Preparing for the future:

The organization’s allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

CSU’s processes for evaluation and planning have a long history, over which time they have been refined and institutionalized throughout the campus. The University community has embraced the value of strategic thought leading to strategic action as the very fabric of the institution’s decision-making process. Planning on campus is an ongoing and open process that involves information gathering, heightened attention to relevant trends, the clarification of CSU’s future and, finally, the outlining of campus priorities. Currently, the University, under the leadership of its new president, is grappling with plans that will address its new focus on Mission Differentiation, while at the same time, keeping intact the solid planning foundation laid by Vision Unlimited.

Introduction: Traditions and Values in Planning

CSU’s traditions and values are the inspiration for current planning activities leading to Mission Differentiation. At CSU, we “transform the people who transform the economy.” The campus planning environment actively incorporates the following institutional values and heritage:

- CSU is at the heart of the region’s economic and civic life and firmly believes that the city is our campus;
- The institution is a key point for higher education access for Northeast Ohio citizens, and as a result of this, the social conscience of our faculty is high, as it has been shaped by years of mentoring older and non-traditional students;
- CSU supplies the workforce, talent, and leadership for business, government, and nonprofit organizations;
- The University educates for the health care and bioscience industries and has the potential to bring varied disciplines to help inform health-related issues;
- Successful entrepreneurship (and the revitalization of the Northeast Ohio economy) requires coupling transformational technology with translational business talent, and this synergy defines CSU today; and
- The University plays a crucial role in attaining the nation’s and state’s goals of increasing the number of bachelor’s degrees.
Core Component: 2a. The organization realistically prepares for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends.

Evidence that Core Component 2a. has been met.

As noted in Chapter 4, CSU’s current Strategic Plan, Vision Unlimited (http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/planning/documents/VisionUnlimited.pdf), represents the culmination of work initiated by campus leadership in 2002. At that time, it was noted that CSU was entering a time of challenge, with increased competition, dwindling state support, and high expectations for campus programs and services. More than ever before, students had a variety of choices for pursuing their college education and for CSU to be successful, the institution was going to require a clear vision for improved services. Further, this vision would need a plan for action that could effectively marshal and direct the University’s energy. With this in mind, an ad hoc University Planning Steering Committee (UPSC (http://www.csuohio.edu/committees/uspc/uspc.html)) was established, launching a “planning to plan” phase. It was anticipated that this exercise would result in the formal adoption of a planning process that was ongoing, collaborative, open and transparent, and involved the active participation of all stakeholders. The UPSC evolved into the USPC (University Strategic Planning Committee), whose charge is to ensure that strategic planning is a grass-roots process that remains relevant to the goals and visions of each and every unit, college, and division. (Detailed information on the history of Vision Unlimited can be found at the Self Study website (http://www.csuohio.edu/committees/selfstudy2010/documents/2a History of University Strategic Planning.pdf)).

Campus-wide Strategic Planning

Working with available planning documents and the impetus for ongoing strategic planning, the University Strategic Planning Committee launched efforts to involve the University community in the strategic planning process. Strategic Planning University Review (SPUR) sessions were scheduled periodically to address pertinent developments at CSU.

SPUR I: November 2005

In November 2005, the inaugural Strategic Planning University Review (SPUR) was held to finalize the goals, strategies, and tactics of the Strategic Plan. The University Strategic Planning Committee (USPC) reviewed 91 Departmental and Divisional reports to identify strategies and tactics crucial to CSU. The leadership of the University was invited to attend, including Faculty Senators, the Senior Administrative Team, Deans, Student Leaders, and Board of Trustees Officers.

The first SPUR agenda included activities to focus and finalize strategies and tactics to support actions aligning with the six goals identified in CSU’s Strategic Plan (http://www.csuohio.edu/committees/uspc/goals.html) (Academic Excellence, Solid Financial Foundation for Advancement, Collaborative Organizational Culture, Commitment to Student Success, Valued Community Resource, and Distinctive Image with a Vibrant Environment). Outcomes from this initial review provided the USPC with identifiable actions to promote and monitor within the University. It was also decided that such a session should continue annually to improve communication among campus leaders and to facilitate the ongoing strategic planning efforts.
SPUR II: April 2007
In April 2007, the USPC hosted its second annual Strategic Planning University Review (SPUR II) to continue the conversation among leadership and to seek answers to specific planning questions. The USPC used the same broad format used in the first SPUR session to maximize interaction among all 56 participants.

Participants responded to questions relating to metrics (Key Progress Indicators, or KPIs), the Master Planning process involving physical expansion and capital outlays, budget integration, and collaboration within the University. SPUR II provided valuable information to the USPC. Suggestions were made to improve the metrics for each of the six goals, to better link the Master Plan to the Strategic Plan, to develop formal procedures for updating the Master Plan, and to better communicate about space use and changes on campus. The groups discussing the relationship between budget and strategic planning suggested an annual retreat between these two campus committees as well as the creation of a special fund to support new initiatives in the Strategic Plan.

SPUR III: March 2008
A key outcome of the collaboration between the Provost’s Task Force on Excellence and Engagement (https://mycsu.csuohio.edu/committees/uspc/documents/Recommendations-TFEE.pdf) and the USPC was the change of focus for SPUR III. The USPC’s prior plan to focus on Master Planning paled in comparison to the timeliness of the new branding mechanism, Engaged Learning, and its challenges and opportunities for all academic units.

Two of the USPC’s goals for SPUR III were to increase University-wide participation and move toward expanded community involvement. A summary of key outcomes for Engaged Learning that emerged from the SPUR III discussion groups included the following challenges: Engaged Learning is time-consuming, and the majority of CSU students are part-time and/or commuting with other life spheres that require engagement (e.g., family, work); reward structures are needed for students, staff and faculty who commit to Engaged Learning; and finally, the assessment of community needs and baseline data to assess our initiative’s progress is essential. The opportunities identified at this session included enhancing the students’ transition from the role of a student to the roles of a worker and citizen, drawing upon the richness of the urban setting and the knowledge and experience of community experts, highlighting CSU’s established record of engaged learning, and finally, utilizing technology to facilitate Engaged Learning programs and activities.

SPUR IV: November 2008
As noted earlier, USPC, due to an extensive and intensive internal, grass-roots planning process, had identified six goals set forth in Vision Unlimited. Within this time period, Ohio’s Chancellor of Higher Education charged state universities with developing Centers of excellence suited to their respective settings and missions. At CSU, working within the goals of Vision Unlimited, the Provost’s Task Force identified Centers in Health and Civic Life and Community Engagement. SPUR IV (Theme: Our Path to Excellence) was designed to address the challenges of initiating the Centers and evaluating their impact upon the University.

A review of the outcomes that emerged from the SPUR IV discussion groups comprised of com-
Community and University stakeholder representatives identified congruence with the six umbrella goals set forth in Vision Unlimited: a common commitment to excellence, a distinctive image, the need for collaboration as well as the need for a solid financial foundation. A review of the participants’ comments revealed several common observations that might contribute to an action plan for the future. These included:

- Assess internal Centers and programs and external environmental scanning of stakeholders’ expectations and needs;
- Define key concepts of health and civic life, of the nature of partnerships, and of existing University Centers as they relate to research and practice;
- Clarify both physical (new building/space) and functional (staffing) needs of Centers;
- Address funding issues, including start-up funds, for the Centers, as well as concerns regarding the impact of Center funding on other needs of a comprehensive university;
- Increase networking with both internal and external stakeholders, including faculty in programs/disciplines, alumni, current students, school districts, the business community, and arts, civic and social organizations; and
- Examine traditional incentive structures and create new incentive structures for faculty and students. For example, explore options for credit for service learning, internships, co-ops, etc.

Alignment of University and State Higher Education Goals

As noted in Chapter 4, the State of Ohio recently restructured all the universities, community colleges and career centers into one system, with the goal of improving the quality and efficiencies of higher education in Ohio. One of the system’s mandates is that each university, and especially the four that serve Northeast Ohio, differentiates its mission from that of the others. The system’s Chancellor issued a Strategic Plan for Higher Education (http://uso.edu/strategicplan/) in 2008, detailed later in this chapter, identifying a health focus for CSU. This focus is in line with the academic strengths of the institution, especially as they align with the economic and civic needs of the metropolitan region we serve. In addition to CSU, the Cleveland area includes the Cleveland Clinic (http://my.clevelandclinic.org/), Case Western Reserve University (http://www.case.edu/), University Hospitals (http://www.uhhospitals.org/), the MetroHealth System (http://www.metrohealth.org/), and several prominent start-up companies focused on health care. The Chancellor’s plan called the campus community to engage in introspection and thoughtful, planned action.

These Signature Themes and Centers of Excellence dovetailed with the March 2008 SPUR III’s identified “opportunities” such as enhancing the students’ transition from the role of a student to the roles of a worker and citizen and drawing upon the richness of the urban setting and the knowledge and experience of community experts.

Health-focused Initiatives:
The State System’s Plan for Higher Education also calls for an increase in CSU’s health-related research funding and an emphasis on a unique
student experience in the academic areas under the health care rubric. CSU has already begun to implement some new programs and Centers that are responsive to the community’s health needs, as described later in this chapter.

NEOCOM
The creation of the University System of Ohio opened up new opportunities for CSU to become part of the regional medical school called Northeast Ohio Universities Colleges of Medicine and Pharmacy (NEOUCOM [http://www.neoucom.edu/]). Prior to 2008, this medical school was a consortium that included the University of Akron, Youngstown University, and Kent State University. CSU is in the process of becoming a full partner in this consortium via the new Ohio System. This change provides the citizens of the Greater Cleveland area the access they need to public medical education. As the details of this merger are refined, CSU contemplates the possibility that students entering NEOUCOM will focus on applied urban health issues including urban primary care.

Undergraduate Degree Attainment
The Chancellor of the University System of Ohio [http://uso.edu/] has also set a goal of educating an additional 230,000 people to a bachelor’s level over the next 10 years, primarily to increase Ohio’s overall workforce education level to be competitive with other states in the region and in the nation (see Ohio’s Strategic Plan for Higher Education [http://uso.edu/strategicplan/]). A significant portion of these thousands of graduates will come from a non-traditional pool. CSU’s history of older students, returning students and transfer students from community colleges places the University in an excellent position to respond to these trends and goals.

Mission Differentiation and CSU Centers of Excellence
During 2008-2009, several campus-wide events and forums involving over 500 faculty and staff participants were sponsored to consider the ideas outlined for CSU in the OBOR system plan. These included a Task Force on Excellence and Engagement, the Strategic Planning University Review (SPUR), Faculty Roundtable, meetings in each College, and an administration retreat (Campus Roundtables on Centers of Excellence). Various campus constituencies studied the full range of academic and research initiatives that had been proposed for CSU. These groups analyzed the campus strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities in the areas of academics, research and student/community engagement. Through these discussions, various priorities emerged that were authentically home-grown and fundamentally a part of CSU’s culture and ethos. The work of these groups led to CSU identifying its Centers of Excellence in Health and Sustainable Communities. The University’s Board of Trustees and its Academic Affairs Committee carefully reviewed and discussed these proposed Centers of Excellence and endorsed them as CSU’s signature academic strengths.

In the summer of 2009, CSU submitted to the Ohio Board of Regents (OBOR) three Centers of Excellence developed in response to the University System of Ohio Strategic Plan for Higher Education. Under the Signature Themes of Health and Sustainable Communities, the three CSU Centers of Excellence are as follows.
The Center for Gene Regulation in Health and Disease
(http://www.csuohio.edu/sciences/grhd.html)

The most established of the three Centers of Excellence, “GRHD” focuses on exploring genetic and molecular causes, prevention, and treatment of disease. The research being conducted by the Center’s academically outstanding and nationally funded staff has significant potential to improve the understanding of the mechanisms and specific molecules that control reproductive health and the aging process, as well as to discover implications for the diagnosis and treatment of many of the most common diseases, including cardiovascular disease, neurological disease, infectious disease, and cancer.

