

Clark University

An Update on the Academic and Financial Plan

With goals, strategies and benchmarks through 2010

April 2005

Table of Contents

	Mission statement	Page 3
I.	Background to the academic and financial plan	Page 4
II.	Situational analysis	Page 5
III.	Major institutional goals	Page 10
IV.	Strategy	Page 15
V.	Enhancing the academic, co-curricular and campus experience	Page 18
VI.	Faculty	Page 23
VII.	Resources: Institutional Identity, Communication, and Marketing	Page 25
VIII.	Resources: Philanthropic Support	Page 26
IX.	Financial model and sequencing	Page 28
X.	Benchmarks	Page 32
XI.	Risk assessment	Page 34

Clark University's Mission

Clark University's mission is to educate undergraduate and graduate students to be imaginative and contributing citizens of the world, and to advance the frontiers of knowledge and understanding through rigorous scholarship and creative effort.

The University seeks to prepare students to meet the challenges of a complex and rapidly changing society. In students as well as faculty, Clark fosters a commitment to excellence in studying traditional academic disciplines as well as innovation in exploring questions that cross disciplinary boundaries. The free pursuit of inquiry and the free exchange of ideas are central to that commitment.

The focus of Clark's academic program is a liberal arts education enriched by interactions among undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty, and closely

linked to a select number of professional programs. Clark also serves students who wish to continue formal education throughout their lives.

The intellectual and personal growth of students is enhanced by a wide variety of educational programs and extracurricular activities. Clark believes that intellectual growth must be accompanied by the development of values, the cultivation of responsible independence, and the appreciation of range of perspectives.

Clark's academic community has long been distinguished by the pursuit of scientific inquiry and humanistic studies, enlivened by a concern for significant social issues. Among many other scholarly endeavors, Clark contributes to understanding human development, assessing relationships between people and the environment, and managing risk in a technological society.

Clark is dedicated to being a dynamic community of learners able to thrive in today's increasingly interrelated societies. The University maintains a national and international character, attracting high caliber students and faculty from all quarters of the globe. As a University residing in an urban context, Clark also strives to address the needs and opportunities of contemporary urban life.

Clark's intimate academic setting and tradition of "elbow teaching" provide many opportunities for students to pursue knowledge through participation. High expectations, as well as easy access to the scholar-teacher faculty, encourage students to become autonomous learners. Clark's international and interdisciplinary orientation is combined with a tradition of strong self-direction among students and faculty. These attributes enhance the University's ability to contribute to the development of new modes of thought and to the advancement of society through the creation and transmission of knowledge.

Clark University Board of Trustees.

I. Background to the Academic and Financial Plan

This document provides an update on the 2003 Academic and Financial Plan for Clark University. Academic and financial planning at Clark University is a continuous and on-going activity. The purpose of the update is to set institutional goals and strategies for the period 2005-2010.

This is not a comprehensive re-write of the existing plan. The scope of coverage is limited to major institutional goals, the strategies and action steps to achieve these goals, and the performance benchmarks to measure progress toward the goals. We do not in this document specify plans for each unit or department of the University. Subsequent to adoption of this update, all units and departments will be asked to prepare plans that help achieve the goals and strategies laid out below.

The broad architecture of the current academic and financial plan of Clark University dates back to the mid-1990s. At that time, Clark University re-affirmed its institutional identity as a liberal arts-based research university with a small number of graduate programs. The University adopted a plan that placed highest priority on enhanced quality.

In 1999 the Board of Trustees, administration and faculty identified four priorities as key action areas: (i) improving the quality and fit of students admitted to Clark University; (ii) mobilizing greater situational advantage from the presence of high quality graduate and research programs; (iii) improving our neighborhood and the campus as the physical and social context for academic and student life; (iv) enhancing the visibility of Clark University among prospective students, parents, alumni and other constituencies.

The appointment of President Bassett in 2000 was made explicitly to provide leadership that would improve the quality, success, and visibility of Clark's academic programs in line with these four priorities. His administration has been guided by the four priorities and benefited from the leadership of Provosts Greenaway and Angel and the other vice presidents and deans. They have defined—with full faculty deliberation—measures of success, strategic management variables, and institutional goals for the period ending 2005-06. These goals were incorporated into the most recent Academic and Financial Plan approved by faculty, president, and trustees in 2002-03. The president and his cabinet also defined three aspects of University academics that could be signatures in defining and marketing Clark's special place among colleges and universities. These are its commitment to making a difference within its community and within communities abroad; a pedagogy of inquiry-based learning that emphasizes the importance of learning beyond the textbook whether through cutting-edge research with faculty members or in creative practitioner experiences; and its international character, as shown both in programs and student body;. The trustees generously assisted Provost Angel in accelerating the initiatives being made in these signature areas through the creation of a new ventures fund. The University also identified a critical need for a new facility for the biosciences and upgraded other science facilities in order to compete more effectively for science students and enhance its graduate-research profile.

This document now updates goals, strategies and operational metrics through 2010. In broad terms, the emphasis of this update is one of building on the accomplishments and strategic directions of the past five years. The four priority areas identified in 1999 remain critical to the mission success of the University. The major differences in this revision relate to 1) the progress made since 1999 and 2) the adoption of strategies and action steps to achieve more rapid progress in improving both the academic reputation of Clark University among prospective students and the attractiveness of the campus experience. At the core of this strategy is the development of a stronger and distinctive institutional identity on the basis of which Clark delivers focused excellence.

Clark University's mission is to educate undergraduate and graduate students to be imaginative and contributing citizens of the world, and to advance the frontiers of knowledge and understanding through rigorous scholarship and creative effort. In

adopting this plan update, we re-affirm our central mission goals as well as our institutional focus as a liberal arts based research university enriched by interactions among undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty, and closely linked to a select number of professional programs. Scholarship and teaching, and the connections between the two, are the central axes of the University.

The next section provides a brief situational analysis focused on undergraduate student enrollment. The situational analysis leads to the conclusion that achieving greater success in meeting Clark University's mission goals depends on enhancing our attractiveness to high quality undergraduate students who are a good fit for the academic opportunities of a research university. Because of the importance and urgency of addressing this challenge, the bulk of this plan update is a management plan directed to this task.

The plan defines major goals for the institution and identifies the strategies to be followed and actions to be taken in order to achieve these major goals, along with performance benchmarks. Action steps are organized around three foci: (i) enhancing the academic, co-curricular and campus experience; (ii) communicating institutional identity; (iii) mobilizing resources and support. The plan reviews the role of faculty in moving Clark forward and includes a financial model indicating anticipated revenues and major areas of expenditure through 2010.

II. Situational Analysis

With respect to the strategic foci identified in 1999, much has been achieved. The University is markedly stronger than it was five years ago. Among the notable accomplishments:

- The quality and fit of the incoming undergraduate classes have improved (for example, the high school GPA of enrolling students increased from 3.27 in 1999 to 3.40 in 2004).
- The campus has been enhanced through the addition of the Traina Center for the Arts, the Dolan Field House, new athletic fields, the Lasry Center for the Biosciences, and renovation of older residence halls.
- The information and technology systems of the University have been substantially upgraded.
- The University Park Partnership (UPP) is cited as a model for university-community cooperation in neighborhood development and has given Clark considerable national visibility, a visibility increased by the success of programs in K-12 education. The UPP has also contributed to improved safety within the neighborhood.
- The University has successfully hired many superb new faculty who are a good fit for Clark's mission - with approximately 25% of the tenure track faculty hired within the past five years.

