

# CRITERION 2: PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE



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

Drake University has a long history of effective planning. In the past few years, the University has become even more focused on comprehensive planning that ensures that the institution is preparing effectively for a future that is in many ways unforeseeable.

**CORE COMPONENT 2A:** Drake University realistically prepares for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends.

Though strategic planning has been ongoing at Drake University for many years, planning that has occurred since 2000 has been most significant in defining Drake's current status and its future. Since January of 2000 planning has been continual and mission-driven.

### 2A.1: PROGRAM REVIEW 2000

In January of 2000, Drake's new President announced "a year-long review process that will examine both academic and administrative programs. The initiative is part of a new long-range planning effort." This announcement initiated an intensive *Program Review*, planned and carried out by faculty, staff and students. In a little over more than a year, review procedures were developed, intensive program analyses completed and submitted, a multi-stage review and analysis of reports completed, recommendations about programs issued, and actions taken by campus governance units and the Board of Trustees.<sup>1</sup>

Every University program, academic and administrative, was reviewed. Each program prepared a self-review and analysis. Academic programs looked at essentiality (how the program assists in achieving the mission of the college/school and Drake University), quality, and cost-effectiveness. The administrative programs examined their importance to Drake, internal demand, quality and cost-effectiveness.

From the beginning expectations were clear that trends and other factors in the external environment must be part of the program review process. The President's Program Review Report (p. 2) noted:

[Summary Description of Program](#)

[Review Process](#)

[Program Review Web site](#)

**Also see Business Officer, NACUBO, April 2007 in the Resource Room.**

<sup>1</sup>Drake's governing board was the *Board of Governors* prior to 2000 when it became the *Board of Trustees*.

*The broad purpose of the Program Review Initiative is quite basic in its articulation, though extremely complex in its realization: Program Review is intended to position Drake University to address the challenges of the 21st century—not simply to meet those challenges but to manage them and to turn them into opportunities.*

**THE PRESIDENT'S  
PROGRAM REVIEW  
REPORT MADE CLEAR  
THAT DRAKE HAD  
EMBARKED ON A  
NEW ERA OF PLANNING  
AND ESTABLISHED  
PRINCIPLES FOR  
MOVING FORWARD.**

In addition to the internal criteria, every academic and administrative program was required to provide evidence of external demand and complete opportunity analysis. Academic programs were asked to “identify trends and other information that suggest current unmet demand or future demand for your program and the opportunities that exist for program development.” They were asked to consider and collect data related to “trends in the external environment” that would impact their programs, as well as to look at innovative and collaborative opportunities.

Based on these analyses, a recommendation to enhance, maintain, reduce and/or restructure, or possibly eliminate, was made for each program and submitted these to the Review and Priorities Advisory Committee (RPAC). All recommendations were reviewed and deliberated by the Committee and their recommendations were submitted to the President’s Advisory Committee, which developed its own set of recommendations. In January 2001, President Maxwell issued his ninety-nine page [Program Review: Report of the President](#) that included recommendations for the future of each academic and administrative program in the University.

The *Drake University Academic Charter (Section VIII:D)*, clearly establishes policies and procedures, grounded firmly in AAUP principles, for program review and elimination. Consistent with these, all RPAC recommendations for academic program discontinuance were submitted to the Faculty Senate, which voted to accept some and reject others. The Board of Trustees then acted [on recommendations to discontinue programs](#). Ultimately, the process resulted in eliminating some programs, restructuring, modifying or enhancing others, and reconfiguring many service and administrative areas. [A Multiyear Financial Plan](#) for implementing Program Review recommendations provides details of the financial savings accrued from Program Review and has been integrated into the University’s annual operating budget.

The President’s Program Review Report made clear that Drake had embarked on a new era of planning and established principles for moving forward. Introductory comments noted that in addition to being institution-wide, Drake’s Program Review was distinguished by being mission-driven, strategic, comprehensive, contextual, community-driven and by its demand that programs be prioritized. The report cited dramatically shifting demographics, technology and access to knowledge, the cost of higher education, and under-prepared students as challenges that confronted higher education nationally and Drake University specifically.

Program Review established Drake University as an institution that consistently evaluates every program in terms of its support for the University mission, focuses its resources on established University priorities, makes strategic decisions grounded in ongoing analysis of objective data and environmental scanning, is more flexible and agile in responding

appropriately to changing conditions, and has systematically addressed and improved equity for faculty and staff.

## 2A.2: THE DRAKE UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PLAN 2001-2006: GOALS FOR THE FUTURE

In addition to recommending disposition of review proposals, the Review and Priorities Advisory Committee (RPAC) was charged with assisting the President to develop a Strategic Plan. In October 2001 *Drake University Strategic Plan 2001-2006* was completed.

The strategic plan preface recognized both internal and external challenges, and the need for ongoing “evolutionary” change. It clearly noted the impact that external factors would have on the future of the University (page 2):

*...our perspective cannot be focused solely on the internal—more than anything, a successful plan must not only take into account a set of critical factors that affect the institution’s ability to achieve its goals and prepare the institution to respond to changes in those factors, but ideally it must comprise a set of strategies to manage those external factors to the greatest extent possible, and to exploit them in ways that bring benefit to the University.*

**THE STRATEGIC PLAN PREFACE RECOGNIZED BOTH INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL CHALLENGES, AND THE NEED FOR ONGOING “EVOLUTIONARY” CHANGE.**

Among societal and economic trends cited as challenges were student demographics, increasing competition, the rapidly changing racial and ethnic profile of America and the Midwest, technology and the philanthropic environment.

With these and other challenges in mind, the 2001-2006 *Drake University Strategic Plan* set forth objectives, strategies and tactics to achieve five goals:

**Goal I:** Ensure the excellence, currency and appropriateness of academic programs

**Goal II:** Improve and sustain the financial strength of the University

**Goal III:** Recruit and retain faculty and staff of the highest quality

**Goal IV:** Ensure that Drake students, faculty and staff are able to function effectively as members of diverse local, national and global communities

**Goal V:** Improve relationships and communications with University’s key constituencies (students, faculty, staff, boards, alumni, prospective students and their parents, friends, community, state and nation)

These goals were defined as essential for fulfilling Drake’s mission and addressing the vision that the University “will enhance its position as a premier comprehensive university in the Midwest and as a national leader in higher education for learning, faculty roles and public service.”

*The Strategic Plan* mandated that Drake's core values of *excellence, learning, integrity, citizenship* and *fiscal responsibility* would guide planning. It further specified that the result of planning must be "implementation of an infrastructure and an institutional behavior that is strategic in nature and that manifests itself in an ongoing planning process."

Tasks related to each objective were assigned to specific individuals or offices. Budgets and sources of funds were identified as appropriate, and target finish dates were specified. Those documents are updated regularly with information about progress or completion of tasks. Since 2001, every University unit has updated or developed a unit strategic plan that supports the University Plan, and in 2003 the University updated its Strategic Plan.

Since 2002, the University has engaged in rigorous activities to ensure that all University constituencies are planning effectively to maintain Drake's exceptional learning environment. The *Drake University Strategic Plan 2001-06* and its successor [Strategic Plan 2003-08](#) have been pivotal in every discussion of direction, allocations and planning, successfully guiding the University to assess possibilities carefully and plan accordingly.

In 2002, the Board of Trustees and Faculty Senate approved a new *Mission Statement*. The new statement evolved from discussion related to strategic planning and from an emerging sense of change in the University. Since then, the *Mission Statement* and the *Strategic Plan* have become the reference points for all planning and decision making.

*Drake's mission is to provide an exceptional learning environment that prepares students for meaningful personal lives, professional accomplishments, and responsible global citizenship. The Drake experience is distinguished by collaborative learning among students, faculty, and staff, and by the integration of the liberal arts and sciences with professional preparation.*

As our mission became more tangible in the life of the University, a need arose to better understand how the University fulfills the promise of its mission and to facilitate efforts to make the mission permeate all that occurs at Drake. This awareness led in 2004 to developing the [Mission Explication](#) in 2004. As noted in Criterion 1A, the explication was developed collaboratively and adopted initially in 2005 and revised in January 2006. It is a living document referenced constantly in planning. Together, these three documents — the *Mission Statement*, the *Strategic Plan* and the *Mission Explication* — have strengthened Drake as a mission-driven institution.

### 2A.3: DRAKE'S STRATEGIC BUDGETING

Drake University has developed systematic and strategic budgeting practices that support its mission and strategic plan.