Two other Centers beginning to take shape are The Center for 21st Century Health Professions and The Next Generation Economy Center. The Center for 21st Century Health Professions is a structuring of work that has been taking place at CSU for decades – preparing high-quality health care and bioscience industry professionals for Northeast Ohio to ensure excellent care for its citizens. The Next Generation Economy Center combines the engaged scholarship and reflective practice of economic development public policy with business development and entrepreneurship. It exists to foster a competitive economic climate in the State and to improve entrepreneurial and business development by providing national leadership thinking on the connections between business strategy and management and the economics of regional development.

CSU’s established expertise in economic development policy formation and evaluation has made it a model of interdisciplinary teamwork within and outside of the University. The Center’s aim is to improve Ohio’s economic climate, change the entrepreneurial climate of Northeast Ohio, and educate the people who will generate the new economy.

University-wide Task Forces and Planning Initiatives

A host of positive and successful initiatives have created a sense of purpose and pride on campus for many successive years. Given that the campus needs to embark on the path of defining a new health care identity for its academic mission, it appears that the ground has been primed for this transition.

Admission Requirements

In early 2003, a significant planning initiative involved reassessing the University’s open access mission through a campus-wide task force. From its founding in 1964, CSU had followed a policy of open admissions for first-year undergraduate students. The University admitted all graduates of accredited Ohio high schools or GED recipients on a first-come, first-served basis up to the limit of available facilities. Clearly, college graduation since that time has had a positive economic impact on the individual students and on the community. Today, however, Ohio’s public universities are judged and funded by whether or not first-time, full-time freshmen remain at CSU and graduate, measures deeply impacted by student input. Based on an analysis of successful CSU students, the University now promotes success by admitting freshmen who are academically prepared, as demonstrated by the three criteria below:

- Completion of 13 units of the state-specified, core curriculum in high school, 4 units of English and 3 units each of mathematics, social science, and natural science. (Additionally, 2 units of foreign
language and 1 unit of visual/performing arts are strongly recommended).

- Attainment of at least a 2.3 grade-point average (GPA) in high school.

- Mandatory completion of the ACT or SAT with a minimum score of 16 or 750, respectively. Students taking the new SAT should earn a minimum combined score of 750 on the math and critical reading sections.

With these criteria serving as the basis for regular admission, the University also offers provisional admission to students who do not fully meet them. As a result, the new admissions standards were initiated in fall semester 2006, where two of the three admission criteria were required for admission. Full implementation requiring that all three criteria be met was implemented in the fall semester 2008, when provisional students were limited to part-time study (11 hours or fewer). Under this plan, the University honors its access mission while enhancing the overall academic quality and success of its first-year students. An analysis of the first-year-over-year freshman retention showed a 9% increase in fall semester 2009, an encouraging sign reinforcing that the University made the correct decision on admission standards.

**Results of the new admission requirements:**
As noted above, the new admission standards were initiated in 2006 and fully implemented in 2008. The average ACT composition score has increased since 2004 (Book of Trends 2009 [http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/iraa/bot/bot2009.pdf], p. 120).

Only the 2008 freshmen cohort have completed a full year of college since full implementation of the new admission requirements. The retention of the fall 2008 cohort (65%) was the highest in more than five years (see Book of Trends, 2009 [http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/iraa/bot/bot2009.pdf], p. 97).

**Bar Passage Rate**
The bar passage rate for first-time test takers from Cleveland-Marshall College of Law reached 90% in February 2010. This was a direct result of the Bar Passage Plan initiated in 2004 in response to the Board of Trustees challenging the Cleveland-Marshall College of Law to place among the top law schools in the state on the bar exam. The Bar Passage Plan includes admitting a smaller and stronger 1L class and a comprehensive bar support program. Since 2006 our graduates’ Ohio bar results have shown a consistently positive trend, placing us among the top Ohio law schools.

**Honors Program**
In AY 2002-2003, the Faculty Senate Academic Steering Committee formed a sub-committee to discuss an Honors Program [http://www.csuohio.edu/honors/] for CSU. The Committee was comprised of 14 faculty members. The charge to the Committee was to examine the need for an Honors

### 5.1 Entering First-time Freshmen ACT Score 2004 – 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average ACT score</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program at CSU, and if this made sense for the University, to develop a curricular structure, an administrative structure, and an implementation plan. The Committee’s work resulted in recommendations to the Faculty Senate Academic Steering Committee in November 2002 that led to the inception of the CSU Honors Program (http://www.csuohio.edu/honors/). The CSU Honors Program was inaugurated in fall semester 2004 with 40 exceptionally talented students, and has grown into a program of over 200 students.

The first class of Honors freshmen was admitted for fall 2004; junior-level Honors students were first admitted in 2005. Admission standards for freshmen were a minimum ACT score of 27 (raised to 30 for the 2006 class) or class rank in the top 10%. Junior admits were required to have a cumulative GPA of at least 3.5. In 2008, the University Scholars program (http://www.csuohio.edu/honors/scholarshome_new.html) was added: admitted students were required to have an ACT score of 27 or class rank in the top 10% (a proposal to lower this to top 15% was approved on May 5, 2008 by the University Faculty Senate).

The program has successfully enrolled and educated a significant number of high-achieving students since its inception, as shown in Table 5.2.

As a contrast, the CSU Book of Trends, 2009 reports that the average ACT score for new CSU students in 2008 was 20.7.

Graduation rates for the initial cohorts of Honors students have been well above the average for CSU as a whole. Among lower division students, 75% of the 2004 cohort graduated from CSU by fall semester 2009 (52% with Honors), and 64% of the 2005 class graduated from CSU by fall semester 2009 (44.4% with Honors). Several students in the second cohort are still active. The Book of Trends reports graduation rates for those years for the broader CSU student population as 15.6% (2004) and 17.7% (2005). Seventy-five Honors students were admitted as juniors between 2005 and 2007. Ninety-two percent of those graduated by 2009; 79% received University Honors.

The goal of enhancing the intellectual and academic experience of the overall student population

### 5.2 Honors Students Entrance Data 2004 – 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Top 10% of High School Rank</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Composite</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Composite</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1266.5</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>1953*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High School ranking, GPA, ACT and SAT scores reported are for “active” and “lower level” students only.

*SAT Composite for 2009 (shows combined 3 scores)
is met, in part, by requiring Honors students to take most of their credit hours in traditional coursework and to take their major classes with non-Honors students. Not only are Honors students integrated into virtually every classroom on campus, but they are also heavily involved in tutoring other students (through T.A.S.C., the TRIO program, the Math Learning Center and a variety of informal study groups in the various classes that they take).

The Honors Program also affects the broader University by serving as a laboratory for curricular innovation. A good example is the program’s role in encouraging the use of the “Reacting to the Past” curriculum in courses at CSU. Reacting to the Past is a curriculum first developed by Barnard College and now supported by a consortium of colleges and universities. It engages students by requiring them to participate in classroom-based “games” in which they learn about and role play important historical events, characters and ideas. The Honors Program has supported several faculty members’ attendance at “Reacting to the Past” workshops. They have taught the curriculum as regular classes (Eng 102), Honors General Education classes (HIS 271H), Universal Honors Experience courses (HON 201) and regular classes (HIS 271). Several other faculty will attend workshops in summer 2010 and develop new courses incorporating the curriculum for both Honors and non-Honors students.

The Honors Program’s need for General Education courses has offered faculty opportunities to develop innovative courses both within disciplines and across disciplinary lines. Several of these are courses that did not previously exist in any form at CSU – a cross-disciplinary course on Science, Technology and Society, a music course that incorporates performances in the Cleveland area, an introductory economics course on game theory (using sophisticated mathematics) and a course on environmental ethics are some examples. Instructors have also developed and offered enriched versions of existing courses in areas such as physics, calculus, the history of Cleveland, and religious studies.

Honors students have also been active collaborators in faculty research programs. In both 2008 and 2009, 16 Honors students participated in funded summer undergraduate research experiences that resulted in posters presented the following fall. Students in the Honors program have also co-authored published papers in various disciplines, including Ryan Richard’s collaboration with Professor David Ball in Chemistry, Max Orseno’s collaboration with Professor Kiril Streletzky in Physics, and Nouffisa Zanati’s collaboration with Professor Mekki Bayachou in Chemistry. Others have presented papers at local, state and even national conferences in a variety of disciplines.

**eLearning**

In 2004-2005, an internal planning Committee on For Profit Competitors was established to assess what CSU’s competitors were doing that the University could be doing better. One of the recommendations of this group was that we develop an “e-learning” strategy, implemented through a new office on campus designated as the hub of such instructional activity. CSU trustees took an active interest in this recommendation and propelled the growth of e-learning to new heights by adopting a resolution to pursue this option. The newly created eLearning office (http://www.csuohio.edu/elearning/) provided faculty development, advice on what courses to offer and how to organize the material. Table 5.3 shows that over the past six years, headcount enrollment in online and web-blended
Enrollment Challenge

In 2006, the University retained two firms, McKinsey & Company and Stamats, to examine the underlying reasons for declining enrollments and help to focus on student success, recruitment and retention. Stamats conducted a student retention review, a marketing review and a recruiting review on campus that involved studying an array of institutional documents and processes, conducting interviews, and making extensive site visits. They issued findings on CSU’s recruitment and retention strategies. McKinsey & Company consulted with campus leadership on how best to attract more and better-prepared students, how to retain, graduate and place them, and how to engage alumni. These reviews resulted in an overall Roadmap for Enrollment Growth, which was followed for the next three years. The Roadmap for Enrollment Growth, managed by the President and Senior Staff of the University, focused on nine areas for improvement, five areas of enrollment enhancers, and four areas of tools for improvement. These included:

- Develop a University culture for student success,
- Organizational change,
- Operational change,
- More recruiting, and
- Initiatives affecting retention.

Tools included:
- Better use of the Web,
- Greater availability of scholarships,
- Greater emphasis on career services, and
- Systematic marketing.

All together, 83 separate initiatives were identified and assigned to senior staff members to complete. Many internal processes were reengineered. For example, new departments were developed, such as Campus 411, a one-stop service center for students to address administrative questions. The Advising Office was restructured. Student Affairs created a new Undergraduate Studies Office in Academic Affairs. Two new positions for faculty as Special Assistants to the President for Student Success were created. Online student services were extensively developed, and recruitment was totally reengineered. All of these initiatives resulted in significant enrollment growth over the past few years.

Student Retention and Graduation

For the past decade (1999-2008), CSU’s fall-to-fall freshmen retention rate has averaged 61%. There are no evident trends even with the introduction of mid-term grades for freshmen in 2002. As noted previously, the University retained two firms in 2006, McKinsey & Company and Stamats, to assist with declining enrollments and help to focus on student success, recruitment and retention. A series of initiatives began in 2007, beginning with decentralized advising in the spring and the forming of Undergraduate Studies in Academic Affairs in the fall. The tentative hypothesis for the high retention rate for the fall 2008 cohort (66%) is the full implementation of the new admission standards, which dramatically enhanced academic support i.e., (supplemental instruction, tutoring), and learning communities. If the
5.3 Recent eLearning Enrollment History as Measured by Student Credit Hours

5.4 Fall-to-Fall Freshman Retention Rates
1999 – 2008
retention rate remains constant or increases for the fall 2009 cohort, the hypotheses that new initiatives have contributed to change will have further support.

From 1996 to 2001, the six year graduation rate increased from 24% to 32%. The rate dropped to 26% for the fall 2002 cohort and has rebounded somewhat for the 2003 cohort. We can find no good explanation for the low rate in 2005. The retention for that year was low (59%), but it was also low for fall 2003. Extensive efforts are now underway to improve graduation rates, including the formation of a Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee focusing on undergraduate success and graduation rates; the Committee began its work in April 2010. As recent research suggests a correlation between higher retention and graduation in universities, the University will strive to increase retention rates for those who begin their higher education at CSU or have transferred from another institution.

**General Education Task Force: 2005-07**
([http://www.csuohio.edu/organizations/facultysenate/Generaleducationtaskforce3-20-07-2.doc](http://www.csuohio.edu/organizations/facultysenate/Generaleducationtaskforce3-20-07-2.doc))

In order to update the quality and relevance of the General Education curriculum, a faculty-led Task Force spurred major reform of General Education programs. Faculty met with various constituencies within the University, considered national discussions on the topic, and investigated approaches to general education at other universities. The final recommendations of this Task Force resulted in course revisions that touched most departments on campus, and in 2007, this reform movement culminated in a full implementation of the new General Education program, which is a very significant milestone for the University in its efforts to raise the curricular bar for its students.