- Campaign 2000 was successfully concluded, having surpassed the \$100 million goal, and has been followed by significant investments in alumni programs based partly on an alumni strategic plan.
- Over the past five years, the endowment has grown from \$129 million to \$200 million. Investment income has grown from the target of \$5.2 million in 1999 to \$8.1 million in 2004.

And yet significant challenges remain:

- The recent growth in endowment and tuition income notwithstanding, the revenues available to support academic programs remain substantially below those of some of our current cross-admit peers and all institutions in the aspiration group.¹
- Revenues also fall short of what is needed to meet the ambitions of the faculty with respect to depth and breadth of academic program, resulting in a continuing concern that resources are stretched too thin across multiple mission goals.²
- Several of our graduate programs are close to the minimum size required to maintain high academic quality.
- The number of faculty members who have successfully obtained the major, multi-year externally funded research grants needed to support research groups is relatively small.
- In undergraduate admissions, the yield on admitted students has remained flat resulting in total enrollment and net tuition revenues below target. We are competing with better colleges for better students but not yet successful in achieving improved yield among these students.
- We have fallen short of our goals to improve retention of first year students.
- We remain heavily dependent on merit aid in undergraduate student recruitment and have a low percentage of enrolling students paying full tuition.
- Our location continues to be cited as a significant negative by many prospective undergraduate students.

Given these challenges, the overarching concern is a need to enhance the attractiveness of Clark University to prospective undergraduate students who are a good fit for the rigorous academic program at a research university in an urban location. Addressing this challenge not only requires and will result in improvements in the undergraduate program but also will help secure a necessary base for progress toward other institutional goals in scholarship and graduate education.

Increased attractiveness allows for continued improvement in the quality and fit of enrolling undergraduate students and will create depth in the admit pool that can serve as

¹ The University identifies a current peer group comprising the institutions with whom we cross-admit the most undergraduate students. Aspiration schools are the sub-set of colleges and universities in the cross-admit group with whom Clark's head-to-head win percentage is 25% or less (for every one student enrolling at Clark, three or more enroll at the other institution).

² This challenge was noted by NEASC during our last ten-year re-accreditation visit.

a buffer against intensified competition for good students. The gains of the past five years in undergraduate student quality and tuition revenue have occurred at a time of stability within the national economy and with the benefit of growing numbers of graduating high school seniors. Over the next five years the University must prepare for the possibility of more difficult economic times and for an expected decline in the number of graduating high school seniors in the Northeast.

Currently just one in five of the undergraduate students admitted to Clark actually matriculates at the University. Absent improvement in yield, any decline in the number of applications would put downward pressure on enrollment, student quality, and tuition revenue. Acceptance of more of our students by institutions in our aspiration group, in order to meet their own enrollment goals, would place further pressure on our yield, student quality, and tuition revenue.

National survey data and our own institutional surveys provide consistent results on the important decision drivers for prospective liberal arts undergraduate students. Generally the most important factors (not ranked) are size of institution, availability and quality of majors, academic reputation, financial and merit aid, location, personal attention, campus social life, and co-curricular experience.

Several of these decision drivers serve as broad filters for applicants. Some students are interested in large institutions, others in small colleges. Some students seek a more urban location, other students a more rural or small-town environment. The availability of a particular major and the actual cost of attendance also serve as filters for students. At a small private liberal arts research university in a mid-sized city, Clark University is a good fit for some students but not for others.

With respect to the other decision drivers, surveys of admitted students indicate that Clark is rated somewhat higher than a broad group of selective private peer institutions in terms of personal attention, actual cost of attendance, and undergraduate teaching commitment. Clark is rated somewhat lower than many of these selective institutions in terms of academic facilities, campus life, academic reputation, extra-curricular opportunities, and the overall environment of academic excellence. Two of these decision drivers—academic reputation and location—require further examination.

Academic reputation

Survey data indicate that academic reputation is a crucial decision driver for most undergraduate students and especially for students of high academic ability. While Clark is viewed nationally as being very strong in certain undergraduate majors (e.g., geography and psychology), our overall perceived academic reputation among prospective undergraduate students is not as high as that of our aspiration comparison group, and not decisively stronger than many of the institutions in our current cross admit peer group.

Why is Clark's perceived academic reputation not higher among prospective students? Several factors are at work here.

- First, perceived academic reputation among prospective undergraduates is influenced more by the students who enroll than by the academic profile of the faculty who teach at an institution. Prospective students typically use widely available benchmarks of student characteristics, such as average SAT scores, high school rank, and admissions selectivity as proxy variables for quality and reputation. This tendency is reinforced by peer-on-peer comparisons: an institution's academic reputation is enhanced when a student of strong academic ability chooses to enroll there. The aggregate academic profile of undergraduate students enrolling at Clark is weaker than that at all institutions in our aspiration group.
- Second, academic reputation is impacted by aggregate measures of persistence (such as first-year retention and six-year graduation rates) and other outcomes (such as career and graduate school placement, student fellowships and awards) that do not control for the characteristics of enrolled students. Clark's six-year graduation rate may be typical of institutions with a similar student profile, but it is below that observed at institutions with a stronger student academic profile.
- Third, academic reputation is in part a matter of resources expended on academic programs and student support. Many of our peers maintain substantially higher expenditures per student as a consequence of larger endowments, larger annual gift income, and higher net tuition revenue per student. Lower resources per student at Clark translate into lower expenditures on everything from the breadth of courses offered to quality of facilities and extent of support for campus life.
- Fourth, academic reputation is enhanced by the presence of nationally ranked professional programs (e.g., law and management schools) and by the presence of academic and research programs with national visibility. Clark University's one professional school – while well regarded – is not nationally ranked.

While we may not agree with all these drivers of perceived academic reputation, we cannot ignore them. We must find ways to translate the strength of our academic core – the quality of the faculty and the academic program – into a stronger received reputation of academic prestige among prospective students.

Clark has gained considerable benefit over the past several years from alternative assessments of colleges and universities, including the book *Colleges that Change Lives*. The national reputation of our strong psychology program, moreover, continues to support a yield among prospective psychology majors higher than that among the admit pool as a whole (26% vs. 20%). Finally, students and parents who look beyond the drivers of perceived academic reputation to markers of the actual quality of the undergraduate academic experience (e.g., quality of teaching, small classes, access to faculty, modern facilities) find much of value at Clark University.

There is also concern about the quality of some fundamental aspects of the academic and campus life experience. While the vast majority of graduating seniors rate their experience at Clark as very good, these seniors also identify areas in which they would like to see improvement. Frequently cited areas of concern include first-year advising, course availability, various aspects of student life (residential life, food, social life), and the overall sense of community on campus. More generally, not enough graduating seniors are truly passionate about their Clark experience.

Location

Among prospective students who visit Clark University and do not enroll, perceptions of Worcester and of the neighborhood are the most frequently cited negative factor. Over the past decade, colleges and universities located in major urban centers, such as New York, Washington and Boston, have experienced increased numbers of applications based in part on growing student interest in studying in large cities. Despite our proximity to Boston, Clark has not found a way to realize major benefits from this urban trend. Worcester does not have the reputation of being either a lively urban location or a strong college town. In addition, the immediate neighborhood in which Clark is located continues to be viewed as unattractive.