#### 2A.3a: THREE-YEAR BUDGET MODEL

In April 2004, the Board of Trustees approved a balanced budget for FY05, successfully completing the University's 5-Year Budget Plan. This Budget Plan focused on implementing

#### Drake University Strategic Plans

[Drake University Strategic Plan 2001-2006](#)

[Drake University Strategic Plan 2003-2008](#)

[Strategic Plan Update – June 2004](#)

[Strategic Plan Update – January 2006](#)

#### College and School Strategic Plans

[Arts and Sciences](#)

[Business and Public Administration](#)

[Education](#)

[Journalism and Mass Communication](#)

[Law](#)

[Pharmacy and Health Sciences](#)

#### Non-Curricular Unit Strategic Plans

[Academic Success](#)

[Admission and Student Financial Planning](#)

[Alumni and Parent Programs](#)

[Business and Finance](#)

[Cowles Library](#)

[Human Resources](#)

[Information Technology](#)

[Intercollegiate Athletics](#)

[Student Life](#)

the Program Review recommendations and eliminating deficit-operating budgets. In fall 2004, the Vice President for Business and Finance proposed development of a new strategic, 3-year model to guide the University's budget planning for FY06 through FY08. The new 3-Year Budget Plan provided an opportunity for the University to rethink its overall budget process. In doing so, the new budget directed Drake's resources toward fulfilling the institutional priorities set forth in the Mission Statement and the Strategic Plan. In a realistic and comprehensive financial projection, it brought together the five goals of the Strategic Plan that focused on academic quality and fiscal sustainability, ensuring that the future vision for Drake would be realized. In addition, the new budget plan increased departmental autonomy and accountability for budget management and budget results.

The stated goals for the *3-Year Budget Plan* (for FY06, FY07, and FY08) were to:

- align budget resources with strategic planning and institutional priorities;
- encourage revenue generation;
- ensure good stewardship of institutional resources;
- improve the fiscal health of the institution for the longer term.

The planning document emphasized the strategic nature of budgeting, noting that “resource allocation should be a quantitative reflection of the strategic plan and institutional priorities. Budget allocations should not be based on where we've been, but rather on where we are going.”

Some unique features of this *3-Year Budget Plan* included:

- Introduction of SIPs (Strategic Improvement Plans) as a means of funding new strategic initiatives and programs
- Opportunity for multiyear resource commitments
- Gain-sharing opportunities
- Public accountability regarding unit budget results

The presentation format for the 3-Year Budget followed generally accepted accounting practices (g.a.a.p.) and National Association of College and University Budget Officers (NACUBO) standards, but was supplemented with two additional schedules. These supplemental schedules linked both operating and capital budget resource allocations directly to the University's Strategic Plan goals and priorities. The schedules were presented in a multi-year format, color-coded by budget year.

The University's commitment to translate the Strategic Plan into financially supported actions is clearly evidenced in these budget documents. Multiyear budgets continue to be developed, shared with the *Board of Trustees, faculty and staff* and other constituents, and used to guide all budgeting decisions. (See *Spring 2007 4-year Budget*.)

### **2A.3b: STRATEGIC IMPROVEMENT PLANS**

In 2005, Drake University initiated a procedure for funding *Strategic Improvement Plans (SIPs)*. In an effort to align strategic planning with budget, each college/school and all major

#### **Supplemental Schedules**

[\*Strategic Planning Goals for FY06-FY09  
Capital Budget\*](#)

[\*Strategic Planning Goals for FY06-FY09  
Operating Budget\*](#)

administrative units were offered the opportunity to submit funding requests linked to their respective unit's strategic plans. The SIPs were given funding priority over and above any other requests for budget increases (excluding compensation and benefits and certain other uncontrollable, but necessary, cost increases). Approved SIPs were granted budgetary funding on a multiyear basis, as needed. SIPs were submitted as part of the University's budget process and were reviewed and discussed by the President's Cabinet, which made the final funding decisions.

Several examples of projects funded by SIPs were described in Criterion 1E. In addition, SIPs have funded:

- Business continuity/disaster recovery plan for Information Technology
- Start-up costs to explore and implement a new health science major
- Electronic security for Drake parking lots

#### 2A.4: DRAKE'S CAMPUS MASTER PLAN: A REFLECTION OF LONG-TERM STRATEGIC GOALS

As other planning progressed, the need for a revised<sup>2</sup> Campus Master plan that reflected the University's new strategic direction became apparent. In the summer 2004, Zimmer Gusul Fasca was selected to guide the development of the Master Plan. Campus input was sought through open town meetings, discussions with key administrators, city and neighborhood officials, and Board members. In addition, the proposed plan was posted on the web. On June 25, 2005, the Board of Trustees approved the final plan. As stated in that plan:

[Campus Master Plan Report](#)

*This campus master plan was necessarily directed by long-term strategic goals, since its purpose is to accommodate the needs of future generations of students, as well as redressing more obvious deficiencies of the present. Drake's Strategic Plan has done much to identify those goals, and from it, specific objectives have emerged — attainable improvements that can be woven into the fabric of the campus.*

[Campus Master Plan Poster](#)

[Campus Master Plan  
Update – May 2007](#)

The “*Approach*” introduction to the master plan clarifies that both the mission and the strategic plan are central to the campus planning:

[Campus Master Plan  
Update – September 2007](#)

*The Strategic Plan provided a mission-based direction for the campus master plan, but the specifics of planned facilities improvements were drawn from the knowledge and aspirations of those who comprise the University.*

Five goals identified for the plan were used to test the relevance and appropriateness of each idea that emerged. First among these was to ensure that the master plan “will enhance the academic and student life programs of the University in the years ahead, and will enable it to continue to grow as a center for higher learning for generations to come.” Another goal was to “strengthen the community of resident students and contribute to the increasing vitality of the neighborhood.”

Regular reports from the Vice President of Business and Finance have documented progress on implementing the *Campus Master Plan*. The September 2007 [Campus Master Plan Update](#) details Drake's progress on each project identified in the plan.

## 2A.5: STRATEGIC ENROLLMENT AND REVENUE PLANNING

In June of 2005, in response to several sections of the *Strategic Plan* the Strategic Enrollment and Revenue Plan (SERP) Steering Committee was formed. Strategic Plan 2003–08 calls for excellence, currency and appropriateness of academic programs (Goal 1), and improving and sustaining the financial strength of the University (Goal 2). Goal 2 calls for increasing non-undergraduate net tuition revenues; developing net revenue-sharing incentive plans for faculty/staff, departments and colleges for program development; and identifying, developing and expanding distance learning opportunities. Goal 5 focuses on improving relationships and communications with University constituencies and specifies that we initiate and support partnerships with local organizations and institutions.

In response to these strategic goals and objectives, subcommittees were formed that examined enrollment; housing; facilities; retention and graduation; potential for new undergraduate, graduate and non-degree programs; and other factors. These discussions began with one fundamental assumption that derived from discussions related to Program Review, the strategic planning process and enrollment capacity discussions with the Board of Trustees ([SERP Progress Report](#)):

*Given the demographic challenges of our primary undergraduate enrollment area, the inherent difficulties of creating new, more distant markets, and our conviction that we are approaching both maximum desired size and maximum capacity, it is unlikely that undergraduate enrollments will be a source of significant additional revenue (beyond annual increases in tuition and a hoped-for lowering of the discount rate). However, it is likely that there are other productive sources of revenue consistent with the University's mission and strengths, and which will enable us to not only support fulfillment of our Strategic Plan objectives, but will subsidize the University's core undergraduate program and enable us to continue to minimize the cost to our students and their families.*

Five subcommittees, formed to undertake the planning process, were charged with the following tasks in their respective areas of focus:

- External environmental scan
- Assessment of Drake's strengths and weaknesses
- Identification of opportunities for increased enrollment/revenue consistent with the University's mission, goals and strengths

**DRAKE UNIVERSITY HAS  
PLANNED DELIBERATELY  
FOR NATURAL AND OTHER  
EMERGENCIES AND FOR  
EVENTS THAT MAY NOT  
EASILY BE FORESEEN.**

The recommendations in the January 2006 *Progress Report* provided the basis for planning and actions during 2006–07 and 2007–08. Among, recommendations that have been implemented are:

- The recommendation that “New programs should bring new students to Drake, not subdivide current programs” led directly to development of the new Health Sciences major.
- A recommendation for a sophomore year experience was followed by Faculty Senate adoption of enhancements being implemented for the *Engaged Citizenship* component of the Drake Curriculum.
- A recommendation to explore new graduate program opportunities led to collaboration of the School of Journalism and Mass Communication and the College of Business and Public Administration to launch the MA in Communication Leadership.
- A SERP recommendation that the Center for Professional Studies develop programs for individual organizations led to expansion of non-degree programs offered to Principal Financial Group, Meredith Publishing and Hubbell Realty.
- Consistent with the recommendation to expand use of facilities during the summer, *Quantum Learning Network*, an academic camp, is being brought to Drake University during summer 2008.

