.**

Eleven of the sixteen four-year and two-year colleges listed objectives designed to increase the amount of funds available for student financial aid. The focus was evenly split between increasing aid from private donors and from state funds. Most of the institutions had either reached their goals or gave evidence of making steady progress in reaching their stated goals.

- **Minimizing costs to the student and the state**

“Student access” is subject to various interpretations and was the basis for a number of creative objectives from the institutions. However, it was disappointing that less than half of the institutions listed objectives that specifically addressed the goal of minimizing costs to students and the state. Christopher Newport University proposed finding alternative sources of revenue to finance some of their programs and identifying funds that could be reallocated from within the institution. Mary Washington College and George Mason University each had specific goals to keep

student tuition and fee costs low as compared to other state institutions and Virginia State University plans to hire a cost accountant to keep track of the growth rate of the cost of administration and finance activities.

- **Use of Technology**

While few institutions listed objectives centered on making greater use of technology, several institutions in Matrix 2 did make it a major issue in relation to using distance education. Virginia Tech and Old Dominion University listed several objectives designed to improve and expand their distance learning programs. Virginia Community College System also made delivery of course work via distance learning a high priority. Longwood College reported focusing on increasing the availability and use of its campus network to off-campus users, the availability of interactive video classrooms, and support for the Southside Virginia Education Network.

- **Buildings**

While not a major objective among all of the institutions, two institutions felt that new construction was needed in order to better meet the needs of the students and/or community. Completion of the Center of the Arts and the Sports and Convention Center was listed by Christopher Newport University while Mary Washington College listed the new James Monroe Center buildings as a means to improving community access to their campuses and to improve the student experience. The University of Virginia's College at Wise listed improving the use of their library by off-campus students as an objective.

- **Student Recruitment**

Almost all of the institutions listed objectives related to increased efforts in student recruitment. These objectives took many forms depending upon the desired result. In some form, all of the objectives within this matrix are rooted in the effort to increase the number of students either via direct recruiting efforts or indirectly by providing a desirable campus experience. The College of William and Mary's primary objective was to find more students while also attracting better students. Longwood College and the Virginia Military Institute were the only two that specifically mentioned the need to address minority enrollment numbers and Richard Bland College addressed increasing its non-traditional student population.

- **Student Persistence**

Student access is empty unless the student is able to benefit from it. With this in mind, most of the institutions included objectives that focused on improving the performance of students already enrolled on the campus. The objectives included improvement of graduation rates and retention rates, student services, and identification of students at risk.

Selected Institutional Observations

Christopher Newport University

Christopher Newport University provided a detailed, diverse, and comprehensive report with major themes related to increasing resources, minimizing costs, and improving student performance.

College of William and Mary

The College of William and Mary had a strong report that followed students from the time they entered the College to graduation. They demonstrated their commitment to monitoring how well their students were prepared for graduate school by tracking acceptance rates into various graduate programs.

Longwood College

Longwood College provided objectives that covered a broad range of activities. They paid special attention to using technology to improve access.

Mary Washington College

A diverse plan listed objectives in all of the major areas of access and minimizing costs. Mary Washington College's report was very thorough in covering the issues in this area.

Old Dominion University

Old Dominion University's report provides numerous initiatives related to providing access by using technology. They also reported on successful efforts in improving their graduation and retention rates and in obtaining additional funding from private sources. Old Dominion University listed changes that needed to be made in several areas as a result of actual results coming in below original targets.

Richard Bland College

Richard Bland College presented diverse objectives that paid particular attention to areas affecting the student experience and performance. There was a clear focus on building partnerships with area school divisions to increase the number of dual-enrolled classes at area high schools.

Virginia Commonwealth University

Virginia Commonwealth University provided substantial information that showed they were very successful in meeting their objectives in recruiting students.

Virginia Military Institute

Virginia Military Institute identified the need to increase minority and female enrollment through special recruiting activities.

Virginia Tech

Virginia Tech was particularly strong on initiatives related to the use of technology/distance learning.

Virginia State University

Virginia State University provided one of the most diverse and well presented plans focused on minimizing costs, use of technology, and recruitment of students.

Virginia Community College System

The Virginia Community College System reported success in strengthening their distance learning programs.

Matrix 3
Efforts to increase administrative efficiency and productivity

General Observations about Efficiency and Productivity

Review of Matrix 3 was difficult to summarize since there were many differences in the way institutions reported progress. There appeared to be some confusion about definitions of “objectives”, “performance measures”, and “strategies.” Many listed strategies as measures and many of their objectives did not appear to be related to administrative efficiencies and productivity.