### 5.5 Six-year Graduate Rates Freshman Cohorts 1996 – 2003

![Graph of Six-year Graduate Rates Freshman Cohorts 1996 – 2003](image-url)
The Task Force on Excellence and Engagement

This campus-wide committee was established in 2008 to plan ways to best implement the Chancellor’s 2008-2017 Strategic Plan. This committee’s findings to establish a Center of Excellence in Health and in Civic Life and Community Engagement became the precursor to CSU’s current Centers of Excellence in Health and Sustainable Communities.

During 2008, the CSU Board of Trustees, the President and the Vice Presidents took on the charge of “branding” CSU with the phrase Engaged Learning. The introspection of the strategic planning process had brought this theme forward. To the CSU community, Engaged Learning meant everything from the bond between students and professors that facilitates academic success, to a partnership with the greater Cleveland community that could solve the major problems facing the city twice labeled as “the poorest city in America.” CSU is the only public university in the Cleveland area that has been engaged with the community since its inception. The new branding/renewal paved the way for CSU to be recognized for its true elements as the institution that had grown over the years, without many external forces or internal analysis, to be recognized as “a steward of place in the region.” With new external pressures on CSU from the Chancellor to define a unique health niche, obtain Mission Differentiation, and play a role in the economic development of the region, in 2008, it was time to take Cleveland State’s institutional strength and publicly affirm it as a campus slogan. One result is the adoption and strong support for Engaged Learning.

Collaborative Initiatives with Other Ohio Higher Education Institutions

As described in Chapter 8, the University has developed strong relationships with Cuyahoga Community College, Lakeland Community College, and Lorain County Community College to provide a multitude of opportunities for 21st century mobile learning in Greater Cleveland and Northeast Ohio. Partnership Programs, housed in Enrollment Services, is responsible for facilitating these relationships.

Dual admission agreements with these three community colleges provide the umbrella for curricular articulations to thrive. Students enrolled in technical associate degree programs (i.e., dental hygiene and engineering technology) are recognizing the need to obtain their bachelor’s degrees for career advancement. Under the dual admission agreement, curricular articulations that accept technical credits for various majors within the University can be quickly implemented. Ongoing discussions with our partner institutions provide insight into students’ curricular and service needs, both of which are continually adapted to fulfill these needs.

Collaboration with other Ohio community colleges is increasing. A recent transfer student analysis identified additional two-year colleges whose students chose CSU to continue their studies. Efforts such as the creation of new transfer guides and a new transfer website are underway to ease student transitions.

CSU and Regional Economic Development

CSU is poised to meet the educational and economic development needs of Cleveland and
Northeast Ohio. During the last several years, the University has forged strong partnerships in the community, has been actively engaged in research projects, and has strengthened its academic and training programs in an effort to respond to both private and public sector economic development needs of the region. For example, the Nance College of Business Administration has created the Nance Global Business Innovation Lab, which focuses on the development of products and services to support regional ventures in developing a global footprint. The College has also assisted in creating a “Hydrogen Energy Roadmap” that will help to establish a better understanding of the potential uses of hydrogen as an economic driver in Northeast Ohio. The Levin College of Urban Affairs is one of the nation’s best known centers for economic development education and research. The College offers four degree programs and two certificates relating to workforce development in organizational management and leadership as well as three master’s degrees and a PhD with specializations in economic development.

Core Component: 2b. The organization’s resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

Evidence that Core Component 2b. has been met.

The period of 2000 through 2010 has been a challenging period for Ohio’s state-assisted universities. The state’s institutions of higher learning have faced state subsidy funding challenges, limits on tuition increases, and of late, a revised state funding model. The institutions have begun to adjust to the restructuring of the Ohio Board of Regents as an integral part of the University System of Ohio (http://uso.edu/) (USO), with the emphasis on making up for lost ground in preparing Ohioans to compete in the 21st century economy. The decade has seen several Ohio institutions face enrollment challenges, with most forced to reduce operating budgets several times and to maneuver the delicate balance between increasing tuition and competing for enrollment based on cost of attendance.

CSU has faced these changes squarely and used the past 10 years to strategically improve its image, bolster its enrollment, and strengthen its financial foundation. Moreover, through prudent planning and allocation practices, CSU possesses sufficient financial resources to support quality programs of Engaged Learning.

Background

Goal 6 of Vision Unlimited addresses the role of resource allocation through the University’s budget process. This process supports the ongoing assessment of priorities as the external political and economic environment changes. Early in the decade, the University reinforced the strategic management of its resources as a key underpinning of its growth and development. Attention to the University’s operating budget was recognized by every unit on campus, and this practice continues to the present day. While budget enrollment projections still mirrored history, trends were showing that CSU could expect a drop-off in its enrollment during the 2000’s. As Table 5.6 shows, total enrollment measured in student credit hours (SCH) fell nearly 9% from FY 2003 to a low point in FY 2007. One of the first measures undertaken was to involve each academic College, the Admissions Office and the Budget Office in developing more realistic estimates
with which to plan enrollment (tuition revenue) for a given fiscal year. This initiative also impressed on all units that enrollment growth and retention was the responsibility of everyone in the University, not just the areas directly involved in these functions. Since then, the University’s continuing efforts in recruitment and retention have reversed the downward trend in enrollment and instructional fee revenue.

The University’s other main source of operating revenue, state subsidy, has not kept pace with the trends in the cost of higher education as measured by the HEPI (Higher Education Price Index) and the broader market measure, the CPI (Consumer Price Index). As Table 5.7 shows, state subsidy declined nearly 9% from FY 2001 to the low point reached in FY 2007. This decline pattern is similar to the University’s enrollment pattern for the same period.
In order to make up for the decline in state subsidy, the University was forced to increase tuition, which was, in part, responsible for the decline in enrollment (see Table 5.8).

Despite these increases, CSU has been able to maintain its undergraduate tuition at an affordable level and compares favorably with other Ohio public four-year institutions. According to the Ohio Board of Regents Fall Survey of Student Charges, CSU is the fifth least expensive four-year institution for in-state resident undergraduate tuition and the second least expensive for non-resident undergraduate tuition out of 13 four-year institutions (see Table 5.9).

This standing has been achieved, in part, with the aid of challenging cost reduction decisions. When state subsidy does not keep pace with the rising costs of energy, health care, and personnel, and there is a limit on the level of tuition increases, then a reduction in operating expenditures is required, unless enrollment growth provides adequate revenues. CSU has reduced its base (permanent) operating budget three times since FY 2001 in order to balance its budget. The reductions have come in the form of 1) eliminating vacant positions in both academic and non-academic areas, and 2) reducing non-labor operating expenses. The University experienced permanent budget reductions of $7.1 million in FY 2007 and $8.5 million in FY 2010 in order to balance budgeted expenditures with declining revenues. These reductions came after careful review and analysis by each Vice President, Dean and department head to ensure minimal adverse impact on the quality of academic programs.

No discussion of Ohio’s public higher education funding would be complete without considering the shift of the financial burden of a college education to the student over the past decade. As Table 5.10 illustrates, state subsidy comprised 49.6% of CSU’s total operating budget revenue, while student tuition and fees contributed 43.1% in FY 2001. By FY 2009, student tuition financed 58.0% of CSU’s operations, while state assistance funded 36.8%. CSU and the State’s other public universities have gradually become state “assisted” rather than state “supported” institutions, due to lagging state sales and income tax revenues and legislators assigning a higher level of priority to other state programs.

### 5.8 Undergraduate Tuition Rates
2001 – Fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>$ per Credit Hour</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>197.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003*</td>
<td>229.00</td>
<td>16.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>253.00</td>
<td>10.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005*</td>
<td>283.00</td>
<td>11.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>306.00</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>330.00</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>330.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>330.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>330.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two increases occurred during these years.*
Managing Resources

Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC) — One of the primary mechanisms providing consultation over the financial affairs of the University is the Planning and Budget Advisory Committee, which meets monthly. The committee is comprised of the President, the Provost, the Vice President for Business Affairs and Finance (the committee chair), five faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate, two academic deans, a Student Government Association representative, and several ad hoc members, including the University’s Budget Director and the Vice Provost of Planning, Assessment and Information Resource Management. The main functions of this body are overseeing the development of each fiscal year’s budget and monitoring the status of the current year revenue receipts and expenditures. In advising the University on budgetary issues, it considers:

- Economic trends relating to enrollment projections,
- Cost and objectives of new initiatives and programs,
- Debt service levels and the impact on the financial health of the University,
- The State’s budgetary situation,
- Adequacy of current revenue levels and possible tuition increases.

### 5.9 Ranks of Least Expensive Undergraduate Tuition & Fees 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four-year Institution</th>
<th>Ohio Resident Annual Cost</th>
<th>Non-resident Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central State University</td>
<td>$5,294</td>
<td>$11,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee State University</td>
<td>6,132</td>
<td>10,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown State University</td>
<td>6,954</td>
<td>12,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State University</td>
<td>7,533</td>
<td>14,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleveland State University</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,970</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,714</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toledo</td>
<td>8,066</td>
<td>16,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron</td>
<td>8,612</td>
<td>17,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>8,679</td>
<td>22,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td>8,726</td>
<td>16,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>8,973</td>
<td>17,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University</td>
<td>9,060</td>
<td>16,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>9,399</td>
<td>23,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>11,442</td>
<td>26,202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.10  State Subsidy & Student Tuition as % of Operating Budget
2001 – 2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Operating Budget</th>
<th>State Subsidy</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Student Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Other Revenue</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$143,460,804</td>
<td>$71,094,316</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>$61,821,570</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>$10,544,918</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>148,110,507</td>
<td>74,508,566</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>68,743,716</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>4,858,225</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>160,357,534</td>
<td>70,020,565</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>85,708,601</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>4,628,368</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>171,998,321</td>
<td>68,740,005</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>98,036,707</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>5,221,609</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>182,368,219</td>
<td>67,161,065</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>108,411,332</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>6,795,822</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>184,920,079</td>
<td>66,119,963</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>111,724,688</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>7,075,428</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>185,730,447</td>
<td>66,085,466</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>108,912,897</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>10,732,084</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>194,786,325</td>
<td>69,732,270</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>112,277,462</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>12,775,593</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>201,001,161</td>
<td>73,902,000</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>116,677,450</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>10,421,711</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Planned amounts in the fiscal year’s budget

– Policies of competing Ohio public universities, and
– Strategic goals of the University.

The University’s Budget Office develops various budget scenarios for the PBAC’s consideration. Following its analysis and discussion on these scenarios, the committee provides guidance for a particular scenario to the University’s administration for establishing the University’s operating and general fee budgets for the upcoming year. After consideration, the President recommends a budget to the Finance Committee of the University’s Board of Trustees, which makes a recommendation to the full Board. A Board of Trustees vote usually occurs in June, before the start of the new fiscal year on July 1. The PBAC’s operating process is further discussed at the Self Study Website.

The University’s Budget Model: In FY 2002, the PBAC initiated an ad hoc subcommittee charged with the development of a University-wide budget model. The group was chaired by the University’s Budget Director and included College deans, staff members from the Provost’s Office, faculty, and fiscal officers from academic and non-academic units, representing an effort to establish a consistent approach to allocating available resources to academic programs and managing the carry-forward of available funds (unspent budget expenditures) to the subsequent fiscal year. For the first time, individual Colleges were afforded the opportunity to share in some of the one-time surplus or “marginal” tuition revenue resulting from higher-than-planned enrollment, as opposed to having the University centrally retain 100% of tuition revenue. Provided the University’s actual revenues and ex-
penditures balanced, the colleges could use these funds to strengthen and broaden academic activities. Since the model’s inception in FY 2005, a portion of tuition revenue margin has been allocated to the Colleges each year except FY 2009, although the methodologies for calculating those allocations varied significantly from year to year.

