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Last October, I became the University of Cincinnati’s 25th president. One year later, I can truly say it has been a most challenging but productive first year!

This technical report focuses on one of the year’s chief accomplishments, our vision for UC’s future, UC|21: Defining the New Urban Research University. Before we delve more deeply into the details of our vision, let me underscore the opportunity we have to build on UC’s greatness:

- **To build** on UC’s comprehensive program array, and the challenge of creating more cross-disciplinary programs ... in the arts, the sciences, the humanities, the health sciences and the professional programs.
- **To build** on UC’s evolution as a “research powerhouse.” UC has exceptional intellectual capacity. And I assure you that we will continue to grow this momentum.
- **To build** on the diversity and excellence of our student body. Let me be clear: I believe that diversity is value-added. UC is unquestionably a destination campus, a global as well as a local and regional campus, thanks in large part to our world-class co-op program and its ongoing potential.
- **To build** on UC’s profound sense of community, given the rich capacities of UC faculty, staff and students, and the resource-rich and, yes, problem-rich environment that is the Cincinnati region – to continue to commit this institution to the region’s economic, social, cultural, educational and artistic future. Great universities contribute in major ways to their urban context. They also draw from the great resources that are inherent in metropolitan areas. Great cities and great universities thrive reciprocally on each other’s strengths.
- **To build** on the energy and the excitement of UC’s rich and successful collegiate athletic tradition.

I am extremely proud, honored and grateful to have been chosen for this very important leadership role. I believe that urban universities, and especially one of the stature of the University of Cincinnati, will become the prototypic 21st-century universities. I intend to invest all my energies in service to the greatness that is the University of Cincinnati.

With these opportunities in mind, the top priority upon my arrival became our Comprehensive Academic Planning Process, the process that led to this technical report. I firmly believe that “vision trumps everything” and organizations are most effective when a well-articulated and ambitious vision for the future exists, reflecting the rich traditions of the past as well as our aspirations for the future.
A 21st VISION

It would be hard to imagine that there’s anyone in the UC family who doesn’t know that today we have formed that vision – a vision of the University of Cincinnati, leading in the 21st century. For short, we call our plan UC|21, which speaks directly to a new century and our ambitions for the future. It celebrates the dreams and aspirations of the broader UC family and commits us to a set of core values that will keep our vision focused and true to these aspirations. The values of scholarship, citizenship, stewardship, leadership, partnership and cultural competence are all qualities we strive to embed in the hearts and minds of our students, not only in their early experiences in our General Education curriculum, but like threads through a cloth, we hope to use every educational opportunity to inculcate these values among our students. Each fall, we raise our Just Community quilt, woven at the hands of our entering freshmen and suspended three stories high to remind us of these core values.

UC|21 also lays out an ambitious set of goals and actions to define the role of the new urban research university in this dynamic new century, both by building on our capacity to serve and to lead. The pages of this report will contain more information on each of our six goals:

• Placing students at the center of our universe and becoming a destination campus for student success;

• Growing our research capacity, building on our greatness as innovators and inventors, creators and designers. While today we reside among the nation’s top 25 public research institutions, we aspire to ever-better standing;

• Achieving increased academic prominence, boasting distinguished programs. We plan to fuel our program excellence by placing liberal education at the core of both our academic and professional programs, prioritizing programmatic investments to maintain and expand academic excellence;

• Forging key relationships and partnerships, and applying our knowledge and best practice to the highest community priorities, seeking to create a front door to UC resources and expertise in reciprocal partnerships with the region, the state and beyond;

• Establishing a sense of place on our Uptown campus and beyond, having engaged in a major physical renaissance, now transforming our institution into one that is truly “UC anytime, anyplace,” with 24/7 services and activities; and,

• Creating opportunity, not only for students with potential, once nurtured, who can blossom into successful graduates, but also serving as a vital economic engine for our local and global economy.

We have also put in place some benchmarks – what I’ve called “stretch goals” – that will define our activities going forward, including changing the mix of students who study at UC, from more diverse geographic locales, more cultural and international orientations, and more students from the higher-performing quartiles of their high schools (see Chapter 11). We seek
more opportunities to recruit distinguished faculty, more external research funds, expanded
technologies that create the innovative instructional and laboratory environments needed on our
campus. And yes, we intend a direct assault on the national rankings milieu.

Vision, I believe, is something that is derived not at the lone hands of a leader, but at the hands
of many. Our visioning process took on a scope some say has never been seen before on this
campus – over 240 individuals from both campus and community worked together in a series of
Town Hall Meetings; 2,400 more attended over 90 input sessions at early and intermediate stages
of our planning; over 300 people voiced opinions online; and over 24,000 viewings accrued to
our UC|21 Web site. UC|21 is in every sense of the word our vision; crafted at our hands; with
our imprint on every value, goal or strategy. Chapter 3 will tell you full details of the process we
used to accomplish this.

We also know that collective vision can only derive from collective action. Since the
announcement of UC|21 to the broader community at my inauguration on May 21, 2004, many
people have worked tirelessly to develop our strategy for moving forward. Our “What’s Next”
Section (Section III) toward the end of this book will tell you more about this, making it patently
clear that we are moving to implement as many aspects of UC|21 as there are creative ideas
therein, and we are moving to assure that we have the needed resources – the pocketbook to
match our aspirations.

**A ‘NEW’ UNIVERSITY**

The people who participated in our academic planning process know that we struggled mightily
over the so-called “tag line” for UC|21. Each word in the after-the-colon debate mattered to
someone. In the end, we agreed to the phrase, “Defining the New Urban Research University.”
It is no coincidence that we began our planning process with a bibliography, distributing
business cards with references to recent books on the topic of higher education in the 21st
century.

Based on that reading list, I am convinced that with UC|21 a new day is dawning in higher
education. One of the authors on our list, former university president Frank Rhodes (*The
Creation of the Future: The Role of the American University*, 2001), reminds us that the “new”
university will be one that is:

- increasingly privately supported but increasingly publicly accountable and socially
  committed,
- campus-rooted but internationally oriented,
- knowledge-based but student centered,
- research-driven but learning focused,
- technologically sophisticated but community dependent,
- committed to quality and cost effectiveness
- and professionally attuned while reinventing the liberal arts.

Whew! No small order, indeed!
Former Michigan president James Duderstadt (*A University for the 21st Century*, 2000) warns that it would be foolhardy to expect one particular model of the university to serve the 21st century. In the end, however, he suggests, that the most “critical challenge” facing higher education in the 21st century is developing “the capacity for change,” so that we can respond to the needs of a rapidly changing world.

At about the same time that higher education has been grappling with these issues, so has the corporate sector. A growing number of voices have suggested that the most successful business enterprises will be that who can embrace paradox. In Collins and Porras’ *Built to Last* (1994), the authors affirm that highly successful companies “do not oppress themselves with what we call the ‘Tyranny of the OR’.” They replace “either/or” thinking with “the genius of the and.”

Collins and Porras, Duderstadt and others will undoubtedly recognize their themes in UC|21. Ours is a vision that truly defines “new” ways of going about the work of higher education. Here are some important examples:

First, UC|21 is in and of itself a new way of examining our vision for the future. It develops within us a “capacity for change,” and a strategic way to realize future dreams. The visioning process also positions us to respond strategically rather than reactively to challenges, like budget reductions, when they do happen.

Second, our university of the future can better embrace paradox. For instance, UC faces the challenge of living up to seemingly diametrically opposed goals. A primary example is our call for top-ranked academic programs as a top-ranked research institution while at the same time remaining committed to clear opportunity pathways for those historically denied access to equal educational opportunity. There are many who don’t believe they can pursue post-secondary education, and others who cannot find educational pathways elsewhere. Sometimes, we have been trapped into thinking that we must choose between access and excellence in order to do them both well. But our new vision refuses to fall victim to either/or thinking and instead affirms that we will do both and do them well.

Third, our newness is reflected in UC becoming more “transparent.” In a recent interview with *The Cincinnati Post*, I admitted that I am perhaps in danger of over-using this word, but it’s my way of saying that we strive not only for openness, collaborative discourse and decision-making, and honest conversation amongst ourselves, but also full information-sharing at all levels of the institution, with openness to our external audiences. In this way, our constituents can hold us accountable and will keep us motivated to do the best we can.

Fourth, our “newness” is also reflected in new performance incentives. UC|21 will work to develop a new performance-based budgeting system for the university. Already, the university’s agreement with the faculty’s collective bargaining unit, negotiated by the Association of American University Professors (AAUP) and the administration, includes a commitment to salary increases tied to specific enrollment increases.

Given recent trends of dwindling state support, our vision also commits us to exploring new avenues for generating financial resources. Our future lies in a more entrepreneurial and
strategic approach across the institution as a whole.

I know that our faculty, staff and students are beginning to recognize a new pace at UC. We moved rapidly as we created our strategic vision last year. As we move into implementation and the future, we will continue to move fast! Speed is not typically associated with academics, but UC|21 is working to reset the “academic” time table.

We’re using technology in innovative and new ways as well. During our Town Hall and Input Session process, the Internet and the Web served as integral tools. As we move forward, we are developing two new strategy centers, or meeting rooms, for decision-making – using the full power of the latest information technology. You’ll find them in our University Pavilion, where most of the UC|21 strategy teams will be invited to meet, and in space in University Hall. Such strategy rooms may be common in the corporate world, but are rare in the academy. Thanks to a partnership between the offices of Institutional Research and Administrative and Business Services, evaluation data and other measures of our progress will be just a click away when key groups gather to make decisions about our future.

Another new approach is the technical report you are reading. In addition to publishing it on the Web, we are putting it on mini-CD-ROM to mail to hundreds of peer presidents, provosts and other academic leaders nationally with the invitation that they share with us their strategic visions and tell us what they think of ours. There is much within our UC|21 plan that is cutting edge, and we think asserting our engagement in creative planning and change strategies can play a significant role in enhancing our national reputation among our peers.

During this past year, with the help of the UC Foundation, the development office and the Alumni Association, I have traveled with the UC road team from New York to Washington DC, to Chicago and the coastal cities of San Francisco, LA and San Diego, back through Austin to Florida, and from northern Kentucky to Ohio to Middletown, Dayton, Toledo and Cleveland, with almost weekly trips to Columbus, making friends and building commitment for UC.

There is much excitement among our national cohort of alumni and friends to engage in regional recruitment, to better tell the UC story, and yes, on the East Coast especially, to enjoy our very positive entry into the Big East athletics conference. I can’t say enough about our process of re-engaging alums in support of our ambitions for the future. We are greeted with great enthusiasm and personal offers of help that will truly enable us to realize our dreams.

Here at home on a weekly basis, the UC Foundation and I are hosting downtown breakfasts with corporate leaders in the region who need to get to know us better and advise us on our future. I have asked our corporate friends, “Do you have the appetite for moving UC from great to premier?” Unequivocally they have replied in the affirmative.

Is a new day dawning in higher education? At UC, it certainly is.

President Nancy L. Zimpher
University of Cincinnati
November 2004
Over the last 15 years, the University of Cincinnati Master Plan has brought about a dramatic physical transformation in the UC campus. It has done so in a way that turns the conventional thinking of an urban campus on its proverbial head. Instead of vast spaces filled with asphalt, seas of concrete and sprawling parking lots, the pedestrian-friendly UC campus boasts park-like green spaces and signature architecture. Now, UC is called to transform the “conventional wisdom” about how and urban research university should act, not just look, in the unfolding 21st century.

**UC|21: Defining the New Urban Research University** is the university’s roadmap to achieve this model. Its six goals and 21 actions resulted from a Comprehensive Academic Planning Process (CAPP) undertaken by UC during the 2003-04 academic year and involved literally thousands of stakeholders. Its ideas will help define the role of the new urban research university in a rapidly changing world.

This section tells us more about UC and the history that uniquely positions it for this new vision, the context that contributed to the development of UC|21 and the process used to formulate it.
UNPRECEDENTED PARTICIPATION

UC|21: Defining the New Urban Research University is UC’s strategic plan for charting its academic course for the 21st century. UC|21 is the result of months of discussion and consultation at a scope never before seen on campus. A wide range of university stakeholders – students, full- and part-time faculty, staff, emeriti, alumni, corporate partners, donors, civic and social service leaders, and neighbors – were invited to participate. More than 240 people, including individuals from the community at large, worked together in a series of Town Hall Meetings to discuss and draft the university’s vision for its future. Additional insight came from over 2,400 people who participated in more than 90 input sessions hosted by UC colleges and units. Over 325 people also voiced opinions using the university’s academic planning Web site, with literally thousands of visits to the site.

OUR HERITAGE

Continual transformation has been a hallmark of the history of the University of Cincinnati. Over the past 185 years, the university has been first a private institution, then a municipal university and now is a comprehensive research university in Ohio’s state system. UC has always been transformative in the evolution of its academic and research programs to meet the ongoing needs of its students and society.

Nearly a century ago in 1906, UC “reinvented” higher education by pioneering cooperative education, the first such program in the world. Today, UC’s co-op program offers students real-world learning by giving them the opportunity to work for employers around the globe. As the 21st century unfolds, UC stands among the nation’s top 25 public research universities with a proud tradition of discovery and transformation. UC’s 34,000 students pursue success through more than 600 academic programs in the sciences, arts, humanities and professions. Throughout its history, UC has enjoyed a deep, reciprocal and widespread connection to its home city of Cincinnati, as an intellectual resource, cultural center and economic driver.

Today, the University of Cincinnati stands ready to “reinvent” itself with a new plan of action: UC|21: Defining the New Urban Research University.

OUR MISSION

The University of Cincinnati is a public comprehensive system of learning and research. The excellent faculty have distinguished themselves worldwide for their creative pedagogy and research, especially in problem solving and the application of their discoveries.

The university system is designed to serve a diverse student body with a broad range of interests and goals. It is a place of opportunity.
In support of this mission, the University of Cincinnati strives to provide the highest quality learning environment, world-renowned scholarship, innovation and community service, and to serve as a place where freedom of intellectual interchange flourishes.

**OUR PROFILE**

UC has achieved distinction through its nationally ranked programs, including the nation’s top-10 architecture, medicine, interior design, music and science programs. UC is perhaps unique in boasting distinguished scholarship and research, while maintaining a deep commitment to accessible education.

UC earned more than $309 million in external funding last year, supporting cutting-edge research, innovative teaching and public service. UC has led all universities in Ohio, Kentucky and Indiana for four straight years in income earned from faculty inventions. Its endowment, supported by thousands of generous donors, ranks 13th among public institutions in the United States. UC’s living alumni number over 200,000, with about half living in the Greater Cincinnati area.

**OUR VISION & CORE VALUES**

UC|21 embraces a set of core values and guiding principles for the new urban research university. The demands and challenges of the 21st century are only beginning to unfold, and these ideals speak directly to this new century. These principles will keep our strategic vision focused and true to our aspirations and dreams. UC|21 builds on the eight values that were developed by the Just Community initiative and endorsed by the university community in the year 2000. UC|21 also identifies a set of six principles to guide the new urban research university.

These guiding principles link back to UC’s rich heritage while looking beyond the past and present to a future where change will be accelerated. In addition to rapid transformation, there will be increased competition for students from traditional campuses, the for-profit sector and online learning alternatives. Higher education, including UC, can also expect to experience major change in the academy itself, an increasingly diverse cohort of learners, an escalating need to bring intellectual capital to bear on societal issues and a rising call to serve as the economic engine in a knowledge-based environment. These principles underscore UC’s profound commitment to serve a rapidly changing world and our local Cincinnati community:

**Scholarship:** The creation and application of knowledge, with an emphasis on scholarly inquiry, research, experimentation, investigation and creative production.

**Citizenship:** The ability to apply knowledge and skills for responsible civic life and action. UC’s emphasis is on public engagement and ethical purpose.

**Stewardship:** The responsibility of the university to carry out its unique place in society, which is to conserve intellectual inquiry. Members of the university community are stewards of knowledge and instill in students an appreciation for the responsibilities that accompany education. In a financial sense, the university is also called upon to generate revenue to ensure
appropriate operating funds to carry on its mission.

**Leadership:** Motivating others to take actions that would not otherwise have been taken. Leadership is measured by the extent to which an individual or groups of individuals can influence and energize the ideas, actions and capabilities of others toward the betterment of society.

**Partnership:** Working collaboratively to address complex issues and problems, both within and beyond the boundaries of UC. A university cannot solve problems by working in isolation. It must do so by interacting with others. By working in partnerships, we gain an understanding and appreciation of what can be accomplished together that could not have been accomplished alone. We also affirm the importance of diversity, since constructive change often occurs when individuals and groups with different identities and various priorities come together.

**Cultural Competence:** To foster a student’s ability to appreciate, investigate and understand a cultural background different from his or her own. Cultural competency promotes tolerance, understanding and respect for a variety of cultures, domestic and international, and facilitates opportunity for interaction, communication and engagement.

**OUR GOALS & STRATEGIC ACTIONS**
UC|21 lays out an ambitious set of goals and actions to define the role of the new urban research university in this dynamic new century, both by building on our capacity to serve and to lead. It summarizes 21 steps that will define the new urban research university for the 21st century.

**GOAL 1: Place Students at the Center**
Become a university of choice, a destination campus, by keeping students at our core.

**Students First** – adopt a philosophy and key mechanisms that put the priority on students’ needs; develop a real and virtual, university-wide concept of one-stop service.

**Selectivity with Clear Opportunity Pathways** – enhance UC’s national rankings and ability to attract the highest-quality students, while maintaining clear pathways for students who seek opportunity.

**UC Anytime/Anyplace** – create a 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-week learning, living and social environment.

**GOAL 2: Grow Our Research Excellence**
Build on UC’s greatness as a major research university to benefit society, have meaningful economic impact and enhance the quality of life for all.

**Research Excellence** – develop research and discovery as core activities that illuminate all we do.

**Interdisciplinary Centers** – establish high-profile centers that cross disciplines to best address societal challenges.
World Class Faculty – recruit, develop and retain the best faculty.

**GOAL 3: Achieve Academic Excellence**
Encourage an environment of high-quality learning and world-renowned scholarship.

**Guiding Principles of Academic Programs** – integrate UC|21’s core principles into academic programs.

**Liberal Education at the Core** – reaffirm liberal education as the core to preparing students as life-long learners.

**Cultural Competence** – foster students’ ability to appreciate, investigate and understand a cultural background different from their own.

**Teaching Matters** – identify, examine and support “best practices” for the university community to enhance teaching effectiveness and learning.

**National Presence and Recognition** – pursue marketing efforts beyond the Cincinnati region that draw attention to the university’s unique assets and help move UC into the top tier of rankings.

**GOAL 4: Forge Key Relationships and Partnerships**
Establish and nurture relationships and partnerships, with our colleagues within the university and with local and global communities. UC|21 underscores a true commitment to community engagement.

**Exchange Programs** – bolster efforts to encourage intercultural experiences for students, faculty and staff.

**Experiential Learning** – become an internationally recognized leader in experiential learning, leveraging our co-op expertise and reputation to an even higher level of excellence in all undergraduate and graduate programs.

**Community Connections** – create a “front door” to UC resources for the community and develop meaningful partnerships.

**Experts-in-Residence** – strengthen our bonds to the community by inviting faculty, staff and students to work in community organizations and vice versa – inviting community experts to serve within the university.

**Seamless Transitions and Educational Preparation** – become a national leader in the reform and revitalization of the PK-16 system by creating seamless transitions from pre-school through college.
Healthy Cincinnati – work to improve the health of the UC community and surrounding Greater Cincinnati region.

**GOAL 5: Establish a Sense of “Place”**
Develop an environment where members of the campus community and the community at large want to spend time – learning, living, playing and staying; provide long-term support to build a better Uptown.

We’re All UC – develop a “UC Community” to unify and create a sense of belonging for students, faculty, staff, alumni and friends.

East-West Connections – build programmatic bridges, people-to-people access and incentives for collaborations and joint programs that promote a unified campus.

**GOAL 6: Create Opportunity**
Develop potential, not just in our students, but in our local and global communities.

Economic Delta Force – strengthen UC as an educator of a skilled, principled workforce, as a catalyst for entrepreneurship and as a partner in economic development.

Performance-Enhanced Budgeting and Revenue Enhancement – provide incentives for performance with effective accountability and identify alternate ways to generate revenue.
Chapter 1

Historical Context: The University of Cincinnati

Continual transformation has been a hallmark of the history of the University of Cincinnati. Over the past 185 years, the university has been first a private institution, then a municipal university and now is a comprehensive research university in Ohio’s state system. UC has always been transformative in the evolution of its academic and research programs to meet the ongoing needs of students and society.

From its founding, the University of Cincinnati has played a dynamic and integrated role in the life of its city. UC also has been the source of many discoveries, including the oral polio vaccine, the first program of cooperative education, the first electronic organ, the first safe anti-knock gasoline, and the first antihistamine. Locally, UC has provided expertise to address issues ranging from planning to education to social issues. Today, the university is the largest employer and a prime economic driver for the region.

The people of Cincinnati have always supported higher education. The first attempt by the citizenry to create a college occurred in 1805, when the city was less than 20 years old and its population numbered fewer than 1,000. Four years later, Cincinnati tried again – this time employing a lottery to raise funds. Both attempts were unsuccessful, as was an attempt to establish a seminary in 1815.

The University of Cincinnati traces its founding date to 1819, the year in which two private institutions – the Cincinnati College and the Medical College of Ohio – were first organized. In that year, largely due to the indomitable Daniel Drake, the State Legislature chartered both colleges in separate resolutions. News of the incorporations was acclaimed by the citizens of Cincinnati. They took great pride in the Cincinnati College building, located at Fourth and Walnut streets. A small faculty was hired and within three years of the college’s opening the first Commencement was held. But financial stress and internal friction handicapped both the Cincinnati College and the Medical College of Ohio, and they gradually fell into inactivity.

1819:
University of Cincinnati origins in Cincinnati College and the Medical College of Ohio
In 1835, the Cincinnati College was revived, with a distinguished Medical Department, Law Department, Academic Department, and an Observatory that boasted the largest telescope in the country at that time. The institution’s president at this time was William Holmes McGuffey who, as author of the famous McGuffey Readers, profoundly contributed to the expansion of educational opportunities throughout America. But, again, financial trouble, internal friction, and the effects of the Civil War prevented the institution from achieving success. Only the College’s Law School survived.

An unexpected boost to higher education in Cincinnati came in 1858 when Charles McMicken, a wealthy merchant and landowner, bequeathed the bulk of his estate to the City of Cincinnati in order to establish a university. This gift provided the foundation of the University of Cincinnati, chartered as a municipal university by the passage in 1870 of an act by the Ohio State Legislature. For many years, the University of Cincinnati was the second-oldest and second-largest municipal university in the United States.

During the next century, a number of Cincinnati educational institutions merged with the University of Cincinnati, including several colleges of Medicine, the Law School of Cincinnati College and the College of Pharmacy. Also merging with UC before 1970 were the esteemed College-Conservatory of Music, the College of Applied Science (founded in 1828 as the Ohio Mechanics Institute) and the Cincinnati Observatory. Over the course of its first century, the university created colleges of engineering, business, education, nursing and art. The university first awarded graduate degrees in the 1880s.

With the arrival of the 20th century, the University of Cincinnati built strong connections to Cincinnati under the leadership of Charles Dabney. As UC President, Dabney promoted his belief that universities must play an active role in their cities. At this time, the university launched a settlement house to provide education and social services to the city’s poor. Dabney also backed Herman Schneider’s plan for cooperative education, in which students alternate periods of study with periods of on-the-job experience. UC launched the world’s first “co-op” program in 1906. The co-op program not only built strong ties with Cincinnati’s industrial community, but lent an enduring emphasis on real-world experience to the university’s curriculum.

The early years of the 20th century saw the first efforts to create comprehensive plans for the institution. Some of these efforts focused on the campus itself. At one time, the prestigious Gaslight-Era firm of McKim, Mead and White was under contract to develop a campus plan. Other planning exercises addressed the university’s organization, academic calendar and athletic programs.

By the 1930s, consolidation enabled the university to create a strong medical center based around the city’s General Hospital. The university’s research enterprise expanded as scholars such as Carl Blegen excavated at Troy, and George Barbour toured China as part of the Peking Man expeditions.
The university was dramatically changed by World War II and the G.I. Bill. The war drove a national need for research and provided federal funding for it, setting the university on the path toward prominence in this area. After the war, enrollments soared as the G.I. Bill sent ex-soldiers, and later their children, to campus.

By the mid-1960s, it was apparent that the university's days as a municipal institution were numbered. The resources of the City of Cincinnati could not be stretched to accommodate the rapidly growing student body and an aging physical plant. The State of Ohio offered relief through state affiliation (in which UC remained a city institution, but received increased state funding). Two branch campuses were established during this period: Raymond Walters College in Blue Ash and Clermont College in Batavia.

A decade later the partial remedy of state affiliation could no longer allow the university to thrive. The citizens of Cincinnati voted overwhelmingly to convert their university to full state status, and UC was named Ohio’s 12th state university on July 1, 1977. The university entered the state system just in time to suffer protracted and ongoing cuts in state funding. During its first quarter-century as a state university, UC saw state support drop from more than 40 percent of its budget to less than 20 percent.

Beginning in 1991, the University of Cincinnati unveiled a master plan to rebuild the campus. The plan involves visible changes, such as new academic and research buildings designed by distinguished architects and the reclaiming of green spaces. It also operates invisibly through the development of electronic connections to classrooms, libraries and student residences. A major update to the master plan in 1994 focused on improvements in the quality of student life and services on campus, which over time grew into MainStreet, the largest capital project in the history of UC. MainStreet’s features such as the One Stop Center (University Hall), the Tangeman University Center renovation, the Joseph A. Steger Student Life Center, the Student Recreation Center and the Jefferson Residence Hall Complex worked to create a 24/7 residential campus that places students first. Simultaneously, campus-wide initiatives such as the values-based Just Community program and the Quality Service program promoted an improved quality of life for students and employees.

As the university enters the new century, this drive toward self-determination and strategic vision will be embodied in UC/21: Defining the New Urban Research University, the University of Cincinnati’s strategic plan for charting its academic course for the 21st century. As the 21st century unfolds, UC stands among the nation’s top 25 public research universities with a proud tradition of discovery and transformation. UC’s 34,000 students pursue success through more than 600 academic programs in the sciences, arts, humanities and professions. Throughout its history, UC has enjoyed a deep, reciprocal and widespread connection to its home city of Cincinnati, as an intellectual resource, cultural center and economic driver.
Today, the University of Cincinnati stands ready to “reinvent” itself with a new plan of action: UC21: Defining the New Urban Research University.

As we move forward, let’s look at some of the achievements that make the University of Cincinnati what it is today:

- **UC’s firsts**: First program of cooperative education, founded in 1906, first oral polio vaccine developed by Albert Sabin, first observations of the National Weather Service, first antihistamine, Benadryl, created by George Rieveschl, first electronic organ developed by Winston Kock, first use of YAG laser to remove brain tumor, first bachelor’s degree program in nursing, first emergency medicine residency program, first safe anti-knock gasoline, and the first degree program offered via satellite.

- **Patent income**: In 2003, UC led all universities in Ohio, Kentucky and Indiana in patent income for the fourth straight year, according to the Association of University Technology Managers. The university’s position in the national rankings rose to 27th nationally out of 151 research institutions in the survey.

- **Research funding**: In fiscal-year 2003, UC and its affiliates earned more than $300 million in grants and contracts, an 18.6 percent increase over the prior year.

- **Endowment**: UC ranks 13th among U.S. public institutions of higher learning with an endowment supported by thousands of donors.

- **National Council on Economic Education**: In October 2002, UC’s Economics Center for Education & Research was singled out from among 250 centers of its kind around the nation to receive the first-ever outstanding performance award.

- **Notable alumni**: Our distinguished alumni range from William Howard Taft, the only U.S. President to have also served as Chief Justice, to performing greats such as opera singer Kathleen Battle and the late trumpeter Al Hirt, to renowned architect Michael Graves and Golden Gate bridge designer Joseph B. Strauss.

- **Stroke Team**: It’s often said that there’s no better place to have a stroke than Cincinnati. The credit for that reputation belongs to UC’s Greater Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky Stroke Team. This acclaimed assemblage of professionals produces miracles on demand – working to give back stroke victims’ ability to walk, talk and live normal lives.
New leadership and new vision often come hand in hand. While the University of Cincinnati’s strategic vision, *UC|21: Defining the New Urban Research University*, does indeed have immediate impetus from the appointment of a new president, even UC’s new leader, Nancy L. Zimpher, would acknowledge that attributing it solely to her arrival would be a tremendous oversimplification as well as misleading. UC|21 has roots in underlying trends, issues and momentum that are much more complex than a mere change of leadership. This chapter will discuss the fuller context that is compelling UC to develop a strategic vision. It also explores why that vision inevitably evolved into UC|21 – a call for a new model of urban research university.

**UC TRENDS**

UC’s Board of Trustees announced on July 22, 2003, its selection of Nancy L. Zimpher, then-chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, as UC’s next president. Dr. Zimpher’s remarks immediately following the board vote of approval left no doubt that new vision would be a top priority for her as UC’s 25th president.

Although she would not officially report to work for eight more weeks, she declared: “I have learned that vision trumps everything. A big fan of Collins and Porras’ *Built to Last*, I know that organizations are most effective when a well-articulated and ambitious vision of the future exists. This is an iterative process and must reflect the rich traditions of the past as well as our aspirations for the future. I look forward to initiating this re-visioning process early in my tenure.” She concluded by urging, “Let’s get started.”

By her 11th work day in October, our new president had begun to move the process forward. In a plenary address to the All-University Faculty Meeting on Oct. 15, 2003, she expanded on the charge for a strategic vision, outlining several ideas about how UC could extend its “greatness into premier institutional status.” On Jan. 15, 2004, the president followed up with fuller details about how our academic planning process would proceed, setting the tone with her instructions not to “dream scrawny” – inspiring words borrowed from Claire Gaudiani, former president of Connecticut College.
In these and nearly every other speech she has given about the UC academic plan, President Zimpher made clear that the call for a strategic vision started with the university’s Search and Selection Committee, which recommended her for the UC job, as well as with the UC Board of Trustees, who approved her appointment.