#### 2A.6: CONTINGENCY PLANNING

Drake University has planned deliberately for natural and other emergencies and for events that may not easily be foreseen. In 2005, the University established a full-time Environmental Health and Safety Specialist position. This person, responsible for designing and implementing safety policies, ensures that Drake complies with all State and Federal regulations, and serves as a primary resource for questions regarding safety policies. The [Environmental Health and Safety Department](#) provides support for all University units and makes [environmental health](#) and [safety](#) policies available on the web.

The *Task Force on Emergency Preparedness and Response* met during summer 2007 to assess Drake University’s needs in relation to emergency preparedness. The resulting updated [Drake University Emergency Response Plan](#) has multiple goals: to ensure provision of a safe work and educational environment for Drake faculty, staff, students and visitors; to protect their safety in the event of an emergency; and to specify response policies and procedures for Level 1, 2, and 3 emergencies and pandemic illness. The Response Plan has also refined procedures for notification of emergencies, including widespread distribution of weather radios. Appendices provide detailed information concerning types of emergencies and appropriate responses.

Efforts are being made to develop and maintain awareness of appropriate emergency procedures. These efforts have included:

- a statement distributed to faculty and staff members that emphasizes the importance of notifying the proper authorities of crimes and seeking the appropriate help for troubled students

- sections of the plan, such as Electrical Power Outage Emergency Procedures, distributed at appropriate times on campus
- consistent review of other emergency procedures, such as the *Drake University Business Continuity Plan* for technology (discussed in Criterion 2B)
- procedures and policies circulated on the campus
- tornado shelters designated on campus reviewed and revised in April 2007

### 2A.7: A NEW PLANNING STRUCTURE: STRATEGIC POSITIONING INITIATIVE, 2006–08

As the Criterion 2 Committee considered Drake's planning for the future, the lack of an institutionalized planning procedure became apparent. Many of the planning procedures described above depended upon the initiative of particular University leaders. After discussion with various groups, the Committee concluded that Drake should develop a set of procedures, independent of specific individuals, to guarantee that systematic planning would continue. They were then asked to propose such procedures.

The Committee first developed *Strategic Planning Guidelines* that were reviewed and adopted by the *President's Senior Advisory Council*. They establish a set of expectations for regular review and updating of unit strategic plans.

The Committee then developed a proposal for an all-University planning cycle. A guiding principle in development of this proposal was the desire to maintain institution-wide responsibility for and involvement in planning, ensuring that Drake continues to bring together faculty, staff, students and Trustees to discuss strategic issues. In spring 2006, the *proposal* was endorsed by the President's Cabinet, Faculty Senate, All-staff Council and the Student Senate.

The new *Three-Year Planning Cycle* specifies that during the first year, all units carry out environmental scans (see 2A.6d below) and prepare white papers (see 2A.6e below) to be presented and discussed at a Summer Futures Conference (see 2A.6f below). The following fall semester a *Planning Council* of faculty, staff and students, chaired by the President, is charged to develop a new or update the current *University Strategic Plan*. The Council is formally reconstituted every three years and exists only for one year of the planning cycle. During the spring of the second year the new strategic plan is implemented.

#### 2A.7a: THE 2006–08 STRATEGIC POSITIONING INITIATIVE

The new planning cycle was initiated during the 2006–07 academic year as the *Strategic Positioning Initiative*. The 2006–07 initiative has been grounded in the 2005 *Drake University: Vision 2025*, augmented by the shorter *Drake University 2012*. This nearer term vision document, prepared during fall 2006 by President Maxwell in consultation with various constituencies, echoes the themes of the Drake Mission: it recognizes Drake's role in the greater society the University serves, its aspirations to create a national model for global education and its commitment to a diverse student population by being financially affordable.

**2A.7b: REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE**

Three Raytheon Corporation senior staff members were invited to visit Drake in November 2006 to provide a “business perspective” on Drake’s administrative structure and procedures. After reviewing many documents and interviewing senior administrators, the team raised several questions for Drake to consider about its current structure. Since that time, Drake has used problem-based teams to address issues such as the fall 2007 enrollment spike, parking and salary planning. During this planning year, the University continues to reference their suggestions.

[Drake Raytheon Presentations](#)**2A.7c: FUTURES SPEAKER**

On January 18, 2007, in conjunction with a meeting of the Board of Trustees, Erik Peterson, Senior Vice President of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, made a presentation on “*Seven Revolutions*” that are shaping the world. All faculty, staff, and Board of Trustees members were invited to attend. The following morning Erik Peterson discussed with Board members future trends and their implications for higher education.

**2A.7d: ENVIRONMENTAL SCANS**

[Guidelines](#) were provided for completing environmental scans to identify and review “trends and factors in the environment outside of the institution that are likely to affect the unit in the future.” [Scanning Reports](#) were submitted by all University units by January 12, 2007, and made available on Drake’s blueView Portal to all members of the Drake community.

**2A.7e: WHITE PAPERS**

Each unit was *charged* with preparing a white paper by May 31, 2007, using information garnered from the environmental scans, to be presented at the 2007 Summer Futures Conference. The white papers had several objectives: to present visions for the future; discuss implications and opportunities identified in the environmental scans; propose future initiatives; discuss possible collaborations and joint endeavors; and identify existing practices or activities that, according to the environmental scans, could be phased out or curtailed to create resources for innovation. These papers were made available to the Drake community on Drake’s blueView Portal.

**Futures Conference Presentations**[Opening Comments](#)[Academic Division](#)[Admission and Financial Aid](#)[Business and Finance](#)[Alumni and Development](#)[Athletics](#)[Marketing and Communications](#)[Closing Comments](#)**2A.7f: SUMMER FUTURES CONFERENCE**

For many years Drake has held a summer President’s Planning Retreat in which senior administrators, members of the Faculty Senate and Student Senate, Trustees and others (dependent on topic) have participated. The 2007 Futures Conference extended this tradition to include all faculty and staff, all members of the Student Senate, and all members of the Board of Trustees. The [agenda](#) for the Summer Futures Conference was built around summary presentations of white paper proposals followed by group discussions and reactions. To promote interaction among the various constituencies represented at the conference, the

approximately 175 attendees were seated in groupings that maximized interaction across the various constituencies represented at the conference.

### 2A.7g: PLANNING COUNCIL

The *Faculty Senate* approved Planning Council, chaired by the President, is comprised of ten faculty members elected by the faculty, the President's Cabinet, two students and other representatives selected by the President and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The Planning Council convened in fall 2007, working on development of a new strategic plan<sup>3</sup> based on the white papers, Futures Conference discussion, Drake's Mission, the *Drake University: Vision 2025* and *Drake University 2012*.

**CORE COMPONENT 2B:** Drake University's resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening its future quality.

Drake University has a rich reservoir of financial, physical and human resources. In recent years the University has planned carefully to ensure that these resources are stable and allocated to support its educational programs; ensuring that Drake is a premier university in 2025.

*Drake University: Vision 2025* identifies several characteristics that will be the hallmarks of the future Drake University. These characteristics include:

- Financial resources sufficient to achieve Drake's mission and managed in an open, responsible, and responsive manner
- An administrative structure and operating behavior that enable a consistently strong, flexible and appropriate response to changing conditions
- A physical plant that supports excellence in teaching and learning, facilitates the true integration of student life into the learning experience and provides a safe, attractive living environment for students.

As this chapter indicates, Drake University of 2007–08 already has achieved considerable success relative to these goals.

### 2B.1: STRATEGIC STRENGTHENING OF RESOURCES

As discussed, Drake University has focused in recent years on developing, implementing and using planning and evaluation processes that will ensure that we fulfill our mission. As articulated in Component 2B, the University's resource base must support such plans. In order to achieve this goal, the University's resource base must be sufficiently large to support its plans and allocations must be guided by the University's mission and strategic plan.

<sup>3</sup>This strategic planning process is ongoing as this report is written. Additional information will be available in the Resource Room.

## THE STRATEGIC PLAN THAT EMERGED FROM DRAKE'S PROGRAM REVIEW FOCUSED ON THE IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING AND SUSTAINING RESOURCES TO SUPPORT A QUALITY INSTITUTION.