Universities can serve as the anchor of neighborhood development. It is not clear, however, that Clark and its institutional partners have the resources to push forward such neighborhood development at a fast enough pace to do more than moderate the current negative impact on undergraduate admissions. Students, faculty and staff must be safe and feel safe on campus. Progress has been made in reducing crime and improving physical security in the neighborhood. Further progress must be made in ensuring that prospective students and their parents see the neighborhood and the campus as a safe and healthy place to spend the college years.

In recent years Clark has made progress in integrating our urban context into the academic curriculum through courses in many different departments – from the arts to urban geography, education to environmental science, the creation of the concentration in urban development and social change, through HERO undergraduate research, and other initiatives.

III. Major Institutional Goals

Over the next five years Clark University's primary institutional goal is to increase the attractiveness of the institution to prospective undergraduate students who are well prepared to take advantage of the academic opportunities of a research university.

Our primary institutional goal is to enhance Clark's attractiveness to undergraduate students who are a good fit for the type of academic and co-curricular experience available at a small liberal-arts-based research university located in an urban setting.

Enhancing the attractiveness of Clark to prospective undergraduate students will allow continued improvement in the quality and fit of students enrolling at the University, support improvements in net tuition revenue, and provide greater capacity to reach other mission goals in scholarship and graduate education.

For Clark to succeed, the resources invested across the breadth of the institution – from faculty scholarship to graduate education and student life – must be viewed in relation to this core priority of enhancing our attractiveness to prospective undergraduate students. If we are to avoid blunt trade offs between different aspects of our mission, then investments in graduate education and faculty scholarship must pay off demonstrably in terms of Clark’s attractiveness to undergraduate students. Stated another way, our goals in research and graduate education cannot be divorced from our primary institutional goal.

Our goal is not to be the preferred choice for all students, but the first choice among a sub-set of students who are a good fit for what Clark has to offer. We do not, for example, expect to be the preferred choice among students seeking a traditional liberal arts college experience in a rural location, or among students seeking a very large school in a metropolitan location. If a prospective student is cross-admitted to Clark and to some very good NESCAC³ schools and that student really wants a classic small-town liberal arts college experience, we should not expect that student to enroll at Clark.

Because Clark does not match up easily with any particular dominant category of higher education institutions (such as traditional liberal arts colleges or large research universities) we are more liable than most to receive applications from students for whom we are not the best fit. At the same time, many of the students who apply to Clark University are a good fit. More of these students must perceive Clark as a preferred choice when set against schools within our aspiration group. Stated another way, a significant share of the existing admit pool are viewed by Clark as being a good fit for the institution, but more of these students themselves must view Clark as a good fit.

To be useful as a planning tool, the directional goal of enhanced attractiveness must take on operational traction and specificity. The plan must provide operational goals that indicate the particular basis on which we seek to improve attractiveness, as well as the scale, rate, and timing of improvement in the context of the resources available.

We now lay out specific operational goals for the year 2010, beginning with the undergraduate program. These goals reflect our assessment of what can be achieved if the strategies laid out in this plan are effectively and successfully implemented, and if resources are secured to fund the action items specified in the plan. This is not a comprehensive list of institutional operational goals. Rather, we focus on operational goals that relate to the primary institutional goal of increasing our attractiveness to prospective undergraduate students who are a good fit for Clark.

³ The NESCAC schools are Amherst, Bates, Bowdoin, Colby, Connecticut College, Hamilton, Middlebury, Trinity, Tufts, Wesleyan, and Williams College.

Undergraduate admissions and enrollment goals for 2010:

Increased attractiveness is most usefully defined in terms of outcomes. Our goal is to increase attractiveness among prospective undergraduate students such that we can:

- (a) Improve the academic profile of the enrolling undergraduate class with an emphasis on raising the floor of enrolled-student academic quality.
- (b) Generate greater depth in the pool of students who would choose to enroll at Clark in order to serve as a buffer against intensified competition.

With respect to academic profile, the University still has some way to go in terms of ensuring a good match between the characteristics of the enrolling class and the demands of a rigorous academic program. With respect to depth in the admission pool, we seek to reach a point where we have a modest wait list of students of adequate quality and fit that can be turned to as needed to ensure enrollment targets are met.

Specific enrollment goals are as follows:

1. Reduce the percentage of first year students with lower levels of academic preparedness (measured as students with a high school GPA of less than 3.0) to no more than 7% of the enrolling class (from 15.3%).
2. Increase the percentage of first year students of high academic ability (measured as students who meet our current eligibility requirements for merit-based scholarships) to 39%-43% of the enrolling class (from 33%).
3. Increase incoming class size to 575-600 students.

Achieving these goals would result in total undergraduate enrollment by 2010 in the range of 2100-2200. The mean high school GPA of enrolling undergraduate students would increase from the current level of 3.40 to between 3.52 and 3.57 in 2010.

4. Increase the percentage of international students to no less than 10% of each incoming class (from 8%).
5. Achieve a yield for ALANA students equivalent to the yield for the incoming class as a whole (from 2-3% below).
6. Increase the percentage of enrolling students with the capacity to pay full tuition to 36% (from 31%).

Undergraduate persistence goals for 2010 are as follows:

7. Increase the average retention of all first year undergraduate students to 89% (from 86%).
8. Increase the six-year graduation rate for incoming first-year students to 78% (from 71%).⁴

Scholarship

Excellent scholarship and creative work take place across the whole institution in graduate and undergraduate departments and in research centers and institutes.

Goals for research:

1. Cultivate four or five areas of critical mass in research in which Clark University can achieve national impact. Each of these research foci should provide a basis for giving Clark broad national visibility and an enhanced academic reputation among prospective students in linked areas of undergraduate study.
2. Research foci may be disciplinary or inter-disciplinary in orientation and may operate within the framework of a department, center, institute, or school. The Higgins School for the Humanities will continue to serve as a coordinating hub for some scholarly activity in the humanities. At least one new research institute will be established at Clark University, most likely in the area of Children, Family and Community Development. While a new research center likely requires some seed funding, most core operating costs will be covered by gifts and grants.
3. Over the next five years externally funded research at Clark University will increase by 30% with enhanced support from the recently expanded Office of Sponsored Programs. Research indirect will grow by approximately 25% as a result of higher levels of grant funding, an increase in the indirect rate, and improvements in net indirect cost recovery.
4. Enhance visibility for and recognition of high quality scholarship across the university, in both graduate and undergraduate departments. Particular attention will be given to ensuring that we retain the collegiality of a single community of teacher-scholars that values scholarly contributions across the breadth of the University.

Graduate education

With respect to graduate programs, the University affirms the core goal as stated in the existing academic and financial plan that Clark seeks “to strengthen the quality and

⁴ By definition six-year graduation rates refer to the characteristics and experience of a class admitted six years ago, rather than the current incoming class. For this reason the impact of initiatives tends to be lag as well.

visibility of its graduate programs and their linkage to the undergraduate college.” The primary institutional objective is best served not by diminishing the University’s graduate profile, but by achieving greater focus and by making clearer the means by which investments in graduate education and scholarship are expected to strengthen the attractiveness of Clark to prospective undergraduate students.