Before the new president’s arrival, what factors had been percolating at UC to feed into the idea that we needed to do some rethinking and that the successor to Joseph A. Steger should have skills in strategic vision? One of the initiatives that moved UC in this direction was the Campus Master Plan, a blueprint that guides our physical environment.

From 1989 onward, the UC Master Plan has been transforming our physical layout in ways not traditionally associated with an urban campus. Instead of vast spaces filled with asphalt, seas of concrete and sprawling parking lots, the pedestrian-friendly UC campus boasts park-like green spaces and signature architecture. The next logical progression in UC’s evolution is to bring about a similar transformation in the conventional thinking about how an urban research university should operate, not just look.

In addition to our physical renaissance, UC has undergone some other recent endeavors that have all built momentum for a university-wide academic vision that is both comprehensive and more integrated than UC has historically experienced. Among these are our reaccreditation self-study done for the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (Embracing the Future, 1999) and the Collegiate Structures Initiative, as well as the university’s integrated branding initiative.

In addition to the gathering forces on campus, there has been an array of external influences challenging UC to rethink the future – to strike out on a new path to better serve the local community, the state and the world – to provide a model for urban research universities in the 21st century.

**HIGHER EDUCATION TRENDS**

In the age of rapid transformation and technological advancement that our world has experienced in the last two decades, there is no such thing as “business as usual.” Yet by and large American research universities operate with the same model they have used since the 19th century, when American educators adapted the German model of elite scientific research to the American undergraduate liberal arts college. Johns Hopkins University, in 1876, led the way as other American research institutions followed this example. And ultimately U.S. research universities grew to be the finest in the world.

Today, great research universities, including UC, stand as vital drivers of local and national economies. The comprehensive public research institution has become a dominating source of scientific talent and research. Both the government and private industry greatly depend upon us. There is a rising call to serve as the economic engine in a knowledge-based economy. Indeed, Frank H.T. Rhodes suggests in *The Creation of the Future: The Role of the American University* (Cornell University Press, 2001) that as knowledge has become the dominant economic force, the university can only grow and its influence increase.
Public research universities also face an ever-escalating need to bring their intellectual capital to bear on a vast array of societal issues, from air pollution and educational achievement gaps to bioterrorism and genetic diseases. At the same time, state support for these universities is dwindling.

Faced with greater pressure to solve societal problems but scarcer resources, universities also face increasing competition for enrollment, with calls to be more market-driven. Today’s savvy students demand that they be viewed as customers not just as “students.” Increased competition for students comes from the for-profit sector and online learning alternatives, as well as traditional campuses. More change undoubtedly looms on the horizon that not even the best experts in higher education can foresee.

One change that we can be sure of is an increasingly diverse set of learners – a cohort with not only larger shares of varied ethnic groups, but also greater shares of non-traditional students – single parents, adult learners entering higher education for the first time or returning learners seeking advanced education or new careers. Demographers predict astounding population growth for the United States, largely from ethnically diverse groups. We expect tremendous Hispanic growth and larger influxes of immigrants from Latin America, the Caribbean, Africa and Asia. By 2030, approximately 40 percent of Americans will be minorities and by 2050, the United States may not have a majority ethnic group. Universities will experience profound pressure to deliver on the increasing demand for education from these varied and expanding populations.

This section has discussed just a sampling of the forces that are influencing the American public university. Greater and more thorough volumes have been written about these trends. Some of those titles are listed at the end of this book. But within those works, the words of James J. Duderstadt and Farris W. Womack in *The Future of the Public University in America: Beyond the Crossroads* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003) perhaps best sum up the need for new approaches: “It is time to move beyond simply analyzing the forces driving change in higher education and to focus instead on strategies that will enable our public universities to serve a rapidly changing America.”

**FINANCIAL TRENDS**

Our higher education trends discussion referred briefly to shrinking support from the state to higher education. Such a passing reference does not adequately address the tremendous challenge presented by this declining support. This section will examine the issue and how it applies to the University of Cincinnati. It will also examine some of the other financial challenges our institution faces.

As UC|21 moves forward, financial planning will be integrated into academic planning and physical planning. Similarly, the birth of UC|21 cannot be divorced from the budgetary pressures that our institution has faced in recent years. Because of our economic climate, the university needs now more than ever to pursue a strategic vision.

When President Zimpher unveiled the plans for the UC|21 academic planning process in a plenary address on Jan. 15, 2004, she likened UC’s budgetary challenges to “an economic ‘near-
perfect storm.’ Speaking to a standing-room only crowd attending the UC Faculty Senate meeting, she pointed out that the university’s budget environment was triggered by a set of variables not unlike those encountered by the Andrea Gale. She went on to describe a rare and sizeable mid-year cut that the university would have to endure for the 2003-04 fiscal year ($6.6 million) and an additional cut slated for FY 2004-05 of $4 million to $8 million.

There are four primary factors that have combined in recent years to create the budget climate UC faces. They are not unlike those faced by many other public universities:

**State support:** Ongoing declines in the State of Ohio’s budgetary support to UC’s general fund have shifted in recent years from flat funding to actual cuts in support. At UC, Ohio’s share of the cost of instruction (also called the SSI) dropped from just over 34 percent of our operating budget in 1985 to just over 19 percent in Fall 2003. Ohio now stands at No. 43 among all states in support for higher education.

Since fiscal year 2001, actual state support to UC has dropped from $160 million to $141 million, for central (Uptown) campus alone. Fall 2003 marked the first time in our history as a state university that students are providing more of the UC operating budget in tuition and fees than does the state.

Ohio’s apparent policy strategy is that tuition (that is, the cost of college for our students and their families) must make up for gaps in state support. That may be a convenient, short-term solution to state budgetary problems. But, in the long-term, it will prove to be short sighted from an economic development perspective. Higher education is an investment in the future that brings vast returns. The impact of higher education on earnings potential is dramatic. On average, individuals with a bachelor’s degree can expect to earn $1 million more over a lifetime than individuals with no education beyond high school. Studies also show that individuals who are better-educated benefit society in the form of greater community service, increased volunteer work and charitable donations, less criminal activity, less dependence on governmental assistance and higher voting rates.

In the words of the aphorism often attributed to former Harvard University president Derek Bok, “If you think education is expensive, try ignorance.” Ohioans already live in a state that is undereducated. Turning that around is key to turning our state budget problems around.

**Threats of future cuts:** On top of existing state cuts, there has been an effort to place on the state ballot a repeal of the one-cent state sales tax increase that hiked the tax from 5 to 6 cents in 2003. The tax, approved as a temporary measure, is slated to expire on June 30, 2005, unless the state legislature votes to extend it. This potential loss of support, coupled with the ongoing threats of additional cuts, place higher education in a state of uncertainty that is becoming the status quo, rather than the exception.

**Enrollment:** UC has experienced loss of tuition income as the result of a decade-long enrollment shortfall. Even though new student applications and enrollments have significantly increased over the period, these demographics have been offset by declines after students enroll and by academic program changes or elimination. Recent year-to-year increases in retention,
coupled with the Fall 2003 enrollment of our largest first-year class in 10 years, may be signs of the dip beginning to reverse.

**Escalation of health care costs:** Although the university works hard to hold the growth of health care costs down, UC, like other employers, has been grappling with rapidly rising expenses in health care for our employees. In the last four years, double-digit increases ranged from 10.6 percent per year to 14.6 percent per year. Not until recently have we asked our university employees to share in the cost of health coverage. In the future, employees may be asked to share an even greater portion of those costs.

**A NEW APPROACH**

The perception of higher education institutions as “ivory towers” – frequently out of touch with the real world – is, of course, a false one. This is especially true at the University of Cincinnati, where a “real world” commitment sits at its very essence. The chief embodiment of this commitment to “applied knowledge” is cooperative education, which was pioneered at UC beginning in 1906 and has spread to more than 900 colleges and universities worldwide. For nearly 100 years, co-op has allowed UC students to put the theories they have learned in the classroom into practice in the workplace. It has also engaged UC on a dynamic level with business, government and industry in a reciprocal relationship. This real-world commitment uniquely positions UC to “Define the New Urban Research University.”

UC21 makes even more sense when you consider that UC already stands at the forefront of the new urban university movement. UC has contributed to inner-city housing development and partnered with community groups; provided access to quality health care and health care options; developed strategies to improve neighborhoods; spearheaded efforts to form better coalitions between the police department and local community residents; and improved job training and training results. In the last decade, the university has earmarked $75 million in endowment funds to invest in community redevelopment projects in the neighborhoods surrounding campus. To date, this commitment has stimulated more than $300 million in new construction investment and project additions to the Uptown area of 425,000 square feet in commercial and retail space, 237,500 square feet of professional office space, 396 units of market-rate, owner-occupied housing, 677 new market-rate rental units, and 1,476 new beds for student housing.

Our vision to serve as the new model of an urban research university resulted from a collaborative process of unprecedented scope. Hundreds of pages of feedback were collected from thousands of people who participated via Input Sessions and Electronic Feedback from an academic planning Web site, while hundreds more formed the working groups that met in a series of Town Hall Meetings (see Chapter 3). Town Hall Action Teams were told that gender and diversity should be underlying commitments throughout all the action teams.

During one of the Town Hall Meetings held during the academic planning process, facilitator Bob Gleason of the Revere Group joked that we could use the Web-based Dilbert Mission Statement Generator to generate our vision with a random arrangement of words. This humorous diversion illustrated the sort of content-free outcomes that UC’s planning process worked to avoid. In reality, the process to name our plan proved to be deliberate and
painstaking. Each word describing UC’s path from “great” to premier was selected with tremendous care and purpose.

**UC|21:** The “21” is shorthand for the 21st century, so UC|21 is an easily remembered and recognizable way to position the University of Cincinnati in our new era. It evolved from “University of Cincinnati: Leading in the 21st Century,” which was an early focus for the Comprehensive Academic Planning Process (CAPP), outlined in an address by President Zimpher to faculty at the Faculty Senate meeting in January 2004.

**Defining:** UC is an institution with a distinguished record of teaching, research and scholarship, and community service. It is a pioneering university. Once again, we are called to distinction – to innovate and serve as a model.

**The New:** As the trends discussed earlier indicate, “business as usual” is not an option. “New” means new ways of doing business, new thinking, new approaches to our teaching, research and service missions, and even new language to describe this triadic charge: learning, innovation and engagement. Even the choice of the word, “the,” speaks to our aspirations. It emphasizes our pledge to stand out from the pack and to develop a premier reputation that is based on our terms.

**Urban Research University:** No word in the UC|21 plan was more strongly debated than “urban.” Given UC’s strong and distinctive accomplishments as a research university, there is no question that our university will continue to expand and excel in its role as a comprehensive, public research institution – regionally, nationally and globally.

But does excelling at research mean the university must distance itself from its home base? Some argued “yes.” Those who cautioned against our vision as an “urban” research university suggested that UC risked identification with negative associations of cities such as decay, poverty and flight, rather than the positive attributes that make cities exciting and alive, such as rich culture, vibrancy and diversity.

UC|21, however, suggests that, in the end, ignoring our institution’s connection to the urban community would be a rejection of something that is just as much a part of our essence as our real-world commitment. To propose that UC’s vision of itself should be separated from its urban base would be akin to classifying the Eiffel Tower as purely an engineering feat, rather than as an icon of Paris. Our international and national reputation links to our location as well as to our distinguished scholarly and research achievements. Our local community is a resource-rich and problem-rich environment that beckons us as a community of scholars.

To ignore the university’s urban base would also deny something that UC can do better than any other university, if we are willing to take an ambitious step – a step as bold as perhaps co-op education seemed to be when Engineering Dean Herman Schneider asked UC officials to support his idea. By fully embracing our urban community, the university seeks a reciprocal partnership right at our doorstep, where our intellectual power, our research capacity and our creativity can be set to work on society’s most pressing issues.
“Urban” also ties into UC’s rich heritage. For the past 185 years, UC has had the city in its very origins. The university was founded with Cincinnati in our name. UC has roots as a municipal university. We reside in the middle of a metropolitan area, in one of the city’s most active economic centers.

The demographic argument for “urban” also is convincing. The very future of our nation rests on the welfare and health of our cities. According to 2002 figures, 50 percent of the global population is urban. By the year 2025, that is expected to increase, with 75 percent of the world’s population residing in cities. Over the next 25 years, almost 2 billion people will be born or will move to cities, especially large urban areas.

UC|21 is built on the belief that UC, and other urban universities, must address the issues our cities face if our communities are to reach their fullest potential. Urban universities have the human and intellectual capital – along with other resources – to help transform urban communities. By unleashing these resources in collaboration with the local community, UC can work with the community toward a more livable city, where the quality of life is enriched immeasurably.

In a true spirit of partnership with our neighbors, UC is called upon to work together to enhance the quality of life locally on a wide variety of issues that include, but are not limited to: local schools, health care, safety, economic development, entrepreneurialism, civic life, infrastructure, neighborhoods and racial relations.

Given UC’s national and international impact, UC has the opportunity and the obligation to redefine the national perspective on what it means to be the new urban-engaged university – one that truly integrates our triadic missions of learning, discovery and community engagement. UC has the capacity to move beyond theory in this realm to real commitment.

To reach out to our home base does not in any way diminish our national or international aspirations or reputation. In fact, the goal of UC|21 is the opposite, to enhance our academic and research standing by virtue of our engagement in society.

Frank H.T. Rhodes says in The Creation of the Future: The Role of the American University (Cornell University Press, 2001), “If I were allowed only one word to describe the distinctive method by which the university pursues its multiple tasks of learning, discovery and service, it would be the word community. Without community, knowledge becomes idiosyncratic: the lone learner, studying in isolation, is vulnerable to narrowness, dogmatism, and untested assumption, and learning misses out on being expansive and informed, contested by opposing interpretations, leavened by differing experience and refined by alternative viewpoints.”

Rhodes suggests that the university should assist and advise in outreach programs, “but it must not dictate or direct. ‘Assistance’ should be just that: The university must not presume to become the arbiter of local priorities or policy issues. …Whatever the details, local autonomy must be respected.”
Speaking more than one hundred years ago at a university president’s inauguration, William Rainey Harper, then-president of the University of Chicago, described this vision of the university of the future:

“A university which will adapt itself to urban influence, which will undertake to serve as an expression of urban civilization and which is compelled to meet the demands of an urban environment will in the end become something essentially different from a university located in a village or small city. Such an institution will in time differentiate itself from other institutions. It will gradually take on new characteristics both outward and inward, and it will ultimately form a new type of university.”

In the same address, Harper invoked John Dewey's fundamentally pragmatic proposition that major advances in knowledge tend to occur when human beings consciously work to solve the central problems confronting their society. “The urban universities found today in… [the] largest cities in this country… and in [Europe]… ” Harper declaimed, “form a class by themselves, inasmuch as they are compelled to deal with problems which are not involved in the work of universities located in smaller cities… [J]ust as the great cities of the country represent the national life in its fullness and variety, so the urban universities are in the truest sense…national universities.” (From "The Urban University," reprinted in The Trend in Higher Education, by William Rainey Harper, University of Chicago Press, 1905). With a new century unfolding, these words still poignantly ring true.

UC|21 chooses to embrace Cincinnati and its urbanity. We choose to take up the challenges that this responsibility imparts upon us. We choose to make a difference locally, as well as globally. As we seek to improve our university’s world standing, we work to enhance our home community – its local school system, its health, its safety, its entrepreneurialism and its civic life, its infrastructure, its neighborhoods – its future and ours.

**THE Core VALUES & GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

UC|21 embraces a set of core values and guiding principles for the new urban research university. The demands and challenges of the 21st century are only beginning to unfold, and these ideals speak directly to this new century. These principles will keep our strategic vision focused and true to our aspirations and dreams. UC|21 builds on the eight values that were developed by the Just Community initiative and endorsed by the university community in the year 2000. UC|21 also identifies a set of six principles to guide the new urban research university.

The eight university values affirmed through the Just Community initiative are:

**Pursue learning and scholarship** by building on successes, learning from mistakes, and pursuing quality in teaching, research and creative endeavors.

**Strive for excellence** by aspiring to achieve our fullest potential in our educational and personal pursuits.
Celebrate the uniqueness of each individual by respecting individual differences and promoting common interests.

Practice civility by extending to those we meet the same respect, cooperation and caring that we expect from others.

Embrace freedom and openness by working to create an environment that is safe and affirming, one that nurtures independent thinking, and the free and open expression of ideas.

Seek integrity by aspiring to the highest moral and ethical standards.

Promote justice by working to build a learning environment that offers everyone an equal opportunity to grow, flourish and contribute.

Accept responsibility by striving to build a learning community committed to these common values and principles.

Building on these values, UC21’s six principles – scholarship, citizenship, leadership, stewardship, partnership and cultural competence – bridge back to UC’s rich heritage and look beyond the past and present to a future where change will be accelerated.

They have evolved from ideals that were frequently mentioned at the Town Hall Meetings, Input Sessions and corporate/donor breakfasts convened during UC’s academic planning process. These values, or guiding principles, will enable the university itself, as well the students it graduates, to thrive in our rapidly transforming world and in our local Cincinnati community.

The guiding principles of UC21 are:

**Scholarship:** The creation and application of knowledge, with an emphasis on scholarly inquiry, research, experimentation, investigation and creative production.

**Citizenship:** The ability to apply knowledge and skills for responsible civic life and action. UC’s emphasis is on public engagement and ethical purpose.

**Stewardship:** The responsibility of the university to carry out its unique place in society, which is to conserve intellectual inquiry. Members of the university community are stewards of knowledge and instill in students an appreciation for the responsibilities that accompany education. In a financial sense, the university is also called upon to generate revenue to ensure appropriate operating funds to carry on its mission.

**Leadership:** Motivating others to take actions that would not otherwise have been taken. Leadership is measured by the extent to which an individual or groups of individuals can influence and energize the ideas, actions and capabilities of others toward the betterment of society.
**Partnership:** Working collaboratively to address complex issues and problems, both within and beyond the boundaries of UC. A university cannot solve problems by working in isolation. It must do so by interacting with others. By working in partnerships, we gain an understanding and appreciation of what can be accomplished together that could not have been accomplished alone. We also affirm the importance of diversity, since constructive change often occurs when individuals and groups with different identities and various priorities come together.

**Cultural Competence:** To foster a student’s ability to appreciate, investigate and understand a cultural background different from his or her own. Cultural competency promotes tolerance, understanding and respect for a variety of cultures, domestic and international, and facilitates opportunity for interaction, communication and engagement.

Now that we understand more about the context, the next chapter will examine the process we used to develop our vision and how the process was evaluated.
UC|21: Defining the New Urban Research University is the result of months of discussion and consultation at a scope never before seen on the University of Cincinnati campus. A wide range of university stakeholders – students, full- and part-time faculty, staff, emeriti, alumni, corporate partners, donors, civic and social service leaders, and neighbors – were invited to participate. More than 240 people, including individuals from the community at large, worked together in a series of Town Hall Meetings to discuss and draft the university’s vision for its future. Additional insight came from over 2,400 people who participated in more than 90 input sessions hosted by UC colleges and units. Over 325 people also voiced opinions using the university’s academic planning Web site, with literally thousands of visits to the site. In this chapter, we describe the context that guided the planning process, Town Hall Meetings, Input Sessions, Electronic Feedback and the Evaluation Data collected.

CONTEXT
The goal of the entire process was to create an inclusive structure in which the entire UC community could create a vision for our future and identify strategies to actualize the vision. The Comprehensive Academic Planning Process (CAPP) formally began in December 2003 with a general meeting of key university stakeholders to discuss the need for the process. Bob Gleason of the Revere Group was employed to help plan and to facilitate the meeting. At the first meeting, we affirmed the current mission statement of the university and decided to develop a dynamic action plan that could be implemented in the coming academic year. While we affirmed the current mission statement, we acknowledged that it may need refinement later as the action plan developed through the CAPP is implemented. The process was initially framed by the theme “University of Cincinnati: Leading in the 21st Century.” Based on the discussion at this first meeting the following three groups were identified to move the process forward:

- **Steering Committee**: The members of the President’s Cabinet served as the Steering Committee, including UC’s two provosts, vice presidents, the chair of the Faculty Senate and the chair of the Deans Council. The Steering Committee monitored the process and shaped key issues as the CAPP progressed.

- **Operations Team**: This small group coordinated logistics and kept the process moving. Team members included President Nancy L. Zimpher; Dale L. McGirr, vice president for
Finance; James R. Tucker, vice president for Administrative & Business Services; Kathryn St. Clair, executive director of the Office of the President; Marianne Kunnen-Jones, special assistant for communications; Lawrence J. Johnson, dean of the College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services; and facilitator Bob Gleason, vice president and managing director of the Revere Group, Milwaukee. Gleason served as the outside consultant throughout the process. He worked with the Operations Team to plan the CAPP and facilitated Town Hall Meetings.

- **Work Team**: The Evaluation Services Center of the College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services was employed to staff the process. The staff helped to collect data, took notes, analyzed data from meetings, developed forms and in general did what needed to be done for the CAPP to keep moving forward. Members of the Work Team were Cathy Maltbie, Shane Burris and Lawrence Johnson. Additional graduate students and professionals were drafted when an event required more staff power.

### OPERATING PRINCIPLES

Once these three groups were identified, the Cabinet in combination with the Operations Team was convened to discuss the process and to identify operating principles as the process progressed. These operating principles were:

1. **Massive “inclusivity”**. UC has a wide variety of stakeholders, both inside and outside the university. The number of stakeholders in any given group can be large, and we were committed to involving as many people as possible. We created the following three vehicles for feedback (discussed more fully later in this chapter).

   - **Town Hall Meetings.** More than 300 people representing a cross-section of key university stakeholders were invited to participate in a series of eight Town Hall Meetings at UC’s Event Pavilion and UC’s Marriott Kingsgate Conference Center. Each Town Hall was scheduled to last four hours and combined both presentations and structured dialogue among participants.

   - **Input Sessions.** Each college or other administrative unit within the university was charged to conduct at least two Input Sessions between January and April. Feedback from the Input Sessions was reported back to Town Hall Meetings, in addition to input from other sources.

   - **Electronic Feedback.** A Web site was developed to update progress and to receive feedback from people electronically ([www.uc.edu/academicplan](http://www.uc.edu/academicplan)).

2. **Urgency.** As a pragmatic matter, a new leader has a limited amount of time to make significant changes and beyond 90 days many new leaders become so assimilated with “the way things are” that change becomes more difficult. President Zimpher immediately established herself as a leader with a purpose. Expectations were raised among stakeholders, and participants understood the urgency to complete the process in a timely manner.
3. **Suspend disbelief.** Participants were asked to suspend disbelief for a time and work together to create the picture of the future. They were asked to let go of history and to avoid making judgments regarding plausibility of proposed strategies. While it was clear that strategies would eventually be prioritized and linked with resources, participants were asked to brainstorm the possibilities without considering these limitations.

4. **Data driven.** Data was an important value that drove the process. Evaluation data was collected after each Town Hall Meeting and Input Session. These data were reviewed by the Operations Team and used to plan future meetings. In all, participants in Town Hall Meetings and Input Sessions generated over 800 pages of input that was systematically analyzed and used to generate goals, strategies and action teams.

5. **Action Teams.** As goals emerged and strategies to actualize goals became clear, affinity groups, or Action Teams, were formed. As a general premise, Town Hall participants were invited to work on the idea or team that most engaged them. Participants were invited to identify the three topics that most interested them, and groups were constructed following these choices. Action Teams were created to represent stakeholder diversity, in addition to interests.

6. **Leader as learner.** President Zimpher was the most public of the leaders in this process. As a leader, she clarified for the group what she thought was important and in the best interests of the institution. As a learner, though, she also suspended disbelief for a time and waited for the ideas to form. She learned along with the rest of the group, and responded accordingly. While the president was the most public leader, the provosts, deans, Board of Trustees members, faculty leaders, student leaders, community leaders and staff leaders all contributed in the same manner: as leaders when necessary, as learners when possible.

7. **Progress, not perfection.** At all times this effort was described as an emerging process open for discussion and reform. As the CAPP moved forward, people made very helpful suggestions that improved the process. As we will see later in the chapter, much data was collected throughout the process to offer encouragement or help identify what was working or what needed refinement. It was understood that moving quickly, with maximum inclusion, to actionable ideas, was more important than doing the process perfectly.

The process was dynamic, and as we described above, massive inclusiveness was a driving force. We met this goal with the participation of thousands of stakeholders. Faculty, staff, graduate and undergraduate students, alumni, local business leaders, UC Foundation board members, the Board of Trustees, civic leaders, nonprofit organization leaders, elected officials, emeritus faculty, neighborhood organization leaders and others were all encouraged to participate in one or more CAPP activities. In the end, approximately 240 invitees participated in the Town Halls, over 2,400 people attended various Input Sessions, and the Web feedback link generated more than 325 individual comments. Additionally, the Web site received more than 24,200 page viewings. In all, the Working Team distilled more than 800 pages of notes and feedback.

The remainder of this chapter describes in more detail the Town Hall Meetings, Input Sessions, Electronic Feedback, and Evaluation Data.

---

UC21 defining the new urban research university
TOWN HALL MEETINGS

To identify stakeholders who would be willing to commit time and energy to Town Hall Meetings, which would each last about four hours, President Zimpher sought suggestions from the chair of the Faculty Senate, vice presidents, deans and leaders of the Student Government. Trying to achieve equitable representation from UC’s various stakeholder groups (e.g., students, faculty, campus administrators, labor, community leaders and others), the president selected more than 300 people from the list of nominees. In addition to Town Hall Meetings, each college or unit of the university not organized around a college was asked to conduct two rounds of Input Sessions for individuals not participating in Town Hall meetings. Feedback from the Input Sessions and from the Web site was summarized and reported back to the Steering Committee and Town Hall participants.

Attendance at the eight Town Hall Meetings numbered from 100 to 150 participants per meeting. Each Town Hall lasted three to four hours with the majority of the participants attending the majority of the meetings. Although Town Hall participants were initially selected by the president, additional participants attended as the Action Teams worked on their plans and expanded their working membership. Topics discussed at each Town Hall Meeting are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of Town Hall Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>AGENDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/8/03</td>
<td>Town Hall #1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Welcome and Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Setting the Stage for Institutional Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Institutional Rankings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ongoing Planning Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lessons Learned from the Campus Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Process of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aspirations for the Future – “What are the unique attributes of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Cincinnati?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communicating the Academic Planning Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attributes of a Successful University in the Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Anticipated Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conclusion and Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29/04</td>
<td>Town Hall #2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Welcome and Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Group Discussion – “Issues, Expectations, Concerns and Desires”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Context for Change at UC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion – “Changes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Process of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion – “What are 21st-Century Issues?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion – “What are the Big Issues?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Feedback and Logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Blackboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>AGENDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Upcoming Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Parking Vouchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Feedback Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Next Steps and Closing Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/04</td>
<td>Town Hall #3:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reflections on Concerns and Expectations for the Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Big Ideas” Generated During January 29th Town Hall Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion – “Are these the right ideas?”, “Will these strategic ideas provide a foundation for UC to play a leading role in the 21st century?”, “Have we missed something?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Form Affinity Groups Around Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion – “What are some specific immediate (Quick Wins), short-term and long-term strategies related to our ideas?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wrap up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/04</td>
<td>Town Hall #4:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Welcome and Opening Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Symposium: Campus Master Plan and Uptown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion – “In what ways can life-space and academic planning support community life at UC?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The What, Why, Where and How of the Academic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Next Steps in the Process – “21 strategies”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Process for Moving Forward: Strategic Affinity Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8/04</td>
<td>Town Hall #5:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Welcome and Opening Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Action Team Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Choose a co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Identify note takers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Sharpen and define the ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Name your idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Action Team Work – “What will be different or better as a result of this work?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work Session for Co-Chairs of Action Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29/04</td>
<td>Town Hall #6:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part I. Breakfast Meeting for Steering Committee and Co-chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opening Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of Work to Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Determine Information Needed from Other Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part II. Town Hall Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Report from the Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Current State of the Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Barriers and Enablers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• First Pass at Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8/04</td>
<td>Town Hall #7:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Working Lunch/Action Teams Work on Deliverables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By the March 8 meeting, the Town Hall participants were assigned to Action Teams to flesh out one or more of 21 strategies. Each participant was given the opportunity to identify his or her top three choices for Action Team work via an Internet Survey. The support team assigned one co-chair and the membership for all teams. From this point on, Action Teams met as a group and were given time during these meetings to continue their discussions. Each team was asked to select at least one other co-chair from among its members. They were also encouraged to meet outside Town Hall Meetings to complete their reports.

Full summaries of each Town Hall Meeting are on the UC|21 Web site at [www.uc.edu/UC21/meetings](http://www.uc.edu/UC21/meetings). Action Team reports were the final outcome from these inclusive and productive meetings. These reports are represented in Section II of this report.

**INPUT SESSIONS**

The second major set of activity, Input Sessions, was undertaken to encourage massive inclusion. Two rounds of Input Sessions with UC stakeholders were encouraged. In the end, CAPP resulted in over 90 Input Sessions convened to provide feedback to the Town Hall participants. The Working Team supported these Input Sessions, which were conducted both within the university and in the community. Within the university, all colleges, many administrative units, students and the faculty organized input sessions. There were also sessions coordinated by Human Resources to invite all employees to provide ideas and feedback, even if their administrative units did not conduct Input Sessions or they were unable to attend the Input Session scheduled by their administrative units. The Input Sessions also included more than a dozen breakfast meetings with corporate leaders and donors organized by the UC Foundation. The president and the UC Foundation also provided an opportunity for alumni and donors to provide feedback about the academic planning process while traveling at events across the country.

The first round of Input Sessions occurred between the last week in January and Feb. 15. The following questions guided the focus of these discussions:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>AGENDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/20/04</td>
<td>Town Hall #8:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work Sessions for Action Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Input Session Output/Process Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Action Team Reports (2 minutes) – “What is one impact you expect to see from your plan?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quick Wins/Stupid Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mission, Vision, Plans for Going Forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Celebration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
1. What is your vision of UC’s leadership role in 21st-century society?
2. What strategic steps and resources are required to realize that future?
3. What outcomes should we hold ourselves accountable for in realizing this vision for UC?