### 2B.1a: STRATEGIC PLAN 2001-06

The *strategic plan* that emerged from Drake's Program Review focused on the importance of developing and sustaining resources to support a quality institution. Among the five core values that guided the strategic plan was *fiscal responsibility*:

*...the University operates with funds that have been entrusted to us by others — we have a moral and ethical responsibility to ensure that those funds are used in ways that are consistent with the University's priorities; the importance of organizational efficiency, financial strength and effective stewardship of the University's resources.*

A discussion of challenges that prefaced the plan included the following paragraph on *budget*:

*[We] must bring the operating budget into alignment, so that expenses are consistent with income (at a 5% drawdown from endowment income); we also need to ensure that our resources are allocated in a manner consistent with the University's goals and priorities.*

The plan also identified *resource challenges* in the following areas:

- *Campus environment and quality of student life*: the need to upgrade residential accommodations and the appearance of the campus;
- *Technology*: the need to secure the infrastructure to support teaching and learning as well as administrative needs; and
- *Philanthropic environment*: the impact of external market factors such as the stock market and competing fundraising projects in the Des Moines area.

The goals and objectives included many fiscal references, and several strategies acknowledged the need for greater resources. Among these:

- Goal 1, Objective 1, Strategy b: "Develop and implement long-range plan to address facilities and equipment needs in support of teaching, learning and research."
- Goal 2 focused on the need to "Improve and sustain the financial strength of the University."

### 2B.1b: FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Drake University is committed to fulfilling its academic mission through budgeting procedures that ensure long-term success and financial health: the strategic allocation of resources to fund University priorities and the application of sound fiscal policies and practices. Financial objectives are set and measured on an annual basis.

#### 2B.1b.1: Systematic and Conservative Budget Procedures

Since approximately Fiscal Year 1999, the University has employed specific budgetary techniques to improve its overall bottom line and restore its fiscal health. Cautious

enrollment projections in particular have contributed to excess revenues necessary to close the deficit gap as illustrated in the [Key Financial Indicators Report](#) for 2000 to 2007.

In addition, Drake exercises caution by overestimating unpredictable budgetary expenditures; through careful monitoring of key budget “drivers”, and prudent budgeting that includes contingency planning. Endowment spending has been held fairly flat for several years. In 2001 the University shifted to a generally accepted accounting practices (g.a.a.p.) budget format. An improvement in Drake’s financial situation has accompanied increasing sophistication and detail of its planning processes.

### **2B.1b.2: Measurable Financial Objectives**

In the past several years, the budgeting focus has been on meeting six annual (and measurable) financial objectives viewed as key indicators of institutional fiscal health. Those objectives are to:

- a) Achieve balanced operating results. The Board of Trustees’ stated goal is to achieve a surplus of 2% of operating revenues no later than FY09.
- b) Generate an increase in net assets. A sub-objective is to increase unrestricted net assets equal to or greater than 5%.
- c) Produce positive cash flow.
- d) Meet/exceed debt covenants.
- e) Exceed investment benchmarks.
- f) Receive an unqualified audit opinion.

The actual outcomes related to these six objectives are reported to the Board of Trustees and the campus community each October. Beginning with FY06, the results also were reported on the [Business and Finance Web site](#).

### **2B.2: FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR DRAKE’S FUTURE**

Drake’s total budget picture demonstrates steadily improved fiscal health over the past seven years, with a bottom line increase of almost \$7.3 million. In FY01, the University had a \$4.5 million deficit. While budget plans for FY01 through FY04 were for deficit spending, in each of these years Drake performed better than budgeted. FY04 was the final year of deficit budgets. As Table 2.1 below demonstrates, in 2007 Drake finished its third year of a balanced operating budget with an overall operations surplus of \$2.7 million.

On May 31, 2007, Drake University’s assets totaled \$411 million and liabilities totaled \$147 million, resulting in net assets of \$264 million.

**Table 2.1: Budget to Actual Results (in 000s)**

	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07
<b>Budget Target</b>	-\$5,269	-\$5,080	-\$3,422	-\$1,354	\$102	\$62	\$500
<b>Actual Result</b>	-\$4,547	-\$2,610	-\$1,686	- \$576	\$337	\$1,380	\$2,729

Drake University relies on many sources of revenue including tuition, gifts, endowment income, grants and auxiliary enterprises.

### 2B.2a: TUITION

Net tuition revenue (gross tuition less institutional financial aid) has increased 57% since FY00. The [10-Year Tuition History](#) with an average increase of 4.3% over the 10 years demonstrates Drake's implementation of a policy of limiting tuition increases. The University thus offers high quality education for a reasonable cost, accessible to a wide population who might otherwise be unable to afford it. The many efforts to control tuition while increasing quality are outlined in a [letter](#) from President Maxwell to U.S. Senator Charles Grassley in December 2006 written for presentation to the Senate Finance Committee. As noted in the Self-Study Introduction, the success of efforts to provide an affordable education has been affirmed by Drake's placement as fifth on *U.S. News & World Report's* list of "Great Schools, Great Prices," and inclusion in *Peterson's Guide to Competitive Colleges* and *Barron's 300 Best Buys in College Education* rate Drake as one of today's best values in higher education.

### 2B.2b: ENDOWMENT

Endowment market value has been volatile over the past several years, due primarily to changing market conditions since 9/11. In FY00 negative operating returns were masked by positive investment returns. Although negative market returns in FY01 through FY03 adversely affected Drake's net assets, more recently and most significantly, the endowment has shown steady growth, valued at more than \$153 million on May 31, 2007.

(See Table 2.2)

As recently as 1998 Drake University's endowment spending rate was 11%. This decreased steadily, down to 6% in 2004 and to approximately 4.5% — below the NACUBO target rate — in FY07. This trend occurred when endowment earnings were relatively low and the investment market was suffering the effects of 9/11. Nevertheless, with the increased value of its endowment fund, the University was able to make progress on various strategic initiatives, including improvements to the campus physical plant and the salary initiative.

**Table 2.2: Endowment Market Value, May 31, 1998–May 31, 2007**

	Value	Change
1998	\$86,258,000	
1999	\$103,485,000	+20%
2000	\$118,525,000	+14.5%
2001	\$114,323,000	-3.5%
2002	\$105,156,000	-8.0%
2003	\$99,223,000	-5.6%
2004	\$106,412,000	+7.2%
2005	\$116,968,000	+9.9%
2006	\$128,768,000	+10.1%
2007	\$153,336,000	+19.1%

### 2B.2c: GRANTS

Drake University receives approximately \$10 million annually in grant funding, a significant amount for an institution of its size. Compared to other ANAC institutions where public service is 1% to 2% of their operating budgets, Drake's public service grant dollars are significant, representing approximately 10% of the total operating expenses. This is due primarily to federal, state and local grant support of approximately \$6.5 million a year received by Drake University for Head Start. In addition to the Head Start funds, the Drake faculty is increasingly successful in securing funding from government and private foundation sources.

### Drake University External Grants

[Fiscal-Year 04](#)

[Fiscal-Year 05](#)

[Fiscal-Year 06](#)

[Fiscal-Year 07](#)

### 2B.2d: GIFTS

Fundraising at Drake University, like fundraising across the country, has been a challenge. Among factors contributing to the downturn in giving since 9/11 is a national philanthropic preference for restricted gifts. Despite this, Drake has met with fundraising success. As noted in section 2B.2b, the endowment has almost doubled since 1998. Efforts to increase unrestricted Annual Fund gifts have been met with incremental success. While unrestricted gifts are relatively flat, donor-restricted operating gifts are growing.

Drake University has been relatively successful in raising funds for targeted projects. Its focused campaign, beginning in 2004, to raise funds for renovation of Drake Stadium was particularly successful: gifts and pledges for the Stadium project totaled \$14.7 million. All

pledge commitments are being met, and all payments have been timely. As of October 31, 2007, only approximately \$1.7 million in pledges to the Stadium remained outstanding. In addition, Drake has been fortunate as a result of various historical planned giving efforts to receive significant bequests in recent years. It is the policy of Drake’s Board of Trustees that all bequests in excess \$25,000 be deposited into the endowment fund (even if the bequest itself does not specifically state such). Table 2.3 provides a summary of fundraising over the past six years.