Doctoral programs:

1. Ensure that the two existing Ph.D. programs that are highly ranked nationally (psychology and geography) are on track to retain national standing. This will require consideration of specific program focus, cultivation of inter-disciplinary linkages involving faculty resources in other departments, and the delivery of well-enrolled undergraduate majors by program faculty.
2. Ensure that the two small PhD programs in economics and history are positioned to achieve excellence by linking to other departments and research foci at Clark and within the Worcester area. In economics, the likely links are to geography, IDCE, and the Marsh Institute. In history, the links are to the Strassler Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies and to local and regional historical organizations.
3. Develop in the sciences a comprehensive plan to identify ways in which doctoral education at Clark can be connected to one or more University research foci. Most likely this plan will draw on partnerships with other institutions in the area, such as WPI and the University of Massachusetts Medical Center.
4. Expect all Ph.D. programs to consider ways to shorten time to degree, to train students pursuing non-academic careers, and to develop teaching skills in line with the recommendations of the Pew Report on Re-Envisioning the Ph.D.
5. We anticipate a stable number of doctoral students, and it is unlikely that any proposals for new Ph.D. programs will be supported.

Master’s programs:

The presence of high quality Master’s programs enriches the University and constitutes another important source of tuition revenue. The recent success of the International Development, Community, and Environment (IDCE) graduate program has enhanced the visibility and reputation of Clark University.

1. We affirm the goal in Master’s education of enhancing the quality of tuition-based professionally oriented degree programs. Specifically those in IDCE, Education, and GSOM (see below) will be emphasized, with the program in English remaining the only liberal-arts oriented MA outside of fifth-year offerings.

2. We anticipate only modest growth in the number of Master's students enrolled at Clark, with emphasis placed on enhancing quality (including quality of the fifth-year student experience).

Graduate School of Management

The Graduate School of Management (GSOM) has recently adopted a new five year plan. Through the implementation of this plan:

1. We seek to elevate the standing and visibility of GSOM in ways that link closely to Clark's academic signatures and that enhance Clark's academic reputation among prospective graduate and undergraduate students.
2. As Clark's only professional school, GSOM has an opportunity to play an increasing leadership role in developing interdisciplinary curricular programs and in enhancing economic development in Central Massachusetts.

COPACE

1. Ensure that the focus and quality of programs offered by COPACE to adult learners support the overall brand identity of Clark as a prestigious liberal-arts based research university.
2. Growth in COPACE will most likely be in post-baccalaureate degree and non-degree programs and will quite possibly have a significant international dimension.

Faculty and Staff

1. Place a high priority in faculty hiring on recruiting faculty who can succeed in an environment where there are high expectations for faculty members in all three areas of scholarship, teaching, and involvement in the work of the University.
2. Expand the diversity of the faculty by increasing the number of faculty of color.
3. Improve faculty and staff compensation as an institutional priority. The capacity to improve compensation is tightly coupled to our success in meeting institutional goals of enhanced attractiveness. While compensation will be benchmarked against peer groups, actual compensation increases will be driven by institutional performance.

IV Strategy

“Clark needs to generate higher visibility and a stronger brand or image as an antidote to the perception that competing institutions are academically stronger.”
Herrup and McSwan 2004.

Success in achieving the primary institutional goal of increasing the attractiveness of the institution to prospective undergraduate students and meeting the attendant operational goals laid out in the previous section depends on implementing strategies that will:

- (a) strengthen Clark’s perceived academic reputation while providing students with opportunities and outcomes that are reasons to choose Clark over other institutions of equivalent quality;
- (b) build a vibrant and attractive campus experience that overcomes current negative perceptions of location;
- (c) enhance the visibility of Clark University among prospective students, parents, alumni and other key constituencies.

The cornerstone of such a strategy is the development of a stronger and distinctive institutional identity on the basis of which Clark delivers focused excellence. To break through existing perceptions of academic reputation and the campus life experience, we must focus attention on these aspects of the institution where Clark can deliver excellence and recruit students well matched to those areas of excellence.

For this strategy to succeed, especially within a constrained resource environment, institutional identity must be based on the assets of the institution, and it must excite passion and interest on the part of faculty, staff, current and prospective students, and alumni. For two decades Clark has grasped for such an institutional identity through such concepts as the University-College, elbow teaching, the ‘pea-pod’, and programmatic innovations such as the fifth year free. In retrospect it may be fair to say that while modestly successful our efforts were not sufficiently market focused, lacked comprehensive integration across the whole institution, and at times suffered from uneven implementation.

Going forward the opportunity exists to build a strong identity that is defined by our orientation as an institution that makes a difference in the communities of which we are a part, and that provides rigorous signature inquiry-based learning opportunities for students within a campus setting visibly international and inter-cultural. This is an institution widely known for a few focused areas of research excellence backed by strong graduate programs directed toward issues of compelling public concern in areas such as science, environment, child development, education, ethnic conflict, and global economic change. It is an institution known for the opportunities available for students to be actively engaged in exploring and addressing these concerns. It is an institution known for a lively international and inter-cultural campus that is connected locally and globally.

Clark’s profile as a research university is critical to this institutional identity. It is through targeted research centers, the scholarship of faculty across the whole University,

and focused graduate programs that Clark will gain and sustain the reputation for having an impact and making a difference in the world. It is time for Clark to move beyond a zero sum trade-off between investing in graduate education and scholarship on the one hand and improving our attractiveness to prospective undergraduate students on the other. The University must not only concentrate the resources of its research profile in areas of real excellence consistent with institutional identity, but also hold faculty and staff involved in these areas accountable for translating program strength into undergraduate enrollments.

How will we succeed in building this stronger institutional identity within the context of available resources? Rapid progress requires overcoming several structural impediments. Foremost among these is the tension between building student quality and increasing tuition revenue as a source of funding for enhancements in academic program and campus life. Because Clark is heavily dependent on undergraduate tuition as a source of revenue, efforts to improve student quality have necessarily been limited by a need to meet enrollment and tuition goals. While over the past five years Clark has made important progress in academic quality, the academic profile of the incoming class remains weaker than that at colleges in the aspiration comparison group, thereby limiting improvement in Clark’s perceived reputational standing.

Because of this ‘Catch-22’ relationship between resources, student academic profile, quality of program, and perceived academic reputation, we intend to implement a plan that tightly coordinates and balances three mission-critical domains of operation:

- Strengthening the academic, campus and co-curricular experience of students in line with institutional identity
- Communicating more effectively institutional identity and attendant opportunities to prospective students, parents and other constituencies
- Mobilizing greater support and resources for the University, including greater involvement of alumni, annual fund and capital gifts, foundation and corporate support, and an enlarged tuition-base.

Table 1 shows strategic action areas associated with the three major domains of operation.

Table 1: Defining areas for strategic action

<p>Enhancing academic, co-curricular And campus experience</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen the fundamentals of the undergraduate experience to enhance educational outcomes and reputation; • Build content behind institutional signatures: <i>make a difference, learn through inquiry, experience diverse cultures.</i> • Enhance and tune the campus life
---	---

	<p>experience to improve student satisfaction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve quality and fit of enrolling students to ensure academic success
Communicating institutional identity and educational opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launch an integrated university marketing plan based on institutional identity using print and web media. • Expand alumni admissions program to communicate the value of a Clark education, and implement a parent and current student program to build word of mouth support.
Mobilizing resources and support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieve growth in enrollment and net tuition revenue in the context of a primary commitment to quality. • Expand alumni communities within the United States and overseas. • Increase Clark fund gifts, endowment, program, corporate and foundation support.