The involvement of administrators and faculty in the PBAC and in the development of the budget model has led to a more open approach on financial and budgetary issues at CSU. Without this transparency, it is doubtful that the University would have succeeded in managing the fiscal challenges of the most recent ten years would have taken place. The University has constructed a firm financial foundation, and it has developed sound practices for planning its financial future and reacting appropriately to the conditions of diminished state funding, enrollment uncertainty, and the rising costs of operation. After significant problems involving enrollment levels, faulty student-support systems, and dwindling reserves in the late 1990’s, CSU has rebounded with a favorable reserve position (see table 5.11) and an S&P (Standard & Poor’s) bond rating of “A+” with a stable outlook. S&P’s “A+” rating is an “investment grade” quality credit rating, indicating a strong capacity to meet financial commitments but somewhat susceptible to adverse economic conditions and changes in circumstances within the borrower’s environment (industry) (S&P investment grade bonds are those rated AAA, AA, A, or BBB).

The budget model as described above has undergone many changes since it was first introduced in 2003-2004. The strength of the current model, developed over the past seven years, is that it has been adapted in response to a variety of internal and external developments. Some examples of external developments have included initiatives championed by the Ohio Board of Regents and pressures stemming from fluctuations in the economy and campus enrollment. Internal developments such as changes in campus leadership, tuition freezes, and the desire to seize opportunities in strategic priorities have also led to the temporary modifications of the current budget model. Although the model has served the University adequately, cost-based budgeting has not been fully implemented. CSU continues to address the challenge of developing a consistent, predictable and transparent way of allocating resources.

In that regard, two processes are underway. First, President Berkman recently instituted a mechanism to provide funding for strategic initiatives in FY 2011. Pursuant to an open proposal process, colleges and units can seek substantial amounts of temporary funds to invest in programs or initiatives that align with the University’s strategic initiatives or that promote Centers of Excellence or Signature Themes.

Second, at President Berkman’s direction, a team of academic and administrative leaders will develop a more comprehensive and effective budget model. The goal is to create a methodology that balances consistency and predictability with flexibility and responsiveness. In the recent past, our budget model has been too reactive. During this upcoming process, we aim to develop a budget model that will ensure continued fiscal stability, and also prepare the University to thrive in the future.

Ohio Senate Bill 6 Financial Ratios: Financial accountability for Ohio’s public institutions of higher learning is measured by a set of ratios known as the Senate Bill 6 (SB 6) Ratios, named for the
legislation that created them in 1997. In order to meet the legislative intent of SB 6, the Ohio Board of Regents (OBOR) computes three ratios from which four scores are generated. Depending on the size of the ratio, it is assigned a score of 0-5, according to a methodology also developed by OBOR. A fourth composite score is obtained by weighting each ratio’s score by established OBOR percentages. (Refer to the OBOR website (http://regents.ohio.gov/financial/campus_accountability/index.php) for a detailed explanation of this methodology.) Beginning in FY 2002, the calculation of the ratios and the resulting composite scores employed financial information reported pursuant to Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statements 34 and 35.

The first ratio, the viability ratio, provides a measurement of the institution’s ability to satisfy its debt obligations and is computed by dividing the institution’s expendable net assets by its plant debt. In FY 2009, Cleveland State’s viability ratio was .317, meaning its net expendable assets of $65,545,884 were approximately 32% of its plant indebtedness of $207,067,009. This ratio earned a composite viability score of 2.00, which is weighted by 30%, or .60.

The second ratio, the primary reserve ratio, measures the length of time an institution can operate using expendable net assets and is computed by dividing expendable net assets of $65,545,884 by total operating expenses of $273,255,255. In FY 2009, Cleveland State had a primary reserve ratio of .240, meaning the net assets could provide approximately 70 days of operations. This ratio earned a composite primary reserve score of 3.00, which is weighted by 50%, or 1.50.

The last ratio, the net income ratio, measures how well an institution operates within its level of resources and is computed by dividing the change in total net assets of $8,327,734 by total revenues of $364,925,521. In FY 2009, Cleveland State’s net income ratio was .031, earning a composite net income ratio score of 1.00, which is weighted by 20%, or .20.

The total composite FY 2009 score for Cleveland State’s SB 6 Ratio measurement is 2.30, the sum of .60 + 1.50 + 0. This composite score exceeded the state’s “fiscal watch” status – a composite score of 1.75 or less for two consecutive years (See Table 5.12). Throughout most of the decade, Cleveland State’s composite scores consistently revealed strong financial performance under the state’s criteria. The 2008 and 2009 reductions were the result of...
of the University adding $50 million in energy saving capital improvements, as required by House Bill 251. The $50 million will be amortized over 10 years through energy and operational savings resulting from these improvements.

5.12 Ohio Senate Bill 6 Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Composite Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the composite ratio remains an indicator of fiscal stability, the decline in value beginning after 2005 is attributed to the University’s increased indebtedness from major construction projects, such as the Student Recreation Center, the Student Center, and renovations to the Main Classroom building. From a financial standpoint, these projects require the University to assume a burden of debt service – principal and interest payments – to the lender. From an operational standpoint, these projects are cornerstones of the campus Master Plan and have spurred interest in CSU’s identity as a student-centered institution for both resident and commuter students. The decline also reflects the use of expense savings to balance the budget in FY 2008 and FY 2009, rather than to supplement University reserves. These two fiscal years, along with the current FY 2010, have been some of the most challenging economic periods faced by CSU, and other public and private universities in Ohio as well.

New State of Ohio Funding Model for Higher Education: The new state funding formula for higher education is the determining mechanism for allocating the State’s higher education budget appropriation to its public universities and colleges. A discussion of the new model is necessary, due to the impact it has on the level of state assistance received by CSU. The University is represented in subsidy conferences and consultations with the Ohio Board of Regents by CSU’s Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs along with the Director of Budget and Financial Analysis. The University has taken an active, participating role in the formulation of the model and continues to advocate for the particular circumstances germane to a large urban institution. A detailed history of Ohio’s funding formula can be found at the Self Study website (http://mycsu.csuohio.edu/committees/self-study2010/documents/2b History of Ohio Funding Formula.pdf).

While the formula itself is referred to as a funding formula, it is actually an allocation formula. Since the formula’s inception, very little has been accomplished in grappling with the issues of how and at what level higher education will be funded in Ohio. Instead, it takes the approved appropriation amount from the budget and allocates a share
to each university, state and community college based on an unwieldy and complex formula based upon a number of factors and categorical breakouts. Periodically, there are “subsidy consultations” convened by OBOR to review the formula and discuss changes. Some consultations are routine, and some occur after changes in political administrations, as in 2006.

Recent Changes (2006-2009)

After the election of Governor Ted Strickland in 2006, his administration began instituting changes in the structure and organization of OBOR and directed the completion of a Strategic Plan for Higher Education in Ohio, as discussed earlier. On May 15, 2007, Amended House Bill No. 2 became law in the State of Ohio. Essentially, the bill changed the structure and authority of the State’s nine-member Board of Regents. Prior to the passage of this legislation, Ohio’s Board of Regents was a non-governing body that guided the development of higher education policy and coordinated its implementation. It did not exercise direct management control over public universities and colleges, but made policy recommendations and administered the state subsidy funding process and certain forms of financial aid. The Board was also responsible for approving institutions’ program changes, collecting data, and providing fiscal and operational oversight. The Chancellor of the Board of Regents was the administrative officer of the Board and was responsible for day-to-day operations of the Board’s staff agency. The nine-member Board of Regents had the authority to appoint the Chancellor, who reported directly to the Board.

The bill also required the Chancellor to report to the Ohio General Assembly and on the Governor’s recommendations and plans for:

1. Making Ohio’s universities and colleges more affordable and accessible,
2. Encouraging graduates to remain in Ohio after earning their degrees, and
3. Maximizing higher education as a driver of the state’s economy.

As noted previously in this chapter, Ohio Governor Ted Strickland appointed Eric Fingerhut as the State’s first cabinet-rank Chancellor shortly after the bill’s passage. One of the Chancellor’s first tasks was to embark upon the development of a 10-year Strategic Plan for Higher Education.

Revised Funding Formula – Effective FY 2010

The Strategic Plan called for a re-evaluation of the funding formula effective with the FY 2010-2011 budget biennium. The revised formula for calculating the SSI (State Share of Instruction) rests upon an “outcome” philosophy that consists of three enrollment components: 1) a course completion component (“D” or better grade), 2) a student success component, and 3) an institutional-specific goals and metrics component. There are now 26 course categories, or models, that are grouped into 5 major categories: AH-Arts and Humanities, BES-Business, Education and Social Science, DOC-Doctoral, MED-Medicine, and STEM-Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics. The formula contains a stop-loss calculation that provides temporary stability to institutions when funding decreases precipitously. The new SSI funding formula is based on a total cost approach (the SSI category/model costs are based on a six-year average cost) to allocating funds, eliminating many of the weightings and steps in the prior model that provided differential funding based on individual characteristics at each institution.
The prior formula was based on total enrollment as of the 15th day of the semester, with no distinction for course completion or degree success. In it, the number of course models numbered 16, and the individual course cost was based on one year—the most recent year’s data. Course models were grouped, not by subject field as in the new formula, but by level of instruction: General Studies, Baccalaureate, Master, and Doctoral. A stop-loss provision was a feature of the old formula as well (See Table 5.13).

**CSU’s Budgetary Concerns**

During OBOR’s State Share of Instruction (SSI) consultation meetings held in the summer of 2008, Cleveland State presented its concerns over the construction of the Course Completion and Degree Attainment components.

– With respect to the **Course Completion** component, concern arises over the University resources employed by a student who fails a course. In some instances, more resources may be employed by a failing student versus an “A” student. The failure to recognize this in the formula disadvantages access institutions like Cleveland State.

– On the issue of **Degree Attainment**, CSU argues that there are better measures of “at-risk” students (students with the probability of not graduating) than the surrogate measure of financial need eligibility, which is what the new formula currently uses. In fact, the Chancellor’s own Strategic Plan for Higher Education emphasizes access to higher education in order to serve a larger population of citizens entering college. Providing the resources to support their path to graduation as defined by their demographics is not served by a formula that relies upon a surrogate factor to measure degree attainment.

– In the pending FY 2010–2011 budget bill, there will be language (at the urging of several universities, including CSU) passed that directs the Chancellor to convene a consultation with state colleges and universities to “conduct a study to identify the socio-economic, demographic, academic, personal, and other factors that identify a student as being ‘at-risk’ of academic failure, and recommend how these factors may be used to determine allocations of the State Share of Instruction after fiscal year 2010.” CSU will be represented at this consultation.

– Finally, CSU stated concerns with the **Doctoral Funding** component not moving fast enough for other measures like research activity, quality measures, and degree cost from the historical shares measure based on FTE enrollment frozen at a base level. The new formula calls for movement away from the historical shares weight in increments of 10% over 10 years. In FY 2010, the historical shares calculation will have a 90% weight, in FY 2011, an 80% weight, etc. CSU is disadvantaged by a heavier weighting for the historical shares calculation and urges a lesser weight more quickly for it.

**Efficiencies**

CSU has been proactive in establishing (and participating in) programs to capture efficiencies leading to reductions in University operating costs.

– State of Ohio House Bill 251 Energy Efficiencies – HB 251 began as an effort to meet a state mandate for increased energy efficiency and has evolved into a comprehensive initiative that will guide Ohio’s higher education institutions’ sustainability initiatives for many years. Signed into law by Governor Ted Strickland in January
## 5.13 Comparison – Higher Education Funding Formula

### Fall 2007 – Fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Prior Formula 2007</th>
<th>New Formula 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Based upon total enrollment as of the 15th day of the semester</td>
<td>Three enrollment categories:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Course completion - grade “D” and/or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Student Success-Degree Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Institutional Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Course Groupings</td>
<td>Based upon the level of instruction:</td>
<td>Based upon subject field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>AH – Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>BES – Business, Education, Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>DOC – Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>MED – Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STEM – Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>16 Course Models</td>
<td>26 Course Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Funding</td>
<td>Based on historical shares with FTE established by OBOR</td>
<td>90% weight to historical shares, new weights for cost of degree, research activity and quality measures,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Funding Commision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop Loss</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Costs</td>
<td>Individual course costs were based on a single year’s cost data – the previous year’s data.</td>
<td>Based on a total cost approach – the course models are based on a six-year average total cost approach where many of the weightings provided different funding based on individual institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2007, House Bill 251 addresses energy efficiency in state-funded facilities, including Ohio’s colleges and universities. The legislation requires all state-funded colleges and universities to develop a 15-year plan for implementing energy efficiency and conservation projects with the goal of reducing building energy consumption at least 20% by 2014, using 2004 as the base year. The bill also mandates the development of energy efficiency and conservation standards for new capital projects that require an investment of more than $100,000. The CSU Board of Trustees approved the plan to finance $43 million in equipment and services to achieve the energy efficiency goals of HB 251 beginning in FY 2009. The financing vehicle is a 20-year capital lease, which will add to the University’s debt service requirements.