**Table 2.3: Drake University Gifts Received, 2002 – 07**

	FY 02*	FY 03	FY 04	FY 05**	FY 06	FY07***
<b>Unrestricted Annual Fund</b>	\$3,031,718	\$2,703,401	\$2,422,743	\$2,836,607	\$3,076,467	\$2,997,174
<b>Restricted Operating</b>	\$3,936,968	\$1,545,548	\$1,733,152	\$2,164,937	\$2,413,448	\$3,890,304
<b>Estates to Endowment</b>	\$815,222	\$896,430	\$386,984	\$64,263	\$342,847	\$553,423
<b>Restricted Capital Gifts</b>	\$2,257,148	\$2,864,257	\$1,133,280	\$10,666,436	\$2,905,659	\$1,870,945
<b>Endowed Gifts</b>	\$1,777,386	\$1,279,293	\$1,701,034	\$8,926,681	\$4,182,234	\$7,454,510
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$11,818,442</b>	<b>\$9,288,929</b>	<b>\$7,377,193</b>	<b>\$24,658,924</b>	<b>\$12,920,655</b>	<b>\$16,766,356</b>

\*FY02: the last year of a fundraising campaign.  
 \*\*FY05: \$10 million received from one donor for the stadium and for scholarship endowment.  
 \*\*\*FY 07: \$3 million received from one donor.

**2B.2e: AUXILIARY REVENUES**

Drake University revenue producing auxiliary enterprises include residence halls, all dining operations and catering, conferences, parking, and intercollegiate athletics. Revenues from auxiliary enterprises have been growing steadily in recent years, producing revenues for FY07 more than \$17.6 million.

Drake generally requires its auxiliary enterprises to be self-supporting. However, Drake Athletics does receive some financial support from the University. As a result of *Program Review 2000* University support for Athletics was reduced from 3.8% (or \$2.9 million) of the University’s operating budget to “a range of 3% to 3.2%.” This was to occur over the succeeding five years “primarily through holding the current budget dollar amount unchanged as the overall University operating budget increases.” Further, the Review and Priorities Planning Committee (RPAC) recommended that the reduction in University support would “be replaced by increased support from external sources.” In the past six years, Athletic revenues have increased significantly, although the University has not increased its support level except for the addition of women’s soccer and golf (to improve gender equity) and some market adjustments to salaries under the auspices of the compensation initiative.

**2B.3: PHYSICAL RESOURCES FOR DRAKE'S FUTURE**

Improving Drake’s physical facilities has played an important role in enhancing its learning

environment. More than \$65 million has been invested in facility upgrades since 2002, including the renovation of approximately 31 classrooms and science labs (See Criterion 3D). These improvements have been funded through external gifts and debt financing. As noted in Section 2A, a formal [campus master plan study](#) was completed in 2005, using Drake's long-term strategic goals as its basis and involving the entire campus community. This plan will guide Drake's efforts to accommodate the needs of students in future generations.

[Facilities Investment History 2002-2007](#)

### 2B.3a: DEFERRED MAINTENANCE

Sodexo Facility Services compiled an inventory in 2002 of Drake's deferred maintenance backlog. The *Facilities Capital Action Plan* (FCAP), updated and revised in the summer of 2006 (*Available in the Resource Room*), was based on a complete survey of 59 campus buildings containing approximately 1.8 million gross square feet. The survey also included utilities infrastructure and various grounds/landscaping components. The FCAP deferred maintenance is organized by categories such as building system or subsystem, aesthetics, energy cost, code compliance, and life safety.

[Facilities Investments Future](#)

[Plan 2007-2010](#)

In 2002, the original Sodexo FCAP report indicated that Drake's deferred maintenance backlog was about \$28 million. A five-year plan recommended eliminating the deferred maintenance backlog and funding both capital renewal and improvement projects. This plan required capital investments between \$2.7 million and \$8.7 million per year. After significant investment in deferred maintenance and capital renewal over the past five years, Drake has reduced its deferred maintenance backlog by more than 50%. The 2006 report estimates Drake's current deferred maintenance at \$12.3 million, which equals 4.2% of the current replacement value of its facilities. The national average for four-year baccalaureate institutions is 6.7%, according to Sodexo sources. Priorities based on need determine how Drake is addressing its current deferred maintenance projects. Projects that affect life safety receive first priority, followed by projects that will impact either directly or indirectly students' learning and living environment. All other projects have lower priority.

### 2B.3b: PLANS FOR FUTURE ACTION

Drake's long-term goal is to invest approximately \$5 million annually from its own cash reserves (roughly equivalent to annual depreciation expense) into capital repair and renewal so that deferred maintenance is virtually eliminated and campus facilities and grounds are continually being renewed and refreshed.

We are working with *Sightlines*, a facilities benchmarking consultant, to compare deferred maintenance, energy use, service standards and various other facilities indicators with peer and aspirant institutions. This work is inspiring new creative approaches and alternatives to the deferred maintenance issue that will be considered in future years (e.g. a building portfolios approach). (The report will be available in the Resource Room.)

### 2B.4: TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES FOR CURRENT AND FUTURE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

Technology resources are increasingly essential to effective teaching and learning

environments in higher education. Recognizing this, Drake has planned carefully in recent years to make changes that significantly improve its technological environment.

Technology was identified in the 2001–2006 strategic plan as a challenge:

*[I]t is imperative that we have both the infrastructure and the expertise to provide the highest possible [technological] support to both the teaching/learning process and the administration of the University; in addition, we must be prepared to meet the challenges of technology-based learning provided by other institutions and organizations;*

Technology was addressed throughout *Strategic Plans 2001–2006* and *2003–08* and those plans have guided allocation of resources. *Strategic Plan* objectives related to technology include charges to “provide technological leadership, support and infrastructure necessary for the highest levels of teaching and learning,” “implement and support technological infrastructure necessary to achieve [previously identified] operating efficiencies,” as well as to improve the learning and working environments of students and faculty.

Most strategies identified in the *Plan* have been implemented. A Chief Information Officer was hired in 2001. Strategic plans for the [Office of Information Technology](#) and [Cowles Library](#) brought learning technology to the front. Both the Cowles and Opperman libraries have committed to becoming models for using technology to access information. Both libraries and the Office of Information Technology recently have implemented new functions to the Digital Library and the Learning Management System, and plans include additional projects each year.

There have been other technological improvements as well. Campus network and Internet connection speed has been upgraded continuously. The University launched a totally new content management Web system in February 2006 and the *blueView* portal in 2007. A wireless network is available in all classroom and residence buildings on campus; in addition, a program of upgrading 10 classrooms each summer with technology equipment, seating, and carpeting has resulted in upgrades to 31 classrooms since summer 2005. We have committed resources to electronic security in parking lots, keyless access to computer labs and some residence halls, and scan debit cards for student food services. Students can even use debit cards to access the laundry facilities in the residence halls.

#### **2B.4a: CAMPUS TECHNOLOGY CONTINGENCY PLAN**

Recognizing the importance of technology to the University—to operations, teaching and learning—Drake developed a Campus Technology Business Continuity Plan in 2005. The Office of Information Technology [directed the creation](#) and testing of plans to ensure that the University could function should access to campus technology be lost. The plans were then tested to ensure that the University could continue to function during such an event. The Contingency Plan provides specifications for all business procedures vital to the functioning of the University. (Plan will be available in the Resource Room)

### 2B.4b: FUNDS FOR TECHNOLOGY UPGRADES

Funding of Drake University technology upgrades provides a clear example of collaborative planning and contributions. The University general budget, which provides significant funding to support technology advancements, has been augmented by two other important sources of funding, the Board of Trustees and Student Technology fees:

- During the past three years, Board of Trustees members have provided \$132,500 in matching funds for upgrades to classroom technology, a move that demonstrates their commitment to Drake’s learning environment.
- With encouragement from the student body, in 2001–02 Drake University instituted a technology fee, starting at \$55 per semester; the fee in 2007–08 is \$150 per semester for full-time students. While the total revenue from this source has been modest (\$1.3 million in FY07), the absolute focus of fund expenditures on support for learning technology has dramatically impacted the technology resources of the University. Each year the Provost submits a report to the Student Senate, providing details of expenditures from technology fees that point to the many technological upgrades at the University.

### 2B.5: HUMAN RESOURCES FOR DRAKE'S PRESENT AND FUTURE

Drake’s human resources encompass our students, faculty, staff, alumni, Board of Trustees and other advisory group members as well as many individuals from the Des Moines and central Iowa communities who support the University. This section focuses on Drake employees while other sections describe additional human resources that support Drake’s endeavors.

Drake’s *2001–2006 Strategic Plan* addressed many human resource issues, including the need to attract, hire and retain employees who will help move the University toward its long-term vision and goals. Goal 3, to “Recruit and retain faculty and staff of the highest quality,” was supported by objectives to “ensure fair and competitive compensation” and to “provide environment conducive to excellence and professional development.” To attain these objectives, Drake developed a strategically driven performance management system and implemented a payroll classification system to support its overall goals.