Initiatives in these three areas of operation need to be carefully sequenced. We will not succeed with a strategy that more aggressively markets Clark University to better students without simultaneously making improvements in key aspects of student academic, co-curricular and campus experience. Investments in the academic and co-curricular experience, as well as in marketing and recruitment, will depend on mobilizing additional resources and support for the University. Efforts to raise the academic profile of the incoming class through increased selectivity need to be balanced with a need to maintain the tuition resource base. A key feature of our plan strategy, in short, is balanced and coordinated implementation.

Cutting across these strategies is a need to focus on effective implementation. The best strategy will fail without a staff that can deliver leadership and effective implementation. Opportunities for enhanced implementation include, for example:

1. Increasing synergies among alumni affairs, admissions, and university advancement in working with alumni and parents and other units in student recruitment, alumni engagement, and fundraising.
2. Ensuring department planning and resource allocation are driven directly by the priorities laid out in this document, and implementing a stronger process to assess the degree to which units and departments have met institutional goals.

3. Assessing the performance of faculty and staff more directly against institutional priorities and implementing greater accountability for achieving institutional objectives. The University will also need to find new ways to help faculty and staff succeed in their work.
4. Establishing with faculty committees the criteria and processes to be followed in evaluating whether any academic programs should be discontinued, and with staff and faculty to evaluate other activities that may need to be discontinued for key institutional goals to be met.
5. Continue and accelerate systematic re-engineering of administrative functions with savings available for use in programs and revenue-generating initiatives.
6. Integration of marketing initiatives across the University under the auspices of a single unified marketing plan that includes both the undergraduate college and graduate programs, including those in GSOM and COPACE.

V. Enhancing the academic, co-curricular and campus experience

We now review action steps that will be taken in each of the strategic priorities areas, beginning with enhancing the academic, co-curricular and campus experience for students. Improving Clark University's attractiveness to high quality students who are a good fit for the academic opportunities of a research university requires that we:

Strengthen the fundamentals of the undergraduate experience to enhance educational outcomes and academic reputation.

Clark must upgrade first-year academic advising, increase access to small classes during the first year, and provide high quality facilities to support the academic program. Getting the fundamentals right ensures that Clark is a credible option for talented students seeking a high quality academic experience. There will be some aspects of the 'fundamentals' that our research and graduate profile should help us to do especially well (e.g. incorporating latest research into introductory courses). Over the next five years, Clark will implement the following action steps:

1. Develop learning and developmental goals for the first-year, the Program of Liberal Studies, and the major. Implement an assessment approach that tracks performance in achieving these educational goals and uses this assessment more systematically to drive specific academic program initiatives.
2. Strengthen first-year advising by ensuring undergraduate students are advised by faculty in their area of interest, providing clear expectations as well as expanded

- training for faculty advisors, use of peer-learning advisors, and providing faculty regular feedback on their effectiveness as advisors.
3. Increase the number and range of small classes available to undergraduate students during their first year by adding to the number of first-year seminars, offering more small sections of large classes, and introducing experimental 'active learning' gateway classes.
 4. Renovate the Goddard Library as the 'intellectual commons' of the University. Schematic design of the renovation will occur in 2005-06. Start-date for renovation will depend on fund-raising success.
 5. Complete other major academic building renovations (math-physics building, Carlson Hall, IDCE House).
 6. Monitor and assess the rigor of undergraduate courses in relation to the profile of the incoming undergraduate class. The initial focus here will be on ensuring that all courses require of students a level of work appropriate for four credit hours.
 7. Implement a stronger program of academic support for ALANA students and first-generation college students that includes the following: an expanded new-student orientation, a program of peer assisted learning in targeted gateway courses, and improved policies and practices for identifying and responding to students experiencing academic difficulty.
 8. Implement a new major in environmental science and a new minor in entrepreneurship. The first is one of several ways to make better use in undergraduate recruiting of recent investments in the sciences as well as acknowledged strengths in such departments as Geography and IDCE. The second is a way to capitalize on Clark's opportunity to develop a unique emphasis in entrepreneurship, one that can not only make a significant impact on recruiting but also enhance general University visibility.
 9. Restructure program offerings in women's studies away from doctoral education toward an undergraduate major in women's and gender studies and tuition-based master's programs linked to IDCE.
 10. Clarify planning for course offerings in interdisciplinary programs relative to academic departments. This addresses a long-standing problem related to Clark's habit of creating exciting interdisciplinary curricula without adequate attention to their economic and personnel impact on existing programs.
 11. Strengthen pre-health (pre-med) advising and co-curricular programming. Clark must exploit for undergraduate recruiting its new building, its opportunities for undergraduate research, and its location near a major medical school (and vet school and pharmacy school for that matter).

12. Expand use of technology in academic programs to enhance, not replace, classroom teaching and particularly to enrich signature areas.

Build program content behind Clark University's signatures: make a difference, learn through inquiry, and experience diverse cultures

“Make a Difference” describes Clark’s mission as an institution that uses its intellectual capital to understand and address problems in the local and global communities of which it is a part. Because of Clark’s status as a small research university, its urban location, and its long tradition of community partnerships, Clark is in an ideal position to make a difference in both local and global communities through the academic and extracurricular activities of its students, the scholarly activities of its faculty, and its partnerships with community organizations. To build this signature we will:

1. Cultivate four or five focused areas of research excellence where Clark University can make a difference on the national and international scale. This also requires a review of the focus and direction of existing research centers, including the Marsh Institute, the Strassler Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies and the Hiatt Center for Urban Education.
2. Ensure tight alignment between graduate programs and areas of research excellence that link to institutional identity. This is especially important for the larger doctoral programs, each of which must be tightly linked to one or more of the research foci.
3. Create additional opportunities for students to make a difference as a part of their Clark education.
4. Promote and give visibility to students and alumni who make a difference. The achievements of graduate alumni, including those graduating with Master’s degrees, should be given greater visibility.

“Learn through Inquiry” describes Clark’s commitment to hands-on learning and problem solving. The skills needed for problem solving in the discipline are developed sequentially, through a pervasive pedagogy of engagement. Throughout their Clark experience, students learn by actively working through real problems, issues and questions, mastering modes of inquiry, and acquiring the knowledge base required to ask and to answer important questions. Each student has an opportunity to participate in a culminating academic experience in the context of senior seminars, research, or other capstone experiences. To build this signature we will:

1. Promote consideration of inquiry-based learning pedagogies by faculty in relation to learning outcome goals.

2. Increase the percentage of undergraduate students who participate in signature learning opportunities. Consider when to make an active-learning project (such as research with faculty, senior thesis or capstone project) a graduation requirement.
3. Investigate ways to use graduate teaching assistants to support enhanced inquiry-based learning opportunities.
4. Promote opportunities for inquiry-based learning and creative civic engagement in Worcester. Our urban location, along with the newly established Worcester UniverCity Partnership, constitutes an important setting for students and faculty to engage in inquiry-based learning and to make a difference in their community. We will encourage further integration of our urban context in the curriculum and teaching pedagogies, as for example in the urban development and social change concentration.