Consistent Themes Across Institutions

- Institutions focused on using technology as a means of achieving greater efficiency and productivity both in terms of their delivery of instruction to students as well as in their management operations.
- Several institutions reported on progress in moving toward a paperless work environment.
- Libraries were reported as making increased use of electronic materials and internet resources.
- Out-sourcing of various campus operations was listed by several institutions.

Selected Institutional Observations

Christopher Newport University

While three out of four of Christopher Newport’s objectives had no baseline data, they seemed to be moving toward evaluating and revising assessment activities at the institution.

College of William and Mary

William and Mary’s report focused on administrative efficiencies. They have plans to streamline their computing environment, administrative processes, and upgrade their administrative systems. However, all are dependent upon acquiring sufficient funding. There was no mention of alternatives should the funding not become available.

George Mason University

George Mason University did not complete this matrix.

James Madison University

James Madison's report was succinct and well written. They have met or exceeded their targets for most of the DPB Core Performance Measures listed. They have developed a division of institutional effectiveness and are working to develop an online strategic plan with links to James Madison University's mission and institutional characteristics. They have also outsourced their bookstore, dining hall, and convenience store.

Longwood College

Longwood's review of technology and administrative systems resulted in an increase of 15% in computer applications that are at acceptable levels of technology. Their need for a fully functional automated library system is dependent upon their ability to fund a projected cost of \$250,000.

Mary Washington College

Mary Washington is in the process of developing a web-based registration and academic information system. They are also moving toward a paperless environment.

Norfolk State University

Norfolk State University has expanded contact with corporate and industrial constituents to increase support for scholarships and academic programs. They have successfully trained over 400 faculty and staff on the use of their new student information system. They are also working to automate manual processes in payroll, human resources, and budget.

Old Dominion University

Old Dominion University has met many of their goals, particularly in relation to technologically delivered educational programs, and has implemented a Council of Graduate Administrators. They are also in the process of developing an information and communications (Datamart) system for students, faculty, and staff.

Radford University

Radford showed progress in many areas. They increased staff training, provided computer ports in each of their residential facilities, and increased enrollment by 268 students. Grants and funding through sponsored programs increased by one million dollars since 1998-99.

University of Virginia

University of Virginia's report showed an increase in used book to total book ratio by 3%. This is being done to lower pricing options to students. They increased their sales of supplies by \$.4 million over baseline. They are using best practices to develop fiscal impact statements and business plans, and have completed 24 total business plans and presented them to their Board of Visitors. They have also created a Central University Planning Office. Their report was very professional and demonstrated progress in various areas which are too numerous to mention in this summary.

University of Virginia's College at Wise

University of Virginia's College at Wise is working with the University of Virginia to provide additional training for managers, streamline procedures to manage funding, increase gifts, and track historical records.

Virginia Commonwealth University

Virginia Commonwealth University has made significant progress in many areas. They were able to reduce crimes on campus by 4% from 1998 to 1999. They increased recycling by 11% over their baseline. They were able to keep their utility bills 2% below budget. They reduced paper costs by creating instant HR-email and using this system as their primary source of communication. In addition, VCU increased its number of University owned parking spaces by 665 since 1998.

Virginia Military Institute

Virginia Military Institute improved security and public safety on the Post by upgrading their outdoor lighting. They also upgraded Scott Shipp Hall building locking systems. They have redesigned their organizational structure and created an administrative team approach for improved performance.

Virginia State University

Virginia State University showed improvement in their Facilities Condition Index by 2.8%.

Virginia Tech

Virginia Tech increased their number of library accessible online databases by 75, the number of online journal titles in the Addison library catalog by 605, and increased the number of online electronic journals offering full content by 7,813.

Richard Bland College

Richard Bland was able to implement a new leave tracking system without any additional costs by partnering with Northern Virginia Community College. They also equipped 100% of their phones with voice mail. In addition, they relocated their purchasing management to increase efficiencies.

