

STRATEGIC PLANNING TASK FORCE 2012-17
Meeting #11 October 6, 2011
Studio Lounge, Arts/Journalism Building Atrium
8-9:30 a.m.

After the working meeting on September 29, the task force presented their analysis on the four questions, as well as the SWOT-A Analysis. The following are their reports.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 13, 2011, 8-9:30 a.m., in the Student Center, 310.

/mt

Questions 1 and 2 Summaries

The following summarizes two of the questions asked during the stakeholder workshops. They were 1. What went well at Ball State during the past five years? and 2. What could have gone better at Ball State during the past five years? Responses were obtained during the stakeholder meetings that were held during the summer and fall of 2011. After the meetings were held, the Strategic Planning Committee identified major theme areas that could be used for the summaries. Following that initial review, the individual responses were placed into the categories shown below.

The first part of each section details the PowerPoint slides that were presented at the Strategic Planning meeting held on October 6, 2011. The text following the slide material was the discussion lead by John Obrycki who summarized the material for the committee members in charge of these questions.

A complete listing of responses for these two questions can be found in the Strategic Planning documents file entitled "Q1 and Q2 responses".

Slide 1 - What Went Well

Campus Improvements/Beautification/Facilities (14)	
Student quality/retention/enrollments	(14)
Student opportunities/experiences	(7)
Identity/uniqueness	(10)
Immersive Learning	(10)
Tech support, emphasis on improvements	(10)

This slide summarizes the top six categories for "what went well" in the data gathering sessions. The numbers within the parentheses indicate the number of sessions in which the comment was mentioned. Campus improvements/beautification efforts were widely mentioned. Similarly, the increased quality of students was highlighted. Student opportunities and experiences, related to their opportunities with immersive learning, getting involved on campus, and so forth, were mentioned as well. The university's branding initiative, as well as developing a strong state and national reputation was mentioned too. Immersive learning was mentioned separately too. Another aspect highlighted for "what went well" was the increased technological support and improvements, for example an increase in wireless accessibility on campus.

Slide 2 – What Went Well

Campus Improvements/Beautification/Facilities	96
Student quality/retention/enrollments	60
Student opportunities/experiences	55
Identity/uniqueness	47
Immersive Learning	41
Tech support, emphasis on improvements	35

This slide shows the number of "votes" each comment received. The votes were counted as the number of checks each comment received. The comment itself automatically received one "vote" because someone had to write the comment down on the tablet. This slide shows a broader discrepancy in how strongly people felt about different aspects of what went well. Campus improvements dominated. The next "what went well" category received about 17-18 votes, so we feel this offers some split between the top vote getters and the rest of the comments. However, if the "student experience" is interpreted broadly, then the comments for the next two categories, related to student quality and student opportunities, would have 115 votes. Generally speaking,

stakeholders felt that the university has done a great job of bringing in high quality students and providing those students with great experiences.

Slide 3 What Could Be Improved

Faculty Support (14)
Technology (8)
Research/Creative Endeavor (15)
Campus Culture/Morale (15)
Administration(13)
Student Experience (10)

This slide presents the top six categories for “what did not go so well” over the last five years. The numbers in parentheses indicate how many sessions in which the comment was mentioned. Interestingly, several of the comments are repeats from what did go well over the last five years, including technology and student experience. These categories were more difficult to categorize compared to the what went well categories. Additional explanation follows this slide regarding what fit into each category.

Slide 4 What Could Be Improved

Faculty Support (163)
Technology (61)
Research/Creative Endeavor (95)
Campus Culture/Morale (196)
Administration(98)
Student Experience (141)

This slide shows the number of “votes” each comment received. The votes were counted as the number of checks each comment received. The comment itself automatically received one “vote” because someone had to write the comment down on the tablet. Campus culture and morale, a broad category, received 196 comments. Some comments may have been double counted. For example, a comment about having all faculty use blackboard for grading could fit within student experience and technology. An additional note about these numbers is that this includes nearly all comments, even those with one vote. With more concrete groupings for the what went well categories, some comments were not placed within those six groups. But for responses to question 2, nearly all comments were placed into a group.