Additional strategies related to other goals were designed to provide greater support for faculty and staff, including:

- increasing faculty development funding,
- establishing a resource center for faculty development,
- enhancing student and faculty research funds,
- improving campus access to technology, and
- providing support for integrating technology throughout the teaching and learning processes.

#### Student Technology Fees Provost Reports

[2001-02 Report](#)

[2002-03 Report](#)

[2003-04 Report](#)

[2004-05 Report](#)

[2005-06 Report](#)

[2006-07 Report](#)

[See the Self-Study Introduction, Section 3 and the Drake online \*Databook\* for summary faculty and staff data.](#)

The *January 2006* and *June 2004* strategic plan updates and other parts of this *Self-Study* provide data about the ways in which the various strategies have been addressed. Examples of efforts using informed planning to promote the development of the personal and professional lives of Drake staff are the *Drake Compensation Improvement Initiative*, the development of a comprehensive performance evaluation system, and enhancement of the faculty and staff development programs

[\*Salary Administration Policies and Procedures: Non-Faculty, Non-Bargaining Unit, Non-Grant Positions\*](#)  
  
[\*Salary Structure 6-06\*](#)

### **2B.5a: DRAKE COMPENSATION IMPROVEMENT INITIATIVE**

The 2000 *Administrative Program Review* laid the groundwork for a comprehensive initiative to address staff and faculty compensation, as well as staff classification, performance management, and training and development. The report noted the need for greater consistency in policies regarding compensation practices and employee evaluation, for a “University-wide pay classification system to ensure equity and reduce title inflation and salary manipulation,” and a system to assess employee performance and effectiveness. The report suggested “continuous monitoring of peer benchmark data is required in order to guarantee Drake’s competitive position with respect to salaries, staffing levels, services, technology and resource allocation.”

This recognition of need for action was reflected in several parts of Drake’s *Strategic Plan 2001–2006*. Goal 3, to *Recruit and retain faculty and staff of the highest quality*, was supported by the objectives to “Ensure fair and competitive compensation” and to “Continue implementation and refinement of performance management system, including merit based pay standard.” Goal 2, to *Improve and Sustain the Financial Health of the University* was accompanied by objectives to develop and implement payroll classification and performance management systems and to explore incentive/merit-based pay system. In fall 2001, Drake initiated intensive analysis and planning to improve staff and faculty compensation and ensure equity in it.

#### **2B.5a.1: Staff Compensation, Performance Evaluation and Support**

In 2001, a comprehensive compensation study was initiated with the assistance of *Arthur Andersen Consulting* (later known as *Clark Bardes Consulting*). The study examined and updated job descriptions for 435 non-faculty, non-bargaining unit staff positions and developed a job description protocol. The University used the evidence gleaned from this study to implement a salary structure reflective of market data and to develop a new compensation structure and guidelines.

In 2003, *Clark Bardes Consulting* helped to develop and implement a performance management system. Based on information gathered from focus groups that assessed Drake’s structure and culture, recommendations were made regarding tools and structure for assessing performance. As a result, this project implemented *standard tools* for setting goals, identifying developmental needs, evaluating performance and recognizing achievement. The evaluation system helps individuals to connect their annual goals and activities

**See the Human Resources**  
[Web site for additional information](#)  
**about staff compensation**

with the University and with their unit's strategic plan. Managers meet annually with employees to help them set goals that provide "a clear line of sight" between their job and the University's *Mission* and *Strategic Plan*. Those goals become the basis for evaluation and salary increases in the succeeding year.

### 2B.5a.2: Faculty Compensation

Systematic benchmarking of Drake faculty salaries was initiated in fall 2001. Each year, the Associate Provost/Director of Institutional Research, using data from College and University Professional Association- Human Resources (CUPA-HR), has compared the salary of each full-time Drake faculty member to discipline and rank specific benchmarks for our selected salary peer group. Using cumulative information, a total amount needed to attain the benchmarked salaries is calculated. Benchmarks have increased from 40th percentile to the median for the peer group.

Information about amounts needed to attain staff and faculty salary targets each year has been used along with other budget planning information to set the salary pool. Human Resources then allocates staff salary pools according to its analysis, and the Provost allocates faculty salary pools to academic units proportionate to the benchmark analysis. Deans and other managers allocate salary funds according to merit evaluations and equity.

### 2B.5a.3: Measures of Progress

Throughout the past five years, by allocating almost \$9 million for compensation increases, Drake has made significant progress toward its salary goals. Even as the University curtailed expenditure growth in an effort to balance the budget, Drake's commitment to attracting and retaining high quality employees has been advanced by strategies to enhance salary, benefits and other forms of support.

Each year the Board of Trustees has approved significant additions to the compensation budget, resulting in \$8.9 million allocated for salary improvement from FY04 through FY08 (see Table 2.4 below). During this time, Drake's *allocation for benefits* also increased by over \$4 million (42.5%).

**Table 2.4: Compensation Budget Increases: Fiscal Years 2004-2008**

Fiscal Year	Total Salary Increase Pool	Faculty Percent	Staff Percent
FY04	\$1.6M		
FY05	\$1.8M		
FY06	\$1.9M	57%	43%
FY07	\$1.75M	56%	44%
FY08	\$1.85M	54%	46%

### Compensation Reports

#### Human Capital Reports

[Fall 2005](#)

[Fall 2006](#)

#### Faculty Salary Reports

[Peer Comparison by Rank](#)

#### Power Points for Faculty

[Faculty Salaries – Fall 06](#)

[Faculty Salaries – Fall 07](#)

#### Progress Reports: AAUP Benchmarks

[AAUP Report 2004-05](#)

[AAUP Report 2005-06](#)

[AAUP Report 2006-07](#)

Each year the Director of Human Resources presents a *Human Capital Report* to the Board of Trustees, and progress reports on the faculty and staff salary initiatives are provided regularly in written and presentation form to faculty, staff, and the Board of Trustees. While progress has been made both on staff and faculty salaries (see links to reports in 2B.5a.1 and 2B.5a.2), we still face significant challenges in trying to achieve salary levels that will help ensure that we continue to be able to hire and maintain exceptional faculty and staff.

**2B.5b: SUPPORT FOR FACULTY AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT**

Both the 2000 *Administrative Program Review* report and the 2001-2006 Strategic Plan addressed the need for staff and faculty development. They noted the need for enhanced employee training and development as well as the need to increase funding for development activities.

**2B.5b.1: Staff Development.** The 2001-06 *Strategic Plan* recognized the need to “Provide an environment conducive to excellence and professional development” and called for several measures such as staff development programming and funding to achieve this objective. This was supported by the Business and Finance Strategic Plan FY04-FY08 that called for phased implementation of increases in learning and development funds for both staff and faculty. Beginning with \$1,000 per exempt employee (including faculty) and \$500 per nonexempt employee, targets were \$2,000 per exempt and \$1,000 per nonexempt by FY09. In response to these objectives the Director of Human Resources developed an extensive [\*Excellence in Learning and Development\*](#) program for staff (See Criterion 4a). In addition, since FY07 funding for staff development initiatives has increased steadily. Annual funding per person is as shown in Table 2.5.

**Table 2.5: Staff Development Allocations FY03 – FY09**

<b>Positions</b>	<b>FY03-06</b>	<b>FY08</b>	<b>FY09 Goal</b>
President and Vice Presidents	\$5,000	\$5,600	\$6,000
Deans	\$2,500	\$3,100	\$3,500
Other Senior Administrators	\$1,500	\$2,100	\$2,500
Exempt Administrative Staff	\$1,000	\$1,600	\$2,000
Admin Staff to Deans/Vice President Group/full-time			
lab instructors	\$500	\$1,100	\$1,500

**2B.5b.2: Faculty Development**

The Drake University Strategic Plan 2001-2006 called for the University to “Establish and enhance faculty development funds” to support travel and program costs. University funding for faculty development was \$1,000 per faculty member per year in FY03 through FY06. This was increased to \$1,300 per faculty member in FY07 and to \$1600 in FY08 and will reach \$2,000 per faculty member in FY09.

In addition to this funding, the Provost's Office has budgeted funds, provided by two quasi-endowment funds, of approximately \$75,000 dedicated to faculty development. Each of the Colleges and Schools also has secured various gift, grant, endowed and/or restricted funds to support faculty development (Details available in Resource Room). Detailed faculty development programs are discussed in the Criterion 3 and Criterion 4 chapters.