– Medical insurance plan changes – CSU continually monitors its cost of providing health care coverage as an employee benefit. Effective in FY 2008, the University negotiated several medical insurance plan changes that resulted in annual savings of $1.8 million.

– Collaborations with other Ohio universities – CSU has realized annual savings of $930,000 by combining with other Ohio IUC (Inter-University Council) institutions in negotiating purchase agreements and insurance contracts.

– Position Review Process – CSU employs a process to review requests to fill vacant positions and to create new positions in both the academic and non-academic areas. Depending upon the budget outlook, the Vice President of Business Affairs and Finance may implement hiring freezes, at which time only strategic hires may be made, depending on the nature of the position and available funding.

Management of attrition is an integral strategy for achieving budget targets. The University conducts a search approval process that requires permission to begin a search be obtained from the Vice President of Business Affairs and Finance, and that all new hires have an additional approval of the University President before positions are approved for search. These conditions apply even if the department has available permanent budget allocation to fund the position. When a hiring freeze is in effect, any exception to the freeze needs to demonstrate a strategic reason for the hire. Exceptions must be approved by the Vice President of Business Affairs and Finance and the President, even if the position is a replacement.

The Future
CSU has concerns over the tenuous nature of the State’s ability to fund higher education at appropriate levels. While the current governor’s administration supports all levels of education as the basis for moving the state forward economically, much will depend on Ohio’s economy and whether depressed income and sales tax revenues can rebound. Thus far, both the Governor and State legislature have been successful in shielding higher education from the severe reductions that have impacted other state agencies.

However, it should be noted that both the FY 2010 and FY 2011 state subsidy appropriations are funded with one-time federal stimulus funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Barring the recovery of the Ohio economy and higher tax revenues and/or the continuation of stimulus funds, state subsidy funding through the SSI (State Share of Instruction) could drop off significantly in FY 2012. As it is, the FY 2011 allocation of SSI for CSU is projected to be down
$1.6 million from the FY 2010 allocation (see Tables 5.14 and 5.15). This is an area that CSU will monitor very closely so that it can formulate a strategy for managing any potential drop in SSI beyond what is currently expected.

While the University must work within the context and boundaries set by the State, CSU is moving ahead strongly under the leadership of the President with Mission Differentiation. The creation of the new Centers of Excellence will not only provide intellectual focus for the institution, but it is hoped that the centers will be economic engines for the region and attract major research funding.

CSU has a creditable record of cost management, especially over the previous ten years. Future budgets will prioritize the core missions of the University and focus on targeted reductions to support these missions if necessary. The institution’s past and continuing fiscal conservatism can only serve to assist us with going forward. In short, we are accustomed to managing our finances under challenging circumstances, yet look for opportunities to benefit the University and the academic programs we offer our students. Over the past decade, CSU has dedicated itself to providing significant campus upgrades through its Master Plan, strengthened existing programs, and broadened its offerings to establish a quality educational experience at an affordable cost to students. This is an advantage in today’s economic climate, where unemployment and erosion of wealth can place post-secondary education out of reach. The fall semester 2009 enrollment picture is a healthy one. Total student credit hours are approximately 6% higher than fall semester 2008 enrollment. If this growth can be sustained and improved upon, the fiscal challenges that may be looming can be managed with less stress to the institution.

### 5.14 State of Ohio Total SSI Funding
**FY 2010 – FY 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Ohio</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Federal Stimulus</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010 SSI Funding</td>
<td>$1,677,708,351</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>$309,874,026</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011 SSI Funding</td>
<td>$1,689,554,971</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$308,802,662</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.15 Cleveland State University SSI Funding
**FY 2010 – FY 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Ohio</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Federal Stimulus</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010 SSI Funding</td>
<td>$64,565,874</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>$11,924,914</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011 SSI Funding</td>
<td>$63,178,641</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>$11,668,701</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget Models: A Historical Perspective

The planning and budgeting process of the University has developed into a more transparent and collegial process over the past six years. Realizing that Ohio’s public institutions of higher learning were dealing with the uncertainty surrounding the level of state subsidy from year to year as well as various versions of state-mandated tuition “caps,” in 2003, an internal study group was established to develop a budget process or model that would evaluate the costs and benefits of programs in light of current tuition and state subsidy revenue levels and the priorities of the University.

Historically, the University has employed a “bottom line” approach for assessing financial performance at the conclusion of a fiscal year. In the past, all sources of revenue were accumulated and compared to the sum of all academic and non-academic expenditures of the University. However, this approach did not attempt to identify the cost of operating individual academic and non-academic units of the University and also led to cross-subsidization among the colleges, without clear links between and among enrollment, revenue production and priorities. In 2003, the University’s Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC) charged its budget model subcommittee with researching budgeting methods that would a) assist in establishing accountability for expenditures within the non-academic units, b) forge a workable relationship between strategic planning and budgeting function, and c) develop a process that would help identify appropriate revenue and expenditure levels of the University’s academic units (Colleges), academic support units (Library, Provost Office, etc.), and non-academic units (Finance, HR, IS&T, etc.) so that fact-based decisions could be made regarding how best to employ University resources.

The subcommittee explored various budgeting approaches in use at other universities, such as the University of Michigan and The Ohio State University; hosted Indiana University for a presentation on Responsibility Center Management (RCM); and worked closely with the Provost’s Cabinet and Deans’ Council to develop budget model recommendations for CSU that could be implemented for the University’s FY 2005 Operating Budget.

The recommended model provided a framework for sharing any surplus (marginal) revenue above the amount necessary for meeting the operating expenditures of the University with the Colleges (academic units). Instead of handling revenue without regard to which college generated it, the new model provided for the retention of surplus revenue earned by a specific college. The portion retained by the Colleges was to be determined each fiscal year and was to be dependent upon the overall fiscal condition of the University. A central tenet of the model was that the University must first balance revenue and expenses for a fiscal year before unexpended current-year budgeted expenses could be carried forward to the next fiscal year. The same held true for surplus instructional fee revenues—a concept introduced in 2005.

Surplus funds available at fiscal year-end (12 months, ending June 30) can be of two types: instructional fee tuition revenue margin and expense carry-over. Expense carry-over has always been a component of the budget model for both academic and non-academic units, while instructional fee revenue surplus has not—this is a feature of the new model, and it is available only to the colleges that
produce the revenue through enrollment. However, should surplus revenue or unexpended budgeted expenses be needed to balance the University’s budget due to a reduction in state subsidy, a decline in student enrollment, or emergency expenditures, then no distribution can occur.

**Presidential Initiative Fund**

This fund was announced in 2002 and consists of three phases: Phase I sought initial ideas to develop the nuclei of signature programs, Phase II requested proposals, and Phase III evaluated the proposals. Two awards were given, totaling $550,000. They were “The Partnership for Advancing Regional Economies” directed by Ziona Austrian from the College of Urban Affairs, and “The CSU Health Initiative: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach to Urban-Based Health Problems.” These two initial projects have since attracted extramural funding of $3,340,057, spanning a total of 17 other projects.

**Physical Resources and Planning**

*The Master Plan:* As mentioned in Chapters 1 and 8, an ambitious $300 million building initiative is underway. Thirteen major building projects were recently completed or are presently taking shape. These projects and their completion dates are as follows:

- Main Classroom Plaza Atrium (2005)
- Soccer Field Renovation (2005)
- East Parking Garage (2006)
- Fenn Tower Renovation (2006)
- Recreation Center (2006)
- Administration Center (including Elements restaurant) (2007)
- Elevator Tower at Main Classroom (2007)
- Parker Hannifin Hall (2007)
- South Parking Garage (2009)
- College of Education and Human Services (2010)
- Stephanie Tubbs Jones RTA Transit Center (2010)
- Student Center (2010)
- East 24th Street Student Housing (Phase I 2010, Phase II 2011)

**The Role of University Advancement**

Between January and March 2010, fundraising plans for five Presidential initiatives and for each college as well as the Department of Athletics were created and completed. The analysis that went into each plan produced a set of recommendations related to monetary goals (annual and campaign) and timelines for reaching them. Detailed information on this analysis can be found at the Self Study website.

Briefly, the operating plan positions the President as Cleveland State’s chief “volunteer” fundraiser, responsible for all prospects over $500,000. The Vice President of Advancement is responsible for managing that portfolio. Meanwhile, all college-based development officers (as well as the fundraiser assigned to Athletics) are operating on a similar pipeline system that involves their deans and requires monthly activity around solicitation, identification and cultivation of a portfolio of 150 individuals associated with an academic college or department. (Some of these prospects, upon qualification, will undoubtedly move into the President’s portfolio. This, too, is an efficient and effective system for tracking and reaching results and ensuring that deans are involved in or kept informed of major development activities.)
With the mechanics of this fundraising plan in place, and as important as prospects and process are to any Development outcome, nothing is more critical than priorities, and that is the real emphasis of this plan.

CSU will be going into this fundraising initiative on solid community footing. The region has clearly seen and felt a turnaround at CSU and has embraced the value propositions the University brings to Northeast Ohio. Because they are so fundamental to this plan, they deserve mention here:

– CSU is uniquely positioned to provide a broad base of students affordable access to excellent higher education.

– CSU, with the majority of its students coming from Northeast Ohio and wanting to remain in the region following graduation, is well positioned to source the region’s employment needs.

– CSU, with the largest contiguous footprint in downtown Cleveland, has the greatest potential for impacting the city’s urban center.

– CSU, through its College of Science and programs in Allied Health Care, is uniquely positioned to serve the needs of hospitals and health care in Greater Cleveland.

– CSU’s College of Education is positioned to improve the public K-12 schools of the region and supply them with a steady flow of competent educators and administrators.

– CSU graduates in business, law and engineering form the backbone of “Business Cleveland”.

– CSU, through its nationally-ranked Levin College of Urban Affairs, is unique in supporting the governmental and civic community in problem-solving.

However, it is the five Presidential initiatives that are attracting Cleveland’s attention and that define our primary fundraising goals. Compressed into “elevator” speeches, a case for support for each initiative can be simply and effectively stated (also provided in the Introduction chapter):

– **Increase the number of baccalaureate-degree holders in Northeast Ohio by increasing scholarship support for CSU students.**

   Studies show that no other factor is a better predictor of economic and civic well-being than the percentage of the population that holds a college degree; it is 23% in Cuyahoga County. By offering qualified students scholarships as an incentive for them to pursue higher education (especially those who would become the first in their family to go beyond high school) and by offering guidance to help them persevere and succeed, CSU plays a critical role in producing more baccalaureate-degree holders for the region (since many of our students come from and intend to remain in the region).

– **Provide the local business community with a ready, steady and stable source of talent by preparing students to meet Northeast Ohio’s economic needs through co-ops.** The ability to attract and retain educated young people to its urban core is a second leading predictor in a city’s economic well-being. Today, Cleveland suffers from “brain drain.” Through a co-op and internship program that not only prepares students for jobs in the region but also engages them in civic issues, CSU increases the likelihood that its graduates will stay in the region. Businesses that support the program will quickly see a return on their investment: by hiring homegrown, job-ready,
college-educated talent, they reduce recruitment costs and increase retention.

- **Establish a national template for effective urban education by establishing a public K-12 “lab” school on the CSU campus.** Studies show beyond a doubt that safe neighborhoods and good schools are essential to attracting residents to urban centers. By addressing the educational needs of Cleveland children while providing a clinical (“laboratory”) experience for College of Education students in real classrooms, CSU will help transform Cleveland’s schools – not to mention the city’s downtown core.