Matrix 4 Other Strategic Plan Objectives

General Observations on Other Strategic Plan Objectives

- Matrix 4 looked at objectives that institutions could not readily place in other matrices. As a result, there was little consistency in the themes of objectives included or the quantity of objectives listed. Additionally, many of these objectives appeared difficult for the institutions to quantify.
- This matrix did provide a valuable look at some of the institutions' more interesting initiatives, by providing a vehicle for them to report on items that did not fit into the other matrices.
- Only a few institutions provided data that showed measurable progress being made on their objectives. In most cases, the institutions included objectives that were more forward looking and that could not yet be quantified.
- Given the nature of Matrix 4, a significant number of the objectives presented are difficult to quantify. As a result, many of the proposed performance measures do not fully describe institutional efforts or accomplishments.
- Many institutions failed to include baseline data, or simply listed the year of the data, but did not say what the data actually was.
- While some institutions offered quantifiable objectives, many offered objectives where the success would be difficult or impossible to measure.
- As a result of the nature of being the "other" category, there was no consistency in the types of objectives included in this matrix.
- Finally, several of the institutions appeared to view this forum as a budget request document rather than a progress report on meeting their strategic plans.

Consistent Themes Across Institutions

Several themes emerged among the institutions. In some cases, these themes were found in nearly half of the institutions, in other cases, 2-3 institutions offered similar concepts. The following is a list that includes relevant institutional efforts:

- **Workforce Development**

Many institutions recognized and responded to higher education's ever-increasing role in helping the Commonwealth provide workforce development by creating or expanding educational programs to meet the needs of business and industry or by producing graduates in heavy employer demand areas. For example, James

Madison University has created a program that makes advanced manufacturing technology more accessible to industry and provides real world learning experience for students at the same time. James Madison University is also in the process of developing an e-commerce program for students preparing for careers in Internet-based business application. The College of William and Mary has expanded curricular offerings in operations and information technology, e-commerce, and programming languages. Virginia Tech has created AlumNet, a new online initiative for lifelong learning for alumni and others, and proposed the addition of an extended campus facility in the Richmond area to address regional educational and training needs. Old Dominion University has increased the number of graduates in engineering and computer sciences and technology. The Virginia Community College System has developed a statewide marketing plan focused on new workforce training.

- **Economic Development**

A number of institutions responded to their role in the Commonwealth's economic development efforts by promoting partnerships with local and regional business, governments and communities. For example, Christopher Newport University provides small and medium-sized businesses with e-commerce service/products. Norfolk State University has 30 business partners in the Industry Cluster program. Old Dominion University actively promotes various cooperative relationships in the Hampton Roads by participation in the Hampton Roads Economic Development Alliance and the Virginia Research and Technology Advisory.

- **Enhance University Identity**

A number of institutions appear to have begun efforts to increase their recognition, either within their local communities or on a more national scale. Such efforts include Radford University increased efforts on its public relations campaign. University of Virginia at Wise has used the Internet as a marketing tool. Norfolk State University has restructured its Governmental Relations office to increase its visibility and effectiveness with the legislature.

- **Outreach and Partnership Efforts**

Recognizing the value of shared resources, community participation, and the opportunities for student and faculty development opportunities, a number of institutions proposed the creation of partnerships. Christopher Newport University has as a main objective the creation and promotion of partnerships with local and regional schools systems, governmental agencies, and others. James Madison University has several programs or partnerships in K-12 education including, a regional best practices center with a grant from the Department of Education, and is in the development of a new Academy for Teaching Excellence. Old Dominion University and Virginia Tech have also proposed the creation of partnerships.

- **Emphasis on Research and Increasing Doctoral Degrees Awarded**

Two of the Commonwealth's doctoral institutions indicated an increased emphasis on research (Virginia Tech and Virginia Commonwealth University). In addition, William and Mary, among other institutions, indicated a desire to increase the number of doctoral degrees awarded.

- **Campus Safety**

A few institutions reflected their commitment to providing a safe environment by starting campus safety training programs and improved facilities (Longwood College, Old Dominion University and University of Virginia at Wise).

- **Campus Diversity**

Two institutions, Virginia Commonwealth University and Old Dominion University, have specific objectives related to enhancing university diversity.

- **Career Services**

Two institutions, Norfolk State University and Old Dominion University have specific objectives related to enhancing career services, such as increased internships and career workshops.

Selected Institutional Observations

Christopher Newport University

Christopher Newport University is working hard to build community partnerships, including the possible establishment of a Governor's School for the Arts in partnership with the regional school systems.

College of William and Mary

The College of William and Mary has increased the number of doctoral students and degrees awarded to better reflect its mission and increase its national stature. Some of the listed objectives of the College of William and Mary seemed very specific and might be combined into a few broader objectives.

George Mason University

George Mason University wants to improve the persistence rates of first-year students through increased mentoring and advising by full-time faculty.

George Mason University indicates that it seeks to be more accountable, but did not provide any baseline data, target outcomes, or anticipated results.