**CORE COMPONENT 2C:** Drake University's ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.

Drake University has a history of providing and using reliable evidence to evaluate institutional effectiveness. As an institution, we model a scholarship of decision-making. That is, we regularly and consistently gather evidence then use it to shape a University that is continuously developing and improving. Most recently, new planning initiatives described in Components 2a and 2b have further institutionalized evaluation and implementation procedures that ensure ongoing strategies for improvement.

Drake is committed to ensuring that evaluative data are available and used for planning in every program, curricular and noncurricular. The University uses evidence-based planning to support the rigor and currency of its academic programs as well and to foster student success. Such planning also is integral to stewarding the University's financial health and to developing the professional lives of faculty and staff. In 2003, the University committed to a *culture of evidence* through creation of the Office of Institutional Research under an Associate Provost. That office developed an online *Databook*, thus making reports and campus presentations more routinely accessible. In 2006 an Associate Director of Institutional Research position was created in order to increase capacity to make data accessible in forms usable to those on campus who are planning and making decisions.

Evaluative information that shapes planning is solicited and obtained through a variety of sources: external accreditation and other academic program reviews; external reviews of noncurricular programs; expert consultants; program audits; surveys of students, faculty and staff; environmental scans; benchmark analyses; and advisory boards and councils. In addition, the University and its units regularly have engaged in internal assessment such as the *Program Review* described in Component 2a.

**DRAKE IS COMMITTED TO ENSURING THAT EVALUATIVE DATA ARE AVAILABLE AND USED FOR PLANNING IN EVERY PROGRAM, CURRICULAR AND NONCURRICULAR.**

### 2C.1: REGULAR EVALUATIONS OF ALL DRAKE ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Drake regularly evaluates its programs through external reviews, self-studies, and consultants hired to provide feedback to specific units. The following examples provide some sense of the range of evaluation and assessment that occurs at Drake in addition to assessment of learning outcomes.

#### 2C.1a: EXTERNAL REVIEW

Drake University's *professional programs are accredited* by national, regional and state organizations that provide regular feedback used in planning. The School of Law, programs in business and accounting in the College of Business and Public Administration, the School

of Journalism and Mass Communication, the College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, the Department of Art and Design, and Department of Music have all received full accreditation. The School of Education programs are also fully accredited by the Iowa State Department of Education. Full documentation for these accreditation reviews is available in the on-campus Resource Room.

In addition, for many years Drake has had in place a program for external review of academic programs not subject to accreditation. *External Review Procedures* initiated in the College of Arts and Sciences in the 1990s were adopted University wide in 2004. All programs are reviewed on a seven-year cycle to ensure that they benefit from and use outside perspectives and critique to provide the best possible programming for Drake students. Examples of assessment and feedback related to external reviews are provided in Criterion 4. Full accreditation and external review reports are available in the Resource Room.

### 2C.1b: PROGRAM SELF-STUDY AND ANALYSIS

In addition to accreditation and external program reviews, Drake University engages in ongoing self-review, analysis, and assessment of the effectiveness of academic programs. Assessment of learning outcomes is discussed in Criterion 3 and Criterion 4C. However, the institution expects all academic units to engage regularly in many other forms of program analysis such as the *2000 Program Review* as well as the environmental scans and white papers that are part of the Three-Year Planning Cycle.

The academic division also uses surveys to provide feedback about program effectiveness. A number of surveys used for feedback in non-academic units also provide information useful to academic units (see Section 2C.3b below). In addition, Cowles Library regularly uses the *LibQual* survey to provide information about the quality of its programming and services. In response to *results of the LibQual survey Cowles Library* has created new positions, improved training for student workers and other staff, improved the quality of computer terminals, and changed the reserve filing system so that it is easier to locate materials. (See Criterion 3A for further discussion.)

For the past several years the College of Business and Public Administration has participated annually in the *Educational Benchmarking Institute* (EBI) surveys as well as the *Business School Questionnaire* (BSQ) administered by AACSB. The EBI survey is administered to graduating undergraduate and MBA students and seeks feedback on their program experience. The BSQ collects data from all AACSB members in an effort to provide institutions with benchmarks across a number of administrative areas (e.g. faculty numbers, student enrollments, and programs offered). EBI results at the undergraduate level highlighted significant challenges faced in the career development and placement area. This became the impetus for changes in placement services for business students, thus helping students integrate their education with professional preparation. At the graduate (MBA) level the EBI survey highlighted less than desired program outcomes. As a result of the survey feedback, the MBA program has undergone a complete revision. (See Criterion 3 for more information on academic program changes.)

## DRAKE UNIVERSITY ENGAGES IN ONGOING SELF-REVIEW, ANALYSIS, AND ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS.

## 2C.2: REVIEW OF NONCURRICULAR PROGRAMS

Drake University routinely engages in evaluation of non-curricular programs. Many of these analyses were discussed in Section 2B. We, of course, have annual external and internal audits of our financial condition. Financial data analysis has been used at Drake for well over ten years as a means of monitoring trends, assessing Drake's financial health and helping us improve our financial practices. The Business and Finance Office also annually compares our financial statement results to all other ANAC institutions and uses the comparison to determine our financial strengths and weaknesses as compared to peer institutions.

Consultants have been asked to provide perspective on many aspects of Drake University's operations, including marketing and admission programs, alumni and development, diversity, facilities management, the Student Counseling Center, and implementation of learning technology. And athletics is subject to regular certification by the National Collegiate Athletics Association.

### 2C.2a: STUDENT LIFE CONSULTANT FOR COUNSELING CENTER

In September 2005, the Dean of Students invited a consultant to review the services of the Counseling Center: its history and current scope, depth and range of services offered, and its operational paradigm. The report (available in the Resource Room) suggested a variety of changes. Since that report was received, two part-time counselors have been added to the staff, and group therapy sessions for students have been expanded. Programming efforts with students and some academic departments have also been examined, and there has been expanded training of the Residence Life staff on suicide and emergency procedures with troubled students. Programs have been developed to keep faculty better informed of services available and how to assist students in accessing them. In addition, the Center has developed a learning outcomes document to assess student learning.

### 2C.2b: CONSULTANT FOR LEARNING TECHNOLOGY

In the fall of 2006, a consultant was brought to campus to assess whether Drake's information technology was current. The consultant's assessment of network, labs, administrative computing, and portal services was positive. The report (available in the Resource Room) noted that Drake will be challenged to anticipate and begin building to accommodate coming trends; the University also needs to increase faculty and student awareness of technology already in place.

### 2C.2c: NCAA CERTIFICATION

During spring 2007, the Drake University athletics program *successfully* underwent its second certification review by the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA). Athletics certification is meant to ensure the NCAA's fundamental commitment to integrity in intercollegiate athletics. Like accreditation, the program uses peer evaluation to review Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance, Academic Integrity, and Commitment to Equity, Welfare

and Sportsmanship. Drake University's Intercollegiate Athletics program received "unconditional certification" and high praise from the review team.

[\*Survey Reports on the Institutional Research Web site\*](#)

### 2C.3: SURVEY AND BENCHMARK DATA IN DECISION-MAKING

Drake University participates in many surveys that provide comparative and benchmarking information for use in planning and development, in both academic and nonacademic units.

#### CIC Key Indicator Reports

[\*FY07 Part A\*](#)

[\*FY07 Part B\*](#)

[\*FY06 Part A\*](#)

[\*FY06 Part B\*](#)

[\*FY05 Part A\*](#)

[\*FY05 Part B\*](#)

#### 2C.3a: INSTITUTIONAL BENCHMARK DATA

Drake University submits data to a number of organizations that provide benchmark comparisons on various performance indicators. These comparisons are used for analysis and assessment of institutional and program performance. Among the organizations to which we submit data are the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), Associated New American Colleges, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities and the Association of Governing Boards.

The Council of Independent Colleges (CIC)-Key Indicators Tool Kit contains information on 18 key indicators of institutional vitality for small and midsized private colleges and universities. These indicators represent commonly used measures of institutional performance in two parts. Part A covers student enrollment, progression and faculty; Part B covers tuition revenue, financial aid, resources and expenditures.

The National Center for Education Statistics (IPEDS) provides an opportunity to order a [\*Feedback Report\*](#) in which institutional characteristics are compared with a selected set of peer institutions. This information facilitates analysis of tuition, financial aid, graduation rates and other important institutional benchmarks.