Slide 5 What Could Be Improved

Faculty Support (163)
 Salary
 Recognition
 Autonomy

While reading through the comments within each category, I picked out a few themes that seemed to be prevalent. Each person reading through the list may find different comments to highlight, and so this is not a definitive summary. The category Faculty Support included comments about salary levels, and related to this salary levels and expectations of teaching/research loads. Also, faculty voiced some concerns about levels of recognition, for scholarly work or teaching abilities. This recognition seemed related to, but separate from the salary issue. The issue of recognition also related to concerns about being asked to do too much. Another issue mentioned was autonomy, and this seemed to appear at a few levels. Individual faculty wanted some autonomy to teach/research and travel to conferences to make presentations. Others wanted autonomy from other

departments around campus. There was also the issue of the relationship between faculty and university administration.

Slide 6 What Could Be Improved

Technology (61)

- Consistency
- Continual Improvement
- Communication

Related to technology, the three themes of consistency, continual improvement, and communication stood out. With regard to consistency, the theme of consistent web sites, consistent use by faculty of blackboard for submitting grades, and stronger wireless connections across campus were mentioned. Related to this, continual improvement seemed to build upon the comments under the “what went well” responses. The technology improvements have campus have been great, and other improvements to consider include greater use of technology in the classrooms. Finally, under communication, several students voiced concerns about wanting less automated service help from the university. Parents wanted a stronger communication with the university too. The “technology” section did not have nearly as many individual comments or votes as the other categories that were responses to question 2.

Slide 7 What Could Be Improved

Research/Creative Endeavor (95)

- Research/travel funding
- Recognition
- Empowerment

The comments under research/creative endeavor related to some of the comments under faculty support. Faculty spoke of stronger support for research and travel funding to present research results to their peers. Others spoke about the different kinds of recognition afforded to immersive learning projects compared to other research. The empowerment issue related to students, faculty, and staff. Some wanted students to take a greater responsibility in their own learning. Others wanted a greater encouragement for employees to become students at Ball State. An interesting comment in this category that is difficult to interpret is a comment from the students about the “Scholarship and Financial Aid Department.” If this means more scholarship money, or referring to interactions with staff in the office, or any other issues, it is unclear, but did receive a high number of votes relative to the other comments in the category.

Slide 8 What Could Be Improved

Campus Culture/Morale (196)

- Connections
- Communication

This was a broad category that fit several kinds of comments. However, the two themes of connection and communication jumped out. With regard to connections, these touched all levels of the university and Muncie community. Students wanted to feel more connected with others students, with advisors, with faculty, with administrators, and with Muncie. Faculty wanted a stronger connection with Muncie and the administration. Departments wanted stronger connections with other departments. Related to more connections was a desire for an increase in the amount of communication. This included very specific comments, such as an update of the Roll Out the Red Initiative, and more general comments, such as more support for tougher grading and a perception of low faculty morale. These two general categories of connections and communication seem to go together. People wanted increased networking, resource sharing, collaboration, and communication.

Slide 9 What Could Be Improved

Administration (98)

- Communication
- Information
- Relationships

Comments related to the administration reflected issues with university administration at department and upper administration levels. With regard to communication, people mentioned wanting to know more about university decisions and a stronger dialogue between university administrators and the university at large. This was related to the next issue of information, as some would have liked more information about implementing immersive learning or implementing the university core curriculum. Students wanted more information about administrative decisions. With regard to relationships, some felt that the relationships with university administration tended to be one-sided.

Slide 10 What Could Be Improved

Student Experience (141)

- Involvement
- Consistency
- Recruitment

Memo in Brief for Questions 3 and 4

We developed 10 overarching themes that are common to both questions. We did not set out to develop a set of themes that converged for both questions; this happened naturally. It suggests, therefore, that a core set of issues, both positive and negative, exist among stakeholders.