Responses to these questions were recorded, and a summary was shared at the Feb. 24 Town Hall. The first round of Input Session responses and Town Hall Meeting discussions were distilled into a vision for the university that called upon UC to be a leader in the 21st century by making a difference.

The second round of Input Sessions occurred from March 8 through April 15. These sessions focused on the emerging principles and strategies developed in the Town Hall Meetings. Our proposed journey for UC’s vision of the future centered on the values developed for the university and a list of 21 strategies that had been developed out of the meetings held to date. Each Input Session coordinator was given a PowerPoint presentation summarizing these identified values and 21 strategies. The second round of Input Sessions focused on the following questions and tasks:

1. Is there anything we missed in the “What, Why, Where and How” of our vision document and the Next Steps action strategies?
2. Reflect on the concepts of Leadership, Scholarship, Partnership, Citizenship and Stewardship. In what ways can these concepts guide the university in the future?
3. Most importantly, select a few of your favorites from the list of 21 and give us creative action steps we could share with the Town Hall Action Teams as they proceed with their work.

Responses from these questions were recorded and shared at the April 20 Town Hall Meeting. Files with responses from both rounds of Input sessions are linked from the Web site at www.uc.edu/uc21/overview.htm.

ELECTRONIC FEEDBACK
Hundreds of individuals utilized the Web-based planning process Feedback form and e-mail to provide feedback. We received comments from all university constituent groups (faculty, staff, students, alumni, friends, neighbors and other interested people). Feedback authors could provide their names or send their comments anonymously. The Support Team reviewed all this feedback on a daily basis and responded to them as appropriate. Individual comments became a part of the overall data and were shared with Action Teams. A file of all comments was shared with Action Teams during the April 20 meeting, and individual comments were sent directly to Action Team co-chairs after this date. A list of all Web comments as of April 15 is linked from the Web site at www.uc.edu/UC21/overview.htm.

EVALUATION OF THE PROCESS
From the beginning, data were seen as critical to the CAPP and therefore steps were taken to collect evaluation data. Table 2 contains the questions/statements and the scale used with questions/statements. The same questions/statements were used for both Input Sessions and
Town Hall Meetings. The word “session” was replaced with “meeting” for the Town Hall Meetings.

We designed the questions to get information on the facilities and the participant’s overall assessment of the process. Affirming statements were developed to access the degree to which participants felt that: a) activities were appropriate, b) they were comfortable sharing ideas, c) their ideas were being accurately recorded, d) the facilitator did a good job, and e) the process was proceeding according to their expectations.

Table 2: CAPP Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Please rate this session <strong>OVERALL</strong>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4=outstanding; 3=very good; 2=satisfactory; 1=poor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Please rate the <strong>FACILITIES and ARRANGEMENTS.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4=outstanding; 3=very good; 2=satisfactory; 1=poor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. This activity is <strong>appropriate</strong> for where we are in the academic planning process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6=strongly agree; 5=agree; 4=somewhat agree; 3=somewhat disagree; 2=disagree; 1=strongly disagree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. I was <strong>comfortable expressing my ideas</strong> in this setting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6=strongly agree; 5=agree; 4=somewhat agree; 3=somewhat disagree; 2=disagree; 1=strongly disagree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. My most important ideas were <strong>accurately incorporated</strong> into the session summary.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6=strongly agree; 5=agree; 4=somewhat agree; 3=somewhat disagree; 2=disagree; 1=strongly disagree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. The <strong>facilitator</strong> did a good job keeping the session focused on the guiding questions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6=strongly agree; 5=agree; 4=somewhat agree; 3=somewhat disagree; 2=disagree; 1=strongly disagree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. The Comprehensive Academic Planning Process is <strong>progressing as I expected.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6=strongly agree; 5=agree; 4=somewhat agree; 3=somewhat disagree; 2=disagree; 1=strongly disagree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. When this type of session is conducted again, is there anything that should be modified? Please be as specific as possible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 9. Are there any other comments you would like to make? |

Figure 1 presents the ratings of Input Session and Town Hall respondents regarding their overall assessment of the process and their assessment of the facilities and arrangements. These ratings were on a four-point scale ranging from 4 (outstanding) to 1 (poor). As you can see in Table 3, the overall rating of the process was just above or below 3, which indicates that participants’ overall assessment of the process was “very good.” Their assessment of the arrangements and facilities was also around 3, indicating that they found them to be “very good”.

The aggregate ratings of Input Session participants on items 3 through 7 are contained in Figure 2. These ratings were on a six-point scale ranging from 6 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). These statements focused on the degree to which participants felt that: a) activities were appropriate (item 3), b) they were comfortable sharing ideas (item 4), c) their ideas were being accurately recorded (item 5), d) the facilitator did a good job (item 6), and e) the process
was proceeding according to their expectations (item 7). As you can see in Figure 2, respondents’ aggregate ratings for these statements were just over or slightly below 5 for both Input Sessions 1 and 2, indicating that respondents agreed with these statements regarding the process.

Figure 1: Overall Assessment of Process/Town Hall and Input Sessions

![Overall Assessment of Process for Town Hall and Input Sessions](image1)

Figure 2: Input Session Ratings’ on Proceedings

![Input Session Ratings on Items 3 - 7](image2)
Figure 3 contains the aggregate ratings for Town Hall sessions on items 3 through 7, which focused on the degree to which participants felt that: a) activities were appropriate (item 3), b) they were comfortable sharing ideas (item 4), c) their ideas were being accurately recorded (item 5), d) the facilitator did a good job (item 6), and e) the process was proceeding according to their expectations (item 7). As with Input Sessions these statements were rated on a 6-point scale ranging from 6 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). Once again, ratings were just above or slightly below 5, indicating that Town Hall participants agreed with these affirming statements regarding the process. In fact, if we were to plot ratings over time, you would see that Town Hall participants became more positive as the planning process progressed.

In conclusion, the Comprehensive Academic Planning Process participants reported very positive reactions from the beginning to the end of this process. While the pace of the process was demanding and very fast, participants’ evaluations of the Town Hall Meetings and Input Sessions proved to be generally very positive. An analysis of the survey sheets gathered at all the Town Hall and Input Sessions shows that participants felt that the experience overall was positive, they were comfortable expressing their ideas and felt their ideas were accurately represented in outcomes of the process. Moreover, participation in the process remained very high, and participants voluntarily attended meetings and contributed to the process even though they had many other demands on their time. By staying with the process, participants “voted with their feet and time” that this was a worthwhile endeavor.
Goals & Strategic Actions

UC|21 lays out an ambitious six goals and 21 actions to define the role of the new urban research university in this dynamic new century. These goals and strategic actions build on our capacity to serve and to lead in the 21st century and provide a clear direction for future efforts.

Action teams took on one or more strategic actions and developed concepts to implement them. This section provides all of the reports from each Action Team, outlining possible action steps for each goal.
chapter 4

GOAL 1 –
PLACE STUDENTS AT THE CENTER

Become a university of choice, a destination campus, by keeping students at our core.

• Students First – adopt a philosophy and key mechanisms that put the priority on students’ needs; develop a real and virtual, university-wide concept of one-stop service.

• Selectivity with Clear Opportunity Pathways – enhance UC’s national rankings and ability to attract the highest quality students, while maintaining clear pathways for students who seek opportunity.

• UC Anytime/Anyplace – create a 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-week learning, living and social environment.

Action Team reports follow on pages 37 to 53.
Action Team –
Students First

VISION
Putting *Students First* in conjunction with a world-class faculty is the hallmark of the new research university in the 21st century. From the first contact during the freshman year experience to graduation and career, the university is committed to meeting the service and educational needs of students. Putting *Students First* is a transformational, university-wide plan of action that provides students with the tools for success, creates a 24/7 service environment, eliminates red tape and barriers, emphasizes self-service and quality, provides a seamless and paperless service environment, and promotes challenges in learning rather than in the delivery of services.

*Students First* is:
1) a *philosophy* that places the needs of students first,
2) a *partnership* that emphasizes working together for the benefit of everyone versus local interests,
3) people who are guided by quality and who view service as their job,
4) a *technology* that encourages and supports self-service, and
5) a *place* that provides friendly service.

*Students First* requires willingness to:
1) challenge traditional service models and assumptions,
2) promote change and support risk-taking,
3) commit to fully automated (paperless) processing, and
4) invest in people, training, and technology.

CURRENT STATE OF BARRIERS & ENABLERS
The current prototype of *Students First* is the One Stop Student Services Center. Launched in November 2002 with the opening of University Pavilion, the One Stop Center represents the culmination of over a decade of cross divisional planning involving Student Affairs and Services (Registrar and Student Financial Aid) and Finance (Cashier, Collections, and Student Accounts) offices. It is recognized nationally as being on the “cutting edge” of student service delivery. However, there are many steps that must be taken to maximize its potential and the barriers we must confront are as follows.

**Barriers**
1) **Organizational** – UC continues to operate in a “silo” environment where there are few opportunities for cross-divisional planning and activities. Services to students are often sub-optimized because of their limited scope.
2) **Cultural** – Today’s students are products of a service culture that in the larger society, anticipates their needs and responds immediately. Given their technology skills, prospective
students are able to go online anytime, anyplace to meet their service needs. Unfortunately, the culture of the campus is not as responsive to the needs of students as students expect.

3) **Technology** – UC does not have uniform, state-of-the-art systems to meet the service needs of students. The current legacy of decentralized systems often follow the pattern of organizational boundaries within the university. As a result, our systems do not permit a seamless, non-bureaucratic service environment.

4) **Staffing** – The university has experienced annual budget cuts for more than a decade. These cuts have been taken while attempting to protect academic priorities. The result has been a reduction of $113 million in the past 16 years and a demoralized staff who have consistently been asked to do more with less.

5) **Financial** – Only recently has a consistent source of funds (approximately $1,264,000) been identified to provide for the enhancement and development of core support systems. As a result, we have a patchwork of systems that have grown up in a more “opportunistic” rather than in a “planful” environment. Given this financial barrier, we do not have a fully integrated service environment that puts *Students First.*

**Enablers**

1) **One Stop Student Services Center** – The current One Stop Student Services Center is an excellent foundation upon which we can build a university-wide model for student services. The fully integrated technology and cross-trained staff approach is portable to other areas of the university.

2) **Potential Students First Quick Wins** – The Students First Action Team reviewed a list of “quick win” service requests that will enable our current One Stop Center to become more comprehensive and universal. The list of 22 recommendations range from real-time transactions to Web tools that will replace all paper forms. The top enablers include:

   a) **Web Grading** – Currently, grading is a paper-driven, data-entry process. Web grading would eliminate the “middle-person,” allowing faculty to enter grades directly into UniverSIS via the Web. In addition to saving staff time and overtime pay, students will benefit by getting their grades faster.

   b) **Waive NOW!** – Enhancements to Web health insurance waiver process would guide students to complete this often over-looked requirement.

   c) **Web Registration X-Plus** – Web registration needs to be expanded to enable online processing of these and other functions as well as pre-requisite checking.

   d) **Pre-PLUS** – This feature will incorporate Parent’s Loan (PLUS) pre-approval into the Web-based financial aid acceptance process, streamline delivery of loan proceeds and better aid estimates on student bills.

   e) **Virtual Advisor 24/7** – The university has obtained software (NetSol USA) that will permit students to ask questions in everyday language and get an immediate response. The software needs to be installed and a team formed to develop a database of answers.

   f) **Online General Education and Transfer Module Advising** – This will provide Web access to information about General Education and the Ohio Transfer Module as well as access to advising about completion of these requirements.

   g) **Web Alerts** – A personalized process that will set a “red flag” to alert students of critical processes (for example, financial aid loan promissory note[s] not signed) that need to be completed.
h) **One-Time Login** – This feature will replace the current process, which requires students to log in multiple times to One Stop when doing more than one function.

i) **Web-Certifications** – This will provide students with immediate online enrollment certifications for routine matters.

j) **Unofficial Transcripts Online** – Students will be able to see and print a copy of their entire academic record for their personal/educational use.

k) **Refunds** – A total review needs to be conducted. Based on this review, overhaul of all systems (including Web) elements pertaining to student refunds. The current processes are confusing and penalize students arbitrarily in some cases.

l) **Alternate Class Titles** – Allows display of alternate titles for specific sections of quarterly class offerings.

m) **Cost Estimator** – Provides a tool for students and parents to get good estimates of their bills.

n) **Faculty Finder** – Provides a Web database linked to various One Stop functions to help students contact faculty who teach specific courses.

o) **Why Am I Blocked?** – Provides an online tool for students to find the specific reason(s) for a block on their registration.

p) **TMS Plus** – Improves online connection to UC’s third-party vendor (Tuition Management Systems) for payment plans.

q) **Wait List** – Gives students an option to be placed on a waiting list for a class with automatic enrollment and notification if space becomes available.

r) **Financial Aid Refunds to the Bearcat Card** – Allows students the option of applying all or a portion of the refund to their Bearcat Card.

s) **Capture UC Alumni Status of Prospective Students** – Records in UniverSIS an applicant’s or prospective student’s status as descendant of a UC alumnus.

t) **Where’s My Loan?** – Gives students a way to track the status of their student loan proceeds in the disbursement process.

u) **Who’s My Advisor?** – Provides an online tool for students to get information about their advisors.

v) **UC “MapQuest”** – Provides a UC campus version of popular Web tool.

2) **Institutional Management Technology Committee (IMTC)** – The IMTC is a subcommittee of the University Executive Technology Steering Committee. The IMTC is charged with determining core systems of the university and recommending financial support for their development and maintenance.

3) **UniverSIS** – The system that drives the One Stop Center is a core system that could be funded for further development.

4) **UC Is Listening** – This quality service initiative is designed to provide feedback to areas of the university where students are experiencing difficulties. This Web-facilitated tool could be expanded to enhance One Stop and evaluate the university’s effectiveness in creating a *Students First* campus ethos.

5) **First Year Experience** – Providing a meaningful first year experience is critical to launching students’ academic careers.

6) **College Success Skills Courses** – Each college will develop courses that are designed to familiarize students with the history and traditions of the university, values and expectations, logistics of matriculation, and what it means to be a university student. Equally important,
students are introduced to the information, skills, and tools that will lead to their full involvement (academic integration and social integration) in the life and spirit of the university.

**STRATEGIES & ACTION STEPS**

More than a strategy or plan, *Students First* represents a major transformation in the manner students are introduced to and integrated into our university. *Students First* proposes to implement campus-wide services and a comprehensive first year experience so that all students are equipped with the essential information and fundamental skills to ensure their retention and ultimate success at UC. Descriptions of both strategies and action steps follow.

1) **Service** – Routine transactions are handled through self-service (Web). The efforts of service staff are focused on responding to unique and complex situations. Key elements for success include:
   a) employing staff who are passionate about service and who have compassion for people and training service staff to be effective in multiple areas (cross-training);
   b) providing clear pathways for information flow, staff input and customer feedback;
   c) developing a robust computer system with self-service options; and crafting spaces that are warm, friendly, inviting and that reject traditional office architecture (i.e., counters and windows).

2) **Organization** – Conduct an environmental assessment of student service functions across the university Fall Quarter 2004 and integrate logical groupings into a One Stop model.

3) **Culture** – Utilize the results of the environmental assessment of student services and the evaluation of the One Stop Student Services Center to train students and staff in the development and utilization of the transformational nature of the One Stop model. Changing culture is a three- to five-year proposition.

4) **Technology** – Use the results of an evaluation of UniverSIS to determine how to expand its utilization in a seamless fashion across the whole university.

5) **Staffing** – Although technology will help respond to the increasing demands for services, staff with more specialized skills will be required. The One Stop model requires a more highly educated, cross-trained staff that is able to respond to a broader range of issues and concerns.

6) **Financial** – Financial barriers to creating a university-wide One Stop model will be mitigated by securing funding through the Institutional Management Technology Committee. Additional support might be achieved by making recommendations to the President’s Budget Committee.

7) **University 101 Model** – There is clear evidence, nationally and at UC, that when first year students take part in an intensive college success program, they are more likely to be successful academically, enjoy their college experience, and most importantly, become engaged in the learning environment. The curriculum for University 101 has already been developed by the UC First Year Experience Steering Committee and it includes: Study Skills, Managing Stress, Effective Time Management, Deciding on a Major, Improving Organizational Skills, Managing Personal Finances, Personal Safety, Enhancing Computer Skills, Engaging in Self Assessment, Learning Outside of the Classroom, Career Planning,
Learning Ethics, Developing Self Advocacy, and Understanding Diversity. Key steps to the implementation of University 101 are as follows:

a) Each college will endorse the University 101 model (that contains common components) and commit to developing a plan for their college.

b) Each college will establish a University 101 Working Group composed of faculty, key administrators and students. The college-based Working Groups will develop a detailed plan to be submitted to their deans and the First Year Experience Steering Committee. The plans should include:
   i) Course approval by the appropriate Curriculum Review Committee;
   ii) Integration into the college’s various academic tracks;
   iii) Teaching assignments for college staff and faculty;
   iv) Resources required to ensure all first year students may benefit;
   v) Evaluation plans linking course to student success.

c) The University 101 Working Group should begin their task this coming academic year with the detailed plan completed and submitted to each respective dean and the First Year Experience Steering Committee no later than March 2005.

d) Clearly, expanding the college success approach to include all first year students requires a significant investment of resources. However, if University 101 leads to improved retention and higher graduation rates, the overall budget picture should improve for the university. Once start-up resources are awarded to colleges to expand University 101, continuing funding will be dependent on student success in each college.

KEY STRATEGIES

Conceptually, the Students First model employed by the One Stop Student Service Center is easily adaptable to any service area or function. Practically, it is very difficult to employ without higher-level support and direction, staff buy-in and resources to get the job done. To get started, the following steps are recommended:

1. All administrators, the president, provosts, vice presidents and deans must:
   a. embrace the vision statement articulated in this document;
   b. set high-level goals;
   c. articulate expectations;
   d. commit to providing resources; and
   e. empower staff.

2. All service areas need to be identified and the directors of those areas should be organized as a group (task force) and charged to develop and implement the Students First concept. From the larger group, a sub-group (steering committee) should be appointed to provide leadership. The steering committee should have representation from each vice presidential area and the deans.

3. Specific resource needs will be identified through the planning, development and implementation processes. They are likely to include staffing, professional development (cross-training), technology (Web development, mainframe systems upgrades, etc.), environmental (space, equipment, etc.) and marketing (advertising, start-up expenses, etc.).

4. Specific responsibilities will be developed during the planning process. Overall responsibility will fall to the steering committee, representing the task force and reporting to the vice
presidents. It is envisioned that implementation teams will be created as “sites” are identified.

5. A full transition to a Student First campus will require several years of hard work. Possibly, a few site implementations could be achieved in a year or less. Others may take as long as three to five years. In the meantime, it is recommended that additional resources be committed to the One Stop Student Service Center to upgrade the self-service (Web) options that are currently available (see Students First Quick Wins).

6. Modest funding mechanisms will be established to provide an on-going source of funds.

**ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY**

Student satisfaction will grow, resulting in improved retention and consequently, increased tuition revenues. By expanding the college success curriculum to all first year students, there should be a significant, positive impact on student retention during the critical period – between the first and second year. Such an improvement will have many important outcomes including higher retention and graduation rates, more engaged and motivated learners, and a broader base of more satisfied alumni.

Before expanding the current One Stop model to the rest of the campus, it should be evaluated to determine its strengths and weaknesses. We have had enough experience with One Stop, having completed a full academic year cycle, to determine both quantitative and qualitative measures of success. Going forward, periodic summative evaluations will be conducted to enhance student service. Operational (continuous) feedback will also be provided by pop-up mechanisms online and UC is Listening, monitoring the level of online versus in-line usage, and conducting online exit interviews.

Benchmark data provided by the Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory and the National Survey on Student Engagement will be used to examine the effectiveness of our efforts compared to other programs around the country. Student success measures including retention rates, grade performance, and other self-reported assessments will help determine the efficacy of the comprehensive University 101 initiative.

Stakeholders will be kept informed of the success of Students First through the distribution of periodic reports and news articles that share good news stories and through periodic feedback sessions.
Action Team –
Selectivity with Clear Opportunity Pathways

**VISION**
Our vision for UC includes better and more diverse students who see clear pathways into our exceptional programs and, upon graduation, into careers of service and distinction. UC increasingly becomes the university of first choice for students in the Cincinnati area, and from around the state, the nation and the world. UC attracts students who enter with varying interests and abilities, learn through a variety of pathways and leave fully qualified to participate in the workplace and community. UC is a university for working adults, as well as high school graduates. It attracts exceptional scholars and seasoned professionals for advanced studies.

UC’s recruitment efforts are highly visible, strategic and effective in attracting academically well-prepared students (top 10 percent), leading UC to recognition as a first-tier research university attracting the brightest high school graduates seeking studies in health care, design and fine arts, engineering and bio-technology, among other disciplines in which UC is already strong or well positioned to become strong. UC students come from diverse backgrounds (including race, ethnicity, national origin, income levels, varying interests, etc.), feel “at home,” and not just succeed, but excel. UC is known as the place where leaders are educated. Building on cooperative education and other field-based learning experiences, UC’s graduates are in high demand by business and industry in Ohio, and beyond. UC is known for innovative partnerships with other Ohio colleges and universities and with regional, state, national and international employers, offering our graduates multiple pathways to opportunity and success in the region, Ohio, the nation and the world.

**CURRENT STATE OF BARRIERS & ENABLERS**

**Barriers**
When our current processes and outcomes are “mapped” against our vision, a variety of barriers can be identified. Generally, barriers fall into three categories:

- **conceptual limitations** (we cannot or do not see our path forward),
- **poor execution and/or a lack of motivation** (we do not have alignment between goals, strategies and rewards) and
- **a preference for maintaining current relationships** (even if suboptimal, if everyone else organizes the same way, then so should we).

Specific barriers are listed below:

1) **Application barriers** (need to increase pool of applicants)
   a) Negative perceptions about UC
      i) If anyone can attend then programs must not be good.
ii) If anyone can attend then why develop high level of personal discipline and preparedness.

iii) Safety

iv) Environment not supportive

b) Uneven program quality
c) Ineffective program promotion
d) Tuition affordability
e) Negative media coverage of university and city
f) Insufficient or ineffective relationships with feeder programs
g) Geographic
h) Program mismatch
   i) Highly selective standards in some programs
   ii) The program of interest is not available at UC

2) Admission barriers (need to increase yield)
   a) Image (fallback, last resort)
   b) Value perception (cost, broadly defined, exceeds value)
   c) Insufficient program space (able students closed out of first choice)
   d) Insufficient and inadequate financial aid
e) Failure to develop relationships with applicants

3) Execution barriers (need to align goals, strategies, structures, rewards)
   a) Uneven program quality fosters poor retention rates.
   b) Resources don't support high demand for selective programs.
   c) Administrative inflexibility limits nimble response to new opportunities.
   d) We're not good at making hard decisions – either developing truly innovative programs or in closing unsuccessful ones.
   e) We can do better in making sure we admit and enroll students who are a "good fit" to UC, either on the central campus, Raymond Walters College or Clermont College.
   f) We struggle in balancing undergraduate and graduate programs, research and teaching, quantity and quality of faculty, space and equipment availability, etc.

4) Information barriers (need to resolve information asymmetry)
   a) Clear understanding of how “selection” occurs from both sides (student and institution)
   b) Effective presentation of the variety of educational opportunities offered at UC

5) Cognitive and emotional barriers (need to understand why change is difficult and how to increase the likelihood of success)
   a) We are 'prisoners' of our own routines and internal ‘realities’, looking inward rather than outward.
   b) We are bound by maintaining current relationships rather than exploring new ones.
   c) Disbelief that UC can aspire and attain to greatness, despite the fact that it has attained national/international recognition of the highest level in a number of fields.

6) Motivational barriers (need to get more people involved)
   a) Poorly designed reward structures
   b) Insufficient or ineffective support structures (administrative, faculty, student) to manage transitions, development of new and additional competencies
Enablers

1) Within UC
   a) Cooperative education
   b) Extraordinary physical environment on campus, if leveraged in recruiting new students (graduate and undergraduate) through campus visits, we would be irresistible
   c) Outstanding programs that afford outstanding educational opportunities to students
   d) Better logic about how to allocate resources in support of the recruitment, admission, teaching, retention and graduation of students
   e) Cincinnatus competition – engages the best and brightest to demonstrate their commitment to academics and community service
   f) Cincinnatus competition – don’t make it an additional barrier for highly qualified students, i.e., National Merit semi-finalists and scholars
   g) Center for Access and Transition
   h) First Year Experience
   i) UC Alumni Association
   j) Center for Exploratory Studies
   k) New Student Enrollment Network

2) Outside UC
   a) Engaged alumni who have been active in helping us recruit great students to UC. Support and expand existing alumni recruiting efforts and leverage existing pockets of successful alumni recruitment at the college level into a unified cohesive effort.
   b) Cincinnati location affords us many unique benefits, including proximity to global corporations and diverse cultural experiences, among other things that can be leveraged to attract students.
   c) Positive media attention, locally and nationally
   d) Greater support from the Ohio legislature if we created a powerful linkage between educational, programmatic growth and economic gains to Ohio
   e) Strong, effective relationships with variety of feeder institutions
   f) State with strong need for new jobs, new industries, better trained workforce
   g) Upward Bound
   h) GEAR-UP

KEY STRATEGIES
Our team has identified three key strategies to help close the gap between our current situation and our desired future state: Looking outward, understanding selection and building relationships of support. These strategies are intended to help us harness our enablers to overcome our conceptual, motivational and structural barriers.

1. Look outward: Expand our edge.

From our first meeting it was clear that the challenge to this action team was to reach beyond established definitions. These definitions form the basis for existing structures and practices. If we accept those definitions then we are essentially locked into a conceptual and operational space, and our task becomes an internal process of moving the puzzle pieces until we find a better (but still probably suboptimal) “fit.” Most of the barriers listed above are internal in
Looking outward is critical for identifying opportunities for innovation. Research on innovation suggests that the easiest location for its occurrence is at the margins, because units at the periphery have looser structural relationships as well as lower levels of interdependence. This encourages experimentation. The most innovative organizations are those that have the greatest “edge,” where flatter structures enable (indeed, demand) closer relationships with individuals and institutions outside our boundaries. When experimentation is paired with resource allocation strategies that enable innovation as well as leverage it, we will become better positioned to anticipate trends instead of simply reacting to the actions of other institutions. Thus looking outward is about increasing our “edge,” those points of contact that represent new opportunities.

Instead of using the puzzle metaphor which implies fixed, unchanging boundaries, we suggest the kaleidoscope – “an optical instrument which, by arrangement of reflecting surfaces and loose bits of colored glass, exhibits various symmetric patterns as the device is rotated” (Webster’s New 20th Century Dictionary). This metaphor helps us see how to look outward:

- First, it reminds us to constantly consider our “reflecting surface.” This is our core, high-impact research and outstanding educational opportunity. Everything must be reflected back onto that surface to ensure consistency and alignment.
- Second, the kaleidoscope metaphor challenges us to rotate our perspective, so that we create a more comprehensive and connected approach to our problems. Additionally, consideration of shifting patterns keeps us mindful of interdependence, reciprocity and mutuality. Thus, it reminds us that our logic must be both flexible and transparent (easily used by all), so that we can use the constantly changing patterns to enrich educational opportunity. In order to take advantage of our enablers, we must try to see ourselves from their varying perspectives.

2. Understand selection: Why us? Why them?

We need to fully understand the selection process from both sides of the equation. From the student’s side this means identifying the constraints (e.g., supply, preparedness, income, information, value and image) on decisions to apply, and if accepted, to enroll. From the institution’s side, this means identifying constraints on acceptance (e.g., administrative processes, selection standards, program availability, and program space). Admission “numbers” provide sharp relief to the issue – how to attract more of the qualified students who fail to apply and how to increase our yield of those who do apply.

3. Build relationships: Create and sustain value.

The common denominator of selectivity and opportunity is building relationships. Better relationships are the source of value. The kinds of relationships we need to develop provide support and advocacy – where students become an end in themselves, not merely a means to an
end. Students “select” us when we can provide a configuration of support programs that enables them to realize value in their relationships with us. Providing such support requires advocates who take total responsibility and accountability for every aspect of the educational experience. Advocacy relationships encompass the operational challenges necessitated by providing support. Building relationships means focusing on needs and support rather than supply and demand. It also means balancing organization and individualization. Instead of duality, we need mutuality. For example:

- **Application barriers**: All three strategies (as well as all our enablers) will be necessary to increase the pool of qualified applicants.
- **Admission barriers**: Increasing yield will require a better understanding of what students/parents/employers are looking for, how best to frame our programs, and building relationships between faculty and prospective students.
- **Execution barriers**: One example of overcoming the execution barrier is to abandon whipsaw management – that is, if retention is key, then so is selection. There are numerous examples of misaligned goals, strategies, structures and rewards that lower our performance levels.
- **Information barriers**: Information asymmetry is a consequence of failing to consider multiple perspectives as well as failure to effectively promote our programs. Each of these is addressed by our strategies.
- **Cognitive and emotional barriers**: Change is difficult because it creates ambiguity and what researchers call “threat rigidity.” When under threat, structures (and perspectives) become rigid. The only way to successfully overcome this problem is to replace the sense of threat with a sense of opportunity. Opportunity is expanded when we allow more groups to provide input and assistance.
- **Motivational barriers**: The challenge of change is that it typically rests on the shoulders of a few people. The benefit of the comprehensive planning process is that it extends outward into the community. But we need to develop engagement. People get involved when they have a reason to believe, believe that achievement is within their grasp (even if it is a stretch) and find it rewarding.

Looking beyond our boundaries and institutionalizing such processes to sustain them over time, understanding the multifaceted nature of selection, developing a connected set of initiatives, and realigning goals, resources and rewards to sustain them, and building relationships of support and advocacy will enable us to alter the selection equation in ways that support our core activities of high-impact research and outstanding educational opportunity.

**ACTION STEPS**

Below are the action steps designed to attract, enroll and graduate the best students.