[\*Summary of Program Evaluations and Assessments - Business and Finance Division Assessments\*](#)

The use of *College and University Professional Association-Human Resources (CUPA-HR) data* for analysis and upgrading of Drake salaries was described in Component 2b. Drake has used financial ratio analysis for more than 10 years to examine financial trends and assess Drake's financial health. In addition, the University has applied benchmark data (mostly gleaned from Moody's) to various key indicators for the past 10 years. The indicators and benchmarks selected have changed slightly over this period (with some new ones added), but they are used extensively to watch financial trends and to set future financial targets for the institution. Drake's Office of Business and Finance produces an annual [\*Key Indicators Report\*](#) that summarizes much of this information.

Audited financial reports ([\*Financial Statements\*](#)) are available on Drake's Web site. In addition, the Vice President for Business and Finance reports regularly to the Board of Trustees and each fall presents information about Drake's financial status in a public forum.

#### 2C.3b: SURVEYS

Drake University on a regular basis seeks information about our academic and cocurricular programming, our campus culture and other services. This is done through local and national surveys of students, faculty, and other constituents.

### 2C.3b.1: Local Constituent Surveys

The University routinely administers evaluations and surveys to ensure that all constituencies have an opportunity for input and that relevant information is available for decision-making. The use of such surveys is too extensive to provide an exhaustive list. A few examples are listed below.

- From 1991 through 2001 all Drake University students were asked to participate in the annual [Drake Student Survey](#) (DSS). The survey was not administered for several years so that the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) could be administered. However, starting in spring 2007 the DSS is being administered in odd numbered years, alternating with the NSSE. The DSS seeks data on student satisfaction and perceptions about a variety of topics ranging from classes, advising and campus services to issues of current relevance such as diversity.
- The Office of Professional and Career Development annually surveys recent graduates [online](#) to obtain career placement information. Results are available in the Resource Room.
- During the *2000 Program Review*, Drake faculty and staff were surveyed about a variety of local and national issues to obtain input for the review and strategic planning processes. The [report](#) results helped guide the process.
- In 2003, the Board of Trustees completed a [Self-Study](#) of their own attitudes and knowledge about Board procedures and responsibilities. These have been used to develop better Board orientations and procedures.
- In fall 2004, when considering changes to the Drake University medical insurance benefits plan, Human Resources [sought input](#) from all faculty and staff.
- In 2005, in response to both informal feedback and information collected from evaluation of a series of computer application trainings, Human Resources personnel initiated *Excellence in Learning*, an ongoing professional staff development program (See Criterion 4A). They collect evaluations of both content and presenter at each program for use in decisions about future programming.

In addition, Drake regularly solicits evaluations of specific services and events, including New Student Orientation and Welcome Week, New Faculty Orientation, Human Resources Learning and Development Programs, workshop participants, and participants at the President's summer planning retreats. A campus expectation has been established that results of such evaluations will be used in planning future events.

### 2C.3b.2: Comparative Surveys

Drake participates regularly in surveys that provide information about our academic and cocurricular programming, our campus culture and other services. Some results from these surveys are discussed in Criterion 3. Full reports are on the [Drake Institutional Research Web site](#).

- Drake administered the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) annually from 2001 through 2006. The survey now is given in even numbered years, on an alternating schedule with the Drake Student Survey.

**THE UNIVERSITY  
ROUTINELY ADMINISTERS  
EVALUATIONS AND  
SURVEYS TO ENSURE THAT  
ALL CONSTITUENCIES  
HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY  
FOR INPUT AND THAT  
RELEVANT INFORMATION  
IS AVAILABLE FOR  
DECISION-MAKING.**

**DRAKE HAS USED  
THE RESULTS OF  
THESE SURVEYS TO  
MAKE CHANGES  
THAT HAVE IMPROVED  
THE STUDENT-LEARNING  
ENVIRONMENT.**

- Drake participated in the fall 2005 inaugural offering of the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE) and again in fall 2007. We will continue to participate in this survey that offers baseline data for the NSSE in even numbered years.
- Since 2004 the Law School has participated in the Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSE).
- Drake faculty participated in the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) in 2004.

Drake also has participated in the [First-Year Initiative Survey](#) and in [Your First College Year Survey](#). The faculty has participated in other surveys administered through the years. Among these have been: the [2001 Higher Education Research Institute Faculty Survey](#), [Survey of senior faculty at Associated New American Colleges](#) (ANAC), and ANAC survey of junior faculty, completed in 2007.

Drake has used the results of these surveys to make changes that have improved the student-learning environment. These include improvements in curriculum, student life, residence halls and the first-year experience. Criterion 3 and 4 chapters provide several examples of using survey and benchmark data to inform institutional changes in teaching and learning. These include changes in the *Drake Curriculum* general education program, Cowles Library and school and college programs.

#### **2C.4: ADVISORY BOARDS AND COUNCILS**

Evaluation of Drake University programs and activities also is regularly solicited through its many Boards and advisory groups. College and school deans, the Dean of Cowles Library, and the Dean of Students each have a National Advisory Council (NAC) that meets on a regular basis and provides advice, support, and feedback concerning the programs and other functions of the unit. Drake also has a National Advisory Council on Diversity, an Alumni Advisory Board, and a Parents Board that meet on a regular basis to provide advice and council to the University. (See additional information in Resource Room.)

The input of these groups is taken seriously in evaluating unit and university programs. In addition, the Councils have contributed direct support to programs by visiting classes, working with faculty and setting up special programs. For example, in 2004, the Arts and Sciences NAC created and endowed the “STAR” fund to support undergraduate travel for research, conferences, and performances. This program has assisted over 30 students, in the words of the college mission, “develop the talents and skills necessary for personal and professional success.”

As the College of Business and Public Administration has focused on better preparing students for professional careers, it has asked its NAC for additional ideas and strategies for achieving this goal. Based on the Council’s assessment that communication and leadership competencies are key attributes desired in employees, the College has implemented a Communication Leadership course. When the College was redesigning its MBA program, NAC input led to a focus on sustainability and its integration into decision making within various organizational functions.

**CORE COMPONENT 2D:** All levels of planning align with Drake University's mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.

As noted in the introduction to Component 2a, though strategic planning has been ongoing at Drake University for many years, planning that has occurred since 2000 has been most significant in defining Drake's current status and its future. Since January of 2000 mission-driven planning has been perpetual.

Discussion in Criterion 1 and in Criterion 2A and 2B already has provided substantial support for the ways in which planning at Drake University extends from and supports our mission. The *Mission Statement* informs planning and institutional decision making by the Board of Trustees and senior administrators, development of curricula and programs, the metrics by which we assess outcomes, and the ways in which we impact the lives of all associated with Drake University. The gravitational center for all planning documents is the University *Mission Statement*. Everything—new course proposals, requests for hiring, capital equipment purchases, promotion and tenure, existing and proposed programs, development projects, strategic plans—receive priority in terms of their centrality to and support for the University's mission and our strategic plan.

As noted previously, the tie between mission and planning has become even more absolute during the past five years. The connections among these processes have been graphically imaged in the *Mission Map*. The ways in which the mission statement was reflected in Drake's *Strategic Plan 2001–2006* and its updates and how it is directing development of the new strategic plan have been discussed. The mission statement and its explication now guide all curricular planning, program development, and decisions about allocations of resources. Criterion 3 will explain the way in which Drake's *Mission Explication* has been developed as a living document that clearly establishes the implications of our Mission for the learning outcomes and obligations of the University to our students.

Current planning efforts are rooted in *Drake University: Vision 2025* which cites the current mission, suggesting both a long-term commitment to that mission and its durability and its status as a living document that can be applied to changing circumstances. As a living document, it binds the Drake community together, mandating participation among all members of that community (students, staff, faculty, administrators, alumni and community neighbors) in key decisions, from determining recipients of student scholarships to selecting college deans.

Discussion in Criterion 2B made clear the ways in which the budget process and fiscal responsibilities reflect and ensure centrality of the University mission. The planning cycle itself is tied to the budget process, allowing the University to prioritize expenses for the coming year and to adjust as needed to unforeseen events (like the higher cost of fuel) or to pursue new initiatives through Strategic Improvement Plans. Finally, Drake's *Strategic Plan* and the strategic plans of the various units, academic and administrative, set clear priorities.

**THE GRAVITATIONAL  
CENTER FOR ALL  
PLANNING DOCUMENTS  
IS THE UNIVERSITY  
MISSION STATEMENT.**

They include academic excellence, financial strength, and recruitment/retention of high caliber faculty and staff. Drake also seeks to ensure that its members can function in a diverse world and to improve relationships and communication among its various constituencies. Taken together, these priorities provide sound evidence of the University's awareness of the relationships among educational quality, student learning, and the diverse, complex, global, and technological world in which the organization and its students exist. As someone observed at the most recent President's Retreat, at Drake the mission statement is a lived experience.