- 1) VISION: focused on recent and continued changes for BSU
- 2) RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT: focused on continued development of BSU as a research-oriented institution
- 3) EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: focused on continued educational development of BSU (includes immersive learning, online learning, etc.)
- 4) SUSTAINABLE/GREEN: focused on BSU's efforts to be proactive in areas related to sustainability
- 5) ISSUES WITH ADMINISTRATION: focused on dissatisfaction with administration's priorities (fame, money, reputation, etc.) and/or bureaucratic policies . . . includes dissatisfaction with how faculty/staff are **treated** by administration (feelings of being underappreciated, top down approaches, etc.)
- 6) ISSUES WITH FACULTY/STAFF SUPPORT: focused on dissatisfaction with pay and support (travel, etc.) for faculty/staff . . . includes dissatisfaction with **actual remuneration and course loads** for faculty/staff
- 7) BSU'S STATE AND COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS: focused on connection between BSU and Muncie or state of Indiana
- 8) REPUTATION: focused on BSU's reputation
- 9) INFRASTRUCTURE: focused on physical and technological advancement and/or needs of BSU
- 10) STUDENT OPPORTUNITIES AND CONCERNS: focused on opportunities and/or areas for potential growth for BSU students

These 10 codes can be grouped together based on the degree to which they express positive or negative sentiments about BSU. Said another way, the themes converge around feelings of *concordance*, loosely used here to mean areas in which BSU is succeeding, and *discordance*, loosely defined here as areas where BSU has room for improvement.

Concordance

The following themes express concordance: Vision, Research Development, Educational Development, Sustainable/Green, Reputation, Infrastructure, BSU's State and Community Relationships, and Student Opportunities and Concerns. These themes were generally positive in tone and expressed both recognition of BSU's many recent achievements and pride for the institution.

- For instance, regarding the university's **vision**, people noted that we have worked toward change and we have done so with much success
 - "The University is capable of change [and] moving in a positive direction,"
 - "[We have the] ability to achieve progressive goals,"
 - "Gora is working hard to move BSU forward."
- Stakeholders are proud of BSU's growing **reputation**
 - we are now "known as a university of excellence,"
 - "recognized as a research institution,"
 - "respected as a university state-wide."
- Both teaching and research were recognized as contributing to the strength and vitality of BSU. With respect to **research**, stakeholders suggested that BSU should
 - focus future efforts on developing "research partnerships" and "research infrastructure,"
 - "continue grant activity" and "external funding successes,"
 - "support and reward faculty scholarship" through such things as money for travel, software for research, and the creation of research institutes or improved workspaces for faculty members.
- Regarding **teaching**, stakeholders recognized both BSU's
 - "important" and "unique" place as an institution focused on "immersive [and] experiential learning" – something that "sets us apart nationally" and allows us to "preserve [the] proven value of on-campus education."

- and BSU's "strong presence" with "quality online and distance outreach for teaching"

Discordance

Two themes suggest discordance in the data: Issues with Administration and Issues with Faculty/Staff Support. At some level these two themes are quite similar: they express a high level of dissatisfaction with the general working environment at BSU. Nonetheless, we felt it was important to develop two distinct themes in order to illustrate the degree to which this dissatisfaction *permeates* the faculty/staff experience at BSU.

- On the one hand, stakeholders were concerned with very concrete, material kinds of **support**, like disparities in raises for faculty and administration
 - "faculty and staff make sacrifices in income and perks although high administration doesn't take same sacrifice (\$39,000 raise),"
 - "the financial decision making of the University Elite is hidden and seemingly unfairly distributed among stakeholders,"
 - there is a "discrepancy in salaries (salary raises) between administration and faculty."
- In a related vein, stakeholders felt that the institution fails to support research by having heavy and/or uneven teaching loads across campus
 - BSU needs to "set reasonable expectations for work-loads. Teaching 3 classes and research and service is unrealistic for [the] tenure track. Reduce something,"
 - there is a "disconnect [between] loads and research expectations,"
 - there needs to be "equity among colleges" in course loads.
- These material concerns can be contrasted to stakeholder dissatisfaction with the way the **administration** treats faculty and staff, especially in regard to extensions of appreciation, respect, and autonomy.
 - "faculty voice is often ignored or not sought,"
 - "the strength/expertise of the faculty are not fully recognized/appreciated,"
 - "faculty don't get credit for student successes,"
 - the "university values administration over faculty/sports over academics/reporting over progress."
- Stakeholders also expressed concern with the increasingly bureaucratic structures of BSU
 - there is too much "top down direction,"
 - "the 'faculty-driven' academy is dead; an autocratic system seems to be replacing this organizational form,"
 - "there's an increasing central planning mentality that crowds out department autonomy."
- One additional area of discord centered around a slight antagonism between teaching and research. Stakeholders noted that
 - "little value [is] placed on activities other than scholarly productivity,"
 - "teaching [is] devalued,"
 - the administration needs to "give good teaching the same respect as research."