“Experience Diverse Cultures” describes Clark’s commitment to integrate the richness of many cultures into campus life and the student experience. Clark has melded its liberal arts focus and specific areas of research excellence to create educational programs with global reach, and has made a commitment to the value of diversity in the education of all students. Global opportunities and the intercultural character of the campus community provide a transformative experience for students. To build this signature we will:

1. Increase the percentage of Clark undergraduate students who study abroad from 30% to 35%, and convert the position of study abroad director to a reformatted full-time 12-month position. As part of this initiative the University will add additional non-traditional summer study abroad opportunities beyond that of the existing May Term in Luxembourg.
2. Explore opportunities to expand area studies offerings through collaboration with other consortium schools.
3. Increase international and inter-cultural programming on campus.
4. Increase international dimensions of such units as GSOM and COPACE while increasing visibility of international elements of such graduate-research programs as those in Geography and IDCE.

Enhance the Campus Life Experience

As part of an integrated institutional identity that includes the setting for learning as a vibrant international and multi-cultural environment, enhance and tune the campus life experience. A strong campus life experience is at the core of the strategy to address concerns over location. While the University Park Partnership (UPP) has made great strides, this remains a project where the most significant returns occur over the long term. A parallel strategy must focus on near term improvements in campus life to complement

the longer term outcomes associated with the UPP. The University will work to develop a stronger and more vibrant campus culture, along with strategies to take advantage of the opportunities offered by Worcester and Boston. To achieve these goals we will:

1. Strengthen the programming of Higgins University Center as a student center by adding a coffee house, extending hours, enhancing use of other spaces within the building, and changing the method of events programming in the building, and by directing a larger share of student activity fees toward support for these campus programming initiatives.
2. Develop Dana Commons as the international and inter-cultural center on campus, relocating study abroad to this location and augmenting programming on the upper floor of the building.
3. Provide faculty and staff mentors for all student groups.
4. Review price and positioning of student meal plans with an eye to offering an upgraded option.
5. Construct a new residence hall with market-attractive amenities, but also as part of a general plan to upgrade living facilities.
6. Strengthen the residence hall experience through programming conducted under the auspices of the office of residential life and housing and the student residential housing association.
7. Strengthen campus safety through improved campus lighting, limited card access to campus residence halls and buildings, experienced staff dispatchers in campus police, and closer cooperation with the Worcester police department.
8. Assess investment of additional resources in visual and performing arts activities for students to enhance yield and student retention.
9. More strategically utilize athletics in recruiting students who are a good fit.
10. Enhance the Main Street frontage to campus through upgrading and property acquisition as resources allow.

VI. Faculty

One of the major accomplishments of the past five years is the successful replacement of retiring faculty by many new talented faculty members who are a good fit for the mission and institutional goals of Clark University. Going forward we do not anticipate any significant increase in the number of full-time faculty, except as needed in response to enrollment growth. The University has targeted the natural sciences as an area of desired enrollment growth but we will need to respond to the distribution of enrollments as it occurs.

Faculty members at Clark University are already asked to do much. A plan that asks faculty who already carry a heavy load in scholarship, teaching and service simply to 'do more' is unlikely to succeed. Our primary focus must be on finding ways to (i) promote the success of faculty as teacher-scholars, (ii) enhance the effectiveness of faculty in teaching and advising, and (iii) to ensure equity in work load across all faculty.

1. We re-affirm the current standards and procedures as codified in the faculty handbook with respect to minimum expectations for scholarship, teaching effectiveness and service, including faculty advising. All faculty are expected to be effective teacher-scholars, effective student advisors, and be responsible for their fair share of service. The integrity of our academic community depends on this principle.
2. This does not mean that all faculty need to assign their time in the same way. At certain points in a faculty member's career, it may make sense for more of their time to be allocated to scholarship, to teaching, or to student advising. We believe some greater flexibility in time-allocation is desirable. For this to work, however, the institution must recognize and reward the different ways in which faculty move the institution forward.
3. The mechanism exists for a faculty member with research grants to buy out a course as a way of re-allocating time. We need a mechanism that allows for some time re-allocation for faculty members who are doing more than their share of effective teaching, advising, and service – for example by occasionally reducing the teaching load of a faculty member who is very effectively advising and teaching unusually large numbers of students – so they can reasonably commit time to scholarship. We are phasing in course releases for this purpose this year with a focus on faculty in undergraduate departments who carry a five course load and who are teaching and advising unusually large numbers of students.
4. Such time re-allocation needs to be distinguished from more general concerns over teaching loads. It is probably not realistic to expect an across the board reduction in teaching loads for faculty during the next five years.
5. Over the last several years the University has clarified the role of laboratories in the teaching load of faculty, especially in science departments. We will examine whether the current policy should be further formalized so that laboratories show up clearly on the teaching record of faculty.
6. The growth of inter-disciplinary scholarship has been an important feature of innovation in the academy. At Clark University, tight faculty resources have sometimes led to difficulties in balancing the demands on faculty presented by their participation in disciplinary and inter-disciplinary programs. We will ensure that core teaching needs of inter-disciplinary programs are met on a continuing basis.

7. The University will investigate new ways of recruiting additional faculty of color, possibly involving fellowships for early career faculty of color.
8. The administration will recommend a revision to the current sabbatical policy to provide faculty with the additional option of applying for a one semester sabbatical leave at 80% salary after every three years of full-time service (details to be worked out in discussions with PBR and COP).
9. We will seek gift funding for a faculty fellowship program targeted at providing summer support or course releases for faculty taking a leadership role in the renewal of the curriculum, and in new approaches to advising and teaching pedagogies, and in institutional grant submissions.
10. We recognize that the current faculty travel fund amount is too low. We will adopt as a goal doubling the faculty annual travel grant from \$700 to \$1400 during the time of the plan. Given our other priorities, including faculty compensation, this increase is most likely to occur on a phased basis starting in FY08. If revenues allow we will move on this earlier.
11. We have had requests for the introduction of a formal mentoring program for early career faculty at Clark and plan to introduce such a program next year.

VII. Resources: Institutional Identity, Communication, Marketing

To support investments in improved program quality, we plan to increase our major revenues streams, including both net tuition revenue and gifts to the University.

To increase total tuition revenue we plan to grow the size of the incoming class modestly (to between 575-600 students) while placing a primary emphasis upon quality. We will also seek to increase net tuition revenue per student. We will pursue a targeted initiative to increase the percentage of students enrolling who have the financial resources needed to pay full tuition. It is important to note in this regard that a majority of students in our existing applicant pool do not apply for financial aid or have no demonstrated financial aid need.

Clark is not well known in some potential enrollment areas outside of New England and the mid-Atlantic States. In those districts where Clark is known and attracts many applicants, its yield is low. Therefore Clark must communicate its identity more effectively to the kinds of students who will thrive here. In communicating the advantages of a Clark education the University will track carefully and give greater visibility to student accomplishments. Communication strategies will address both the opportunities available to students while at Clark and the outcomes that follow upon

graduation. To achieve this goal the University will adopt an integrated communications strategy that derives from our defined institutional identity. A key element of our communication strategy is enhanced engagement of alumni, as well as current students and their parents, as a key resource for spreading word about the opportunities available at Clark University. To enhance visibility for Clark University we will:

1. Working with TMP, implement a new marketing plan for the University. The communications strategy will derive directly from brand identity (orientation, signatures, and setting) and address both the opportunities available at Clark and the outcomes associated with a Clark education.
2. Revise the University internet home page and admissions landing pages.
3. Align all units—including, for example, GSOM, COPACE, and IDCE— with brand identity and communications strategy.
4. Revise undergraduate admissions printed materials in line with the updated communications strategy.
5. Strengthen coordination between undergraduate admissions, alumni affairs, and university advancement in joint marketing, and continue to grow the alumni admissions program.
6. Implement a coordinated series of programs to leverage investments in science facilities and raise the visibility of Clark in the sciences.
7. Continue to explore avenues to provide a major impetus to visibility. One proposal, but only one, is for a Center for Public Policy that among other activities would regularly disseminate a “Clark Report,” whose purpose would be to clarify policy issues for a broad audience.