- **Address the regional shortage of urban primary care physicians and allied health professionals through NEOUCOM and related programming at Cleveland State.** A city’s economic health is correlated to its physical and mental health. By recruiting medical students who want to become primary care physicians and other health professionals specializing in urban health, Cleveland State addresses a critical hospital shortage while ministering to the needs of an underserved class.

- **Contribute to the city’s arts and entertainment programming by integrating campus and community.** By building housing for its 16,000+ undergraduate and graduate students; by aligning with partners in the Campus District; and by working with Playhouse Square to strengthen local arts and entertainment, the University adds density to its surroundings. Density is key to business growth and civic stability. At the same time, by making “champion” synonymous with the Cleveland State Vikings, CSU nationalizes its name, increasing the likelihood of attracting new students to its classrooms and new residents to the city.

To prepare for the fundraising that needs to occur to fulfill these initiatives, CSU has taken full advantage of the Presidential transition by testing the marketplace. The institution has cultivated prospects at the upper level, and in the past months, a number of key relationships that had gone dormant have been resuscitated under President Berkman’s leadership.

CSU has also shored up areas within University Development that needed attention. This includes alumni programming and events, young alumni programming, e-philanthropy, data collection and mining, and, most importantly, adding fundraising specialists to each academic college and Athletics who can cultivate prospects for University-wide advancement goals. As noted, in addition to preparing a detailed plan for the Presidential initiatives, plans have been created for each college and the Department of Athletics. The University has implemented a system to reach goals through time- and cost-efficient means, where fundraising results are measured in terms of performance against outcome. Lastly, CSU has begun producing separate publications for fundraising purposes that describe the new Student Center, the College of Education and Human Services building, the New Pathway program, and each college’s fundraising priorities.

To fulfill the potential for fundraising, several steps, strategic and tactical, still need to occur. They include:

- Build a communication strategy around the President’s vision and philanthropy

- Formalize support from CSU leadership for vision and plan

- Leverage philanthropic synergy with Sponsored Research
– Lead Board members through a process of prospect review and assignment

Also of paramount importance is putting a volunteer structure around Development. This had just begun under former President Schwartz but needs to continue.

**Marketing Plan:** The University Marketing Office ([http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/marketing/](http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/marketing/)) is charged with elevating the reputation of the University on a national level. In tandem with the University’s mission and Strategic Plan, all marketing efforts at CSU are focused on amplifying the University’s success in achieving its mission. In spring semester 2008, the University launched the Engaged Learning campaign, which seeks to capture the essence of the University’s mission and strategic direction in a simple, aspirational statement. Engaged Learning is the hands-on learning environment at CSU that connects students, ideas and real world experience. Because of CSU’s position in the Cleveland community and its varied and numerous connections with civic organizations, corporations, non-government organizations and more, the University is in the unique position to offer its students an “engaged learning” experience while also acting as an important driver in the overall economic development and sustainability of the region.

The University developed a marketing campaign that utilized a multi-media approach to introducing and explaining the concept of Engaged Learning. The first six months of the campaign focused on awareness-building of the concept, while follow-on elements of the campaign sought to demonstrate Engaged Learning by example. One cornerstone of the campaign was an innovative use of inserts in regional editions of the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal, using the common headline, “CSU is Redefining the Rules of Engagement.” Additional media deployed were print ads (various), outdoor, radio, television and the Internet.

In addition, the University Community was invited to a kick-off event for Engaged Learning, at which they could contribute their own Engaged Learning story. The stories are housed online (as videos and written examples) on the University’s home page ([http://www.csuohio.edu/news/inthenews/](http://www.csuohio.edu/news/inthenews/)). A new series of interviews with students is underway to update the website versions of the original Engaged Learning stories.

In addition to paid media, the CSU Marketing Office hired a New York public relations firm in 2008 to begin positioning the University in the national media. Several very large media placements followed, one by the Associated Press, showcasing our special program for returning veterans in newspapers throughout America, one telling the story of Professor Rashidi’s groundbreaking wind research ([http://www.csuohio.edu/news/releases/2009/06/14692.html](http://www.csuohio.edu/news/releases/2009/06/14692.html)) in several national publications, and a story that appeared on the CBS Evening News with Katie Couric ([http://www.csuohio.edu/news/inthenews/090620cbseveningnews.html](http://www.csuohio.edu/news/inthenews/090620cbseveningnews.html)) chronicling the Engaged Learning experience of a student and a recent CSU graduate who engineered a high tech row boat that they rowed from Cleveland to Key West, Florida, volunteering at Habitat for Humanity homebuilding projects along the way.

After one year, feedback on the campaign is favorable. At a recent focus group conducted with incoming freshmen, new students were able
to articulate the concept of Engaged Learning in their own words, without any prompting from the moderator. Other important stakeholder groups have expressed a sense of the “new and heightened positive visibility of CSU” through both paid and unpaid media they have consumed. Numerous examples of the internal adoption of the Engaged Learning concept abound across campus, through re-named scholarships, groups, initiatives and programs, and departments that feature some element of Engaged Learning as a part of their message.

The Engaged Learning platform gives the University a distinctive motto and presents a broad umbrella for marketing specific achievements of CSU, some of which include, but are not limited to: 1) important new University initiatives, 2) research and grant wins, 3) groundbreaking research results, 4) student success stories, 5) outstanding faculty efforts in the community and 6) the showcasing of University Centers of Excellence. All of the above support the overarching goal of the Vision Unlimited plan by demonstrating how the University is engaging with the community to be a force for economic sustainability while also providing CSU students with an “engaged learning” experience.

In year two of the Engaged Learning campaign (2009-2010), the University Marketing Office has developed the following objectives:

– Develop and communicate examples that demonstrate the power of Engaged Learning to students, parents and the community at large.
– Showcase CSU’s Centers of Excellence and other important initiatives at the University.
– Maintain continued presence with all important stakeholders through targeted communications.
– Continue to explore digital media opportunities to broaden the reach and effectiveness of the CSU message.
– Aggressively pursue national media for placement of CSU successes.

The University Marketing Office will continue to deploy many of the media tactics it used when launching Engaged Learning while focusing on the need to add context to the concept in 2010. Planned measurement of the Engaged Learning concept awareness and comprehension will be conducted in late 2010.

Core Component: 2c. The organization’s ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.

Evidence that Core Component 2c has been met.

One of the concerns from the Commission’s 2000 report was that “assessment efforts are uneven across the University, and the process of assessment needs to be more thoroughly ingrained in the academic culture.” The context for this comment was primarily directed towards assessment of student learning. The response to this concern is detailed in the Introduction, and a thorough description of University assessment can be found in Chapter 6. However, this section outlines CSU’s successful transformation in the past 10 years in developing evaluation and assessment procedures that are now an institutional strength and a model for other universities.
Monitoring Strategic Planning through Key Performance Indicators

The long-term success of Vision Unlimited rests on the University’s ability to chart progress and track planning outcomes. The primary purpose of developing Key Performance Indicators was to construct a system that would provide the campus community with tangible data and operational instruments for determining how well the Vision Unlimited plan was working. Outlined below are selected key indicators associated with each goal (a complete list is available on page 9 of the Annual Report to Faculty Senate and Administration 2006-07 (http://mycsu.csuohio.edu/committees/uspc/annualreport2007.html).

Key Performance Indicators for Goals

Goal 1: Develop CSU’s Academic Excellence as a University.

KPIs for Goal 1: These include measures of how many students continue studies from year to year (retention rates), how many graduate (graduation rates), how many persist in studies from year to year (persistence rates), and the preparation of the incoming student class, including high school academic performance and standardized test data (high school GPAs, high school class rank, and ACT or converted SAT scores). KPIs of faculty productivity include measures of both teaching (tenured instructors teaching undergraduate classes) and research output (articles published and articles cited by other authors).

KPI Results and Analysis: From 1999 to 2008, freshman retention rates averaged 61%. In 2008, they rose to an 8-year high of 66%. Graduation rates increased steadily from 1996 to 2001 but dropped in 2002, then rebounded somewhat in 2003. The low graduation rate in 2002 corresponded to a low retention rate that year; however, retention rates were low in 2003 also. These figures corroborate the needs of CSU’s many non-traditional students who have outside commitments that preclude a traditional graduation timeline. Many others come to campus from community colleges.

Nonetheless, the analysis of these KPIs has led to extensive efforts to improve graduation and retention rates. New admissions standards initiated in 2006 and fully implemented in 2008 have greatly improved...
the outcomes of these two KPIs, as well as the average ACT scores of incoming students, from a 20.1 in 2004, steadily increasing to 20.7 in 2008. The Honors program began admitting students in 2004, and it has brought about dramatic improvements in the KPIs selected for Goal 1. Graduation rates for honors students are at 75% for the 2004 cohort, and 64% for the 2005 cohort graduating in fall semester 2009. Other endeavors to improve retention and graduation at CSU are the newly reorganized Tutoring and Academic Success Center, Viking Boot Camp (prepares incoming students for college-level math and English), Electronic Early Alert (conveys concerns regarding students’ academic performance to the appropriate advisor), and SERV, a program assisting returning veterans’ transition into civilian and college life.

Faculty productivity in teaching peaked at a five-year high in 2007, with 46.8% of full-time tenure track faculty teaching classes at the undergraduate level. In terms of the number of journal articles published by CSU faculty and students, in 2008, 181 articles were published, capping a steady five-year increase. The table to the left is from the USPC Annual Report (2009) (http://www.csuohio.edu/committees/uspc/2009Reports/USPCAnnualReport2009.pdf).

In 2008, the establishment of the annual Undergraduate Engaged Learning Research Awards program increased the number of faculty and undergraduate student collaborative research projects, and the program is expected to maintain and/or improve upon this increase in productivity as these awards are granted. This program supported 75 CSU students in summer research projects. Forty-eight proposals were received from five colleges, and 34 were funded across 14 departments, totaling $289,414 in funds provided by the Provost’s Office.

Goal 2: Provide the Financial Foundation for Academic Excellence.

KPIs for Goal 2: CSU’s financial foundation is tracked by such measures as student credit hours, the number and amount of grants and gifts, the amount of total revenues allocated for academic purposes, the implementation of international programs, and the number of international students enrolled. These KPIs represent multiple income sources vital to delivering academic excellence at CSU.

KPI Results and Analysis: Student credit hours, percent of Operating Budget allocated to academic areas, and international program and international student activity all maintained their targeted levels of achievement. Gifts to the University and sponsored research fell short of benchmarked levels.

In 2008, annualized student credit hours and FTE census show a rebound over 2007 (despite a five-year overall decline), up by 2.9% and 2.5%, respectively. According to faculty, grant and award expenditures are a more consistent measure of research activity than the grants and awards themselves. As such, these expenditures show a lesser decline than the awards, as these expenditures are down 15% from 2008 to 21% overall from 2002 benchmark levels. That said, it is important to note that some grants span multiple years, and also that a temporary cessation of spending for the Wright Center for Sensor Systems Engineering impacts this KPI. Contributions to the University were down by nearly 10%. The academic portion of the Operating Budget has just slightly declined by 0.3%. However, the number of international programs and international students shows an increase for AY 2008, meeting targeted benchmarks with 23 contracted programs and 831 foreign students represented.
On August 8, 2008, the Confucius Institute at CSU officially opened. The Institute promotes the use of Chinese language, appreciation of Chinese culture, and economic enterprise between Ohio and China. The Institute augers well for future KPI assessments of Goal 2.

Though general regional indicators showed an economic decline in 2008, CSU’s economic health remained intact. Also, while massive regional layoffs were taking place in Northeast Ohio and across the nation, CSU was itself able to avoid such layoffs. The sparing of these jobs demonstrates CSU’s excellent administrative and fiscal decisions during a time of extreme challenge, and the analysis of all Goal 2 KPIs should take place within the greater context of the recessed regional and national economies.

**Goal 3: Nurture an Open, Supportive and Collaborative Organizational Culture.**

*KPIs for Goal 3:* The Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey was selected as an instrument for collecting data pertaining to Vision Unlimited’s Goal 3. This nationally recognized survey has been administered on campus on four previous occasions, and baseline data from prior administrations spans a 15-year period. Items from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) were also selected to provide data concerning the collaborative culture at CSU. These items included “Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments” and “Taught or tutored other students.” The university conducts Academic Program Reviews in four-year cycles to provide feedback to units and departments. This KPI provides both quantitative and qualitative data. The number of articles published by multiple CSU authors and articles* published in collaboration with other institutions also serve as KPIs for this goal, and it should also be noted that the Office of Student Life declared university-wide collaboration as a priority in response to Goal 3.