An Observation

The areas of concordance were associated with multiple stakeholder voices (faculty, students, alumni, employers, etc.), while the areas of discordance were largely associated with one voice, that of the faculty.

- One might be inclined to dismiss these complaints as artifacts of a particular group of people, rather than see them as meaningful indicators of areas of needed improvement for BSU.
- However, of the 21 stakeholder groups that were part of the data gathering sessions, 6 of them were non-faculty/non-staff groups (i.e. employers, alumni, students, parents, etc.). Fifteen groups represented faculty and/or staff from across campus.
- This means that the vast majority of the data, *both* positive and negative, comes from faculty and staff stakeholders.
- Thus, the faculty see much in BSU that is positive and worthy of praise, but they seem to feel excluded from these processes and devalued for their efforts. Addressing faculty morale, then, may be the greatest challenge for our strategic planning efforts.

Strategic Planning Data Analysis Questions 3 and 4

Analytic Memo October 6, 2011

This memo synthesizes the information gathered from questions 3 and 4 during the stakeholder meetings. During the process of data coding, we developed 10 overarching themes that are common to both questions. As noted in our initial analytic memo (see Sharepoint site: “Strategic Planning Data Analysis: Developing Codes for Questions 3 and 4”), we did not set out to develop a set of themes that converged for both questions; this happened naturally. It suggests, therefore, that a core set of issues, both positive and negative, exist among stakeholders.

The 10 themes were as follows:

- 1) VISION: focused on recent and continued changes for BSU
- 2) RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT: focused on continued development of BSU as a research-oriented institution
- 3) EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: focused on continued educational development of BSU (includes immersive learning, online learning, etc.)
- 4) SUSTAINABLE/GREEN: focused on BSU’s efforts to be proactive in areas related to sustainability
- 5) ISSUES WITH ADMINISTRATION: focused on dissatisfaction with administration’s priorities (fame, money, reputation, etc.) and/or bureaucratic policies . . . includes dissatisfaction with how faculty/staff are **treated** by administration (feelings of being underappreciated, top down approaches, etc.)
- 6) ISSUES WITH FACULTY/STAFF SUPPORT: focused on dissatisfaction with pay and support (travel, etc.) for faculty/staff . . . includes dissatisfaction with **actual remuneration and course loads** for faculty/staff
- 7) BSU’S STATE AND COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS: focused on connection between BSU and Muncie or state of Indiana
- 8) REPUTATION: focused on BSU’s reputation
- 9) INFRASTRUCTURE: focused on physical and technological advancement and/or needs of BSU
- 10) STUDENT OPPORTUNITIES AND CONCERNS: focused on opportunities and/or areas for potential growth for BSU students

These 10 codes can be grouped together based on the degree to which they express positive or negative sentiments about BSU. Said another way, the themes converge around feelings of *concordance*, loosely used here to mean areas in which BSU is succeeding, and *discordance*, loosely defined here as areas where BSU has room for improvement.

Concordance

The following themes express concordance: Vision, Research Development, Educational Development, Sustainable/Green, Reputation, Infrastructure, BSU’s State and Community Relationships, and Student Opportunities and Concerns. These themes were generally positive in tone and expressed both recognition of BSU’s many recent achievements and pride for the institution. For instance, regarding the university’s **vision**, people noted that we have worked toward change and we have done so with much success. To that end,

stakeholders said such things as “The University is capable of change [and] moving in a positive direction,” “[We have the] ability to achieve progressive goals,” and “Gora is working hard to move BSU forward.” Relatedly, stakeholders are proud of BSU’s growing **reputation**, noting that we are now “known as a university of excellence,” “recognized as a research institution,” and “respected as a university state-wide.” Importantly, we have not only achieved national recognition for our “focus on quality,” but we also have the “ability to sustain national rankings and visibility.” As such, people felt the university should continue to improve **state and community** outreach by “initiat[ing] more interactions with local/area business,” “campaign[ing] to promote BSU’s impact on the community,” “working with state officials and boards to enhance [the] status/better promotion of BSU to legislature,” and continuing to attempt to “influence state gov’t policy.” Stakeholders suggested these things even while recognizing the “changing political climate” that BSU now operates in.