George Mason University has an objective of increasing the number of graduate students, which is relevant to the institution's mission, but only offers increasing the number of scholarships as the vehicle for achieving change

James Madison University

James Madison University's objectives address statewide issues such as workforce development and creating partnerships with other institutions and local businesses.

James Madison University has begun efforts to identify and implement specific academic competency measures.

James Madison University's performance measures do not seem to relate to rest of the information in the matrix. As a result, it is difficult to assess the institution's progress and efforts in meeting their objectives

Longwood College

Longwood College has committed resources to improving faculty and staff development. Longwood College's performance measures would be more impressive if they were more clearly output related.

Mary Washington College

Mary Washington College did not include any items in Matrix 4.

Norfolk State University

Norfolk State University has restructured its advancement office in order to increase private giving.

Norfolk State University is moving to make email accounts available to all students.

Old Dominion University

Old Dominion University has reallocated funds to meet most of their objectives. They have also has increased the number of mini-grants for faculty to internationalize General Education courses, and created the Council for International initiative with Title IV grant to provide seminars abroad in the summer.

While Old Dominion University's objectives are clear and laudable, the performance measures do not seem to be specific enough to measure the success in meeting the objectives.

Radford University

Radford University has used mostly its own existing funds to meet their objectives.

Radford University did not provide specific baseline data or actual results.

University of Virginia

The University of Virginia is planning to improve parking and transportation services to students, faculty and staff.

The University of Virginia's objectives and performance measures appear to be both specific and reasonable thus making the document clear and understandable.

University of Virginia College at Wise

University of Virginia College at Wise has included the objective of improving the comfort, safety, and aesthetic qualities of campus.

University of Virginia College at Wise did not include data/results so assessing their success in meeting the objectives is not possible.

Virginia Commonwealth University

Virginia Commonwealth University included very broad objectives that relate clearly to the institution's mission.

Virginia Commonwealth University, in order to minimize somewhat duplicative efforts, requires the reader to have read the institution's IPA in order to adequately assess their objectives and success to date.

Virginia Military Institute

Virginia Military Institute did not include any items in Matrix 4.

Virginia State University

Virginia State University did not include any items in Matrix 4

Virginia Tech

Virginia Tech has developed several measurable objectives to meet the federal and state mandates such as ADA and health and safety compliance.

Richard Bland College

Richard Bland College provided data that indicated progress on their strategic plans was being made.

The objectives offered by Richard Bland College seemed to be more strategies than objectives.

Virginia Community College System

Virginia Community College System' objectives indicate that they are striving to help the Commonwealth address its workforce needs.

Virginia Community College System is using many of its own current resources to address their objectives.

Virginia Community College System provided data that indicated progress on their strategic plans was being made.

Matrix 5
Proposals for enhancing managerial autonomy and streamlining operations

General Observations

- Virginia Military Institute did not submit a Matrix 5;
- Richard Bland College stated “None to Date,” on Matrix 5;
- Virginia State University’s Matrix 5 was blank;
- Longwood College reported “No plans for decentralization at the present time” on its Matrix 5;
- University of Virginia’s-College at Wise – said to see University of Virginia’s report.

Most frequently identified changes desired by the institutions:

- MEL elimination was most frequently cited desired change - **9 institutions**.
- Use of yield on tuition/fees, deregulation of lease authority, property acquisition authority, deregulate technology and telecommunications procurement, eliminate central accounts deposit of nongeneral funds, and, restructure year-end reappropriation - **5 institutions**.
- Extend capital & lease pilots, eliminate approval of temporary facilities, deregulate purchasing/procurement, make payroll and non-payroll pilots permanent, make voluntary use of prison industries - **4 institutions**