*KPI Results and Analysis:* The HERI survey reveals increases in all areas of faculty job satisfaction in 2004, with the most dramatic improvements in the areas of faculty relationships with administration (up 28.6%), visibility for jobs at other institutions (up 26%), and overall job satisfaction (up 18%) from results obtained in 1998. The NSSE survey results from 2002 to 2009 regarding student satisfaction with campus services and support areas also show a remarkable increase across all aspects covered. From 2005 to 2008, 15 academic programs submitted their Program Reviews and received subsequent feedback. Journal articles* with multiple authors collaborating across various CSU departments or units totaled 8 in 2007 (3.9%), and out of 204 articles published by CSU authors in 2007, 47 (23%) were in combination with other Ohio institutions. 36.5* (18%) of these were published with other Northeast Ohio institutions, with the Cleveland Clinic Foundation leading institutional collaboration with CSU at 21.5 (10.5%).

*Numbers of journal articles published refer only to those recognized in the ISI Thompson Indices. Decimal values reflect the rating system of journals with multiple authors. See the USPC Report (http://www.csuohio.edu/committees/uspc/2009Reports/USPCAnnualReport2009.pdf) for further details.*

**Goal 4: Create a Culture of Student Success that Supports all Core Communities of Students.**

*KPIs for Goal 4:* Items from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) were chosen as a KPI for Goal 4; the NSSE has been administered on
can support the annual review of CSU’s community relationships and service, a comprehensive method to assess progress toward stated outcomes of this goal has been developed by the University Strategic Planning Committee in conjunction with Institutional Research.

KPI Results and Analysis: The University did cut some community and student service programs in response to Ohio’s and CSU’s subsequent budget cutbacks for the biennium. As of 2009, CSU partners with 32 regional, national, and international institutions, including high schools, community colleges, four-year colleges and universities, and other organizations. A total of 74 agreements (46 undergraduate, 28 graduate) in the form of program articulations, consortium agreements, and joint programming have been established in CSU’s colleges. In addition, 18 memoranda of understanding provide facility usage and academic collaboration with external partners. As of 2008, these partnerships and agreements represent substantial increases of 24% and 12%, respectively. The USPC Report describes responsive growth in the local, region, and state arenas in CSU’s service and academic endeavors. Some examples: CSU is negotiating to have the Allen Theater, part of downtown’s Playhouse Square theater complex, become the home for two new resident companies—one of which is CSU’s Dance and Theater programs; CSU has been approved as the newest member of NEUOCOM, a regional university consortium that offers an accelerated B.S. and an M.D. program; and CSU’s 2009 Summer Honors Institute, funded by the Ohio Department of Education, provides extended academic learning and personal growth opportunities for gifted high school students.

Goal 5: Improve Community Relationships and Service.

KPIs for Goal 5: Consultations with University Marketing revealed that these data are typically collected by contacting the offices of the President, Vice Presidents, Provost, and Deans. KPIs for this goal are the scope and number of all developing and existing partnerships, collaborations and initiatives that meet educational, social, and/or economic needs of the community. While some measures
Goal 6: Enhance CSU’s Physical Environment and Image.

*KPIs for Goal 6:* In the past, analysis of student-oriented spaces (classrooms, labs, lounges, recreation, and space for other types of activities) has been conducted by external consultants on campus. Similarly, market research has also been conducted on campus by hiring consultants from external firms. The internal replication of both of these types of studies on an identified cycle was adopted as a mechanism for reporting KPIs under Goal 6. In addition to these studies, the University assesses its physical environment and image via responses to locally prepared survey questions administered to faculty and students.

*KPI Results & Analysis:* The development of CSU’s environment and image continues to emerge as a vigorous and thriving central campus initiative in 2009 (see visual in Introduction chapter). Continued refinement and progress toward the realization of the campus Master Plan remain on schedule. In March 2009, the Plan was modified to include the Rooftop Garden (atop the Recreation Center), and the North Union Farmer’s Market came to the campus. The list begins in 2005 with the completion of the Plaza renovations. The Fenn Tower residencies and the Recreation Center with adjoining garage opened in 2006. In 2007, Parker Hannafin Hall was completed. In 2008, the Law College renovations and the opening of Main Classroom’s atrium and renovations were completed, the new Student Center construction commenced, and ground was broken for the College of Education and Human Services Building, and in January of 2010 it opened for occupancy. The long-anticipated opening of the new Student Center occurs in September of 2010.

University Marketing joined with faculty and graduate students from the School of Communication to administer surveys and conduct interviews with prospective students to obtain their views on desirability, communication, decision processes, and CSU’s attributes—the results of which will influence future marketing initiatives.

Survey questions for faculty, staff and students regarding satisfaction with the campus planning process, on-campus student spaces, beautification of the campus, parking and student housing are in lieu; data collection for these KPIs will commence immediately upon their completion.

**Program Review with External Evaluators**

Academic Program Review at CSU is a systematic, University-wide process that proactively and consistently enhances the quality of the institution’s academic and supporting programs. The Program Review process is designed to assess all of the undergraduate and graduate degree programs administered by an academic unit (usually an academic department, school or program) as well as other related functions, such as service courses and centers. Interdisciplinary and supporting programs and units are also subject to program review. CSU’s Handbook for Program Review (http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/planning/programreview/documents/ProgrReviewHdbkuCC_FacSenFINALweb.pdf) details the components of this systematic process and serves as a University-wide resource.

The Program Review process at CSU has continued to evolve and improve since the implementation of a new review system in 1999-2000, which served to reinstitute formal review of all undergraduate and graduate programs at the University. After
three cycles of reviews under the new system, a moratorium was placed on Program Review during the AY 2002-2003 in order to re-evaluate and further refine the process. This self-evaluation resulted in the current University-wide process detailed in the *Handbook for Program Review*. Twenty-seven programs have been reviewed under the rigorous guidelines implemented in 2003-2004.

A Historical Program Review Schedule ([http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/planning/programreview/documents/Historical Program Review Schedule 10.27.05.pdf](http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/planning/programreview/documents/Historical Program Review Schedule 10.27.05.pdf)) (1998 – 2005) is available online, kept up-to-date by the Office of Planning, Assessment and Information Resource Management (see Appendix 5.1).

**Institutional Research Systematic Studies**

The Office of Institutional Research & Analysis ([http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/iraa/](http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/iraa/)) supports the mission of CSU by providing consistent, accurate and timely information to internal and external decision-makers and stakeholders. Specifically, the Office is responsible for compiling, organizing, maintaining, and analyzing data from internal and external sources.

Studies conducted in Institutional Research support University planning and decision-making in a systematic fashion, addressing the evaluation and assessment of information related to students, faculty/staff, academic units, finances and facility usage, as related to academic units and a multitude of other ad hoc requests for information. The largest and most visible compilation of studies conducted in IR is available in its annual publication, The Book of Trends ([http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/iraa/bot/bookoftrends.html](http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/iraa/bot/bookoftrends.html)). Several other significant studies are detailed to the right.

**Studies Related to Students:**

IR posts daily enrollment and credit hour reports and trend reports on the web, as well as admission statistics, peer comparisons, and other ad hoc reports as needed. The analytical studies in this area include such things as analysis of retention and graduation rates, enrollment projections, assessment of Honors Program and Learning Community enrollment, studies on student preparation, trends in eLearning, success of developmental education, and international enrollment. Assessment of student learning, satisfaction and related trends is conducted through surveys, several of which are conducted on a regular cycle and available online ([https://mycsu.csuohio.edu/ResourceCheck/VerifyServlet?loc=/offices/iraa/survey/survey.html](https://mycsu.csuohio.edu/ResourceCheck/VerifyServlet?loc=/offices/iraa/survey/survey.html)).

Included among the prominent surveys administered on campus are the Quality of Service Survey, Senior Satisfaction Survey, LibQual+™, Your First College Year (YFCY), Non-returning Students Survey, ACT Alumni Outcomes Survey, National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), Freshman Survey, and Survey of Off-campus Students (East and West Center).

CSU’s rigorous program for campus-wide student assessment is complemented by the student and alumni surveys conducted by the academic departments. In 2009-2010, there were 56 departments and/or units conducting their own student surveys. Links to these surveys can be found at the Planning, Assessment, & Informational Resource Management website ([http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/planning/](http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/planning/)) (access is limited to authorized personnel).

Managing student data for the purpose of official reporting requires a substantial amount of data
administration. This is accomplished by working with various offices and stakeholders to establish definitions of data fields and facilitating the accurate capture of PeopleSoft information by involving the Office of the Registrar and IS&T.

The external reporting for student data primarily involves the Ohio Board of Regents reports, federal IPEDS reports, US News and World Report reports, Peterson’s Survey, and other reports such as the Common Data Set reports.

Studies Related to Faculty:
Managing and reporting faculty information is one of the more complex tasks accomplished in IR. The Office creates meaningful definitions for faculty headcount, FTE, and workload in the areas of teaching, research and service that are aligned with the existing union contracts. Several other reports on overloads, retirements, courses taught with low enrollment, and salary information are also available. Analytical studies in this area involve large scale projects on understanding workload differences by discipline across the institution and studying policies in each college pertaining to such things as guidelines for service, research contributions, course buy-outs, and reasons for justified course reductions.

Assessment and evaluation studies in this area have involved the Higher Education Research Institute’s (HERI) Faculty survey that is conducted from the University of California at Los Angeles. This survey has constituted one of the longitudinal studies in IR, as it has been administered four times, in 1989, 1995, 1998, and 2004. This survey report provides insight into the evolution of faculty characteristics and faculty satisfaction mapped against the recent 20-year history of the institution. For instance, faculty satisfaction for the item “Opportunities for Scholarly Pursuits” significantly increased throughout the years: 1989: 39.7%, 1995: 47.2%, 1998: 51.4 %, and 2004: 57.2%.

CSU has participated for several years in the National Consortium for Data Exchange associated with the Delaware Study on instructional costs and faculty productivity. Participation in this study has provided the institution with benchmarks for such things as cost-per-credit hour and student credit hours by type of faculty (regular or other) in each discipline represented at the institution. (Note: CSU no longer participates in the Delaware Study.)

Addressing Needs of Academic Units:
The major reporting initiative in this area involves a compendium of all relevant institutional information that is centrally available for each academic unit, called The Academic Unit Profile – 5 Year Trend. This compendium is arranged by college and each department or academic unit within its structure. This comprehensive report provides five-year trends in one publication for the following information: student headcount and credit hour enrollment; degree awards; faculty headcount and instructional workload for regular, adjunct and other faculty; staff, compensated and uncompensated leave of absence; and other variables associated with expenditures, grants and contracts. IR monitors Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) code assignments to accurately track instructional programs, course offerings, and passage rates for various national exams by discipline.

Addressing Financial Issues of Academic Units:
The IR office provides information in support of budget requests submitted to the Provost for filling
faculty vacancies created through turnover or for new positions. The office has been involved with cost-per-credit hour studies, the analysis of unit budgets, various resource allocation models, and revenue planning models that could enhance productivity and efficiency. The office contributes to salary studies conducted annually to implement the faculty union contract stipulations. This involves gathering salary data from peer institutions. The Ohio Board of Regents (OBOR) also requires CSU to submit faculty salary data on an annual basis.

**Facility Usage of Academic Units:**
Campus space usage requires systematic analysis in the context of day, evening and night programming. This usage has implications for the time and day individual courses and programs are offered to traditional and non-traditional students. IR assists in maintaining data for room inventory, utilization, and determining how this information relates to course schedules. OBOR also requires CSU to provide annual reports on facilities that are used to determine the institution’s subsidy.

**Ad Hoc Reports:**
Ad hoc requests may come from anyone in the campus community. The ability to respond to ad hoc requests in a timely and accurate manner is crucial and is a significant function of IR. The response often serves as a measurement by the campus community of IR’s customer service. The online request process is described below under the heading of “Internal Requests,” and the Information Request form (http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/iraa/links/RequestForm.html) is available at the IR website.