Feelings of pride for BSU went beyond a focus on vision and reputation, though. Many stakeholders talked about the traditional areas of academia as well – **teaching** and **research**. To be sure, there was *significantly* more commentary about teaching than research – and this is likely a reflection of the university’s tradition of focusing on quality education – but both areas were recognized as contributing to the strength and vitality of BSU. For instance, stakeholders suggested that BSU should focus future efforts on developing “research partnerships” and “research infrastructure,” we should “continue grant activity” and “external funding successes,” and we should “support and reward faculty scholarship” through such things as money for travel, software for research, and the creation of research institutes or improved workspaces for faculty members.

Stakeholder sentiments regarding teaching included positive comments about the university’s “more restrictive admission standards” and the resulting positive effects for enrollment and the quality of students. To that end, stakeholders would like to see BSU “continue to raise standards for admission” and recruit the “highest quality students” possible. Stakeholders also recognized BSU’s “important” and “unique” place as an institution focused on “immersive [and] experiential learning” – something that “sets us apart nationally” and allows us to “preserve [the] proven value of on-campus education.” Nonetheless, the university’s successes and “strong presence” with “quality online and distance outreach for teaching” garnered a considerable amount of attention as well. Thus, both immersive learning and online education were recognized by stakeholders as innovative and important areas that warrant further attention and development for BSU.

As noted above, there was a significant difference in the amount of attention given to teaching versus research. Although much of the commentary about both teaching and research was positive (as illustrated in the preceding paragraphs), the data also revealed a bit of antagonism or competition between these two areas. For instance, stakeholders said that the university needs to “recognize the importance of tenured/tenure line faculty as teachers, not just researchers or grant writers,” “figure out the role of [the] university in its identity – research or teaching,” and “get back to our roots – teaching institution.” Comments such as these, coupled with the disparity in the number of comments on teaching versus those on research, suggests that, at least at some level, a divide remains regarding the roles of teaching and research at BSU. This kind of divide provides an appropriate segue into our discussion of the discordance in the data.

Discordance

Two themes suggest discordance in the data: Issues with Administration and Issues with Faculty/Staff Support. At some level these two themes are quite similar: they express a high level of discontent with the general working environment at BSU – the culture of the institution, if you will. Nonetheless, we felt it was important to develop two distinct themes in order to illustrate the degree to which this dissatisfaction *permeates* the faculty/staff experience at BSU.

On the one hand, stakeholders were concerned with very concrete, material kinds of **support**, like disparities in raises for faculty and administration. Here, stakeholders said such things as “faculty and staff make sacrifices in income and perks although high administration doesn’t take same sacrifice (\$39,000 raise),” “the financial decision making of the University Elite is hidden and seemingly unfairly distributed among stakeholders,” and there is a “discrepancy in salaries (salary raises) between administration and faculty.” In a related vein, stakeholders felt that the institution fails to support research by having heavy and/or uneven teaching loads across campus: BSU needs

to “set reasonable expectations for work-loads. Teaching 3 classes and research and service is unrealistic for [the] tenure track. Reduce something,” there is a “disconnect [between] loads and research expectations,” and there needs to be “equity among colleges” in course loads. Suggested solutions included “competitive faculty salaries for recruitment and retention,” “pay[ing] faculty wages consistent with peer institutions,” “money to support faculty – travel, research,” rectifying “faculty salary/load imbalances,” and “reward[ing] teaching innovation in loading.”

These material concerns can be contrasted to stakeholder dissatisfaction with the way the **administration** treats faculty and staff, especially in regard to extensions of appreciation, respect, and autonomy. These comments seemed to have a qualitatively different feel from those about monetary support and course loads – they had much more to do with the lack of a positive emotional connection between faculty/staff and the administration. Here then, stakeholders noted that “faculty voice is often ignored or not sought,” “the strength/expertise of the faculty are not fully recognized/appreciated,” “faculty don’t get credit for student successes,” and that the “university values administration over faculty/sports over academics/reporting over progress.” Stakeholders also expressed concern with the increasingly bureaucratic structures of BSU, noting that there is too much “top down direction,” “the ‘faculty-driven’ academy is dead; an autocratic system seems to be replacing this organizational form,” and “there’s an increasing central planning mentality that crowds out department autonomy.” Stakeholders suggested that the university needs to “improve faculty morale,” “trust professors more,” “reduc[e] centralized control of college level activities,” use “less top-down [approaches] and more leverage of expertise,” and “increase[e] recognition of different faculty roles – all roles are important.” Interestingly, comments associated with this theme also revealed the antagonisms between teaching and research once again. Stakeholders noted that “little value [is] placed on activities other than scholarly productivity,” “teaching [is] devalued,” and the administration needs to “give good teaching the same respect as research.”