VIII. Resources: Philanthropic Support

Clark’s top three fundraising goals between now and 2010 are:

1. Increase unrestricted gifts to the University to enable increased operational flexibility;
2. Expand the capital donor and prospect base to increase the University’s financial stability via the endowment and restricted gifts; and
3. Reduce the University’s reliance on tuition revenues by increasing number of donors, particularly among alumni, and increasing the amount of contributed income to a minimum of \$16 million per year.

It should be noted that strategic discussions are now in progress to assess the viability of a new comprehensive campaign. Should a new campaign go forward, both revenue and expense projections will need to be revisited and revised accordingly.

Alumni Affairs

The major focus of Alumni Affairs will be to continue increasing alumni engagement through event participation, both on and off campus, and volunteer opportunities. Clark alumni who are engaged and attend events give at a rate roughly double that of all alumni; thus this focus should have a direct positive impact on contributed income. Our goal is to increase event participation by 25%, relying when possible on alumni communities to handle off-site event logistics.

Alumni Affairs will also: align its programming and communications to the University's marketing and communications strategies; continue to encourage alumni registration with the On-line Community and collect email addresses; and focus on initiatives to engage younger alumni, graduate alumni and international alumni.

Specific goals are to: strengthen regional communities; emphasize alumni participation in admissions activities; and expand career networking opportunities between alumni and students through programs such as Alumni in Residence.

Clark's alumni are young – over half of our living alumni graduated within the past twenty years. Further, over 40% live in Massachusetts and approximately 80% live in New England or the Mid-Atlantic states. We will utilize demographics such as these to strategically plan our outreach, events and activities.

The Clark Fund

As the primary vehicle for annual unrestricted donations to the University, the Clark Fund plays a critical role in providing budget relief and financial flexibility. At the beginning of Campaign 2000, the Clark Fund brought in about \$1.5 million annually; by the end of the campaign that figure was in excess of \$2 million annually. Post-campaign growth has slowed at the same time that the numbers of donors and average gift size have remained flat. Our goal is to increase the overall percentage of alumni making annual gifts through the development and implementation of an undergraduate philanthropy program and cultivation of recent graduates. We will also increase gifts from all sources (alumni, parents, friends, foundations, and corporations) for a total of \$3 million annually.

Specific goals are to: double the number of Jonas Clark Fellows; improve stewardship activities; engage younger alumni in philanthropy; and increase the level of alumni participation, recognizing that 500 graduates are added to the alumni base annually.

In order to achieve this level of growth, the Clark Fund will identify, cultivate, solicit and steward additional Jonas Clark Fellows, as well as work cooperatively with corporate and foundations relations to identify foundation funding and matching gift opportunities.

Increased giving percentages will result from increasing the number of young alumni making gifts through targeted programming; growth in parent engagement and fundraising; additional development of class volunteer programs; and reduced donor attrition.

Major Gifts, Planned Giving and Foundation & Corporate Relations

As the primary vehicle for capital and endowment gifts to the University, Major Gifts raises funds for both current needs and new initiatives. During Campaign 2000, major gift fundraising was between \$10 million and \$12 million annually, and the University was successful in developing a core of major donors who remain both generous and loyal to the institution. Post-campaign, the University has met with modest success in expanding its pool of major donors; however, major gifts have been in the \$6-8 million range.

The fiscal 2005 goal is \$8.5 million and our goal is to raise a minimum of \$13 million annually by 2010, with \$7.5 million coming in outright pledges and gifts from individuals. Planned, foundation and corporate gifts and pledges will make up the balance.

Planned Giving

The University's Planned giving program has been growing as bequest intentions, gifts of stock, gifts of life insurance, and a variety of gift annuities and trusts have attracted alumni support. The number of alumni approaching retirement age is rising, which should fuel continued growth in this area. Our goal for 2010 is to be raising a minimum of \$3 million annually in planned gifts.

Foundation & Corporate Relations

Gifts from foundation and corporate sources rebounded in FY05, approaching \$1.5 million. We anticipate continued growth in this area and have a minimum goal of \$2.5 million annually by 2010, largely through a focus on national foundations and increased corporate support.

Specific goals are to: financially support the strategic objectives of this plan by focusing fundraising efforts on priority programs and building projects; and provide budget relief by expanding the University's endowment through the addition of funding for scholarships, fellowships and professorships.

Development Operations

Development Operations will continue to improve its technical capabilities in support of Alumni Affairs, the Clark Fund and Major Gifts, including Planned Giving and Foundation & Corporate Relations. With the establishment of the datamart, there is now in place a solid platform from which prospect research, gift processing, reporting and

stewardship can occur. These new improvements to data collection and fundraising systems should enable the University to stay in closer contact with its alumni, engage them in the life of the University and, ultimately, convert many of them into loyal donors. Over the next five years, Development Operations will continue to enhance and automate its processes; provide actionable data; and strive to create seamless management of the University's expanding prospect and donor pools.

Great strides have been made in this area in recent years. Fundraising strategies continue to evolve as e-mail solicitations, on-line giving, automated phone rooms and online alumni registrations become more commonplace.

Specific goals are to: keep pace with the changes in technology; improve data accuracy; and provide donor-focused support and services.

IX. Financial Model and Sequencing

The attached spreadsheet provides a five-year financial model comprising projected revenues and expenditures through 2010. It is important to emphasize that this is a financial *model*. Its purpose is to project the consequences for both revenues and expenditures of the goals, strategies, and action steps laid out in this update of the academic and financial plan. The following decision points have particular impact on the budget model:

Revenues:

1. The goal in the plan of improving the quality and fit of the undergraduate class constrains the rate of growth of net tuition revenue per student to 2%-3% per year.
2. Growth in total undergraduate enrollment, from improved retention and larger incoming classes, supports growth in total undergraduate revenues *with the exception of FY07*.⁵
3. Net income from enterprises grows slowly as a result of a strategic decision to invest in the future growth of enterprises, with the University continuing to carry the cost of the deficits accrued by GSOM and COPACE.
4. Clark Fund shows modest growth using a baseline projection that exceeds recent performance.
5. Investment income grows at an average annual rate of 3.5%. This assumes the endowment is growing at 3% a year as a result of returns on investment of 8% and a spending rate of 5% while cash balances earn 4% annually and grow by \$1 million per year.

⁵ The graduating class of FY06 was significantly larger than other classes. With the graduation of this class there will probably be a fall in total enrollment in FY07.

6. Sponsored research indirect grows as a result of grant activity increasing across a broader group of faculty, increased recovery of indirect, and some increase in indirect rate.
7. Auxiliary net income increases significantly in FY 08 onwards following the addition of a new residence hall, partially offsetting additional debt cost.
8. Net tuition revenue per student is assumed to improve in the mid-quality level as a result of an increase in the percentage of enrolling students coming from families with incomes over \$100K.