1) **Build exceptional programs.**
   a) Looking outward: Expand our “edge.”
      i) Expand co-op.
      ii) Develop strategies (e.g., identify new educational space, underserved or emerging economic sectors).
iii) Focused short list of achievable goals to reach those spaces within the next three years (e.g., increase co-op participation).
iv) Create highly selective scholars program (e.g., Honors Plus, UVA).
v) Use urban location and curriculum to create exciting learning opportunities, e.g., create “academies” (e.g., leadership academy, urban academy) offering distinctive certificate programs.
vi) Increase international programs.
vii) Examine low value programs across the university and either change them to create value, eliminate them or continue to subsidize them with the understanding that they reduce the resources available to others.

b) Understanding selection: Rotate our perspective to attract the best.
i) Clarify missions within the UC system to maximize alignment among strategy, structure and rewards to create high-performing systems.
ii) Task each unit to identify criteria for exceptional program’s designation.
iii) Identify exceptional programs and “fast movers.” Develop resource allocation models that reward programs for self-sufficiency.
iv) Selectivity and student demand are seen as market/performance indicators that drive resources allocation.
v) Each academic program needs to identify curriculum attributes that would attract students (e.g., undergraduate research, multidisciplinary learning opportunities, action research etc.) and implement them.

2) Communicate our excellence.
a) Looking outward: Expand our “edge.”
i) Create a Task Force on University Rankings to develop a model of how to improve image that encompasses all baccalaureate units. Ask each unit to identify the external criteria (e.g., rankings) that matter and determine how universities “move” up the list.
ii) Ask each unit to develop and implement plans to move up in the rankings.
b) Understanding selection: Rotate our perspective.
i) Each unit tasked to develop list of great things to promote.
ii) Each unit identifies potential market.
iii) Each unit has marketing materials for targeted markets.
c) Build relationships: Create and sustain value.
i) Creating the National Employer Survey that ranks work effectiveness of recent graduates (i.e., develop a ranking where we can shine).
ii) Establish university-level task force of “communications” specialists to develop a set of best practices and share contacts.
iii) Encourage units to develop long-term relationship with the community.

3) Improve entrance pathways.
   a) Looking outward: Expand our “edge.”
      i) Examine multiple aspects of educational opportunity to determine key factors we should embrace (affordability, geographic convenience, family constraints, socioeconomic mobility and barriers).
      ii) Evaluate programs for flexibility that supports clear pathways.
      iii) Identify expanded set of feeder schools (regional, national, international) that will send us students.
      iv) Each program should establish admission criteria and enrollment targets related to analysis of educational opportunity described above.
   b) Understanding selection: Rotate our perspective (enrolling the best).
      i) Develop entrance profile and how to overcome opportunity barriers listed above.
      ii) Develop clear, consistent entrance pathways into each college.
      iii) Set standards and develop a plan for next three to five years to increase percentage of applicants in the top 10 percent.
      iv) Develop recruiting strategies for getting students who will be successful.
      v) Develop incentive plan for exceeding enrollment targets at or above standards.
      vi) Target prepared students who have applied but choose not to enroll at UC. Understand why this is happening and develop quick response plan to remediate the trend.
   c) Build relationships: Create and sustain value.
      i) Develop effective relationships with feeder schools.
      ii) Develop set of multiple “touch point” experiences that bring UC to attention of 10-16 year-olds.
      iii) Develop programs involving faculty in the recruiting process (i.e., beyond Cincinnatus) in order to help improve our yield.

4) Improve exit pathways.
   a) Looking outward: Expand our “edge.”
      i) Increase the number of students involved in co-op or other experiential education programs.
      ii) Increase the number of co-op jobs by 25 percent in three years.
      iii) Each program to articulate how it creates pathways to post-graduate opportunities (graduate school, job, public service, volunteerism).
      iv) Establish scholarships and fellowships office to support students making applications.
   b) Understanding selection: Rotate our perspective (launching the best).
      i) Develop a plan to increase retention. Understand the relationships between admission standards, post admission support, advising and other factors key to retention.
      ii) Develop fund to units to provide financial aid assistance to keep students enrolled.
   c) Build relationships: Create and sustain value.
      i) Improve relationships with co-op employers.
      ii) Support and expand roles for alumni networks in retention and recruitment in the following areas:
         (1) Getting jobs
         (2) Critiquing student projects
(3) Mentoring
(4) Scholarships

**ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY**

1) Higher ranking/reputation for UC and specific programs.

2) Admissions
   a) Increased pool of desirable (e.g., top 10 percent) applicants and
   b) Improved enrollment yield

3) University develops resource allocation strategies to support and encourage selective admissions.

4) Increased co-op participation.

5) Greater involvement of alumni and other external constituents in educational programs.

6) Each college develops:
   a) A focused set of programs and priorities,
   b) Program assessment becomes institutionalized, and
   c) Revenue generation plans to promote self-sufficiency, for example grants and contracts, are encouraged and rewarded.

7) Improved retention rates to 95 percent.

It takes courage to make choices, and we need to find more courage in this institution. We must commit to managing our present from our future, not our past. To make progress means focus, making tough choices, crafting transition plans as we reposition ourselves to lead in the 21st century.

Our task requires us to be creative, examine opportunities for programmatic focus, investigate alternative structural and resource allocation models and generate benchmarks to be used to assess progress toward these goals. We will know our work is complete when:

1) Missions are clarified, and resources are focused on mission fulfillment; model strategies and support structures are identified.

2) All colleges identify a target set of high-quality programs, set selectivity goals, clear admission pathways, performance targets and program assessment procedures; a program review process is created to facilitate assessment and support program innovation.

3) The pathways into UC as well as the paths available to our graduates become clearly articulated.

4) Leadership dedicated to identifying new opportunities for high-quality associate and para-professional degree programs emerges.
**Action Team – UC Anytime/Anyplace**

**VISION**
The University of Cincinnati will be the right choice for lifelong learning. … Anytime and anyplace.

The University of Cincinnati is an institution of lifelong learning customized to the needs of adult, traditional and business constituents. We assure simple, friendly access to UC educational opportunities and resources. We have an infrastructure that leverages the university’s strengths to better serve our community. We provide seamless connectivity for learning and interactivity, anytime and anyplace.

**CURRENT STATE OF BARRIERS & ENABLERS**

**Barriers**
The university currently is not prepared to effectively meet the growing need for creative, non-traditional learning opportunities. Delivering classes during evenings, on weekends or off-time/off-site is not easily accomplished. If UC is truly committed to transforming itself into a campus without boundaries, it must embrace new ways to conceptualize, develop and deliver our “products” for current and future students. More specific barriers are listed below:

1) Current revenue models and organizational infrastructure do not encourage or facilitate innovation in regards to anytime/anyplace learning opportunities.

2) There are few incentives to colleges, departments and faculty to innovate and be responsive to ever-changing customer needs.

3) Silo structure within the university discourages cross-disciplinary collaboration and integration. For example, in some programs it is easier for the UC Clermont County student to transfer to Northern Kentucky University than it is to transfer to the UC central campus.

4) Current student services, systems and program offerings are best suited for the traditional academic model (e.g. hours of operation, when courses are typically offered), whereas UC needs to be able to move quickly to serve new markets and schedules, and implement enhanced and new delivery mechanisms.

5) There is not an effective “model” of how a program or college can shepherd an innovative approach through the university system.

6) Campus culture and incentives discourage units from working as an integrated high-performance group.

7) Systems to disseminate the right information to the right people at the right time in the right manner are unreliable and ineffective.
**Enablers**
The following list of enablers can be used to overcome barriers that inhibit our ability for seamless connectivity for learning and interactivity, anytime and anyplace.

1) UC stakeholders want us to succeed: students, faculty, staff, administration, community, alumni, business, entrepreneur, and neighbors. They are committed to providing resources, expertise and support to enable our success.

2) The president is committed to the expansion of UC learning opportunities, and this enthusiasm and support combined with grassroots efforts and champions within the units will help make this effort a reality.

3) UC has successful non-traditional models (i.e., online, off-site, off-time, etc.), which can help guide us in establishing effective directions, support new systems and infrastructure.

4) A customer focus is a competitive necessity for continued growth and prosperity.

5) UC has a powerful technology infrastructure, which can serve as a conduit to current and future anytime/anyplace offerings.

**KEY STRATEGIES/ACTION STEPS**

1) Establish a center, Edu-Start, to coordinate, facilitate, and promote non-traditional learning opportunities including weekend, evening, offsite, and distance education with funding to support course and program development and/or fill gaps. This center will serve as an incubator-type enterprise to help start and support new/nontraditional courses and programs.
   a) The Edu-Start Center will be housed at the provostal level with connectivity to East and West Campuses as well as the branch campuses. It will serve as an incubator for new courses, certificates, degrees, non-credit, etc., and also as a “brokerage” for ongoing and even “outside vendor” offerings.
   b) Edu-Start will exist to broker, identify and support these opportunities and increase the capacity of the units and the university to successfully compete in the marketplace.
   c) The center will receive university funding to provide staffing and seed money for projects that are proposed internally via an application process. The center will also initiate requests for proposals to respond to customer requests and identified areas of opportunity.
   d) The university’s financial and administrative units will work closely with the center to insure that all learning opportunities are serviced in a quality way.
   e) The center will work with the financial and administrative services of the university to create a supportive infrastructure that facilitates offering new programs fast, effectively and of high quality to meet the dynamic needs of our constituents.
   f) The center will insure that the revenue agreements associated with the new/brokered programs will be shared in a way that there is incentive for all parties.
   g) The center will pursue new opportunities via marketing and research and continually foster additional pathways to better serve students and businesses.
   h) The center will become financially self-sustaining through revenue sharing with new programs and product offerings.
2) Establish a one-stop client services portal, “UC Navigator” (for defined clients, such as employers, professional development and state licensure learners, lifelong non-degree learners, businesses searching for employee training programs, etc.).
   a) Develop a telecommunications-connected community that extends beyond the campus into the larger community, similar to the physical master plan and our partnerships with the Uptown Consortium.
   b) Students, faculty, staff and alumni are connected wherever and whenever – 24x7x365, from the residence halls, the suburbs, Toledo, Seoul, anywhere – via seamless access (wireless whenever possible) and associated support.

**ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY**

1) Students have timely, reliable and cost-effective access to course program content, UC faculty and staff, and program peers regardless of the program in which they are enrolled (e.g. daytime, evening, weekend, local and nonresidential student).
2) Support systems (application, registration, financial payment and aid services) are universally accessible, responsive, reliable and of high quality for all UC constituents (current students, potential students, alumni, faculty and staff).
3) Students find UC is an “educational space/place,” not constrained by time and location, which can stimulate and satisfy their lifelong personal and professional development needs.
4) Regional corporations, agencies and school districts seek UC “first” for their training and employee advancement programs.
5) UC is the provider of choice in the region for experiential-based programs. These programs build and leverage individual and organizational competencies and create competitive advantage beyond a traditional degree or certificate program.
6) The Edu-Start Center becomes a “best practice” model for higher education, both regionally and nationally.
7) The UC Navigator portal becomes the gateway to the university in all ways and, as a result, is a model for education providers.
8) Establish accountability, measure results and reward performance for new programs and systems.
GOAL 2 –
GROW OUR RESEARCH EXCELLENCE

Build on UC’s greatness as a major research university to benefit society, have meaningful economic impact and enhance the quality of life for all.

- **Research Excellence** – develop research and discovery as core activities that illuminate all we do.
- **Interdisciplinary Centers** – establish high-profile centers that cross disciplines to best address societal challenges.
- **World-Class Faculty** – recruit, develop and retain the best faculty.

*Action Team reports follow on pages 55 to 61.*
VISION
A University of Cincinnati where the entire university community is committed to research and discovery as core activities that illuminate all we do. If met, we believe this vision will enhance the reputation of the university more than any other single factor.

Scope
The University of Cincinnati is a premier research extensive university, defined by the quality and breadth of its research, having local, regional, national and global impact. We must develop new research ideas and discoveries that have critical impact within their disciplinary communities. Ultimately, these ideas and discoveries must benefit society, have meaningful economic impact and enhance the quality of life for all.

Values
The University of Cincinnati is committed to high-quality research and discovery as the foundation for all of its activities. This commitment:

- Infuses our efforts in basic research, applied research, translational research, clinical research, creative works and performance.
- Leads to programmatic initiatives that enhance our research excellence in areas of community, state, national and international interest.
- Requires continued investment in the intellectual and technical infrastructure, including library resources, computer enhancements, travel support, competitive graduate student stipends, modern laboratory space and up-to-date buildings.
- Supports path-breaking research.
- Implies pride in our nationally recognized areas of research strength.
- Fosters interdisciplinary activities.
- Rewards enhancements while cutting inefficiencies.
- Rewards entrepreneurial activities related to discovery.
- Builds appropriate reward structures to maintain research excellence.
- Contextualizes our research enterprise with regard to our history, strengths and multiple purposes.

The University of Cincinnati will enhance the quality of its research by making focused investments that build on current strengths while creating the future. These investments must on the one hand be inclusive, recognizing the key role partnerships will play in future research excellence, and on the other hand incorporate the input of government, business and other organizations. The selection of focused themes will be based on the following criteria:
• Build on existing strengths by recognizing those areas and programs that have strong national reputations, internal and external partners, funding success and nationally recognized faculty.
• Our innovation and venture creation must discover areas of rapid growth and have a high return on investment. Opportunism will be rewarded through start-up funds, new faculty and success in obtaining extramural (external) support for research.
• Ability of multiple colleges or units to form multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary research programs. Interdisciplinary research centers with long-term funding will be expected; graduate courses not labeled by discipline but taught by a range of scholars; doctoral students have multiple courses with diverse student population rather than students only in their discipline; training not only to build experts in a field but to become leaders for diverse teams – all are attributes of this interdisciplinary activity. Ultimately, it is the enhanced research excellence of the university’s reputation that will guide the choice of themes.

CURRENT STATE OF BARRIERS & ENABLERS

Barriers
1) How we allocate resources.
2) No significant direction from the top.
3) Lack of overarching expectations.
4) Paucity of inter, cross and/or multi-disciplinary programs.
5) Limited philanthropy.
6) Hospital infrastructure not supportive of research.
7) Silo mentality.
8) Lack of appropriate reward structure.
9) Technology transfer limited.
10) Open-admission colleges inhibit overall research.
11) Not investing enough money in faculty development for research.
12) Inability to move or motivate nonproductive faculty.
13) Reluctance to hire new faculty.
14) Lack of adequate state funding.
16) Increased burden and costs of compliance and regulations.
17) Insufficient workforce for research technicians and research associates.
18) Lack of adequate research space.
19) Lack of programmatic excellence in certain key colleges and departments.

Enablers
1) Current funding, such as: investment of Third Frontier, University Research Council.
2) Strong existing business relationships such as promoted by Genome Research Institute, etc.
3) Marked increase in extramural (external) research funding in past decade.
4) Career development and mentoring programs currently in place.
5) Existing programs with strong national ranking and reputations as benchmarks.
6) Peer-reviewed training programs.
7) Libraries and information systems.
8) Some excellent research space.
9) Excellent core facilities.
10) Models of interdisciplinary research such as Biomedical Engineering.
11) Excellent faculty, students and staff in certain areas.

STRATEGIES

1) Establish a common research mission and a research plan.
   a) Create university-wide criteria for research excellence while recognizing differences in disciplines.
   b) Align rewards and incentives with these criteria.
   c) Develop a common level of expectation in reappointment, promotion and tenure across the university landscape.
   d) Retain the best and brightest faculty and students.
   e) Establish appropriate career development, training and mentoring programs to enhance the research mission.
   f) Hire carefully.
   g) Develop a customer friendly and supportive infrastructure.
   h) Develop a new, effective communication/marketing strategy to both the internal UC audience as well as public.
   i) Develop a pro-active university-wide research plan that positions the university to be opportunistic and responsive to new discoveries, innovations and research initiatives.

2) Establish interdisciplinary pathways.
   a) Develop an interdisciplinary clearinghouse for information exchange.
   b) Appropriate rewards for interdisciplinary activities that are tied to funding success, funding attempts, new interdisciplinary courses, interdisciplinary programs and crossover publications.
   c) Establish extramurally funded interdisciplinary training programs.
   d) Develop clear definitions and criteria for the establishment and support of research groups, centers and institutes.

3) Develop funding streams commensurate with UC|21 goals.
   a) Establish funds for both new initiatives and infrastructure that are available to all, clearly tied to priorities and in keeping with donors’ interests and values with UC.
   b) Implement a targeted allocation plan for new research buildings and renovation of existing research buildings.
   c) Assess outcomes from research investments while noting different measures in different areas.
   d) In the capital campaign, establish significant support for research, such as endowed chairs and professorships.
   e) Develop a strong advocacy for governmental state and federal funding opportunities.
   f) Support funding for translational and clinical research.

4) Establish and strengthen existing partnerships including: industry/business, community, government/military/national research laboratories, patient advocacy groups and hospital systems.
   a) Create a listing of available partners.
b) Invite partners to join UC faculty in forming a task force to assess partnerships and to offer specific recommendations.

c) Develop a mechanism to invest resources to facilitate partnerships internal and external to the university.

**ACTION STEPS**
1) Establish university-wide criteria for research excellence and productivity to which all departments in the university are held accountable.
2) Develop a system of greater accountability with rewards.
3) Survey and assess infrastructure requirements to support research excellence (e.g. development of a searchable database for all UC research).
4) Improved marketing/public relations to promote research.
5) Establish a task force to assess need for university-wide research fund and define mechanisms for the establishment and support of interdisciplinary research.
6) Create and strengthen partnerships to facilitate research.

**ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY**
1) Increased numbers of peer-reviewed publications.
2) Increased quality of peer-reviewed publications.
3) Increased amount of extramural funding.
4) Higher quality of graduate students/research trainees (MD and PhD post-doctoral fellows).
5) Higher quality of faculty hired and retained.
6) Increased numbers of collaborative training grants, PPGs, center grants
7) Multidisciplinary collaboration across the university, including partners in community and industry.
8) More interdisciplinary research programs and training opportunities.
9) Improved ranking and reputation as defined by NIH ranking, NSF ranking and *U.S. News & World Report* rating and AAU inclusion, etc.
**Action Team – World-Class Faculty**

**VISION**
Five years from now the university will have developed and begun implementing a plan for the recruitment, retention and reward of “World-Class” faculty.

World-class faculty should be defined to include exemplary teaching, research, scholarship or service. A commitment to world-class faculty must be made by the university as well as by individual colleges. It will be the case that a world-class faculty can achieve international or national preeminence.

It is essential that each college, with university approval, develop performance criteria of what it considers to be world-class faculty for the purpose of developing a university-wide plan to be implemented by individual colleges.

**CURRENT STATE OF BARRIERS & ENABLERS**
There are three significant barriers to achieving the vision.

1) Appropriate resources to hire and recruit the best – The university must commit to competitive compensation and benefits at a market level as well as the appropriate resources for recruiting.
2) Knowledge of the best recruiting strategies – While some programs are on the leading edge, others could benefit from knowing more about “what works.”
3) Commitment to hire the best faculty and having university-wide and college-based plans – It would be valuable to have the university define the general goals and objectives and have the colleges draft their specific plans for achievement.

**ACTION STEPS**
The Action Plan for a world-class faculty can be developed over the first six months of the 2004-05 academic year.

1) The university announces its commitment to the goal of recruiting, retaining, developing and rewarding world-class faculty.
2) In conjunction with such an announcement, the university directs individual colleges to develop criteria and plans for recruiting, retaining, developing and rewarding world-class faculty.
3) Individual colleges develop performance criteria.
4) These criteria are approved at the provostal and presidential levels.
**KEY STRATEGIES**

The university and college-based plans barrier can be overcome relatively easily and quickly. It would be valuable to have the university define the general goals and objectives and have the colleges draft their specific plans for achievement. Some strategies that might be included in the college plans are as follows:

1) Compile information from the most successful programs on campus on how they conduct searches. That is, learn from and model success at UC.

2) Bring in consultants from successful programs in a department’s field to help train them in how to conduct successful searches.

3) Compile systematically the research literature on recruiting and retaining faculty. This information should be compiled on the university level and shared on a regular basis with departments conducting searches.

4) Hire faculty who have demonstrated records of research productivity (or, at least, extraordinary potential for research productivity). This principle should never be compromised.

5) Hire faculty who show evidence of being collegial and willing to contribute to the common good of the department.

6) Hire, most preferably, at the advanced assistant rank when conducting “junior-level” faculty searches, rather than unproven new PhDs. These faculty cost only marginally more to hire, but they have records of proven (or unproven) productivity.

7) Hire, most preferably, candidates at the advanced associate professor rank when hiring at the more senior level. They cost less than full professors, but they often have records of research productivity that are outstanding.

8) Have departments prepare for searches “all the time.” They should have lists of potential candidates to recruit. Some of these might be invited to campus to give invited lectures. These are not job interviews, but they are ways of eliciting interest on the part of candidates for UC – when and if a faculty line opens up down the road.

9) Have departments consider developing depth in certain specialties, hiring two, three or more faculty in these areas. It is often easier to recruit faculty to a department where other scholars share their interests.

10) Develop a UC Web site and/or detailed brochure that can be given to each candidate (or potential candidate) for a faculty position. This Website or brochure would present the kind of information candidates frequently ask about in searches: information on UC; information on benefits; information on housing; information on schools; and so on. Right now, each department must supply this information individually – a task that is done unevenly.

11) Consider a range of UC incentives that are marginally costly but might be especially attractive to new faculty. For example, one possibility might be a research stipend to the first summer a faculty member comes to campus. Another possibility might be a “mini-sabbatical” in the pre-tenure year (e.g., one quarter off at the faculty member’s request – to be devoted to research). This kind of support makes jobs attractive and makes staying at UC attractive. Because it is often “one-time money,” it may not be extraordinarily expensive to implement.
12) Develop competitive packages including such things as moving expenses, computers, money in the summer, opportunity for additional compensation and spousal support.

**ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY**

Assessment and accountability will be based upon satisfaction of specific plan objectives and goals.
GOAL 3 –
ACHIEVE ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

Encourage an environment of high-quality learning and world-renowned scholarship.

- **Guiding Principles of Academic Programs** – integrate UC|21’s core values into academic programs.
- **Liberal Education at the Core** – reaffirm liberal education as the core to preparing students as lifelong learners.
- **Cultural Competence** – foster students’ ability to appreciate, investigate and understand a cultural background different from their own.
- **Teaching Matters** – identify, examine and support “best practices” for the university community to enhance teaching effectiveness and learning.
- **National Presence and Recognition** – pursue marketing efforts beyond the Cincinnati region that draw attention to the university’s unique assets and help move UC into the top tier of rankings.

*Action Team reports follow on pages 63 to 82.*
Action Team –
Guiding Principles of Academic Programs & Cultural Competence

VISION
To foster and integrate the five “ships” of scholarship, citizenship, stewardship, leadership and partnership in conjunction with cultural competence as the Guiding Principles (GPs) of the University of Cincinnati’s academic plan into the fabric of the university.

Challenge
To develop and implement a compelling vision/mission is an extremely difficult process for any organization. It cannot be generated by a mechanical formula. Judgment and analytical ability are needed to synthesize the vision, but intuition and creativity are important as well. To develop and implement an appealing vision, it is essential to have a good understanding of the university culture and the underlying needs and values of its faculty, staff, students, alumni, parents, civic leaders, donors and other stakeholders. A clear and compelling vision is not the creation of the heroic efforts of a single leader but instead the collective efforts of all stakeholders of the university.

Not all stakeholders will buy into the new vision or mission of the university. Before stakeholders will support change, they need to have a vision of a better future for the university that is attractive enough to justify the sacrifices and hardships the change will require. Stakeholders also need to know exactly how and where they “fit” in the new mission. Leaders of the university can do many things to facilitate the successful implementation of change. It is important that the process takes a grassroots approach, but the upper administration can encourage deans and heads to transform their own units in a way that is consistent with the vision and strategy. The central administration should provide encouragement, support and necessary resources to facilitate change, but should not dictate the outcome.

Definitions
To provide a context for the guiding principles the following definitions are provided:

- **Scholarship**: The creation and application of knowledge, with an emphasis on scholarly inquiry, experimentation, investigation and creative production.
- **Citizenship**: The ability to apply knowledge and skills for responsible civic action. UC’s emphasis is on public engagement and ethical purpose.
- **Stewardship**: The responsibility of the university to carry out its unique place in society, which is to conserve and to contribute to intellectual inquiry. Students develop an appreciation for the responsibilities that accompany education. In a financial sense, the
university is also called upon to generate revenue to ensure appropriate operating funds to carry on its mission.

- **Leadership:** Motivating others to take actions that would not otherwise have been taken. Leadership is measured by the extent to which an individual or groups of individuals can influence and energize the ideas, actions and capabilities of others towards the betterment of society.

- **Partnership:** Working collaboratively to address complex issues and problems, both within and beyond the borders of UC. A university cannot solve problems by working in isolation. It must do so by interacting with others. By working in partnerships, we gain an understanding and appreciation of what cannot be accomplished alone. We also affirm the importance of diversity, since constructive change often occurs when individuals and groups with different identities and various priorities, skills and disciplinary practices come together.

- **Cultural Competence:** To foster a student’s ability to appreciate, investigate and understand a cultural background different from his or her own. Cultural competency promotes tolerance, understanding and respect for a variety of cultures, domestic and international, and facilitates opportunity for interaction, communication and engagement.

**CURRENT STATE OF BARRIERS & ENABLERS**

**Barriers**

1) The GPs do not have buy-in across the university. There may be cultural resistance to these unifying themes.

2) It was very difficult to get the current General Education Program approved by all colleges. Adding these concepts will be difficult.

3) UC is often more a collection of colleges than a university. Inter-college barriers make interdisciplinary projects difficult.

4) The governance structure: Faculty Senate and Student Government are separate.

5) The relationship among the new GPs, existing programs and projects is a concern. The relationships must be thoughtfully examined.

6) The relationship of the GPs and their implementation to the demands of outside agencies, such as the state and accrediting agencies must be considered.

7) Resources allocated to academic programs that support cultural competency are insufficient.

8) Not all members of the UC community have respect for cultural differences.

9) The university does not currently offer the full array of courses and programs that would be essential to foster cultural competency.

10) Language instruction at UC is overly reliant on the use of part-time adjunct faculty members.

**Enablers**

1) The university’s new performance-based budget system should encourage multicultural, global and international efforts.

2) General Education is a mechanism for a coherent undergraduate experience. The General Education Coordinating Committee should be utilized to help provide structure.

3) Existing programs, offices, organizations
a) Just Community Initiative – funded out of the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs and Services, it annually publishes a reader for incoming students to read and for others who are interested.

b) Institute for Global Studies and Affairs (IGSA) – as a division of the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, IGSA receives its funding from the provost’s budget.

c) Center for Organizational Leadership – housed in the McMicken College of Arts & Sciences, the center offers disciplinary expertise in the field of leadership studies.

d) Student Activities and Leadership Development (SALD) – funded out of the general fee for which the Student Advisory Committee for the University Budget makes recommendations to the Vice President for Student Affairs on the amount to be budgeted to SALD, which oversees all university student groups and student government.

e) The Center for Women’s Studies in the McMicken College of Arts & Sciences, the Women’s Leadership Program and the Women’s Center. The Center for Women’s Studies in McMicken College is one of the oldest and most respected academic programs in women’s studies in the country. It houses a path-breaking MA in women’s studies, its innovative and still unique MA/JD joint degree in women’s studies and law, and an undergraduate degree program.

f) There are three women’s leadership programs funded out of the provost’s office. These are:
   i) Women’s Institute for Leadership Development (WILD),
   ii) Women’s Initiative Network (WIN), and
   iii) Women and Science and Engineering (WISE).

g) Center for the Enhancement of Teaching & Learning (CET&L) – provides support for the enhancement of teaching and learning for faculty through building and funding learning communities based around a central theme such as service learning, global studies, assessment etc. The center is exclusively for faculty use for the betterment of student’s quality of education at the university.

4) Area studies programs, certificates, degrees, and academic units – Dozens of programs exist in several colleges, especially the McMicken College of Arts & Sciences. Courses and faculty from these programs will prove a useful resource.

5) Ethnic Programs and Services/African American Cultural and Research Center – Both are funded out of the general fee for which the Student Advisory Committee for the University Budget makes recommendations to the Vice President for Student Affairs.

6) Service learning opportunities throughout UC.

**KEY STRATEGIES & ACTION STEPS**

1) Incorporate the concept of Guiding Principles into the university General Education program and other academic programs: (to be completed by January 2006).
   a) General Education and program/major requirements should be reviewed by the General Education committee to determine to what extent current requirements address and the concept of Guiding Principles. (Fall/Winter 2004-2005).
   b) Working collaboratively, General Education and academic programs within each college should create a set of recommended changes and a plan for implementation and assessment (Spring 2005).
c) Offices listed as “enablers” should examine ways courses and experiences addressing cultural competency might be expanded and/or more closely coordinated with academic program requirements (Fall/Winter 2004-05).

d) Incorporate the GPs into each unit’s mission statement and planning documents (Spring 2005).

2) Budgeting model must encourage cross-cultural and interdisciplinary activities.
   a) Budgeting model should include a mechanism for giving credit to multiple units when efforts cut across units and programs.
   b) Budgeting model must reward the units that support the university’s international programs through the provision of courses and experiential opportunities.
   c) Budgeting model must allocate resources to strategically enhance academic programs and student service areas that address cultural competency. Existing programs and opportunities should be strengthened, and gaps should be identified and filled.

3) Strengthen the university’s commitment to global engagement and experiences.
   a) Increase the opportunities for students to have an undergraduate study abroad experience.
   b) Strengthen the ties between IGSA and academic departments and programs that promote cultural competency.
   c) Improve the technical infrastructure for delivering cultural and language instruction at UC.
   d) Identify program inadequacies related to cultural competency and strategically provide resources to these areas.

4) Provosts, deans, department heads, program directors and faculty need to engage in a thorough review of the structure of the university to determine to what extent the existing situation reflects and supports the Guiding Principles and what, if any, changes are necessary to bring the architecture of the university in line with the university’s mission.