**Environmental Scanning informs Vision Unlimited**
In 2003, the University Steering Planning Committee members crafted a comprehensive process for environmental scanning. The environmental scans they laid out were to be used to inform planning in a variety of intervals, some annual, others on a two- to five-year cycle. A majority of such scanning is undertaken by the Office of Institutional Research, as described in the above section. However, several other offices on campus are involved in such scanning; for example, the monitoring of employment trends in the form of growing/declining regions, employers’ needs by subsector of economy, and other Ohio initiatives are tracked by various offices in the College of Urban Affairs and the Office of Career Services. They also track local expectations for CSU among Northeast Ohio cities, counties, private and nonprofit sectors, and other community organizations.

Studies on student decision-making are regularly conducted in the Office of Enrollment Services (http://www.csuohio.edu/enrollmentservices/). This office studies ratios of students applied, admitted and enrolled at CSU and elsewhere. Off-Campus Programs and the Office of Partnership Programs (http://www.csuohio.edu/enrollmentservices/partnerships/) on campus study community college and private school patterns in CSU’s service area. Assessment and evaluation studies related to State finances, tuition and pricing, and the expectations of the State Legislature, Ohio Board of Regents, Governor, and other State Executive agencies are primarily conducted in the Division of Business Affairs and Finance.
Studies on the latest trends in technology and their impact on CSU programs are conducted by the Center for eLearning (https://mycsu.csuohio.edu/elearning/), the Michael Schwartz Library (http://library.csuohio.edu/), and IS&T. Additionally, each academic unit is on a five-year program review cycle that involves assessing its strengths, weaknesses, and challenges with respect to its technology infrastructure.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

As detailed in Chapter 6, each academic program and student support service unit, office or division has a set of goals and corresponding outcomes that places student learning at its core. The complex process of assessing of student learning outcomes provides every constituency with a wealth of information from which to plan, allocate resources, evaluate the ways in which it meets its mission, and prepare to respond adequately to future challenges and opportunities. A strong commitment to continuous improvement is the overarching principle supporting all assessment efforts across campus.

Student learning outcomes are identified by program/unit/division, faculty/staff and students in collaborative ways, allowing for flexibility in curriculum implementation. These outcomes differ from the undergraduate to the graduate level within academic programs, among colleges, as well as among student support service units or divisions. The common thread that cuts across all of these outcomes relates to a wide range of knowledge, skills, and dispositions CSU graduates should demonstrate as a result of completing a program and/or having access to support services. The University utilizes the breadth of knowledge and skill areas in the General Education program coupled with program-specific learning outcomes derived from the various academic disciplines.

Two programs – Master of Public Administration and Bachelor of Social Work capture the essence of the process by which faculty-driven curricula have a positive impact on student learning which, in turn, becomes an integral part of the planning and evaluation culture at CSU. Both programs are described in Chapter 6. For further examples of student learning outcomes, access the Office of Student Learning Assessment (OSLA) website (http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/assessment/).

**Outcomes in Non-Academic Areas**

All non-academic divisions and units use benchmarks for planning purposes and to measure success. A few selected examples of types of benchmarks that are monitored are provided in this section. For instance, the Enrollment Division sets specific targets for number of prospects, number of applications, and number of students who actually enroll. Each year the division sets targets for each of these areas, for both new students and transfers. Another example is the Office of Information Services and Technology (http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/ist/) (IS&T), whose outputs are measured in terms of successfully operating the University technical infrastructure, managing software and software upgrades, and measuring customer satisfaction based on help calls and resolution of help calls. A third example is that of student recruitment, whose 2008-2009 media campaign benchmarks included estimates of the following: total estimated gross impressions, advertising exposure through internet, TV, radio, outdoors, print, airport marketing and shopping mall advertising.
Performance Evaluations for Staff and Faculty

Faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure is clearly defined in the AAUP contract (http://www.csuohio.edu/organizations/aaup/contract/0609contract/) (Article 12) and further described by the Faculty Senate Bylaws (Section 8.1.2), which state:

Recommendations for appointments and promotion shall be made to the President and thence to the Board of Trustees (http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/trustees/) pursuant to the procedures set forth in Sections 8.1.2(D)(1-2) and shall be accompanied by the academic and personal qualifications of nominees, as stipulated in Section 8.1.2(A)(1-6), including relevant biographical data, evidence of academic degrees and honors, a statement of publications and other professional achievements, and letters or memoranda evidencing recommendations from at least three responsible academic or professional sources.

Article 12 (http://www.csuohio.edu/organizations/aaup/contract/0609contract/article12.html) in the AAUP contract states that there are six kinds of appointments: term, probationary, tenured, research and public service, clinical, and visiting. The conditions of the appointments are also defined. The contract also describes qualifications for academic rank, conditions of tenure, procedures for promotion and tenure, as well as the standards for granting promotion and tenure in the areas of teaching, creative achievement, and professional service.

Department chairpersons review faculty productivity on an annual basis, as described in the AAUP contract, Article 13 (http://www.csuohio.edu/organizations/aaup/contract/0609contract/article13.html). Chairpersons and faculty negotiate faculty workload as set in the contract and review faculty productivity through the use of Faculty Annual Activity Reports (FAARs). The Law faculty follow a similar, but not identical process.

Staff and Administrators are reviewed by their immediate superiors, as outlined in the Professional Staff Personnel Policies (http://mycsu.csuohio.edu/offices/hrd/Policies_Procedures/Personnel_Policies.pdf). For full- and part-time employees, the unit administrator will use written performance evaluation as the basis for personnel decisions such as merit increase in salary or re-appointment. The performance of assigned duties shall be reviewed and signed each year by the staff member’s immediate supervisor and the administrator to whom the supervisor reports.

The Department of Human Resources Development and Labor Relations is responsible for the development, approval and provision of guidelines and forms as well as training for the evaluation process. Detailed guidelines regarding the Performance Appraisal process can be found by referencing the CSU Performance Management System Supervisor’s Guide.

The annual performance reviews are completed prior to March 1st for the previous year (January 1 - December 31). In addition, a fiscal performance review cycle is also available to CSU employees. Special provisions are made for Professional Staff members who have been employed for less than one year at the time of annual review. Evaluators are responsible for monitoring performance throughout the year, especially that of new employees.
A Merit Reward Program for Non-Bargaining Unit (NBU) staff was instituted in 2008 to recognize and reward exceptional performance. It provides department/division heads with the opportunity to link meritorious performance with increased compensation.

**External Agencies that Accredit CSU Programs**

All academic colleges feature at least one academic program that is accredited by an external agency. CSU has had a noteworthy record in terms of the tenure of such accreditation over the past decade. Appendix 5.2 lists these programs and their accrediting agencies.

The Office of Institutional Research and Analysis ([http://www.csuohio.edu/business/about/visiting-commit/](http://www.csuohio.edu/business/about/visiting-commit/)) reports the passage rates of CSU students, where applicable, to academic programs on campus.

**Advisory Boards Provide Input and Assessment**

Several Colleges utilize advisory boards to help guide policy. For instance, the Nance College of Business Administration’s Visiting Committee ([http://urban.csuohio.edu/visiting_committee/](http://urban.csuohio.edu/visiting_committee/)) aids the College in meeting its mission to provide high-quality education, research, and public service programs. Subcommittees include Internship and Mentoring, Strategic Reframing, Development, and Budgeting and Public Finance. The Cleveland-Marshall College of Law also has several advisory committees composed of lawyers, judges, and members of the business community who provide advice and counsel to the law school. The College consults its National Advisory Council twice a year, and its Visiting Committee on a quarterly basis regarding matters that apply to the College’s strategic goals—from admission to career planning. In addition, the Cleveland-Marshall College of Law has created more focused groups to assist it with particular initiatives. It holds quarterly meetings with its Development Council regarding fundraising and the Health Law Advisory Committee to seek guidance for its nascent Center for Health Law & Policy; its Development Council of the Curriculum Review Advisory Group meets more frequently to consult with faculty as part of its comprehensive curriculum review.

Information on various academic Colleges’ visiting committees is provided below.

- Cleveland-Marshall College of Law ([http://www.law.csuohio.edu/faculty/deansoffice/visitingcommittee.html](http://www.law.csuohio.edu/faculty/deansoffice/visitingcommittee.html))
- College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences ([http://www.csuohio.edu/committees/selfstudy2010/documents/2c CLASS Visiting Committee.pdf](http://www.csuohio.edu/committees/selfstudy2010/documents/2c CLASS Visiting Committee.pdf))
- College of Science ([http://www.csuohio.edu/sciences/alumni/visitingcommittee.html](http://www.csuohio.edu/sciences/alumni/visitingcommittee.html))
- Division of Continuing Education ([http://www.csuohio.edu/ce/about/visiting_committee.html](http://www.csuohio.edu/ce/about/visiting_committee.html))
- Fenn College of Engineering
Core Component: 2d. All levels of planning align with the organization’s mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.

Evidence that Core Component 2d. has been met.

Collaborative Execution of Vision Unlimited
As described in Chapter 4, the development of Vision Unlimited (http://www.csuohio.edu/offices/planning/documents/VisionUnlimited.pdf) is one of collaboration. In addition, the response to the Strategic Plan for the State of Ohio has been very collaborative also. The use of roundtables engaged community members inside and outside the University. The formulation of the two Signature Themes and their subsequent Centers of Excellence required the solicitation of various University and Northeast Ohio entities.

Since the genesis of the Vision Unlimited idea, strategic planning has involved many internal and external constituents, as demonstrated by the reports of the Strategic Planning University Reviews (SPUR) in Chapter 4. The University Strategic Planning Committee (USPC) consists of faculty, staff, and administrators from across the institution. The Committee’s discussions and recommendations are made public through its website and publications.

Strengths, Challenges, and Self-Recommendations for Progress toward Continuous Improvement
The following section identifies the strengths of the University regarding Preparing for the Future and areas that need institutional attention, or “challenges.” Finally, self-recommendations for progress toward continuous improvement are listed. These strengths, challenges, and self-recommendations are based on the evidence described in this chapter.

Strengths
– In 2008, the University adopted its new marketing strategic theme, “Engaged Learning,” in order to capture the essence of the Institution in both its internal engagement with students and external engagement with the community.

– The strategic reaction to Mission Differentiation promises to bring new State and extramural funding resources to the University and to strengthen the regional community and State economy.

– The University’s response to a drop in State funding allowed it to maintain services and avoid layoffs of faculty or staff.

– The University has developed many initiatives to increase quality of service in a time of rapid environmental change.

Challenges
(Evidence that demonstrates Preparing for the Future needs institutional attention):

– How to market more effectively the University based on its strategic themes (e.g., “engaged learning.”)

– Number of recent changes on campus—Vision Unlimited, MyTime, General Education reform, Ohio University System mandates, and Engaged Learning—while encouraging and worthwhile, may lead to a sense of confusion and may seem overwhelming among internal constituents.

– The changing role of CSU in the Northeast Ohio Universities Colleges of Medicine and Pharmacy
(NEOUCOM) has created a whole new set of opportunities and implementation issues.

- Resources are finite due to re-appropriation of State funding, and a subsidy system that is in transition leads to challenges for implementation.
- Realignment of resources requires acceptance of an appropriate budget model based on guiding principles that support Mission Differentiation.

Self-Recommendations for Progress toward Continuous Improvement:
- Achieve Mission Differentiation by merging internal initiatives with those of the new Ohio’s Strategic Plan for Higher Education.
- Facilitate academic strategic planning to reach the goal of alignment with the Chancellor’s goals outlined in the State Strategic Plan.
- Integrate excellence and engagement into a single construct underlining all our efforts.
- Define areas of excellence within the University that correspond to the State Strategic Plan.
- Integrate the General Education curriculum to the Health and Sustainable Communities Signature Themes.
- Utilize programs for Undergraduate Research to promote the goals of the State Strategic Plan.

CSU continues to address the challenge of developing a consistent, predictable and transparent way of allocating resources.

The partnership with NEOUCOM will greatly enhance the University’s capacity as a key player in the health care industry in the region.

From Societal and Economic Trends (Appendix 4.3): [CSU has the] opportunity to remake (the) institution in the face of dramatic (economic) crisis.