**Matrix 5:
Complete List of Changes Desired**

Proposals	Institutions
Elimination of MEL	CNU, JMU, MWC, ODU, RU, GMU UVA, VCU, VPI
Extend NGF Capital and Lease pilot	CNU, ODU, UVA, VPI
Eliminate Strategic Plan Reports	CWM
Funding for Enterprise Resource Planning System	CWM
Eliminate approval for temporary facilities	JMU, GMU, UVA, VPI
Deregulate surplus property auctions	JMU
Deregulate Higher Education Equipment Trust Fund procedures	JMU, UVA
Deregulate purchase/procurement requirement, and make pilots permanent.	JMU, RU, UVA, VPI
Deregulate motor vehicle purchase/lease	JMU, UVA, VPI
Eliminate Secretary of Education out of state conference approval	JMU
Deregulate the use of yield on tuition/fee revenues	JMU, RU, GMU, UVA, VPI
Deregulate state compensation requirements	JMU, UVA
Deregulate delinquent accounts collections	JMU
Eliminate P-14 hour restrictions	JMU
Deregulate lease authority and make pilot permanent.	JMU, GMU, UVA, VCU, VPI
Deregulate property acquisition approval and make pilot permanent.	JMU, GMU, VCU, UVA, VPI
Eliminate Academic Program Approval	MWC, ODU
Delegate the authority of technology related and telecommunications procurements from DIT to the institution	NSU, ODU, UVA, VCU, VPI
Permit autonomy to payroll and nonpayroll processing, and make pilots permanent.	NSU, UVA, VCU, VPI
Raise capital project threshold up to \$500,000	NSU
Extend nongeneral fund capital outlay pilot to general fund projects	ODU, UVA, VPI
Simplify maintenance reserve reporting	ODU, RU, VCU
Eliminate Bureau of Capital Outlay Management approval for buildings	ODU, UVA, VCU
Use prison industry on voluntary basis	ODU, UVA, VCU, VPI

Proposals	Institutions
Eliminate central accounts deposit of nongeneral funds	ODU, JMU, GMU, VCU, VPI
Eliminate draw down requirements	ODU
Eliminate monthly reconciliation	ODU
Eliminate fluctuation analysis	ODU, JMU
Restructure year-end reappropriation	ODU, RU, JMU, UVA, VPI
Set aside consolidated salary authorization	RU, GMU
Reduce mandatory reporting requirements	RU, VPI
Establish centralized administrative system	GMU
Simplify the capital outlay approval process	RU, GMU
Eliminate Bureau of Capital Outlay Management from the design review process	UVA, VCU
Deregulate building permit authority	UVA, VCU, VPI
Deregulate fire/safety compliance process	VCU, UVA, VPI
Deregulate Construction and A&E service authority	ODU, VCU, VPI
Delegate the approval for the campus Master Plan to the Board of Visitors	VPI
Delegate the authority of investment of Depreciation Reserve Fund and local funds to the Board of Visitors	UVA
Allow netting of financial transactions before depositing with the state	UVA
Reduce Higher Education Equipment Trust Fund holding period to 3 years	UVA
Allow for a min 30 days to collect documents required for an audit process	UVA
Expand the definition of "original invoice" to accommodate electronic media	UVA
Allow the procurement of pcs and associated peripherals without based on performance-based specifications	UVA, VCU
Credit medical center with the imputed interest on its nongeneral fund cash balances on deposit with the state	UVA
Discontinue providing annual reports to Department of Risk Management and Employee Dispute Resolution	VCU
Eliminate quarterly reporting of sole source procurements over \$10,000	VCU
Eliminate preparation of allotment requests for nongeneral fund programs	VCU
Automate the Personnel Management Information System and an Benefits Employee System file transfer processes	VCU

Summary of Hours Needed To Complete The 2000 Strategic Plan Progress Report

For several years the institutions have expressed concern about the time needed to complete the annual institutional report – this year called the Strategic Plan Progress Report. Part of this year’s report asked the institutions to provide the number of person hours that went into completing the report. Six institutions did not provide this information. The range for those institutions reporting varied widely, from 60 hours to 573 hours, with 125 hours as the average number of hours reported as needed. Information on each institution’s report on the time needed to complete the report is contained in the table below.

NAME OF INSTITUTION	Number of Person Hours Needed to Complete Report
Christopher Newport University	129 hours
College of William and Mary	Over 140 hours
George Mason University	None reported
James Madison University	170 hours
Longwood College	Approximately 60 hours
Mary Washington College	About 110 hours
Old Dominion University	None reported
Norfolk State University	None reported
Radford University	Approximately 60 hours
University of Virginia	Cannot give number of hours
University of Virginia’s College at Wise	None reported
Virginia Commonwealth University	None reported
Virginia Military Institute	Approximately 573 hours
Virginia State University	Approximately 180 hours
Virginia Tech	220 hours (estimate)
Richard Bland College	Approximately 60 hours
Virginia Community College System	None reported

DETAILED MATRICES

Matrix 1: “Efforts to Improve Quality of Instruction, Public Service, Research and Student Life.”

Matrix 2: “Efforts to Maximize Student Access and Minimize Cost to State and Students;”

Matrix 3: “Increase Administrative Efficiency and Productivity;”

Matrix 4: “Other Strategic Plan Initiatives;” and

Matrix 5: “Enhancing Institutional Performance.”