5) Integrate guiding principles into the marketing plan.

6) Identify and empower key stakeholders to facilitate change

7) Establish an Office of Academic Assessment, directed by a qualified faculty member, and working in conjunction with the CET&L and General Education. This should be a faculty-driven endeavor with strong administrative support that helps provide program assessment free of charge (Spring 2005).

**ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY**

The goal of fostering cultural competency as an outcome of a UC education will be judged as successful when:

1) The university strategically enhances academic programs and student service areas that address cultural competency. Existing programs and opportunities will be strengthened while gaps will have been identified and filled.

2) Cultural competency becomes central to the ongoing dialogue concerning General Education.

3) Integrative, multi-college and multi-office cooperation help us achieve cultural competency.

4) The heterogeneity of our student body is viewed as a positive force that is thoughtfully harnessed to provide students with experiences to respect diversity.

5) UC’s marketing plans reflect the goal of cultural competency.
6) UC will be more economically, racially and culturally diverse. The university establishes and continually monitors diversity goals.
VISION
The University of Cincinnati affirms its commitment to provide all undergraduates with a high-quality liberal education designed to expand their intellectual horizons, sharpen their analytical and critical thinking skills, develop strong foundations for ethical judgment, broaden their understanding of important historical and contemporary issues, and provide them with the mental agility, breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding needed to respond to the accelerating changes in our knowledge-intensive society and global environment.

Definitional Context
As defined by the National Panel Report of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), “liberal education” is a “philosophy of education that empowers individuals, liberates the mind from ignorance, and cultivates social responsibility.” Liberal education is characterized “by challenging encounters with important issues,” by the experience of “broad and deep learning” from multiple perspectives in diverse learning environments, and by the erasure of “the artificial distinctions between studies [traditionally] deemed liberal (interpreted to mean that they are not related to job training) and those called practical (which are assumed to be).” The AACU report notes as well that liberal education today “anchors the practical in the theoretical, as it develops in students important, sophisticated skills and intellectual capacities.”

Liberal Learning at Our Core
Enhanced emphasis on liberal learning at UC will also enrich the intellectual environment of the university by fostering deeper understanding of and appreciation for the significant ideas, themes, modes of reasoning, and forms of discovery of diverse societies, cultures and communities, past and present. This renewed emphasis on liberal education corresponds to a nation-wide trend to reaffirm the importance and practice of liberal education for all students, regardless of their major, college affiliation or career aspirations. By strengthening the liberal arts core and promoting the centrality of liberal education, UC will be known as an institution that excels at the creative integration of liberal arts and professional education, with graduates who are well prepared to be adaptive, lifelong learners and responsible contributors to our complex world.

In emphasizing the centrality of liberal education at UC, we seek to promote in our students a heightened awareness of the diverse modes of inquiry and areas of discovery that describe our world, including the core “Liberal Arts” disciplines of the humanities, social sciences and sciences. We also seek to develop in our students the analytical, technical and communicative skills needed to integrate and apply the knowledge they acquire in order to function effectively in a rapidly changing global setting, make informed and responsible judgments, and become influential public, professional and community leaders.
CURRENT STATE OF BARRIERS & ENABLERS

Barriers

1) Parents, students, guidance counselors and teachers often do not understand what liberal education means or why it is essential. The recent AACU report indicates that this lack of understanding about the value of liberal education is a challenge for institutions of higher education across the country.

2) UC does not currently draw attention to the importance of liberal education, its general education requirements or the coherence of the undergraduate experience in its marketing materials, university Web site or in other campus forums for students, faculty and staff.

3) Cooperative education is a recognized academic strength at the university that has been associated almost exclusively with professional colleges and with professional education.

4) The idea of co-op education suggests to many people that co-op college degree programs will lead more easily to job placement and, by extension, that if students are not in a co-op college, they won’t be as marketable, which in fact is not accurate, as business and community leaders frequently remind us. Experiential learning opportunities for students in non-co-op colleges have not been effectively integrated into university-wide marketing on the value of “real-world” experience that both professional and liberal arts programs can provide.

5) Without a minimal admissions standard across the university, UC fragments the concept of admission to the university and fragments as well the type of education it provides. Moreover, UC does not emphasize through its admission policies that there is any common core of educational experiences for all undergraduate students. Collegiate designations on transcripts highlight this silo mentality.

6) There is a false perception that an emphasis on liberal education will not work for professional colleges in which the curriculum needed to graduate is relatively rigid. In fact, most professional college students take a significant portion of their curriculum in liberal arts disciplines.

7) Even when they are not ready to do so, students are encouraged, even before they enter UC, to select a major and a college, despite the fact that many students are uncertain about a choice of major and feel nervous about that uncertainty. Entering students who have declared a major change their major one or more times, indicating that they were not ready to decide.

8) General education and foundational courses are not sufficiently promoted across the campus as opportunities for the exploration of academic options and interests.

9) Liberal arts instruction is currently overly dependent on term adjunct instructors in a number of key service and general education disciplines, which has weakened the quality of instructional delivery and innovation, often impeding the goals of liberal education. The consequences of this instructional imbalance include: unsatisfactory adjunct hires due to insufficient staffing resources; lack of sufficient sections at lower levels to meet student demand; lack of program integrity and quality control; graduate student teaching overloads; and the lack of a competitive edge with our desired institutional cohort since the percentage of courses offered by full-time instructors is an important factor in student satisfaction surveys and criteria for national rankings. Disciplines where this imbalance in
undergraduate part-time instruction is the most egregious include Spanish, English, Communication, Art History and Psychology.

10) Historically, the application of budgeting processes and budget allocation decisions at UC has emphasized the separate missions of individual colleges and major program headcount, rather than on the interconnectedness of collegiate instruction – especially undergraduate instruction, and the importance of service instruction as well as general education instruction for the university. However, the strength or weakness of the undergraduate instructional base in each college, and especially in A&S, affects students in all colleges.

11) Extracurricular activity is not effectively connected to the academic learning environment. On campus there is insufficient attention to the promotion of campus intellectual life beyond the classroom and in addition to the various activities sponsored by individual units and colleges. The structural divisions of academic affairs and student affairs tend to reinforce the perceived separation of intellectual and social activities.

**Enablers**

1) “Learning communities” across the campus and innovative First Year Experience programs are receiving positive reviews from students and parents and are contributing to college and university retention efforts.

2) The Center for Exploratory Studies serves all students and helps them explore their academic interests and proficiencies, professional objectives and life goals.

3) Faculty members from all baccalaureate colleges have expressed their commitment to the principles of liberal education by their adoption of the UC General Education program, especially its inclusion of the four baccalaureate competencies (CT, EC, KI, & SR).

4) Interdisciplinary and integrative liberal learning experiences are promoted in undergraduate programs such as African American Studies, Mind/Brain Studies, Public History, Urban Studies, Women’s Studies, and in new certificate programs in European Studies and Ethnic Studies.

5) Existing experiential learning opportunities have expanded through service learning courses, internships for academic credit, co-op, co-curricular and student-led organizations, and study abroad.

6) Integrative learning and assessment in the interdisciplinary capstone courses are now required to meet the university’s General Education requirements.

7) There is increased recognition among UC faculty of the importance of interdisciplinary teaching and research.

8) Interdisciplinary and intercollegiate cooperation across the colleges is growing, with initiatives such as BA/MA degree in Physics and Engineering, partnerships with A&S, the College of Education, Criminal Justice and Human Services (CECH), and the College of Applied Sciences (CAS) in K-12 engagement, instructional and research connections with Philosophy, Psychology and Neuroscience, etc.

9) Collegiate restructuring has resulted in greater consistency of quality in liberal arts instruction and liberal learning across all colleges, day and night.

10) Expanded use of Blackboard technology, Web-based learning and other internet technologies are facilitating greater global reach for our students and faculty.

11) Business employers recruiting future employees recognize the importance of effective writing, strong communication skills, critical thinking, analytical and technical skills, breadth of learning, flexible thinking, cultural awareness, effective interaction with diverse
groups, and the ability to learn new skills. These are the expected outcomes of a strong liberal education.

KEY STRATEGIES

1) UC must become an educational innovator in creating strong linkages among liberal arts and professional programs that are fully integrated and promoted with pride. As a result, potential students, parents, guidance counselors and business/community professionals will view UC as an institutional leader in the meaningful integration of liberal learning across all academic programs. Our students will understand and demonstrate the principles of liberal learning and will take full advantage of the unique opportunities at UC to engage in interdisciplinary and integrative modes of learning that span and connect the liberal arts and professional colleges.

2) In order to raise quality across the institution, UC will implement a university-wide baccalaureate admission requirement that will emphasize the interconnectedness of all of its colleges and more competitive baseline admission standards, with the expectation of a modest but meaningful rise in UC baccalaureate admission standards for what are currently less selective colleges, while allowing for individual colleges to have additional, more selective admission requirements as well.

3) The university’s liberal arts college will be significantly strengthened by reducing its heavy dependency on part-time faculty in a number of the foundational liberal arts disciplines, by increasing student contact with full-time faculty at all levels in order to ensure high-quality instruction, effective learning and continuity in the instructional mission, and by continuing to build innovative programs in the liberal arts that offer intellectual depth, pedagogical advancements, practical applications and research recognition.

4) The university will promote “real world learning” (experiential learning) for all of its students, including liberal arts majors, through cooperative education, internships opportunities, service learning and problem-based learning pedagogies, applied research experiences, and study abroad, with an emphasis on the integration of experiential, “real world” learning with classroom learning and with significant cultural events beyond the classroom. Opportunities for our students to be engaged with community issues will be strengthened, and UC will be known for its success in enabling the application of liberal education through community outreach and civic engagement.

ACTION STEPS

1) When promoting the goals of liberal education, we will develop more effective ways to describe the meaning and value of liberal education. We will develop a new language for the market, and also for our internal constituency, that speaks clearly to the value of liberal education and liberal arts disciplines. In its marketing materials, on the Web and in campus discussions, the university will emphasize the importance of liberal education for all UC students, regardless of major or collegiate affiliation, and will underscore the diverse and expanding opportunities for liberal learning outside the traditional classroom – through research projects, internships, workshops, cultural events and civic engagement. The dean of A&S, or a designee, will act in an advisory capacity, beginning in the 2004-05 academic year, to the University Communications staff that will develop these materials.
2) The percentage of liberal arts courses taught by adjuncts will need to be significantly reduced in areas such as Spanish, English, Communication, Art History and Psychology so that within two years the percentage of courses taught by adjunct instructors (versus full-time instructors) will not exceed 40 percent in the targeted liberal arts disciplines.

3) The current permanent part-time instructional budget in A&S is gravely inadequate ($1,500,000 in permanent funds in annual budget; $2,500,000 in actual part-time expenses annually). Resources to fund unmet needs for part-time instruction in liberal arts service and general education courses will need to be identified.

4) The quality of liberal education at UC is critically dependent upon the quality of its liberal arts college. Investment must be made in core liberal arts disciplines that have suffered critical losses of faculty lines over the past decade, despite significant numbers of majors and important general education and service contributions, have developed an over-reliance on large enrollment courses, and have the potential to attract more majors with an increase in faculty lines. Disciplines fitting this description include: Biological Sciences, Economics, History and Psychology.

5) Incentives will be developed to reward faculty and units for strong, innovative contributions to liberal arts education and liberal learning objectives. As part of the university’s commitment to faculty development, criteria will be developed and included in funded faculty development programs to encourage contributions to liberal arts education beginning in the 2005-06 academic year.

6) Faculty will receive encouragement from the Office of the Provost for the integration of liberal and professional education in diverse and inclusive learning environments that stress the importance of encountering multiple modes of inquiry, crossing disciplinary lines, exploring knowledge and experience from many cultures, integrating a wide range of learning experiences, fostering a sense of social responsibility and preparing students for leadership in society.

7) We will strengthen the connections among the liberal and professional programs and curricula, across diverse modes of educational practice and pedagogy, including experiential learning environments, cross-college curricular offerings, integrative modes of learning at all degree levels, and among the research activities and innovations of our faculty and students. This will be accomplished through the immediate concerted effort of the deans of the liberal and professional colleges to provide guidance, support, incentive and rewards for faculty and staff who undertake these initiatives.

8) We will develop strong ties between the baccalaureate liberal arts programs and UC’s preparatory colleges in an effort to extend the opportunities provided by exposure to the liberal arts to all UC students. Beginning in the 2004-05 academic year, the deans of colleges offering liberal arts degrees will meet with the deans of the preparatory colleges to develop a plan to assess and implement strategies to accomplish this goal.

9) We will develop in our students an understanding of and ability to work with the complexities of international, ethnic and cultural diversity to enable them to function effectively in a rapidly changing global environment. Learning environments that promote this awareness in our students will be supported and promoted.

10) Beginning in summer 2005, we will make better use of orientation periods to introduce freshmen and transfer students to the cultural life of the campus, the academic richness of our curricular offerings, and the intellectual opportunities to learn in many diverse environments. Representatives from the dean’s office in A&S will consult with Admissions
administrators to develop strategies for augmenting and enhancing the orientation experience in effective ways. Admissions activities and programming for potential students need to include faculty and alumni contact and their input regarding the content of what should be conveyed in admissions materials and events. This input will be solicited beginning in the 2004-05 academic year through stronger connection between Admissions, faculty and alumni, developed through discussions with the Faculty Senate and UC’s Alumni Association.

11) Liberal arts programs will actively seek to attract Cincinnati Pride recipients to their degree programs. The Center for Access and Transition (CAT) will be effectively aligned with the goals of liberal education. During the 2004-05 academic year, Admissions will consult with deans/associate deans of baccalaureate colleges with liberal arts degrees to develop strategies for recruiting Cincinnati Pride recipients. These deans will also meet with CAT administrators to determine strategies for alignment with liberal education.

12) In order to expand the First Year Experience of liberal arts students, broaden its impact, and ensure close contact with a tenured or tenure-track faculty member in the first year of study, arts and sciences freshmen will be required to take a Freshman Seminar that will introduce them to research, writing and communication skills focused on an important topical issue or theme. Appropriate annual funding for the Freshman Seminar program will need to be secured in order to offer 50 Freshman Seminar sections annually. A committee composed of representative arts and sciences faculty reporting to the associate dean for undergraduate affairs will develop the curricular selections for the expanded Freshman Seminar program.

13) Beginning in the 2005-06 academic year, arts and sciences students will be discouraged from declaring a major during their first two terms in order to encourage exploration of student interest and diverse academic options.

14) Integrative approaches to learning will be emphasized from the outset of the UC baccalaureate experience, with an expansion of first year “Learning Communities” organized around common themes and with expanded emphasis on freshmen seminars focusing on topics of compelling interest for human society and the natural world. New forms of integrative learning will be promoted for sophomore, junior and senior-level instruction, and the required capstone experience will be promoted as an important opportunity for synthesis and integrative learning.

15) A university-wide “theme term” each year (similar to University of Michigan) would promote intellectual engagement and campus dialogue. The chosen theme could focus on a significant topic of broad interest to the liberal arts and professional colleges; each year the announced theme would be connected to clusters of courses across the colleges, special workshops, lectures and community projects that will engage students, faculty, staff and community members in lively intellectual discourse on topics of compelling national and/or global interest. A subcommittee of the Faculty Senate, to include at least one member each from a liberal arts college, a professional college and a preparatory college will be formed to determine the form and scope of this “theme term.” The implementation of a theme term should begin in the 2005-06 academic year.

16) We will increase the student residence rate and expand MainStreet activities to emphasize student opportunities to engage in intellectual and cultural dialogue and enhance the learning environment. We will also support more opportunities for peer mentoring and student-to-student learning with the goal of integrating residential and non-residential student learning. Representatives from the Office of Student Affairs will consult with faculty
in arts and sciences to develop effective strategies for attaining this goal, beginning in the 2004-05 academic year.

17) The funding mechanism used to support instructional delivery will be a responsibility-centered, performance-based budgeting model that is transparent and that takes into account the General Education commitment and large service mission of the liberal arts disciplines as well as interdisciplinary and cross-college programs of study. This funding model will be developed as part of the larger university model of responsibility-centered funding.

ASSessment & Accountability
1. The Office of Enrollment Management will engage in regular assessments of student application rates to liberal arts degree programs, and the Office of Institutional Research will provide and assess student retention data, especially in the freshman and sophomore years. The General Education capstone assessment process will provide student satisfaction assessment surveys, exit surveys and student assessment data. Data will be provided beginning with the academic year 2003-04. Data for 2004-05 will be available in early Fall 2004 and will allow for initial comparison. Each autumn, data will be added for the previous academic year admissions, and the Office of Institutional Research will analyze appropriate comparisons.

2. At the administrative level, the dean of A&S, other interested deans and the provost will engage in periodic assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of liberal education at UC as compared to other institutions with which we aspire to be compared. A committee will be formed of appropriate interested deans and the provost, beginning in Fall 2004. This committee will provide a written report of its assessment each summer.

3. The expected economic benefit of strengthening liberal education at UC will be a stronger, university-wide undergraduate applicant pool and increased funding from a rise in undergraduate enrollments overall, and especially in liberal arts majors and disciplinary offerings. These expected outcomes will be measurable; the Office of Enrollment Management will provide data. Initial data will be gathered beginning with the 2003-04 academic year for baseline comparison.

4. Strong linkages with the UC Alumni Association will be developed to provide a means for tracking alumni and employers. Investigate existing or explore new sources with UC Alumni Association and Career Placement Center to survey graduates about satisfaction with the liberal education they received, especially as they are able to evaluate it after time away from the university. Alumni who employ UC graduates and co-op students will be surveyed to assess their satisfaction with the liberal education of these graduates and students in regard to the ability to apply critical principles. It is expected that the initial survey will be distributed in the 2005-06 academic year.
Action Team –
Teaching Matters

VISION
The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning is an effort by the university community to create a
dynamic environment that promotes optimal interaction between students and facilitators of
learning. This form of scholarship identifies, examines and supports Best Practices for the
university community to enhance the effectiveness of teaching and learning. The outcome of its
application produces lifelong learners who have the ability to think critically, communicate
effectively, appreciate differences and embrace social responsibility.

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning includes:

- Knowing and applying the literature on Best Practices in teaching and learning.
- Identifying the learning styles of your students and determining whether your classroom
teaching strategies appreciate those differences.
- Assessing teaching activities at the faculty level with the goal of achieving desired learning
outcomes.
- Instituting department-level programs for assessment of learning outcomes and teaching
effectiveness.
- Improving student learning by continuously developing and refining teaching practices.
- Sharing findings on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning with peers.
- Generating and implementing research on teaching and learning.

By promoting the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, the University of Cincinnati can
achieve the following outcomes:

- Become known as a leading teaching and research institution.
- Become a model for regional, national and international colleges and universities for the
assessment of teaching and learning effectiveness.
- Be known for our high levels of student satisfaction, retention and graduation rates, and
positive career outcomes.
- Produce lifelong learners who are actively recruited by local, regional, national and
international businesses.
- Continue to be a leader in excellent academic programs such as co-op, service learning,
first year experience and Learning Communities.
CURRENT STATE OF BARRIERS & ENABLERS

Barriers
1) Lack of centralized guidance or standards for reappointment, promotion and tenure that emphasize a balance between teaching and research to promote teaching effectiveness and student learning.
2) Presence of a pervasive view by many administrators and faculty that teaching is secondary to research in terms of the university’s mission.
3) Lack of a university financial commitment to improve the quality of instruction on campus, which is particularly reflected in the lack of an effective operating budget of the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (CET&L).
4) Lack of university-wide assessment to ensure uniformity in teaching effectiveness across campus.
5) Lack of proper recognition that tuition-driven activities are approximately 45 percent of the university’s operating budget, and without effective instruction, this too will be in jeopardy.

Enablers
1) Support from President Zimpher who has demonstrated her commitment to improve the quality of teaching and learning.
2) Support from CET&L, which has begun the process of providing needed support to improve the quality of instruction at UC including:
   a) The September Institute.
   c) The university-wide TA Orientation.
3) Support of faculty members from across the university who have expressed a need for an effective CET&L.
4) Support of faculty members from across the university who have expressed agreement with the suggestion to revise RPT guidelines to better balance teaching and research.

KEY STRATEGIES
The realization of these goals requires foremost a change in university culture, which is supported by the new leadership at UC. This new approach includes taking advantage of existing resources such as the Faculty Development Council and the CET&L, as well as a fresh look at reappointment, promotion and tenure guidelines with a view toward changing the reward system to a better balance between teaching and research. Finally, this endeavor requires the sustained support and commitment of all facilitators of learning at this institution.

1) A university-wide commitment: This must be established to promote UC as an institution of teaching and research excellence by expanding the support structure for faculty, departmental, program and college level development of teaching and learning through:
   a) Expanding the function of the CET&L to meet the needs of the faculty. Those needs will be addressed through the implementation of several major approaches:
i) Developing Topical Workshops and Seminars and informing faculty of new pedagogies, and how to make effective use of them.
ii) Developing workshops tailored to the needs of units or groups of faculty.
iii) Providing individual consultations.
iv) Promoting active scholarship.
   (1) Researching new methods for effective teaching and learning.
   (2) Mentoring graduate students whose degree projects focus on teaching and learning.
   (3) Providing university-wide orientation.
   (4) Providing on-going workshops.

b) Revising the promotion and reward structure to better balance teaching and research.
c) Coordinating assessment of teaching practices and student learning outcomes.
d) Increasing the availability of instructional technology in classrooms across the university and continuing to support:
   i) Instructional Technology Workshops (University Libraries & AIT&L).
   ii) Early Summer Technology Institute (University Libraries & AIT&L).
   iii) Faculty Technology Resource Center (FTRC).
   iv) Electronic Classroom Services (ECS).

2) College and Department Commitment: a college and department commitment requires leadership, flexibility, communication between units, and resources, which promote effective teaching and learning. Specifically, a college and department commitment includes:
a) Maintaining high teaching standards.
b) Revising RPT requirements to reflect the importance of teaching.
c) Supporting faculty development in regard to teaching.
d) Training teaching assistants to become effective teachers.

3) Faculty/instructor commitment: A faculty/instructor commitment requires the incorporation of the scholarship of teaching and learning into personal practice and includes, but is not limited to, the following:
a) Engaging in on-going professional development.
b) Formulating and implementing research on effective teaching practices in higher education.
c) Collaborating across disciplines.
d) Sharing teaching strategies with colleagues.
e) Serving as mentors to peers and Teaching Assistants.
f) Participating in peer review.

**ACTION STEPS**

We have listed below a limited number of realistic first steps that need to be followed in order to bring about the necessary changes in the university structure and culture that will allow for the academic growth of our institution. The CET&L will play a leading role in helping to reshape the academic culture of the university to enable a greater appreciation of teaching and learning. Finally, we must address the renovation of the current reward system, as well as address accountability through effective mechanisms of assessment.
1) CET&L – The development of a successful CET&L requires significant changes in funding and staffing resources. The university needs to make a budgetary commitment to the CET&L based on the business plan that will clearly demonstrate a commitment to teaching and learning.
   a) Establish a realistic, working budget.
   b) Employ a full-time assistant director and a full-time administrative support person.
   c) Create a Teaching Fellows program.
   d) Establish curriculum grants to support improved teaching.
   e) Establish awards for excellence in teaching and learning that recognize a wider range of faculty.
   f) Re-establish faculty retreats, which focus on teaching and learning.
   g) Take the lead in creating tools for assessment which examine:
      i) effective teaching and learning, and
      ii) student outcomes.
   h) Provide consulting services for programs and individual faculty.
   i) Expand the scope of the CET&L Web site to include:
      (1) articles on teaching and learning,
      (2) a newsletter on CET&L activities,
      (3) a calendar of CET&L offerings, and
      (4) online versions of recent workshops.
2) Provost-mandated revision of RPT guidelines to better balance teaching and research.
3) Departmental and program level review through which departments are made accountable for upholding Best Practices in teaching and learning.

ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY

Direct Assessment
1. Faculty assessment of services offered by CET&L.
2. Faculty assessment of changes made in teaching strategies (minimally through self-report).
4. Assessment of changes made in RPT guidelines.

Indirect Assessment
1. An increase in revenue due to higher enrollment and retention rates.
2. An increase in the completion of baccalaureate degrees at UC.
3. Surveys which assess student satisfaction with the quality of instruction (including course design) and how this impacted their experience at UC.
4. Higher performance outcomes on standardized tests including GRE, LSAT, MCAT.
5. Higher employability rates of UC graduates.
6. National recognition of UC as a leader in undergraduate and graduate education.
Accountability

1. The provost would provide centralized guidance on RPT standards.
2. Deans would implement RPT revisions to better balance teaching and research and oversee the development of assessment tools for their programs.
3. Faculty would maintain Best Practices in teaching and learning that would be evident in tenure and promotion decisions.
**Action Team – National Presence & Recognition (NPR)**

**VISION**
Create an excellent and measurable marketing program to be presented locally, regionally and in selected statewide, national and international markets that focuses on the University of Cincinnati’s unique assets and helps move UC into the “Top Tier” of rankings in *U.S. News & World Report*. The marketing program will be multi-faceted and directed at the following audiences: internal, local, regional, selected statewide, selected national and selected international markets.

UC will enhance its rankings and emerge as a first choice among parents, students, faculty and staff. Prospective students worldwide will attend UC because it meets their needs, it offers quality programs, it is affordable, it offers experiential learning and has a real world orientation enabling students to lead productive and fulfilling lives as members of society. It will be a tremendous source of pride and status to be associated with the University of Cincinnati.

**CURRENT STATE OF BARRIERS & ENABLERS**

**Barriers**
1) Image among students, faculty and staff is generally not good.
2) Marketing resources are insufficient and sporadic. University Communications needs a permanent budget and more resources.
3) UC is in tier three of national rankings and should be in the top tier.
4) UC has multiple constituencies (e.g. students, faculty, staff, legislators and other elected officials, government agencies, community members, university presidents, raters, coaches, alumni, donors, research funders, media, etc.) that demand attention and their interests may be in conflict with each other.
5) Arts & Sciences college reputation must be improved.
6) UC has a negative image on some sports pages that reflects badly on the institution as a whole.
7) Reputation of the City of Cincinnati impacts the university. We should work with city to improve image.
8) UC must answer the question – ”Who do we want to be?” Is UC going to remain a comprehensive academic research institution or change the nature of its mission?

**Enablers**
1) New leadership provides opportunities to enhance the image of the institution.
2) President Zimpher is a strong communicator, which provides opportunities.
3) Admission into the Big East athletic conference provides opportunities for advancement.
4) Several colleges and programs are highly ranked.
5) Recent marketing efforts have created momentum that should be continued.
6) Research efforts at UC are strong.
7) Cincinnati has had some positive press in the past (i.e. "City that Rocks" and a "Most Livable City"). We should leverage these labels.
8) Strong community and business connections create opportunities.
9) City of Cincinnati governance is generally supportive of UC. We should use this to our advantage.
10) Part of MainStreet is open, and the campus is coming together. As major construction projects come to an end, there are obvious opportunities to market the physical aspects of campus.
11) UC offers many educational opportunities for prospective students.
12) Location in the Midwest provides affordability and a solid quality of life.
13) Support and enable efforts to improve and engage the positive support that remains untapped among a broad base of our more than 200,000 alums.

**KEY STRATEGIES**

1) Enter "top tier" of *U.S. News & World Report rankings*, which will be indicative of improved performance in a number of key areas.
   - Use UC|21 results as a marketing device.
   - Develop talking points about significant academic/research accomplishments to provide coaches and others representing the university in out-of-town markets.
   - Individual academic units need to focus their efforts upon building their national reputations by pursuing media coverage, involving University Communications in relevant issues, initiating community involvement, mobilizing alumni, working with peers, excellent Web presence, etc.
   - Value and reward successful schools that achieve national recognition.
   - Improve the marketing materials for student applicants.
   - Use state and federal lobbying efforts to market UC.
   - Improve the UC image with students, faculty, staff and alumni by more frequent and high-quality communications.
   - Identify and market UC's unique strengths (e.g., including experiential learning, highly ranked academic units, interesting and exciting campus, multiple career path opportunities).
   - Enhance student experience by capitalizing on President Zimpher's significant communications ability. She could teach freshmen seminars, attend and lead orientation camps, cook pancakes or burgers for students, etc.
   - Attract people to campus by working with student organizations to enhance programming on campus, working with the faculty to start promoting the "Academic Freedom Speakers Series," and working with the president to initiate a "President's Speaker Series."

2) Get UC into the Association of American Universities (AAU), which will be indicative of improved performance in a number of key academic areas.
3) Leverage the Big East membership, including athletics, for greater East Coast market penetration.
   - Prepare institutional TV spot to reflect UC's unique attributes.
• Provide new merchandising/licensing revenue opportunities by updating and enhancing athletics logo.
• Develop plan to welcome Big East universities to UC and Cincinnati market.
• Develop template for plans to welcome UC into their markets.
• Utilize President Zimpher and marketing to enhance image of the institution prior to athletic events.

4) Sustain current marketing campaign momentum.
• Consider cross-marketing effort with the Chamber of Commerce, the Convention and Visitors Bureau, and others to promote significance of UC.
• Develop a docents program to handle and promote UC tours.

**ACTION STEPS**

1) The Board of Trustees, president, faculty, students, staff, UC Foundation, financial supporters and the alumni need to be committed. University Communications will spearhead implementation of the key strategies in conjunction with the president’s office, Athletics, UC Foundation, the Alumni Association and any other relative unit of the university.

2) Enroll other stakeholders with influence (i.e. Mayor, City Council, County Commissioners, Chamber of Commerce, Cincinnati Business Committee, etc.).

3) Resources, both human and financial, are currently not sufficient to accomplish strategies outlined in the document. The general operating budget for University Communications should be increased, with permanent line items established for marketing. In addition, ask for a matching gift from a special alumni/foundation/corporation.

**ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY**

1) Survey research has already been conducted that provides attitudinal benchmarks. Drill deeper on the existing research to see if there’s more useful information. In addition, admissions statistics, inquiries from targeted areas, Web hits, phone calls can all serve as barometers of impact.

2) Rankings will improve.