Overall, then, it is clear that these two themes point to consistent and widespread dissatisfaction with the way faculty and staff are treated by administration and compensated relative to other similar institutions and the administration. This brings us to an important observation: while the areas of concordance were associated with multiple stakeholder voices (faculty, students, alumni, employers, etc.), the areas of discordance were largely associated with one voice, that of the faculty. One might be inclined, then, to dismiss these complaints as artifacts of a particular group of people, rather than see them as meaningful indicators of areas of needed improvement for BSU. We would caution against such an interpretation. Of the 21 stakeholder groups that were part of the data gathering sessions, 6 of them were non-faculty/non-staff groups (i.e. employers, alumni, students, parents, etc.). Fifteen of the stakeholder groups represented faculty and/or staff from across campus. This means that the vast majority of the data, *both* positive and negative, comes from faculty and staff stakeholders. Thus, the faculty see much in BSU that is positive and worthy of praise, but they seem to feel excluded from these processes and devalued for their efforts. Addressing faculty morale, then, may be the greatest challenge for our strategic planning efforts.

SWOT-A Sub-Group Meeting Notes from September 29, 2011 Meeting (revised 10/6)

The group reviewed the results of the Spring 2011 administrative retreat SWOT-A. These appear on the next page. We observed that while most of the strengths seem to be specific to Ball State, most of the weaknesses appear common to higher education institutions. There were no surprises in this material. We asked ourselves which results create a sense of urgency or demand action?

This was followed with a discussion of the interest and desirability of Ball State becoming a “public ivy” university such as Miami University or the College of William and Mary. In response to a question about what steps would be necessary to move us to this level, recent information about Ball State’s ranking in the U.S. News *Best Colleges’* report was shared. That information is provided in the two accompanying documents. For Ball State to approach the ranking of these aspirational peers, our peer assessment, student selectivity, retention and graduation rates, percentage of faculty members with terminal degrees (including contract faculty members), percentage of undergraduate classes with fewer than 20 students, and expenditure per student would have to increase substantially. It was pointed out that changes towards an even greater emphasis on performance funding from the state might help us move in this direction, although this funding would represent “a somewhat larger slice of an increasingly small pie.” If this aspiration for Ball State is embraced, then doing a detailed analysis of this sort and being transparent about the results would be very useful. The group also observed that the criteria for academic program excellence in terms of accreditations and rankings does not necessarily equate to those for university excellence overall.

We ended our discussion with a focus upon one specific result of the SWOT-A analysis: the hope that Ball State will become a place where people are happy to work. The group concluded that perhaps having higher turnover of faculty members and professional staff members in the future would have both some positive and some negative outcomes for the University.

SWOT-A Analysis (from Provost King, 9/22/11)

Strengths:

- Campus (campus life/physical environment)
- Value
- Caring faculty
- Open to innovation
- Technology
- Virginia Ball Center/BBC/immersive learning

Weaknesses:

- Insufficient resources
- State not supportive of our success
- Alumni engagement and support
- Alumni not attached strongly to university
- Geographical location
- Low faculty salaries
- Lack of focus – faculty being asked to go in too many directions

Opportunities:

- Small enough to change
- Design thinking – create culture of change/learning reciprocity
- Establish an environment for learning
- Strategic replacement of retiring faculty and other personnel

Threats:

- Dynamics of state and fiscal environment (changing funding sources)
- Organizational cultures/change management
- Risk Tolerance (Low)
- Miss the “Blue Ocean”
- At times lack of willingness to make difficult resource decisions

Aspirations:

- Distinctive national and international reputation
- A place where people are happy to work.
- Interdisciplinary collaboration – institution of choice, creative and bright students
- Learner focused
- Reward both process and end result
- Collaborative learning among faculty and students
- Adequate resources to support aspirations
- Leading online/distance education by rebranding to “multimedia education”