3) Comparative data from national organizations and other institutions can provide useful benchmarks – for example, increased student applications and admissions process becomes more selective. Opinions about the university become more favorable.

4) Development of plans for the strategies outlined herein shall begin immediately upon completion of the academic plan and continue through the summer of 2004. Implementation of these plans should begin with the opening of classes in mid-September 2004.
chapter 7

GOAL 4 – FORGE KEY RELATIONSHIPS & PARTNERSHIPS

Establish and nurture relationships and partnerships, with our colleagues within the university and with local and global communities. UC|21 underscores a true commitment to community engagement.

- **Exchange Programs** – bolster efforts to encourage intercultural experiences for students, faculty and staff.

- **Experiential Learning** – become an internationally recognized leader in experiential learning, leveraging our co-op expertise and reputation to an even higher level of excellence in all undergraduate and graduate programs.

- **Community Connections** – create a “front door” to UC resources for the community and develop meaningful partnerships.

- **Experts-in-Residence** – strengthen our bonds to the community by inviting faculty, staff and students to work in community organizations and vice versa – inviting community experts to serve within the university.

- **Seamless Transitions and Educational Preparation** (STEP) – become a national leader in the reform and revitalization of the PK-16 system by creating seamless transitions from preschool through college.

- **Healthy Cincinnati** – work to improve the health of the UC community and surrounding Greater Cincinnati region.

*Action Team reports follow on pages 84 to 103.*
Action Team – 
Experiential Learning & Exchange Programs

VISION
In five years, the University of Cincinnati will be an internationally recognized leader in Experiential Learning (EL), leveraging our co-op expertise and reputation to an even higher level of excellence in all undergraduate and graduate programs. Our graduates will be in high demand, with Experiential Learning Portfolios in hand that document exceptional capabilities, proven performance and high motivation.

Definitions
To guide the Experiential Learning Action Team and support future implementation efforts, clear and consistent definitions are vital. The following list of definitions seeks to provide a starting point toward a common understanding and pervasive UC model of experiential education.

- **Experiential education**: a form of education that has active learning at its core. Experiential education programs at institutions of higher education provide students with an opportunity to learn from direct experience in addition to the traditional formats.
- **Co-op**: professional experience in a work environment related to students’ academic discipline, where students practice and observe the application of classroom principles. An integral and substantial part of the curriculum, co-op enables students to expand their learning opportunities by alternating quarters of classroom study and paid discipline- and career-related work experiences.
- **Internships (academic)**: experiential opportunities coordinated through an academic department to complement students’ in-class studies. Academic internships allow for practical application of the theories and ideas studied in class while providing an opportunity for students to gain “real-life” experience related to their academic major and earn credit toward their degree.
- **Partner projects**: applied research projects that provide challenging, hands-on learning experiences for students and add value to the focal community partner (often viewed as the project “client.”
- **Professional practica**: industry, clinical and teaching experiences designed to build skills, knowledge and confidence in area of practice. A practicum is guided by faculty and integrated within the curriculum. Community partners vary from corporations to research labs to educational institutions.
- **Service learning**: reflective experiences in which students earn academic credit by participating in meaningful service activities. Guided by faculty and linked to a
community partner, these experiences are designed to foster deeper understanding of course content and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility.

- **Study abroad**: international learning experiences in which students are evaluated and earn academic credit by participating in purposeful activities that are led by faculty and enabled by an international partner. These activities can encompass all aspects of experiential learning, including co-op, academic internships, service learning and partner projects.

**CURRENT STATE OF BARRIERS & ENABLERS**

**Barriers**
1) Cost of launching and sustaining EL infrastructure.
2) Faculty resistance – break from traditional effort.
3) Student resistance – fear of EL extending time to gain degree; lack of motivation and/or understanding of value of EL.
4) Inconsistency – students not consistently held accountable or evaluated for EL.
5) Assessment – scope, cost, missing metrics such as placement data showing students “in demand” by employers.
6) Silo mentality – challenges of coordination and communication across programs and colleges.
7) Language – different terminology and understanding of types of EL.

**Enablers**
1) Existing EL at UC – Most undergraduates have some EL opportunity; top programs EL-based (CCM, DAAP, Engineering, Medicine).
2) Faculty core – All UC programs have small but strong core of EL faculty.
3) Central support – Professional Practice, IGSA, Service Learning, IR, Career Development, Adult Learning Center, Center for Community Engagement.
4) Value – EL potentially makes students and programs more marketable; strong marketing and enrollment initiatives in place.
5) Community ties – Current and potential partners offer EL, funding and community support opportunities.

**KEY STRATEGIES**
1) Develop portfolio concept – Portfolios will demonstrate a student’s experiences, skills and performance, going well beyond a traditional resume. The portfolio model also signifies EL choices at UC, enabling students to set personal career goals and plan experiences to reach those goals.
   a) Building an experiential portfolio becomes a theme across colleges from orientation through graduation and placement.
   b) Leverage existing UC tools such as Blackboard’s new E-Portfolio and current support systems such as Professional Practice, IGSA, Career Development Center, etc.
2) Develop EL standards – To be a global leader in EL, we must develop an approach to EL that is distinctive. Standards must be clearly defined, rigorous and consistently applied.
   a) Develop common and shared language for EL at UC to aid understanding across programs.
b) Develop clear standards for EL (how intensive, number of credit hours, degree of interaction with faculty member, link with community, etc.); standards will include assessment of EL.

3) Develop EL infrastructure.
   a) Provide adequate funding.
   b) Decentralized efforts – organizational structures within colleges and programs.
      i) EL menu – Each college and program develops an EL menu and a portfolio process that fits their academic goals.
      ii) EL Point Person – Each college and program has an EL leader.

4) Centralized – across UC.
   a) Coordinating team – Comprised of EL leaders from each college.
   b) Priority – EL is a recognized and funded priority throughout UC.

**ACTION STEPS**

1) Achieve commitment of university leaders (e.g., president, provosts, deans): Integrate EL into goals/programs of each unit. For example, EL should become a prominent component of university academic plan (UC|21 materials) and in college mission statements.

2) Implement actions to overcome barriers to achieving the vision of EL.
   a) Cost – Provide funding; no unfunded mandates.
   b) Faculty resistance – Recognize and reward EL leaders; provide EL options and support.
   c) Student resistance – Develop portfolio model; choose from EL menu; allow students to customize their learning experiences.
   d) Inconsistency – Develop EL standards and guidelines that ensure consistent EL rigor and quality.
   e) Assessment – Develop EL scorecard by prioritizing key metrics and strengthening central support services, e.g., Career Development Center, Professional Practice, IGSA, FYE.
   f) Silo mentality – Formalize EL options and build master EL schedule; establish EL coordinating team across colleges and programs.
   g) Language – Develop definitions of types of EL that can be consistently applied across colleges and programs as well as in marketing, recruiting and advising.

3) Implement actions to leverage enablers that support the vision of EL.
   a) Existing EL at UC – Raise visibility; make EL a central theme in recruiting, marketing, and advising; showcase top programs.
   b) Faculty core – Enable role models; recognize and reward EL faculty leaders; involve leaders in faculty development efforts.
   c) Central support – Make EL a priority for central support areas.
   d) Value – Promote EL in marketing campaigns and enrollment initiatives.
   e) Community ties – Develop effective EL databases within and across colleges; recognize model partners.

4) Establish central and college EL infrastructure: For example, central office could include faculty director and one staff member. Each unit (program/college) should have a clear EL leader. Central faculty director would lead EL steering team comprised of unit EL leaders.

5) Develop five-year EL plan: EL steering team would develop explicit plan that should include the following components:
a) Raise EL visibility: Central EL staff would develop marketing plan for university-wide EL theme and to support marketing of unit EL programs. Furthermore, university EL Web site could include links to unit EL Web sites, demonstrating the importance and pervasiveness of this theme across programs/disciplines.

b) Coordinate EL activities and assessment: For example, central EL staff would work with registrar to develop EL “flag” that identifies EL courses across campus and enables tracking of EL involvement and its impact on student success. EL items should be key components of institutional research (e.g., satisfaction, exit and graduation surveys, retention analyses).

c) Identify EL funding opportunities: Funding sources could include grants, tuition, fees, co-op income, university support, fund-raising and partnership support. For example, EL could be set up like FYE/Success Challenge providing university funding for annual EL proposals for faculty, course and program development specific to EL.

**ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY**

EL is not currently measured/tracked at UC or at other universities (other than the measure of co-op involvement). This provides a challenge, but also a tremendous opportunity for distinction as our assessment of EL holds potential to be an international leader in EL. Components of the assessment system should include:

1. Integral to curriculum – e.g., identify EL requirements within every program; track student involvement; showcase EL components of university and college mission statements. By flagging EL (ideally identify each specific form of EL), UC could conduct sophisticated analyses of EL involvement and impact. EL items should be key components of institutional research (e.g., satisfaction, exit and graduation surveys, retention analyses).

2. Internationally recognized leader: e.g., identify benchmarks that would include related rankings, including *U.S. News & World Report* (co-op ranking and beyond) and rankings of EL-infused programs; track related media coverage (e.g., EL-related articles).

3. Graduates in high demand: e.g., need to enhance placement data collection and analysis to test whether EL enhances placement potential (e.g., time to job offer/acceptance, salary, graduate program acceptance); showcase corporate and community EL partnerships (e.g., leading firms participating in EL, such as largest co-op employers).

4. Supported by a well-coordinated academic and administrative infrastructure: e.g., showcase and track internal/external funding for EL-related programs and faculty development; could add EL faculty award (outstanding EL facilitator – leading field projects, practica, study abroad, etc.)

5. Expected outcomes: Implementing these action steps is expected to improve recruitment and retention; raise visibility and reputation for UC; expand and strengthen connections to community; fuel placement of graduates; foster new fund-raising opportunities and partnerships; and foster greater alumni involvement.
VISION
UC is a nationally recognized source of scholarship and new thinking on urban life and is a model for university/community partnerships. Community service and engagement is a valued part of the university and the community. UC is physically, programmatically and intellectually accessible, and noticeably integrated into the community. Uptown is culturally diverse community with a wide variety of opportunities and amenities. It is a vibrant, safe, regional destination and an ideal place to live, work and play.

CURRENT STATE OF BARRIERS & ENABLERS
Current state
While there are many community partnerships at work within UC, they are not coordinated and communicated in ways that make them readily apparent within the university or to the larger community. Additionally, there has been little institutional support and stimulation of community connections, and they are not valued in the reappointment, promotion and tenure process.

UC is frequently perceived as impenetrable and unwelcoming. Our campuses are not seen as open to the community, and there is little use of our tremendous cultural, intellectual and other physical and programmatic resources by the larger community. Community leaders seeking to connect with the university’s intellectual resources are stymied by the question of where to start. As we have made inroads in student access through programs like One Stop, we need to do the same for the community.

Uptown, the neighborhood surrounding our central campus, is challenged by crime, deteriorating infrastructure, low home-ownership rates, a dearth of amenities and increasing issues with congestion due to the large daytime population of workers at UC and other major employers. Perceptions about the safety of Uptown have a deleterious effect on UC student recruitment. UC’s ongoing community development programs and the creation of the Uptown Consortium are hopeful signs that a better Uptown is on the horizon.

More specific barriers and enablers are listed below.

Barriers
1) No framework around a community vision.
2) No formal linkages among community development groups or coordination among these groups.
3) Perceived borders between UC and Uptown.
4) Perception of the quality of Cincinnati Public Schools in Uptown area as an impediment to families wanting to live in the area.
5) Perceived and real safety issues.
6) Maneuvering of City of Cincinnati processes is difficult.
7) Lack of awareness of Uptown.
8) No direct pathway established to tap into university resources and expertise.
9) University silos continue to hold on to turf in ways that make connections difficult.
10) Gaps between East and West Campuses.
11) Staff not trained to serve as resource in handling basic functions like sending maps, offering free parking/directions, connection with needed resources, etc.
12) Front door to university not apparent to community.
13) Limited culture/reward system for community engagement for faculty and administration.
14) Dependence on Ohio funding and resources – need other funding sources.
15) No incentive, tool or mindset for faculty to communicate what they are already doing in the community.
16) No targeted communication within UC community regarding community activities and needs.

Enablers
1) Depth and breadth of university expertise and resources that can be drawn upon in the building of a better Uptown.
2) Civic Engagement Council has convened key campus leaders involved in engagement.
3) MainStreet path to overall footprint of university (addresses physical impenetrability).
4) The availability of the Uptown process as a fertile learning ground for students.
5) Proximity to amenities of downtown and other areas of city.
6) Mutual desire on the part of the university and the community to create an Uptown area an asset to all stakeholders.
7) Creation of Tony Brown’s position (CEO of Uptown Consortium) to serve in a facilitating and bridging capacity.
8) Cultural and economic diversity that exists and opportunity to build on it and make it a major component of revitalization of the business district.
   a) More purposeful dissemination of information about UC/community partnerships.
   b) Media – have good access, and they are paying more attention.
   c) UC’s many assets, such as technical expertise, research programs, ability to leverage intellectual capital in both very broad and targeted ways, repository of significant thought leadership.
   d) Wide range of UC campus attractions, programs and activities that make the campus an exciting destination.
   e) UC’s educational expertise that can be applied to better train staff to direct the public to the right places/people.
   f) UC is discussing potential collaboration on civic engagement with Northern Kentucky University and Xavier University.

KEY STRATEGIES
1) We will move toward our vision through:
a) Building a better Uptown by providing long-term support and expansion of the Uptown Consortium, emphasizing its role in the success of Uptown revitalization and developing a long-term funding strategy for the neighborhood development corporations serving Uptown.

b) Creating a front door to university resources for the community by developing an overall university plan to making UC’s campus a destination – physically and programmatically – that is easily accessible and welcoming and noticeably integrated into the community.

c) Developing meaningful partnerships by better leveraging of existing alliances and by providing support for new partnerships through a coordinated program of civic engagement that focus on shared expertise.

d) Growing our reputation by positioning UC as a national leader in community development and engagement.

2) Enablers will be used to effectively implement the action steps, for example, by putting Tony Brown, CEO of the Uptown Consortium, on the implementation team.

3) Barriers will be considered as action steps are fleshed out and resources identified, e.g. by making sure that there is adequate representation from East and West Campuses, regional campuses and the community in implementation process.

4) We expect that acting on these strategies will position the university as a critical partner in the revitalization of Uptown, make our campuses more accessible and user-friendly, leverage our resources to the benefit of the region and build our reputation nationally as a leader among urban universities.

ACTION STEPS

1) Building a better Uptown.
   a) Actively participate in Uptown Consortium initiatives which increase cooperation, coordination and collaboration between public safety and private security forces operating in the Uptown to reduce crime and create a safe campus and community for all residents, employees and visitors. Develop best practices and share them across sectors.
   b) Actively engage community development partners, including the community development corporations and the Uptown Consortium, in the process of developing a comprehensive plan for housing, economic development and transportation that is inclusive of all economic levels.
   c) Develop, with the existing community development corporations and Uptown Consortium, a plan for housing development that is inclusive of all economic levels and stimulate private investment in mixed income housing for Uptown neighborhoods.
   d) Identify collaborative opportunities to leverage current community development investments with additional Uptown stakeholders and partnerships.
   e) Provide a process and structure for accessing financial and technical support for community partnerships.
   f) Support the work of Action Team – Economic Delta Force for creating a center for workforce development.

2) Creating a front door.
a) Create both a virtual and physical place(s) that will be the initial point of contact or entry for the community to access UC resources and services (see no. 1 in “Developing meaningful partnerships”). The “front door” needs to be highly visible and easily accessible, staffed with knowledgeable people committed to customer and community service. The “front door” may be located in the community rather than on campus.

b) Establish a UC “hospitality unit” to assist campus departments with hosting effective meetings and events on campus. The office will produce and distribute information, and provide event and meeting planning and coordination.

c) Blur and blend the lines of campus into the community. Create easily used routes which move through the community to get to other areas of campus i.e., east/west. Distribute UC publications (e.g. class schedule, Horizons) in the surrounding community.

d) Develop a training program for staff to welcome and handle community inquiries, provide basic instructions, direct people to various resources.

3) Developing meaningful partnerships.

a) Create UC|Connect, a center for our civic engagement, community outreach, service learning, and community development programs and services.

i) Develop UC|Connect that will generate and disseminate knowledge about community initiatives; sponsor partnerships, think tanks and debates; promote community scholarship and service; be a convenient place where UC and community people can meet; and showcase and promote the work of UC units and programs like the UC Institute for Community Partnership (UCICP), a university press, Center for Community Engagement, the Niehoff Studio, Community Design Center, Institute for Policy Research and more.

ii) Identify six benchmark institutions (e.g. University of Pennsylvania, University of Illinois at Chicago) to explore for models.

iii) Hire graduate assistant to investigate and report.

iv) Hold first UC|Connect Awards (Fall 2004).

v) Hold colloquium with benchmark schools (by Spring 2005).

vi) Identify space on sixth floor of University Pavilion for initial location of center (suggests its importance to the institution).

vii) Identify a faculty member to research and report opportunities for inclusion of community service through engagement as a part of the RPT process (release time).

viii) Establish UC|Connect Community Advisory Committee.

ix) Secure space in a strategic and symbolic location in Uptown for permanent site of UC/Connect.

x) Hire executive director (administrator) and appoint the first faculty leader for the center (three-year special appointment to lead policy development for center and produce scholarship related to the work we are doing).

b) Launch and grow the Community Connections micro-site and database.

c) Stimulate scholarship on UC community partnerships and urban life.

i) Develop a community “Experts-in-Residence” program, placing community leaders in the classroom through guest lectures, panels, team teaching, etc. or in short-term administrative roles related to community projects.

ii) Develop a roster of UC experts who are available as “Experts-in-Residence” for consultancies in the community and add to online resources. Stimulate participation through incentives.
iii) Provide release time or stipends for faculty to engage in research related to UC’s civic engagement.

d) Develop a mechanism for recognizing faculty, staff, students and administrators for outstanding community service to encourage community involvement.

e) Make community service integral to performance expectations for UC leaders.

4) **Growing our reputation for engagement.**

a) Leverage the information in the Community Connections database to tell our community engagement story more effectively.

b) Expand internal and external communications efforts related to engagement, including creation of an annual awards program.

c) Increase our participation in regional and national conferences on community development, civic engagement and urban life.

d) Host conferences and symposia on topics in Item 3.

e) Explore development of a university press focusing on urban issues.

f) Coordinate efforts with the National Presence and Recognition team.

**ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY**

1) Positive impacts will be measured by

a) **Building a better Uptown:** Reduced crime and higher perceptions of safety; reduction in derelict properties; increase in amenities, such as retail and food service; increased home ownership; increased retention of employees at UC and other partners.

b) **Creating a front door:** Reduction in negative perceptions about “UC shuffle”; significant increases in “customer” satisfaction levels; marked increase in campus facilities and program utilization by community members.

c) **Creating meaningful partnerships:** Civic engagement is supported throughout the organization and is integral to performance measures. Satisfaction levels (demonstrated by periodic surveys) from community partners are high. Community projects and programs can document their effectiveness and impact.

d) **Growing our reputation for engagement:** UC has an annual awards program for exemplary community partnerships; UC people are frequent keynoters at conferences related to engagement; UC is included in stories on “town/gown” and community relations; UC hosts major conferences on engagement; university press releases are in demand across the country.

2) Benchmarks used for comparison with other universities nationally: We will develop a list of schools seen as leaders in this area, such as University of Pennsylvania, research their current levels and extent of engagement, and create standard measures (number of service learning courses and enrollment) across the institutions and UC for benchmarking.

3) Stakeholders will know that this is a successful endeavor when UC is seen a valued and critical community partner and a national leader leading in university/community connections.
Action Team –
Seamless Transitions & Educational Preparation (STEP)

VISION
The University of Cincinnati will establish and spearhead a regional coalition that will achieve national prominence by reforming and revitalizing its PK-16 system and propelling it into a new era. This newly transformed PK-16 system will be defined by a fully integrated educational continuum distinguished by the close alignment, seamless connectivity and strong coherence of its various parts. Moreover, this PK-16 system will be recognized nationally by the high degree of investment and participation of its stakeholders, whether students, teachers, families, business/industry, government, or other regional colleges and universities.

Based on a strong compact or covenant with these various partners, the system will undergird the region’s economic development and prosperity by assuring greater participation in higher education across all segments of the community and producing more graduates who can compete successfully in the high-tech, knowledge-based economy of the 21st century. These graduates will also enrich the region’s societal and cultural health and well-being through enhanced levels of civic engagement and lifelong learning.

If our vision is fulfilled, the University of Cincinnati and its PK-16 collaborators will be instrumental in closing the educational achievement gap across segments of the system and among economic sectors of society. As a result, all students will have equal opportunities to realize their fullest intellectual potential and to navigate throughout a system containing high-performance expectations and accountability for all stakeholders, including UC and its higher education colleagues, PK-12, the business community and boards of education (state and local). Such a network and system have the potential for a major impact: in a knowledge-based world that demands constant innovation, education is the key to Ohio’s economic competitiveness and economic growth.

CURRENT STATE OF BARRIERS & ENABLERS
Our vision requires that, over the next five to 10 years, the university forge much stronger collaborations with PK-12 than ever before. We envision a permanent coalition that is anchored by UC’s full range of resources and strengths in teaching, research and service.

Barriers
1) Ohio’s per capita income has steadily declined over the past 40 years.
2) Ohio continues to lose ground in training knowledgeable workers and in creating high-skill jobs.
3) Ohio ranks 39th in the nation in the percentage of its population that holds a baccalaureate degree (21.1 percent).
4) Ohio ranks 36th in the nation in the percentage of its population aged 18 to 34 that is enrolled in some form of higher education.
5) Especially in the areas of math and science, too few Ohioans aspire to the process and intellectual values of higher education, and too many fail to appreciate the connection between education and earning power.

6) The compartmentalized culture of the PK-16 educational system has no strong tradition of effective collaboration and has conflicting expectations about knowledge and skills at different points along the pipeline, which makes seamless transitions difficult and increases attrition.

7) The state of Ohio, throughout its socio-economic and socio-political history, has failed to fund public education adequately.

8) Business, industry, and other segments of the public sector have failed to adequately invest in education.

9) The K-12 system has become increasingly re-segregated.

**Enablers**

1) The Cincinnati Public Schools (CPS)/University of Cincinnati/Cincinnati Federation of Teachers/KnowledgeWorks Task Force can help forge stronger partnerships and collaborations to minimize the achievement gap.

2) The Greater Cincinnati Consortium of Colleges and Universities (GCCCU) has built up a longstanding network of collaborative relationships within the region, a network that can now be focused more strategically on PK-16 issues.

3) UC’s Center for Access and Transition (CAT) represents a significant new resource for an education coalition, promising as it does to provide college access for under-prepared students and also to encourage their transition into baccalaureate programs. As UC becomes a model for transition and transfer within Ohio, CAT can play an especially key role in facilitating transferability throughout regional institutions.

4) Over a hundred programs and initiatives already exist fostering UC/CPS collaboration.

5) The Tech Prep consortium can serve as a partner for education-based collaboration. The New Vision Planning Grant team within the consortium, for instance, is currently seeking funding for a regional College Access, Transition and Success Center that would help to direct more high school students into technology-oriented fields.

6) Other local and regional initiatives include the Ohio Project, a state program for improving science education; the Southwest Center for Excellence in Science Education, funded by the Ohio Board of Regents; the Center of New Science/Math Education Programs for Today’s Society (CONSEPTS), and the Miami Valley Higher Education Professional Development Center, which concentrates on science and math education.

7) UC is thus strategically positioned in various ways that will promote mutual development with its PK-12 colleagues such as CPS, with local businesses and government agencies, and with other colleges and universities in the region.

**KEY STRATEGIES**

1) Convene a summit that brings together a group of consultants and leaders to consider PK-16 education within its broadest regional and economic context. In particular, this summit will define the parameters for the Center for Leadership in Educational Advancement and Reform (CLEAR, see Strategy Two) and the alignment of all PK-12 school districts in the region with UC initiatives within the scope of CLEAR. The summit will sketch a vision for
UC and the Cincinnati region as a national leader in educational design and reform (e.g., as a new Research Triangle or Silicon Valley for education).

2) Establish CLEAR as a resource for development of a barrier-free PK-16 education system within the Cincinnati area. Operating within an interdisciplinary context that transcends college and institutional lines, CLEAR will become a major force, both regionally and nationally, in the areas of educational reform, research, professional development and community engagement. CLEAR will have the expertise and capacity for brokering relationships among diverse stakeholders and sharing accountability for closing the achievement gap.

a) In our vision of UC as a critical player within a seamless PK-16 educational system, we are proposing CLEAR as a center that will continually define and redefine the future of educational theory and praxis. It will operate in an interdisciplinary context that transcends college and institutional lines. CLEAR will become a major and leading force in the areas of educational reform, research, professional development and community engagement. CLEAR’s agenda will be to dissolve the boundaries between “town and gown” and create a seamless symbiotic relationship between the university and its PK-12 partners, one that will be driven by informed research and extensive engagement.

b) CLEAR will pursue a vigorous research-driven agenda directed toward the development of a body of theory that will catalyze fundamental reform throughout the educational system. The goal is to firmly establish UC as a national leader in the scholarship and methodology of teaching and learning, cognitive theory, educational administration, community engagement and the enhancement of the teaching profession. Our focus will be pedagogy and the learning process as well as the broad range of strategies that continuously improve them at all levels, whether student, teacher or system performance. Creating effective measures of assessment and principles of accountability throughout the educational system will be pillars of CLEAR’s mission.

c) The CLEAR agenda that is research and theory-driven must also be closely aligned with praxis in the broadest sense. At its most fundamental level, CLEAR will serve to oversee, expand and coordinate current UC efforts towards community and PK-12 outreach. Staffed by the very best individuals across a wide variety of sectors, CLEAR will bring experts together on a part-time, temporary-systems basis to address complex but specific problems. It will help to forge compacts between the educational system, on the one hand, and government, business or industry, on the other hand, although with both hands now joined. It will revolutionize the concept and practice of civic engagement for schools and universities, not simply through new forms of service learning or volunteerism, but also through the strategic integration of the myriad activities and projects currently undertaken or planned.

d) In many ways, UC already has in place many of the blocks necessary to build CLEAR. The General Education Program, for instance, offers many possibilities to teams of students conducting research and performing service in area schools within the framework of an interdisciplinary capstone project. The Center for Access and Transition (CAT) will expand access for the under-prepared, even as it facilitates their transition into baccalaureate programs. Current initiatives to enhance teacher-preparation programs in mathematics and the natural sciences can continue to expand, thereby
bringing more students into the pipeline that supplies the classrooms. Dual-enrollment programs between UC and area schools have expanded the walls of the college classroom to encompass and inspire future college students. Connections between UC and other area colleges and universities have already demonstrated the benefits of sharing resources in more efficient ways. Individual faculty at UC are already performing many of the activities that we envision as a part of CLEAR; with greater coordination, integration and focus for those activities, and with an emphasis on the leadership that such activities can exemplify and the reform that such activities can produce, they can become much more than the sum of their isolated parts.

e) For a project like CLEAR to achieve its potential, it must look far beyond our current levels of research into teaching and learning, or our current efforts to connect our students with area schools. We will need to create a new vision for the role of education generally, a vision in which the level of debate about education is heightened and expanded, in which the qualities of knowledge and the intellect become valued by our culture, and in which an institution like UC becomes recognized as a major community and regional resource.

3) Create a permanent coalition of key regional stakeholders that will enhance the capacity of regional PK-12 school districts to achieve their core mission of ensuring the high academic achievement of every student. Using the CPS-UC connection as its showcase, this coalition will help to construct a PK-16 educational system that is barrier-free, standards-based and value-driven. Working from the premise that the economic success and continued growth of any community depend on the existence of an educated citizenry, executive leaders of education, business (e.g., Cincinnati Business Committee), government and community organizations will be asked to serve and to commit key people and real resources to this effort.

**ACTION STEPS**

1) Plan and implement a high-profile regional summit to be held in early 2005. Supplemented with additional members so as to maximize regional participation, the STEP Action Team will plan the summit and form a pool for a representative governance structure for CLEAR, one that identifies it as a regional asset and not exclusively as a UC center. The charge to the area and national education and economic-development leaders invited to the summit will be to establish a vision of the future that forms the mission statement and identifies the goals of CLEAR.

2) Convene the summit with the predicted goals of:
   a) Developing a foundation and initial framework for the mission and scope of CLEAR;
   b) Gaining commitments from all of its necessary stakeholders;
   c) Forming a compact for the purpose of better preparing the 21st century workforce by channeling more students through the PK-16/18+ pipeline;
   d) Creating a permanent CLEAR Steering Committee; and
   e) Solidifying support for a PK-16 partnership that will underpin regional economic development.

3) Create an innovative structural design for CLEAR that maximizes its potential to become a valued community resource, acting as both a center for applied, responsive research and a regional incubator for cutting-edge educational theory.
4) Review and recommend revision to regional PK-16 organizational and operational structures to create patterns of closer institutional cooperation. This review will include government regulations that affect education, as well as the internal policies, rules and procedures of all involved educational institutions and systems that act as barriers to efficient operations and the ability of students to complete their educational goals. One purpose of this review will be to strengthen linkages between education, business and government.

5) Identify and pursue funding sources, including: university reallocation, foundations, grants (federal and state), philanthropic organizations, and business and industry.

6) Develop mechanisms for regular reporting of activities to public forums and media.

ASSessment & AccountAblity

Working with its K-12 partners (such as CPS), CLEAR will measure its success through demonstrable change and improvement over the next five to 10 years in benchmark areas such as the following:

1) Student academic achievement and persistence to graduation.
2) Percentage of local/regional students advancing successfully through the PK-16+ system.
3) Ethnicity percentages of high school graduates versus college graduates.
4) Percentage of college students in two-year programs who complete their degrees in four years or less.
5) Percentage of college students who complete the baccalaureate degrees.
6) Percentages of graduates remaining in the region, contributing to its economic prosperity and functioning as the backbone of its workforce.
7) Range of affordable opportunities for higher education and post-secondary education.
8) Range of access points that allow for ready entry for a diverse range of students arriving via the PK-12 pipeline, as well as linkages between the adult workforce education system and universities and colleges.
9) Degree to which the Transfer Module has been implemented at UC and collaboration and articulation between/among higher education institutions in the region has been expanded and enhanced.
10) Degree of alignment of PK-12 standards and curricula with higher-education admissions standards and curricula.
11) Number and strength of links between UC and regional PK-12 education systems, e.g., license agreements that provide complete access to the UC library system and OhioLINK to regional high school students.
12) Acquisition of world-class faculty who wish to study at and contribute to CLEAR and to the enhancement in the quality of PK-12 teaching in the region.
13) Quality and impact of research, through the amounts and variety of funding sources to support CLEAR.
14) Growth of new business and industries in the area.
15) Linkage of the region's prosperity and economic development to its PK-16+ system.
16) Sustainability and adaptability of the partnership during the throes of economic and social change.
17) Number and effectiveness of mechanisms to encourage high-quality teachers with national certifications to work in poorer schools rather than in those that are more affluent.
18) UC’s standing as an engaged university leading the region’s economic renaissance.
19) The region’s awareness of UC/CLEAR’s leadership in reforming and revitalizing the regional PK-16+ system.
20) The nation’s view of Southwest Ohio as visionary and invested in education.
**Action Team – Healthy Cincinnati**

**VISION**

“Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.”

As one approaches the University of Cincinnati campus on a brisk winter day at lunch time, small groups of people, i.e. students, faculty, staff and community members, can be seen walking briskly on well-marked pathways that include mileage markers as well as workout stations. These individuals are participating in an initiative that began in Fall 2004 as part of UC’s Comprehensive Academic Planning Process. Some people have lost a significant amount of weight with a decrease in hypertension and cholesterol and decreased risk for developing diabetes. Others are maintaining their weight by walking 2,100 steps a day and decreasing their caloric intake by 100 calories a day. This is part of UC’s partnership with America on the Move to help decrease the number of obese individuals.

The Greater Cincinnati Health Status Survey in 2002 reported that 61% of adults in the Greater Cincinnati area are overweight, with 22% being obese. Both cardiovascular-related illnesses as well as diabetes are strongly correlated with obesity. These percentages have dropped 15% for UC employees and 15% for the vulnerable population base contiguous to the university, participating in the Healthy Cincinnati initiative. The resulting savings in health insurance premiums for the UC community have been reinvested in projects and facilities to help sustain healthy lifestyles. While some individuals strongly supported decreases in health premiums, others pointed to the fact that premiums had remained flat because of the changes in lifestyle, and that savings should go to continuing to improve the health status of the employees and the community.

This decrease in weight, as well as projected weight gain, can be attributed to four major initiatives:

- Community and university participation in America on the Move.
- Development and implementation of a School of Public Health.
- The signing of a formal partnership between UC and the Center for Closing the Health Gap in Greater Cincinnati.
- The integration of healthy lifestyles into the curriculum in the most likely places such as freshman seminar classes, but also in graduate education in such classes as Organizational Behavior.
- Easy access to workout facilities.
Selected examples of campus/community activities include:

- A weekly heart-smart menu as part of the UC Web page with recipes and nutrient analysis performed by students in the Nutritional Sciences program.
- Workout facilities jointly used by students, faculty and staff, as well as vulnerable populations from the contiguous community. These individuals’ membership fees are subsidized by the state as part of a community health-promotion, disease-prevention grant award.
- Health Science students and Exercise Science students regularly participate in providing “exercise prescriptions” as requested.
- Throughout the campus, the UC public access channel regularly includes programming related to healthy lifestyles.
- Walking teams of faculty, staff and students have contributed to a decrease in alcohol use on campus.
- There has been an increase in the intramural sports teams on campus, including volleyball. These activities, combined with a major effort to decrease alcohol consumption among students have contributed to healthier student lifestyles.

Several activities have led to the formation of a formal partnership between UC and the Center for Closing the Health Gap in Greater Cincinnati. In addition to partnering with the center on an annual health disparities conference, an award-winning interdisciplinary course titled “Creating Healthy Communities”… through eliminating racial and ethnic health disparities has been developed and implemented. This interdisciplinary course includes faculty from Family Medicine and other primary care departments such as Pediatrics and Internal Medicine; Medical Anthropology, Geography and Sociology, Allied Health, Nursing and Pharmacy. The exciting thing about this course is that it includes a service-learning component, is a required part of the curriculum, and as such, after initial funding support for its development, is sustainable. It also serves as a foundation course for the newly developed School of Public Health.

The university has become an active member of Campus-Community Partnerships for Health and teams of faculty regularly attend their national conference and make joint presentations. Several exciting publications and an edited textbook have emerged as an indirect result of this community engagement effort.

Individuals feel they belong, that they are part of the larger community, working together for the health of everyone. Together the university and community have developed a set of mutually agreed upon goals to continue the journey toward a healthy lifestyle. This has helped create a dynamic living and learning community, where optimal health is considered important for everyone.
CURRENT STATE OF BARRIERS & ENABLERS

Barriers
1) Issues of community health are not among the highest priorities at UC.
2) UC’s budgetary “near-perfect storm” precludes the use of new internal funding for health initiatives.
3) There are no administrative mechanisms in place at UC to take charge of a Healthy Cincinnati initiative.
4) There is a need for comprehensive data (including appropriate community health metrics) about the health and well-being priorities of UC students and employees, and the residents of the surrounding neighborhoods and communities.
5) There is a need for comprehensive information on what other urban universities/institutions are doing in community health promotion and wellness, including the identification of appropriate benchmarks and best practices.
6) A focused and coordinated use of UC’s community health resources could provide significant improvements in the health and well-being of the residents of surrounding neighborhoods and communities.
7) There are many UC health-related programs with community linkages, but they are not coordinated or part of a comprehensive program for addressing the most important health issues of the residents of the surrounding neighborhoods and communities.
8) There is a lack of comprehensive information about what options exist, how these are delivered and coordinated, and whether they are effective.

Enablers
1) Many of the academic units at UC already have well-established, health-related connections with the surrounding neighborhoods and communities.
2) Existing student and employee health programs can serve as the foundation for comprehensive approaches.
3) UC has outstanding human and technology resources for collecting information, assessing problems, and designing and implementing solutions.
4) UC is a tremendous reservoir of human, intellectual and technology resources capable of improving the health and well-being of UC students and employees, as well as the residents of the surrounding neighborhoods and communities.

KEY STRATEGIES
1) Identify a short list of related tasks that can be implemented quickly, at low or no cost and with minimal administrative approvals, and assess the “net benefits” of each task.
2) Identify a list of related tasks that are more difficult to implement and assess their “net benefits.”
3) Recommend an adaptive administrative structure within UC for providing more effective preventative and curative health and well-being services.
4) Recommend an adaptive administrative structure within UC for bringing UC’s community outreach under a “single umbrella” to better facilitate, coordinate and enhance the effectiveness of efforts to address critical health issues.
5) Educate UC administrators and trustees about the “net benefits” of making community health issues among the highest priorities at UC.
6) Find low and no-additional internal cost solutions; explore external funding mechanisms.
7) Identify and educate UC administration and trustees about potential mechanisms at UC that could take charge of a Healthy Cincinnati initiative.
8) Assign responsibility for inventorying and coordinating the connections health-related with surrounding neighborhoods and communities.
9) Build on the existing student and employee programs for comprehensive approaches to health and well-being.
10) Develop a plan to systematically assess and utilize UC’s human and technology resources for collecting information, assessing problems, and designing and implementing solutions in support of a Healthy Cincinnati.
11) Utilize faculty resources for collecting data, assessing data, and designing and implementing solutions to identify related tasks and assess net benefits.
12) Developing a partnership with the Health Collaborative of Greater Cincinnati, the On-the-Move project, and other community-health organizations.
13) Obtain major grant funding for Healthy Cincinnati.
14) Demonstrate the return to UC, the State of Ohio, charitable and federal funders on investing in community health prevention and treatment.
15) Develop a few high-profile projects to jumpstart efforts.
16) Create an inventory or registry of UC’s community health outreach programs.
17) Revise the structure of incentives for UC faculty and staff to better recognize and reward efforts to improve community health.
18) Develop a better, more comprehensive understanding of the health needs of UC students, staff and faculty, and those of the surrounding communities.
19) Obtain the resources for opening a UC School of Public Health with a focus on urban populations, especially those in surrounding areas.
20) Make the UC Medical Center more attuned to the needs of the community by using UC Health Partners to provide comprehensive disease management services for Cincinnati’s 5,000 sickest, poorest residents.
21) Connect UC’s health-related resources to the surrounding communities to prevent as well as treat disease and disability in UC-area communities.

**ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY**

As a result of implementing the key strategies, it is expected that UC will develop a model university assessment system that documents:

1) Community-based educational experience as a part of all UC educational programs.
2) Aligned needs (i.e. healthier, happier communities) with internal research programs and projects.
3) Benchmarks that can be marketed to the corporate community to promote interest and expanded collaborations and/or partnerships.
4) Key health issues of the UC community and how to resolve them, and shares this success with the surrounding communities.
5) Connection of UC to the urgent health needs in the surrounding neighborhoods and communities.
6) Connection of UC health resources with vulnerable populations through increased cultural competency, improved health knowledge, and raising the health expectations of vulnerable populations.

7) Comprehensive registry or inventory of UC’s health-related programs and services, identifying the “top 25” outreach programs and focus these on one or two of the most pressing health disparity issues found in the surrounding neighborhoods and communities.
GOAL 5 – 
ESTABLISH A SENSE OF “PLACE”

Develop an environment where members of the campus community and the community at large want to spend time – learning, living, playing and staying; provide long-term support to build a better Uptown.

- **We’re All UC** – develop a “UC Community” to unify and create a sense of belonging for students, faculty, staff, alumni and friends.

- **East-West Connections** – build programmatic bridges, people-to-people access, and incentives for collaborations and joint programs that promote a united campus.

*Action Team reports follow on pages 105 to 111.*
**Action Team –
“We’re All UC” & East-West Connections**

**VISION**
The vision for “We’re All UC” is to create a University of Cincinnati that includes strong interactions and unified efforts between the East and West Campuses and develops a strong sense of community for students, faculty, staff, and alumni on all campuses.

**Establishing a Sense of Place**
One of the strategic actions for the University of Cincinnati is to “establish a sense of place” – develop an environment where members of the campus community and the community at large want to spend time – learning, living, playing and staying. UC is geographically and organizationally challenged with an East Campus, West Campus, three branch sites, a major medical facility, 15 colleges and one free-standing school. The purpose of establishing a sense of place is to enhance, develop and encourage campus unity from an operational and management standpoint, thus “We’re All UC.” This effort tends to be internally focused, but ultimately leads to support of all the university’s core values.

While “We’re All UC” is meant to encourage campus unity, it is not intended to diminish the unique characteristics of the various colleges and departments. Our goal must be to encourage unity without discouraging pride. To achieve a positive outcome, we should work together to:

- Avoid total amalgamation.
- Break down physical barriers.
- Break down philosophical barriers.
- Break down communication barriers.
- Establish programmatic linkages and partnerships (i.e. research, interdisciplinary, etc.).
- Seek additional opportunities to provide seamless service.
- Involve all (including branch campuses) stakeholders – faculty, staff, students and alumni and beyond to build bridges that will lead to long-lasting partnerships.

**Teaching/research unity**
- A university where the students, faculty and staff interact on the basis of their interests, their educational and research goals, irrespective of department and college boundaries.

- A university made up of strong academic disciplines with a desire, and drive to “connect” with members of UC in other disciplines, on an intellectual, social and practice level, as a greater opportunity that will strengthen the individual academic disciplines.
• Investments in novel interdisciplinary research and teaching efforts with increased interdisciplinary majors among undergraduates.

• Faculty working and communicating together at all levels – in governance, teaching, research, recruiting, hyping, promoting, etc.

**Physical Unity**

• Stakeholders referring to the University of Cincinnati as one place (breaking down barriers across campus and branch campuses).

• A single campus joined physically by walkways, bridges, shuttles, a redesigned Martin Luther King Drive/Vine Street intersection and a monorail.

**UC Pride/Communication**

• UC as a cohesive community will foster a more collaborative environment with a “can do” culture that embraces solutions and change.

• Faculty, alumni, staff and students that “market” UC with every breath.

• UC as an integral driving force within the community, state, country and world. A destination choice for lifetime experience for all – resulting in uniqueness and self-reliance.

**CURRENT STATE OF BARRIERS & ENABLERS**

Our broad scope includes developing a culture, which permeates all stakeholder groups with common goals for the good of the institution as a whole.

**Barriers**

1) Barriers to East/West unity are both geographic and philosophical. The “silos” are strong in part due to budgetary, organizational/territorial and philosophical reasons.

2) The university lacks a unified strategy to identify clusters of common interests and bring people together in forums for sharing and common planning.

3) Poor communication:
   a) At present there are many uncoordinated forms of communication with alumni, organizations and departments that entrench the silo mentality.
   b) Limited UC marketing. Current advertising and marketing efforts have proven most focused and effective in their first year. They need support of all stakeholders and financial resources to be expanded. Presently our reputation locally is good, but it needs to be improved nationally and internationally. UC needs an integrated “branded” approach to selling itself. UC is not the first or second choice for students; we must determine ways to change this. Also *Horizons* magazine is professionally done with broad appeal but narrow distribution. Reinvent this communications vehicle. Consider subsidizing change with paid advertising reflective of the nature of Horizons and other university publications.
   c) Limited promotions for public presentations of employee’s work.
d) Emphasizing the focus on students as our major stakeholders! We must consider the thoughts of students. We need to develop new, unique educational opportunities. Need to include the commuter group in planning process.

e) Elevate Homecoming, reunions, Commencement and other traditional UC activities in the minds of faculty, staff, administration, community and alumni. Reinvent these traditional models.

4) Limited collaboration
a) Rewards for collaboration do not exist or are unknown.
b) Stakeholders do not know about projects planned for the university, nor how to find out about these projects.
c) Current faculty recruitment and new faculty orientation do not address/introduce the concept of collaboration with other groups. Collaborate with community groups.
d) Limited faculty participation/interest in/ knowledge of the Quality Service Initiative.
e) There is no identified common place for faculty to gather and interact.
f) Limited resources (time commitments, staff and funds).

Enablers
The University of Cincinnati has many departments, programs, service, and activities where good models of bridging and collaboration already exist. Below are some examples:

1) Collaborations across colleges/departments/units
a) Libraries
b) Faculty Technology Resources Center (FTRC)
c) College of Nursing and College of Business joint MBA program
d) Interdisciplinary faculty position – nutrition between the colleges of Nursing, Pharmacy and Medicine
e) Department of Biomedical Engineering (joint program between the Colleges of Medicine and Engineering)
f) College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services and College of Medicine (Department of Pediatrics) collaboration to offer a new MS in medical education
g) College of Applied Science and the College of Medicine explorations to develop a lab technician associates degree
h) The Center for Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (CET&L) – September Institute
i) Neuroscience Interdisciplinary Program
j) MD-MBA Program
k) College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services Baccalaureate Completion programs at branch campuses
l) Credit center programs

2) Collaborations across programs
a) Just Community
b) Quality Service Initiative
c) Celebrate UC
d) WISE Program
e) Dual admissions program for medical school

3) Collaborative activities
a) International/Global Studies
b) Student International Healthcare Team
c) Graduate School Recruitment Day
d) Institutional Research Board
e) Cross-department funded grants
f) Faculty Senate and other forms of faculty governance
g) Student governance (i.e., GSA)
h) Student and employee fairs
i) One-on-one (personal) collaborations
j) Professional organization events – i.e. UCAAMP, AAPW, etc.
k) Professional training and development sessions
l) Cincinnatus Scholarship competition
m) Brown Bag Lunches
n) Sports
o) Alumni events
p) Mentoring and job shadowing
q) Joint search committees, advisory councils, task forces, etc.

**KEY STRATEGIES & ACTION STEPS**

The key strategies for “We’re All UC” will focus on breaking down the barriers that mitigate unity and creating an atmosphere for teamwork and positive change. With that spirit in mind, below are examples of strategies that can address the goal to “establish a sense of place” and unity.

1) **Overcome artificial and/or real barriers to ensure that faculty and students, administrative staff, alumni and the community believe that all the resources of the university are available to them.**
   a) Develop ways to make transfer of credits between colleges seamless. Another way to look at this is a way to offer uniform academic standards across the university. Expand the ideas behind the College Structures Initiative to encompass all academic activity. One suggestion to implement this is to select one department to be in charge of all courses in that discipline (e.g. one math department responsible for all math courses on all campuses). Similar courses would have the same course number, but would be listed as available at different sites. Centralized oversight would afford a cyclic review of courses. With centralized oversight of courses, similar courses on all campuses would be equivalent (uniform academic standards), and thus credits would transfer between colleges.
   b) Hire new faculty into a single department, with input from departmental colleagues (regardless of their campus location).
   c) Allow all students to take courses in any college if they have the proper prerequisites (barring limitations on resources, i.e., over-crowding, number of sections, etc.) to ensure that students identify with UC, rather than a smaller part of it.
   d) Increase advertising of university’s resources that are at low to no cost for usage by stakeholders.
   e) Hold a Showcase UC event to bring awareness and exchange of ideas.
   f) Collaborate with the Uptown to discuss beneficial partnerships.
g) The provosts could present a “vision statement” describing the concept of centralized oversight of course offerings; the deans and the faculty would then be charged with determining the best way to accomplish this. The idea that “We’re all UC” would be reinforced in the provosts’ vision statement. Deans and department chairs would be responsible for the implementation. Faculty and staff would be responsible for the follow through.

h) Explore grant monies, corporate sponsorships and other fund-raising mechanisms to fund these activities.

2) **Create an environment that encourages students, faculty, staff and alumni to share the concept of a singular community.**
   a) Conduct a survey of faculty, staff, students and alumni to help determine what strategies and actions can be taken to unify the university.
   b) Create major communication connectors between campuses:
     i) VP-VP, provost-provost, deans-deans, faculty-faculty, staff-staff, students-students, committee appointments. … Ensure that the communication connectors are multi-disciplinary between all constituents, including our president.
     ii) Improve communications to allow the entire university community to know its component parts better. This would include making the entire university aware of activities, interests of faculty, research interests, academic interests, successes, etc. across campuses. These communications (at least some) would be available to students, faculty, staff, alumni and interested members of the community.
     iii) Develop a single login, a single password for access to the multitude of databases at UC and to increase efficiencies in the day-to-day business operations.
     iv) Redesign the UC Web Site. Develop a central site that can be used by faculty, staff, students, etc. to see what is available, accomplishments of the UC community members, and what is going on at UC – a UC “Google.” In addition to a virtual site, establish a physical site (central office) that could facilitate interactions among the UC community.
     v) Develop a UC intra-net. This could be designed so that the news of the day could appear on the computers of all members of the UC community each morning that cut across the all units.
     vi) Develop *E-Currents* or its derivative, appearing weekly. It would be accessible to the UC community, to alumni, to the general community (e.g. via subscription). In each issue, include a feature that emphasizes, “We’re all UC.” This site could be connected to a “Dean’s List” from each college, accessed from the E-Currents site, and featuring important news relevant to the colleges.
     vii) Foster a shared information model to enhance a shared community.
   c) Support and collaborate with the Uptown Consortium to improve the neighborhood and join the East and West Campuses.
   d) Improve transportation – the shuttle service (allow advertising on shuttles to help support this); build a monorail, a walkway. Collaborate with Metro and TANK to improve service to UC – especially direct service from outlying areas (e.g. Kings Island in the winter; Raymond Walters, Clermont).
   e) Improve parking; make concerted efforts to reduce parking costs by minimizing (rather than maximizing) the construction charges assigned to the parking auxiliary.
   f) Establish satellite parking and increase the level of shuttle services.
g) Increase awareness and encourage the use of centralized meeting places where faculty, staff and students can get together to exchange ideas.

h) Have students, faculty and staff all wear “We’re all UC” T-shirts during a specific week or day to celebrate “We’re All UC” day/week. During that week, have an outdoor event that involves collaboration across colleges and supports unity. Invite local businesses in the Uptown area. Consider cross-campus/cross-faculty incentives.

i) Present networking forums to learn about each other and to celebrate successes. This would include both formal events [e.g., colloquia, “Celebrate UC Research Day”] and informal events. Create Alumni College weekends and feature the work of the faculty and staff.

j) Establish a Center for Interdisciplinary Planning and Activities. This could be a physical center and/or a virtual center. It would provide a hub for exchanges between colleges, departments and individuals. Encourage the development of an annual report (state of the university) by the president to inform us of our successes, i.e. the present status.

k) Establish periodic forums that bring stakeholder groups together to discuss continuous enhancements of UC.

l) Enhance existing mentoring programs and include students across campuses.

m) Overcome physical barriers.

3) **Build rewards for collaboration into performance reviews of departments and into tenure criteria, etc.**

   a) Go beyond the scope of academia to include units, departments, colleges, alumni, vendors/suppliers and community.

   b) Seek buy-in from faculty and all other UC stakeholders to agree to the importance of collaboration.

   c) Enhance and increase the existing models of bridging that lead to unification.

   d) Implement core values that can lead to a change in the present culture in an effort to break down “silos.”

   e) Celebrate graduate students, undergrad students, faculty and staff who cross these boundaries.

   f) Use the Deans Council as one venue to have an open exchange of ideas on the elevation of the interdisciplinary concept. Open discussion at the associate dean level or at the vice-presidential level could foster an awareness of the need for collaboration.

   g) Continue partnership between provosts. Continued communication, joint actions, etc., will help to reduce barriers between the East and West Campuses.

   h) Devise a way to give co-PIs as well as PIs “credit” for grants. This would require an advance agreement to show where indirect dollars will go. A sharing of credit would celebrate the interdisciplinary nature of projects when appropriate.

   i) Establish one Office for Sponsored Research (although there could be a satellite office for logistical purposes). Change cultural attitudes from “can’t do” to “try this.”

   j) Change the culture from one of compliance to one of pushing boundaries. Instill a focus on what *can be*, instead of what can go wrong. The Worst Policies and Quick Wins groups can assist with this effort.

   k) Further exploration and development of novel interdisciplinary programs at both the undergraduate and graduate level; development of cross campus courses taught by faculty from more than one college; to further understand requirements for professional school admissions, faculty could serve on each others’ admissions and curriculum.
committees; increase number of summer positions for undergraduate students; development of a lab technician associate degree to help meet the growing need for trained Research Assistants, skilled in new technologies.

l) Establish mentoring programs, buddy system projects and job shadowing across colleges and divisions and across faculty, staff and students.
m) Departments and colleges can be reminded that collaboration is part of their mission. This could be done by tying collaboration to new position lines (e.g. the ability to search for new positions would require evidence of on-going collaboration, or specific plans for collaborative efforts). The provosts might set aside funds for positions that cut across collegiate lines.

n) Recognition of interdisciplinary work/collaboration would be included in criteria for RPT at all levels.
o) Financial support must be available to support collaboration – collaboration both in teaching and in research. Sources could include Faculty Professional Development, the University Research Council, etc. Earmark certain dollar amounts to support interdisciplinary work/research.

**ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY**

1) Increased recruitment and increased retention of students, by tracking the success of graduates, documenting improvement in student satisfaction levels, increased collaboration and the development of interdisciplinary units.

2) Using 2004 as the benchmark year, improved alumni donor levels, membership and volunteer participation should show growth within five years.

3) The number of students, faculty, staff and alumni participating in sponsored events, participant satisfaction levels, quantity and quality of joint ventures that are developed, and cost savings that may occur.

4) Improved admission and retention rates.

5) Improvement in revenue generated and fiscal responsibility.

6) More positive outlook by all stakeholders, and willingness to support/embrace change.

7) Increased numbers of joint courses, joint programs, satisfied students, graduates who are sought after by employers and recruited by other universities, increased numbers of undergraduates who attend graduate school at UC and other programs, trained pool of technicians to meet needs of research labs, pooled resources and as well as motivated faculty and staff.

8) Benchmark data from professional organizations and competitors can be used to determine the level of effectiveness.
GOAL 6 – CREATE OPPORTUNITY

Develop potential, not just in our students, but in our local and global communities.

- **Economic Delta Force** – strengthen UC as an educator of a skilled, principled workforce, as a catalyst for entrepreneurship and as a partner in economic development.

- **Performance-Enhanced Budgeting and Revenue Enhancement** – provide incentives for performance with effective accountability and identify alternate ways to generate revenue.

*Action Team reports follow on pages 113 to 120.*
VISION
UC leads in the 21st century as an educator of a skilled, principled workforce, as a catalyst for entrepreneurship, and as a partner in the economic development of the region.

More specifically, UC leads in the 21st century as:

1) A university educating a workforce with the right skills and values to meet the needs of the region’s businesses now and in the future. This is accomplished by:
   a) producing attractive graduates who will be new employees in the region and beyond, and
   b) educating current employees of the region’s businesses through degree and non-degree programs.
2) A university acting as a catalyst for entrepreneurship
   a) where great research is conducted and that research is successfully transformed into business opportunities, and
   b) where expertise is available to others in the region that seek to create and build economic enterprises.
3) A university working with partners to create an environment that attracts and keeps employers and employees who contribute to the economic well-being of the region. This includes:
   a) business creation, attraction and retention, and
   b) developing potent/desirable commercial and residential areas attracting a diverse community of individuals and families.

The vision demands partnerships that broaden and deepen our impact. Partners come from businesses and other organizations in Uptown, in Greater Cincinnati, in the 3C Corridor (Cincinnati, Columbus, and Cleveland), and beyond. Economic impact can focus on our strengths and breaking down obstacles that hinder the creative process and collaboration. Our goal is to develop a set of initiatives that will enhance UC’s role as an economic engine. Key components of the economic engine are workforce development, research, application of intellectual property and community/regional development.

CURRENT STATE BARRIERS & ENABLERS
Barriers and enablers include communication, cooperation, physical space, personal investment, political climate, attitude, decision-making, leadership, leadership development, business expertise, politics and red tape. That is, there are assets and liabilities related to each of these concepts. As we implement specific actions, we must target and maximize our assets and
confront liabilities. This will require a frank and honest discussion of barriers and enablers as actions are undertaken.

**KEY STRATEGIES & ACTION STEPS**

1) **University entrepreneurship: key strategies**
   a) Increase and focus funding for research.
      i) Evaluate strengths and cut out the weak.
      ii) Choose where to place limited dollars to create critical mass.
      iii) Develop interdisciplinary linkages – producing non-traditional connections for idea stimulation.
      iv) Leverage limited dollars to create jobs, business opportunities and a skilled workforce.
   b) Create a mechanism for research transfer/commercialization.
      i) Reinvent the way the university links to area employers and governmental/private economic development organizations.
      ii) Evaluate and improve the university’s partnerships affecting the success of our economic engine.

2) **University entrepreneurship: action steps**
   b) Expand local, state and federal lobbying to increase the flow of funds to support the university’s focus.
   c) Build a database (or set of databases) about university expertise (including student projects like the Niehoff Studio) available for economic development projects.
   d) Develop a plan for a mechanism to spark entrepreneurship.

3) **Workforce development: key strategies**
   a) Create a Center for Workforce Development.
   b) The center will focus on producing graduates who will be new employees in the region and beyond. It will also focus on educating current employees of the regions’ businesses through degree and non-degree programs.
   c) The center will pull together campus units and connect them with community-based partners. The campus units include placement, Professional Practice (co-op), internship coordinators, curriculum developers in provostal and college offices, executive education programs in the College of Business and elsewhere.
   d) The center will build a working partnership with community and business leaders who can identify the educational needs and skills of future workforces. In addition to corporate human resources personnel, this also includes chambers of commerce and economic development units of local governments.

4) **Workforce development: action steps**
   a) Reinvent the placement office and connect it better with Professional Practice.
   b) Aggressively pursue appropriate grants for workforce development.
   c) Create a Web site that provides a single point of contact for employers seeking new employees or seeking education/training for their current employees.
d) Sponsor annual conference on regional workforce development, bringing together university units and regional partners to identify current and forecast gaps in skills and values.

5) **Community development: key strategies**
   a) Create a Center for Community Development.
   b) The center will coordinate campus units/activities with community partners. These campus units include the Office of the University Architect, Architecture and Planning faculty in the College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning (DAAP), Real Estate faculty in the College of Business, and Construction Management faculty in the College of Applied Science.
   c) The center will help the university demonstrate its commitment to the adjacent neighborhoods by its support and joint leadership of the Uptown Consortium. This partnership with major Uptown employers reinforces the current commitment already made by the university to Corryville, Clifton Heights and University Heights.
   d) The center will help to connect the community with other elements of the university that can provide assistance on investing, physical decision-making, community design (Niehoff Studio), community organizational structure, grant writing, leadership training and educational training and mentoring.

6) **Community development: action steps**
   a) Develop a database of:
      i) community organizations seeking help or expertise, and
      ii) educational programs and university faculty and staff interested in providing the help and expertise.
   b) The president and trustees should reinforce the university’s role as a major player in the City and region, advocating community service as a part of every educational program on campus.
   c) The president currently occupies seats on nearly every major community oriented organization and should encourage other university administrators to serve on community organizations. Tenured faculty should also be encouraged to work in some capacity with community organizations.
   d) Establish walk-to-work, down payment programs to stimulate home purchases by employees.

**ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY**

1) **University entrepreneurship**
   a) Benchmark against peer universities.
   b) Track the number and amount of grant dollars and public awareness of success and/or contribution to society.
   c) Track the number of new patents.
   d) Fund cost benefit studies of research productivity.
   e) Fund economic value/contribution studies of research value to the community.
   f) Track the amount of grant dollars and percentage increase on a yearly basis.
   g) Quantify the number of endowed chairs.
   h) Take the pulse of public image and perception.
   i) Seek recognition for the physical quality of life that supports research.
j) Track the number of partnerships with nationally-known individuals and firms.

2) **Workforce development**
   a) Number of graduates hired by local and regional companies.
   b) Amount of time, after graduation, it takes grads to find employment in their fields.
   c) Expansion and expanded support of Honors and Honors-PLUS programs.
   d) Number and variety of corporate or business partners with university colleges or departments working on workforce skills and capacity for employment.
   e) Success rates of graduates (retention and advancement in their firms).
   f) Number of new business ventures started by graduates.

3) **Community development**
   a) Determine the number of employees currently active in community organizations.
      Record the number of active projects produced by university partnerships with community organizations.
   b) Benchmark UC’s community involvement with peer universities.
   c) Measure the amount of money that supports community partnerships and physical development.
   d) Measure the length of time for financial support and the “churn rate” of money supporting community development.
   e) Determine the number of new and rehabilitated housing units created by UC/community partnership.
   f) Track the zip codes around campus to determine how many employees live near work and its growth rate would demonstrate program success.
**Action Team – Performance-Enhanced Budgeting & Revenue Enhancement**

**VISION**

By providing incentives for performance with effective accountability, we can create a University of Cincinnati where faculty, staff and administration work together with agreed-to goals and objectives that are understood by all (including our community partners and legislatures), and resources are distributed based on clear public indicators. An incentive system for units and individuals is in place that encourages the development of creative ways to reach new learning markets, improve learning outcomes, advance scholarship and creative endeavors including the development of intellectual property. The university community is encouraged to discover and produce new sources of revenue including the development of a major comprehensive fund-raising campaign.

**CURRENT STATE OF BARRIERS & ENABLERS**

**Barriers**

1) We have a budget cut process and not a budgeting and planning process.
2) The financial system has been opaque, often making it difficult to answer even simple questions about resource allocation or performance measures.
3) Current performance data systems do not provide a consistent, universal basis for internal tracking and decision-making.
4) We continue to receive less state support.
5) It is not clear how much of our budget goes to administration and how much goes to instruction. We need to provide much improved analysis if we are to improve our ratio of instruction-to-administration-to-overhead cost.
6) The current budget system relies on ad hoc negotiation rather than on a consistent, transparent process, which provokes unnecessary tension.
7) It is unclear where budget authority lies. Where do academic units go when special opportunities or threats present?
8) The tension between colleges, which generate the income, and central financial operations, which control expenditures, stands in the way of a unified “team” culture.
9) The current budget cut process does not encourage inter-college and interdisciplinary efforts essential for institutional progress.
10) The performance measures are not clear, comprehensive or discipline-specific.
11) General funds cuts do not seem to take research and other performance into account.
12) Differing messages concerning graduate enrollment and tuition recovery are sent by different offices.
13) Because of past practices there is concern that any new system will not be honored.
14) New initiatives have been canceled and the resources removed from academic budgets after commitments have been made (e.g., Doctoral Investment Awards).
15) Central unrestricted endowments, temporary investment pool funds and other items have been removed from academic support outside of the provostal budget cuts, causing significant budget impact on affected colleges.

**Enablers**

1) The president has encouraged the development of a performance-based system.
2) There is a great deal of support for a performance-based budgeting system among deans and other administrators.
3) The revenue-driven programs are the beginnings of a performance-based budgeting system from which we can learn as we develop a more comprehensive performance-based system.
4) There is great expertise in the university that could easily be marketed to key stakeholders.
5) The Tristate has a large, diverse population base to draw from.
6) There are many critical needs in the local, national and international community that create opportunities for our university.

**KEY STRATEGIES**

1) Emphasize a team approach to budget development.
2) Restore a sense of confidence by examining current budget arrangements to restore equity and transparency among programs and units.
3) Understand successful models of performance-based budgeting.
4) Examine how other comparable institutions mix revenue generation, scholarship and core academic values in developing a performance-based model.
5) Explore alternative models for budgeting such as:
   a) privatizing or chartering the university,
   b) cost-center budgeting,
   c) deregulating of tuition,
   d) differential tuition, etc.
6) Effectively lobby the state for increased funding and incentive programs like Research Challenge and Success Challenge.
7) Institute a budgetary structure and process that recognizes new initiatives, yet acknowledges the importance of core responsibilities.
8) Performance- or incentive-based initiatives (competitive processes, annual calendar) will eventually be folded back into the regular budget – central investment will yield to new income streams.
9) Respond to time-bound opportunities (exceptional negotiations, “nimble” and responsive to the circumstances – an academic “venture capital fund” or a “quick response fund”), with the possibility of becoming part of the ongoing regular or performance-based budget.
10) Develop performance-based budgeting criteria through a consultative process such that faculty and staff understand the purpose, goals, procedures and benefits.
11) Develop both common criteria across the institution along with unique criteria appropriate for individual units.
12) Develop standards for academic units that include enrollment (both majors and credit-hour production), academic quality, student outcomes, diversity, research productivity and funding, centrality to the UC mission.
13) Develop different considerations for graduate and undergraduate programs.
14) Include performance criteria with local measures as well as comparisons against national standards (“peer” institutions) for each program.
15) Develop appropriate measures for nonacademic units, and units without “enrollment,” such as efficiency, profitability and student/client/customer satisfaction.
16) Develop performance measures for non-academic components to ensure that every possible resource is available to support our mission.
17) Include public disclosure of process results as part of performance-based budgeting.
18) Institute a process for regular review of the criteria based on experience to insure that they are effective and that they keep pace with changing circumstances.
19) Encourage a regular, yearly faculty reward system that recognizes performance through the AAUP contract.
20) In addition to performance measures as part of a yearly budget process, include in each budget cycle a Presidential Proposal Initiative, called by senior management in consultation with the Council of Deans, and centrally funded, to encourage innovation and collaboration in effecting the goals of UC|21.
21) Place some services on a cost-recovery basis like Clermont and Raymond Walters.
22) Build upon existing academic partnerships to strategize on priorities and methods to strengthen the fund-raising process and maximize results.

**ACTION STEPS**

1) In the near term, the model will be incentive-based with a “tax” structure to maintain overhead/essential services, recognizing that each unit must have a base general funds budget, starting with the current “base” budget, moving to a “rationalized” budget (base compensated for local variations, special enrollment conditions and previous commitments) within two years, and finally to a “performance” model (fully implemented national standards with performance incentives, central initiatives and accountability) within three years.

2) Recognizing the immediate critical budget issues for many academic programs, we recommend that every measure be considered during the current budget hearing cycle to provide investment in mission-critical areas, using cost reduction, reprioritization and endowment, in order to position the university for performance-based budgeting and initiation of the Academic Master Plan.

3) Every effort will be made to consult with, and inform, faculty and staff about these developments. Performance-based budgeting should become a part of the UC culture.

4) Every effort will be made to secure merit pay for faculty and staff within upcoming negotiations, while preserving opportunities for major adjustments and bonuses.

5) Each unit, including academics and administration, will compile a dossier of current budget issues, plans and impacts as part of planned budget hearings in May 2004.

6) The Administration will provide a transparent analysis of funding trends so that the community can see where resources are going and can assess whether costs are balanced with goals. To accomplish this, the Administration should work with deans and other
administrators to develop a consistent, useful, common set of data on which to base performance measures. We suggest that the Administration provide a budget trend analysis in draft by July 1, 2004, followed by a revised data system by Jan. 1, 2005.

7) The Council of Deans will recommend a Policy for Academic Initiatives and Advancement by Oct. 1, 2004, to encourage collaboration and cooperation among units. This policy will provide incentives to units that collaborate and will provide central administration with an important tool for academic advancement, making one-time and permanent resources available to achieve the goals of the Academic Master Plan.

8) Each unit, including academics and administration, will produce a dossier of proposed performance measures, identifying a comparison group of institutions, including “current” matches as well as “target” matches, with those performance numbers for the comparison institutions. These dossiers will be submitted to the appropriate vice president by Jan. 1, 2005, for transmittal to the president by Feb. 1, 2005.

9) Units will develop the capability to generate and manage credible financial plans.

10) With the leadership of the president and in partnership with the cabinet and individual units, UC Foundation will initiate the planning of a comprehensive fund-raising campaign by Dec. 31, 2005, which will incorporate fund-raising plans initiated by each unit.

11) UC will provide seed funding to initiate five research centers each of the next three years to improve collaboration and funding opportunities.

**ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY**

1) Success of performance-based budgeting will be evaluated based on performance, increased income from new initiatives, meeting targets on enrollment, and measurable improvements in quality measures.

2) Each budget hearing cycle will include a review before the Budget Committee of all funding issues, with performance measures provided for each core program as well as special initiatives, such as centers, degree programs, etc.

3) For programs not meeting performance standards, the unit in question will provide a revised budget; each program not meeting its performance standards may face a budget adjustment.

4) UC will produce an action fund for new initiatives, which will be replenished out of new income from successful programs. The goal will be $1 million available each year by the third year. For income-enhancing projects, income beyond investment will be shared equally between the central administration and the responsible unit.

5) Each program and initiative will receive a report from the Budget Committee on its performance and have an opportunity to appeal budget changes.

6) Revenue-enhancement efforts will be determined successful if revenue from these efforts increases and if the units that generated the revenue realize increased revenue as a result of their efforts.

7) Performance-based budgeting will be judged successful if the university community has confidence that the system has integrity – resources are determined by performance.

8) Performance-based budgeting will be judged successful if UC meets its overall performance targets – a stable budget with adequate resources and significant improvement in outcomes – educational success for our students and professional advancement for our faculty and staff.
Conclusion: What’s Next?

Now that we have articulated ambitious aspirations for our future with agreed-upon guiding principles and possible action steps and strategies that will help us to achieve our vision, how will we know if we are making progress and if we are experiencing success? How will we implement UC|21: Defining the New Urban Research University? How will we support it financially? This section deals with the questions that will move UC|21 forward.
NEXT STEPS

UC21 is more than a set of initiatives and ideas. It is intended to reshape the university academically as certainly as the Campus Master Plan has reshaped our physical landscape. To carry our vision forward and implement it, we will need to make changes in our decision-making process as well as some structural changes. To support our strategic plans, the university also will need to take steps to address some funding issues. “We must have the pocketbook to achieve our goals,” as President Zimpher has said on more than one occasion. Before we discuss implementation and finances, however, let’s examine some of the issues involved in achieving real change.

CULTURAL CHANGE

The process of changing an organization – how it works and what it does – is in many ways more challenging than changing the physical plant. The real hurdle comes when the proposed changes collide with the culture of the organization. “Culture” is expressed in the following elements.

History. The parts of the history of the University of Cincinnati that are brought forward have a powerful effect on how UC views itself, its place in the community and in academia.

Values. Some of the values that have made UC successful to this point may not be appropriate for moving the institution forward. An objective look at the current value system can help leaders make decisions about what values to keep, what values to change and what values are needed in the future.

Rules for success. Every institution has rules that enable people to be successful. Some rules are explicit and clear to all. Most are implicit and are handed down from one person to another in the form of stories and object lessons. These rules are informed by history and values. They play a powerful role in guiding people’s behavior.

Habits. Just as people have habits, so organizations have habits. Organizational habits can be identified when people observe: “That’s just the way we do things here” or “That’s the UC way.” These habits, along with the rules for success described above, tend to work against significant
change. They are often called “organizational inertia” or “the status quo.” They can cause change initiatives to stall.

**Self image.** Organizations have a self-image, just as people do. Significant organizational changes can sometimes outrun that self-image and cause people to lose heart. If members of the university community cannot believe the institution can achieve significant change, it is likely to be so.

**Vision.** Most change initiatives begin (and often end) with vision. Casting vision is an important part of what leaders do in launching change. As world-renowned leadership expert Dr. John Kotter has observed, change needs to be anchored in the culture of the organization. If it isn’t, the changes will be isolated, minimized and marginalized. They will, in short order, disappear. This hurts the organization in at least two ways. First, the vision is not achieved. Second, it can reinforce for people that significant change can’t really happen. New initiatives are greeted cynically with: “Here we go again” or “This too shall pass.”

For UC|21 to fully succeed, organizational and cultural changes will need to be made that are at least as far reaching as the physical changes brought about by the Campus Master Plan. The following section talks about the structure the university will use to carry UC|21 forward.

**IMPLEMENTATION STEPS**

The ideas that grew out of the UC|21 process – and are contained in this book – will be vetted, reworked and prioritized within an implementation structure that is designed to make the vision a reality and weave it seamlessly into the very fabric of the institution. Throughout the coming months, some of the UC|21 ideas outlined earlier in this book will receive funding, at least with seed money to start. In addition, the ways in which decisions are made at UC, how new initiatives are supported or rejected, and how to best to organize a 21st-century university will all be studied.

To move implementation forward for the 2004-05 academic year, President Zimpher has consulted with Provosts Anthony Perzigian and Jane Henney, MD, to begin examining the governance structures within the university to clarify and improve the decision-making process in a representative and collaborative environment. As part of this examination, the Faculty Senate has already submitted a summary of its thoughts on governance, compiled at its June 2004 meeting. The university also has begun to look carefully at the roles and responsibilities of key leaders in the administration, since they greatly influence implementation. Some personnel and structural changes were announced, in consultation with Provosts Perzigian and Henney, prior to Labor Day 2004.

To discuss what ongoing implementation structure should be used to carry UC|21 forward, the President and the President’s Cabinet met in a retreat with the Council of Deans on Sept. 2, 2004. Two weeks later, that structure was formally announced in a memo to the university community.
To implement UC21 on an ongoing basis and weave it into the fabric of the university, a UC21 Strategic Planning Council has been formed and is chaired by UC’s provosts. (A full organizational chart and timeline for year one is available in the Appendix). Provost Perzigian will serve as chair of the UC21 Strategic Planning Council, at least for the first year, with Provost Henney as the co-chair. Other council members will include a community representative, the Faculty Senate Chair, chairs of three allied UC21 committees, two students and two faculty members to be selected by the Provosts.

The three allied committees that will work under and in support of the Strategic Planning Council are:

1) **The Implementation Committee**: The charge of this committee is to develop and present to the UC21 Strategic Planning Council implementation plans associated with the six goals that emerged out of the Comprehensive Academic Planning Process.

2) **The Resource Support Committee**: The charge of this committee is to develop a plan to move UC to a performance-based budgeting system and to implement “50 in 5,” a plan to increase our revenues through strategic enrollment research and entrepreneurial growth over the next five years. (More details about the plan can be found below).

3) **The Support & Accountability Committee**: The charge of this committee is to work with the Implementation Committee in developing clear and measurable benchmarks that are linked to implementation timelines, assessment indicators that monitor progress towards benchmarks, and the continuous improvement infrastructure support needed to carry out implementation plans.

In addition, the Implementation Committee will facilitate and work with six Implementation Teams that will develop implementation plans associated with the strategic goals of UC21:

- Place Students at the Center
- Grow our Research Excellence
- Achieve Academic Excellence
- Forge Key Relationships and Partnerships
- Establish a Sense of “Place”
- Create Opportunity

On the critical question of financial resources, the university has already embarked on some strategies and made progress. Student enrollment is up this year. We are not yet out of what President Zimpher has called our budgetary “near-perfect storm,” but we are no longer sinking.

Although our progress is very encouraging, we also must increase our annual income substantially in order to successfully implement UC21. The 50 in 5 Plan mentioned above is the university’s enrollment expansion plan to use our strongest programs to attract higher levels of enrollment, with the intention of putting that new tuition income to work in support of those units taking in the new students and to fund quality improvements proposed in the UC21 plan. This plan, also mentioned in President Zimpher’s inauguration speech, proposes a 20-percent
increase in our enrollment and 50-percent increase in our general fund resources over five years. The 50 in 5 plan will be pursued in consultation with colleges and schools across the university and has been integrated into the UC|21 implementation structure as a part of the Resource Support Committee.

With an implementation structure and financial plan agreed upon, UC|21 will also need measurement tools in place by which we can gauge our progress toward our future vision. The next chapter examines some stretch goals and benchmarking tools that will aid in this assessment.
STRETCH GOALS –
YOU GET WHAT YOU MEASURE

True to the challenge – “don’t dream scrawny” – we have added even more to our ambitious UC|21 vision: 10 stretch goals, all plausible, and if achieved, would truly redefine the University of Cincinnati as a new urban research university.

These targets were articulated by President Zimpher as she unveiled UC|21 in her inauguration speech on May 21, 2004. She articulated them as potential measures of our progress. They are derived from the work of the Action Teams and directly link to our plan to become a premier urban research university.

Simply stated, the stretch goals are:

**Stretch Goal No. 10:** Enhance our mix of students to include more students from out of state and from different cultures.

**Stretch Goal No. 9:** Further deploy technology to improve learning, access to learning and the student experience.

**Stretch Goal No. 8:** Create a 24/7 campus for students, faculty, staff and our neighbors.

**Stretch Goal No. 7:** Triple our number of faculty awards and distinctions in five years.

**Stretch Goal No. 6:** Double our research funding in five years.

**Stretch Goal No. 5:** Strive to change the ranking criteria and improve our position within them.

**Stretch Goal No. 4:** Recruit more high school scholars while improving success rates for all students.

**Stretch Goal No. 3:** Improve our graduation rates to at least 75 percent.
Stretch Goal No. 2: Join the ranks of the nation’s top universities.

Stretch Goal No. 1: Increase our general funds by 50 percent in five years, or 50 in 5 as we call it.

These stretch goals will inspire us to extend our reach both internally and externally. They will compel us to build upon our current areas of excellence while remaining innovative and responsive to the changing needs of society. Next, we must decide how we will realize the goals and what mechanisms or processes will best ensure their success.

THE MEASURE OF THINGS

Faced with changing expectations and ambitious plans like ours, public and private entities have looked for ways to channel their efforts and measure their improvement. Likewise, consumers, faced with a multitude of choices, have sought ways to rank or measure one company’s product or services against another’s. Business and industry, and higher education to a lesser degree, have turned to benchmarking to measure and compare standards in an effort to improve performance and results. On the other side of the coin, consumers take advantage of third party assessments to whittle down the host of choices to a manageable few. In the higher education marketplace, college rankings have become the preferred shortcut. Annually a slew of rankings publications hit the newsstands purporting to help students and their families decide on the right college. Over 6.7 million copies of college rankings or guides are sold annually, clearly signaling their popularity among the college-bound.

Despite their perceived value in various quarters, benchmarking and college rankings have no shortage of naysayers in higher education. Some would argue that business tools, like benchmarking, have no place in the assessment of the academic enterprise. Some smugly deride the rankings game with its flawed criteria and measures as absurdly simplistic. Despite these considerations, we cannot ignore college rankings and their influence. Nor should we dismiss outright a tool for improvement merely on its business origins. Benchmarking and college rankings are, in fact, worthy of our attention, especially as we begin to redefine our university. We plan to employ them as catalysts for change and ways to measure and monitor our improvement. Used wisely, they can help us stretch and realize our goals.

WHO’S ON FIRST: RANKINGS OVERVIEW

Just over 20 years ago, U.S. News & World Report released its first college rankings report. Soon other contenders entered the field, including Barron’s Profiles of American Colleges, Fiske Guide to Colleges, ARCO Field Guide to Colleges, Newsweek-Kaplan Guide and the Princeton Review of the Best 345 Colleges. The demand for such guides grew out of the higher education marketplace. In 1965 there were six million college students. By 2002, the number had risen to 15+ million. By 2012, the projected college enrollment in the U.S. will be 17 million. Today’s college-bound students can choose from over 4,197 colleges and universities offering over 6,000 majors. According to various analyses, higher education is an $86 billion business. What is driving this amazing growth? While numerous factors play their parts, the overriding driver is the promise of increased earning power for the college graduate. Today’s students and their
families more often than not take a utilitarian approach to higher education. And it is no wonder. Over a lifetime, a college graduate earns almost twice as much as a high school graduate ($2.1 million vs. $1.2 million). Earn a master’s degree and your earning power jumps to $2.5 million. A professional degree can ratchet up your earning power to $4.4 million.

Given the demand and the sheer number of institutions with their tantalizing array of programs, the emergence of rankings and college guides was inevitable. A college education costs a lot of money, and consumers want the best for their dollar. But how can students make sure they are choosing the “best,” or at least choosing from the best? College recruitment brochures are little help, since most of them look alike and tend to have similar messages about their institution’s value and quality. The rankings publications made making the college choice easier. On the surface, rankings publications seem to offer an unbiased comparison. *U.S. News & World Report*, for example, conveniently measures several factors and ranks institutions accordingly from top to bottom. It has quickly become an annual bestseller, influencing perceptions and ultimately a student’s choice. In addition to their impact on recruitment, rankings also influence an institution’s image, reputation and even alumni and donor participation. As Paul Boyer notes about *U.S. News & World Report*’s guide in *College Rankings Exposed*, “No institution is immune from its influence.”

Seen as the gold standard among guides, *U.S. News & World Report’s America’s Best Colleges* ranks and scores institutions according to seven categories: peer assessment (25 percent of overall assessment); faculty resources (20 percent); graduation and retention rates (20 percent); student selectivity (15 percent); financial resources (10 percent); graduation rate performance (5 percent); and alumni giving (5 percent).

Peer assessment (25 percent) is an indicator of how a school is regarded by administrators at peer institutions. The top schools score in this category between 2.5 and 4.9 with the average at 3.7. UC’s current score is 2.7. (See Figure 1.)

![Figure 1: Peer Assessment Comparison](image-url)
The faculty resources category (20 percent) includes six subcategories: faculty compensation, percent of classes under 20 students, percent of faculty with terminal degree, percent of classes with 50 or more; percent of full-time faculty and the student-to-faculty ratio. UC is competitive with the top schools in all subcategories.

In the next category, the average six-year baccalaureate graduation rates (20 percent) are compared. The top schools rate 74 percent. UC rates at 49 percent. In addition, this category compares first-year baccalaureate retention rates. In the top schools, the average is 89 percent. University of Cincinnati is at 73 percent. (See Figure 2.)

The student selectivity category (15 percent) examines the freshman class in all colleges on an institution’s main campus. It includes three subcategories: SAT or ACT scores; percent of first-year students who graduated in the top 10 percent of their high school class; and an institution’s acceptance rate. For SAT/ACT scores, the top schools scored between 20 and 31. Scores for entering UC students range from 19 to 26. (See Figure 3.) In the top schools, 53 percent of the freshmen were in the top 10 percent of their high school graduating class, while only 12 percent of UC’s were. The acceptance rate at top schools averaged 57 percent. UC’s is 88 percent. (See Figure 3.)

At the other end of the continuum, *U.S. New and World Report* examines graduation rate performance (5 percent). In this category, the top schools and peer universities averaged a positive 1.1, while UC’s performance was a negative 4.0. (See Figure 3.)

In this perspective, where does UC stand overall? According to the 2004 *U.S. News & World Report*, the top schools rank from 1 to 123. In comparison, the University of Cincinnati is ranked 160. To get into the top ranks, UC will need to move up 37 positions. Clearly, to move up in these influential rankings, we will need to concentrate our efforts in the areas of peer assessment, graduation rates and student selectivity.
In addition to these broad-brush rankings, there exist numerous specialized rankings. Currently UC has seven programs ranked in the Top 10 in specialized categories: Pediatrics, Opera/Voice, Conducting, Music, Music Composition, Orchestra, Paleontology and Co-op. Several UC programs or units have also broken into their respective Top 10 competitions. UC also can boast of an extraordinary external funding record: $309 million last year alone. Its endowment, supported by thousands of donors, ranks 13th among U.S. public institutions of higher learning.

To climb to the next level, we will need to build on these achievements, grow more highly ranked programs and establish more meaningful measures of institutional success.

**COMPARATIVELY SPEAKING: BENCHMARKING OVERVIEW**

A meaningful measure is the hallmark of benchmarking. At the heart of its theory and practice, benchmarking is the use of comparative data for improvement. Based on hard data and research methodology, benchmarking can help answer questions such as: How well are we doing compared to others? How good do we want to be? Who is doing it the best and how are they doing it? In short, it is improving by learning from others through an ongoing and systematic process. Benchmarking can provide objective baseline measurements, goal setting and improvement tracking. Combined these can lead to dramatic and innovative changes for an institution.

There are four common types of benchmarking: competitive, functional /industry, best in class and internal. The selection depends on what you want to analyze and the availability of the data. For example, benchmarking could be used to study undergraduate and graduate teaching processes, as well as academic and business administrative practices. Individual institutions, graduate business schools, professional associations and higher education consortia are all conducting benchmarking projects to measure quality and cost and to improve their results.
As UC sets out to redefine itself, benchmarking may prove to be an essential instrument for identifying opportunities, measuring improvement and finally achieving our stretch goals. Benchmarking will allow us to compare our performance with the best practitioners, identify the gaps and explore new approaches to improving performance and monitoring our progress toward our goals.

**FROM GREAT TO PREMIER: GOALS AND MEASUREMENT NEXUS**

Without question the University of Cincinnati is a great institution with a long tradition of research, teaching and service excellence. A pioneer in co-operative education and home to some of the best programs in the country, UC has a strong foundation on which to build and attain premier status. The work of literally hundreds of people throughout the academic planning process has resulted in an inspirational roadmap for our future. To those we have added 10 stretch goals that when achieved will redefine our institution and will advance our position among the country’s best.

We will join the ranks of the best by resolutely pursuing the goals we have set for ourselves. The rankings competition and benchmarking tools will help us measure our progress. They will focus our efforts so that we do not waste time or precious resources. They will provide a meaningful link between our dreams and their realization.

Several of the stretch goals relate specifically to the rankings competition and, if achieved, should positively impact UC’s position in the future. For example, a tripling of faculty awards and distinctions in five years should influence our score in the peer assessment category of the *U.S. News & World Report America’s Best Colleges*. It would also improve our position in the *Lombardi Center’s Report*, as would the doubling of external funding. The goals that specifically focus on student enrollment and graduation rates should also enhance our scores in related categories of the *U.S. News & World Report* guide.

While we seek to improve our position in the various rankings, we must also strive to change the ranking criteria to reflect more meaningful measures of institutional and societal success. One approach may be through concerted and collaborative efforts with other institutions and thought-leaders to begin a national conversation about the value of higher education beyond the simplistic and reductive measures of the current rankings methodology. We may advocate for separate rankings for public and private institutions. As our work unfolds we may discover other approaches and strategies for transforming the rankings criteria in ways that better serve students and society’s needs for measuring higher education.

**THE END OF THE BEGINNING**

With a slight twist on the Winston Churchill quote, President Zimpher emphasized at the end of her inaugural speech, “This is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning… for *UC|21: Defining the New Urban Research University*.”

We have undergone an unprecedented and inclusive planning process that has resulted in an ambitious roadmap for our future. But it is imperative to emphasize that the strategic planning process begun by UC|21 is a dynamic one. It is a beginning that has no end. Consequently, one
of its chief legacies will be that systematic planning becomes a characteristic of the University of Cincinnati going forward.

Now, it’s time to roll up our sleeves and get to work putting our plans and goals into action. As we move forward, benchmarking and assessment will be essential. Our stretch goals serve as an opportunity to raise the bar in our service to students, Ohio and the larger society, as well as an opportunity to gauge our success.

UCI21, after all, represents a set of high expectations that we have gathered from a wide range of stakeholder groups, both internal and external. We will meet these expectations only if we hold ourselves accountable.
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- John Eck
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- Dan Gahl
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- Karen Gould
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- Marla Hall
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- Donna Hamilton
- Greg Hand
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- Jane Henney
- William Henrich
- Arlen Herrell
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- Ronald Kull
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- Darnice Langford
- Daniel Langmeyer
- Michael Lehman
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- Diane Lewis
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- Mitchel Livingston
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- James Masterson
- Charles Matthews
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- Debbie Page
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- Frank Pinski
- David Plank
- James Plummer
- Ed Prather
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- Eric Rademacher
- Catherine Rafter
Karen Ramos
Rob Reinerman
Ted Richmond
Margie Rolf
Mary Ann Rosensweet
Matthew Rosensweet
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Sunny Saelinger
Steven Sayers
Carolyn Schwier
Justin Shafer
Frederick Siff
Steve Simendinger, Alumni Assn.
David Lee Smith
Charles Springmyer
Smriti Srivastava
Kathryn St. Clair
Mary Stagaman
Barry Stedman
Maggie Stevens
Keith Stichtenoth
Tara Stopfel
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Dolores Straker
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Ann Sullivan
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Sue Trakas
James Tucker
Benjamin Uwakweh
Julie Valente
Gregory Vehr
Nelson Vincent
Les Vuylsteke
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Michael Walker
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Barbara Watts
Philip Way
Ann Welsh
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Henry Winkler
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**UC|21 Implementation Structure**

**Resource Support Committee**
Chair: Fritz Russ
Vice-Chair: Dale McGirr
(Committee to be announced)

**Implementation Committee**
Chair: Larry Johnson
Vice-Chair: Karen Gould
Vice-Chair: Andrea Lindell
(Committee to be announced)

**Support & Accountability Committee**
Chair: Jim Tucker
Vice-Chair: Lee Mortimer
Vice-Chair: Andrea Lindell
(Committee to be announced)

**UC|21 Strategic Planning Council**
Chair: Tony Perzigian
Vice-Chair: Jim Tucker

Members:
- Fritz Russ
- Lee Mortimer
- Dale McGirr
- Andrea Lindell
- Karen Gould
- Larry Johnson
- John Cuppoletti
- Mark Gooden
- Paul Biddinger
- Tony Brown
- Jon Masterson
- Arlen Herrell
- John Henenny

Focus
- "50 in 5"
- Performance-based Budgeting System
- "50 in 5" Focus
- Place Students at the Center
- Grow our Research Excellence
- Achieve Academic Excellence
- Forge Key Relationships & Partnerships
- Establish a Sense of Place
- Creating Opportunity
- Support & Accountability

**Implementation Teams**
- Place Students at the Center
- Grow our Research Excellence
- Achieve Academic Excellence
- Forge Key Relationships & Partnerships
- Establish a Sense of Place
- Creating Opportunity
- Support & Accountability

Focus
- Focus
- Focus
- Focus

**Assessment Tools & Indicators**
- Benchmarks
- Communications
- Information Technology Support
- Space/Facilities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Specific Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enhance mix of students and student outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Expand access to higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increase enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Improve student success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Improve student persistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Increase funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Enhance student experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Improve student experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Enhance student success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Improve student engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Enhance student outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Improve student outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 align with the strategic action of improving student outcomes.*