Expenditures

1. Annual compensation increases are modeled at 4%, *except in FY 07 when total revenue growth is below 4%*, reflecting a priority to enhance faculty and staff compensation. To the extent that revenues allow, we will endeavor to ‘catch up’ on anticipated lower salary increases in FY07 with an above model salary increase in out years.
2. Study abroad expenditures grow considerably as a result of the plan to increase the number of students studying abroad, although some of the planned growth is assumed to be in short programs like the current May term in Luxembourg.
3. Additional strategic initiative funding is required to implement the action steps specified in this plan, including the absorption into the budget of items currently covered by new venture funding.
4. Additional debt service is incurred to finance a new residence hall.
5. Any other major capital projects, including renovation of the Goddard library, are to be funded by gifts.

As indicated earlier, a key feature of this plan is the need to achieve an appropriate sequencing of investments in the University that reflects available resources. It is not likely that we will be able to fund all desired investments in the first years of the plan. In considering the sequencing of investments, we have been particularly mindful of: (i) our primary focus on improving attractiveness to undergraduate students; (ii) identifying investments that can generate near term revenue growth – revenues that can be re-invested in further rounds of improvement; (iii) investments that respond to factors that detract from the Clark experience and undermine an otherwise positive experience.

Table 2 lays out a provisional sequencing of selected action initiatives. The table identifies three time blocks: 2005-06, 2006-2008, and 2008-2010. While the action initiatives for 2005-06 are now finalized within the FY06 budget, other initiatives are

subject to change based on resource availability and shifting opportunities. Only selected major initiatives are identified (with an emphasis on those with budget impact).

Table 2. Sequencing of action steps

	Enhancing academic, co-curricular and campus experience	Communicating institutional identity and educational opportunities	Mobilizing resources and support
2005-2006	<p>Expand first year seminar program.</p> <p>Enhance faculty advising program.</p> <p>Improve academic profile of enrolling class.</p> <p>Launch entrepreneurship minor.</p> <p>Launch a Women’s Studies major.</p> <p>Launch new ALANA orientation.</p> <p>Strengthen programming of Higgins University Center.</p> <p>Complete Math-Science renovation.</p> <p>Relocate Math-Computer Science, freeing up additional space for GSOM.</p> <p>Implement food facility enhancements.</p>	<p>Introduce new undergraduate view book based on TMP communications strategy.</p> <p>Revise main web pages based on TMP communications strategy.</p> <p>Launch new format alumni communities in target US cities and internationally.</p> <p>Link enterprise units to communications strategy.</p> <p>Implement targeted marketing initiatives in natural sciences and entrepreneurship</p>	<p>Expand alumni admissions program.</p> <p>Implement targeted initiative for households able to pay full tuition.</p> <p>Pilot new parent-current student program in eastern Massachusetts.</p> <p>Complete campaign feasibility study.</p> <p>Growth in Clark fund and alumni participation.</p> <p>Growth in major gifts.</p> <p>Target enrollment for the Class of 2009 at 555 students.</p>
2006-2008	<p>Construct new residence hall.</p> <p>Commence library renovation.</p> <p>Launch environmental science major.</p> <p>Establish Center for Children, Families and Community.</p> <p>Continued improvement in student academic profile.</p> <p>Implement additional</p>	<p>Implement integrated marketing plan.</p>	<p>Plan for capital campaign.</p> <p>Growth in Clark fund and alumni participation.</p> <p>Growth in major gifts.</p> <p>Target enrollment for Class of 2011 at 585 students.</p>

	<p>program initiatives in the visual and performing arts. New faculty hires based on enrollment. Introduce new study abroad options.</p>		
2008-2010	<p>Continued improvement in student academic profile. New faculty hires based on enrollment. Introduce additional varsity sport. Introduce new study abroad options. Main street frontage projects.</p>	<p>Implement integrated marketing plan.</p>	<p>Possible capital campaign. Growth in Clark fund and alumni participation. Growth in major gifts. Class of 2013 targeted at 600 students. Add an Alumni House.</p>

X. Benchmarks

The use of benchmarks to track processes and outcomes is a key part of the implementation strategy for this plan. We recognize three categories of benchmarks: outcome variables, management variables and peer overlap group benchmarks. We review each group in turn.

Outcome variables track progress made toward achieving operational goals.

Undergraduate Quality and Fit	2004-05	Five Year Goal -FY 10
% of enrolling class with high school GPA of less than 3.0	15.3%	7.0%
Average high school GPA of entering class	3.40	3.52-3.57
% of enrolling class of merit/achievement quality	33%	39%-43%
% of enrolling class who are international students	8%	10%

Undergraduate enrollment	2004-05	Five Year Goal -FY 10
Size of 1 st year class	528	575-600
% 1 st year class with the financial capacity to pay full tuition ⁶	31%	36%
Yield on admitted 1 st year students	20.0%	22.0%
Total fall undergraduate enrollment	2004	2150-2250

Undergraduate Outcomes	2004-05	Five Year Goal -FY 10
Retention rate for 1 st year students	86%	89%
Six year graduation rate	71%	78%
% students participating in active learning projects ⁷	40%	60%
Number of students admitted to medical school ⁸	4	10

Graduate	2004-05	Five Year Goal -FY 10
Doctoral programs ranked in top two quartiles by NRC ranking	2	2
Mean combined GRE score of enrolling		

⁶ Measured as % of enrolled domestic students with no financial aid application or no demonstrated financial need.

⁷ For the moment we are using the % of seniors doing independent research as a proxy. We are working on a more targeted measure for tracking active learning experiences.

⁸ Calculated as a five year average. Note that the admit rate of our students is 10-15% above the national average.

doctoral students	1236	1250-1300
Average PhD time to degree	7.5 years	6 years
Undergraduate enrollment per full-time faculty member in doctoral depts.	46-79 students	70-85 students

Resources	2004-05	Five Year Goal -FY 10
Clark Fund budget support	\$1.93 million	\$3.0 million
New capital gifts and pledges	\$6.8 million	\$13.0 million
All cash gifts received ⁹	\$6.6 million	\$10.0 million
Total undergraduate net tuition revenue	\$33.4 million	\$44.9 million
Undergraduate NTR per student	\$17.2K	\$20.7K
Enterprise overhead	\$2.3 million	\$2.7 million
Investment income	\$8.1 million	\$9.2 million
External research grant funding	\$5.9 million	\$7.7 million

Management variables: track the processes necessary to achieve outcomes

Undergraduate – admissions	2004-05	Five Year Projection
First year applications	4232	4600-4800
# of offers of admission	2649	2726
Transfer applications	220	260
AAP ¹⁰ interviews completed	934	1800

Graduate – financial	2004-05	Five Year Projection
% doctoral students supported by grants and fellowships	27%	50%
GSOM net income (payable against accrued deficit)	\$21K	\$109K
COPACE net income (payable against accrued deficit)	(-\$284)	\$100K

Research – grant support	2004-05	Five Year Projection
# of research proposals submitted	60	80
Net Research Indirect	\$754K	\$910

Advancement and alumni affairs	2004-05	Five Year Projection
% of undergraduate alumni giving to the Clark fund	28%	32%
# major gift prospect visits	1116	1300-1400

⁹ This category measures actual cash received from current gifts as well as past pledges, settlements and multi-year gifts.

¹⁰ The alumni admissions program (AAP) offers informational interviews to undergraduate applicants.

# major gift asks made	225	400-500
# alumni attending Clark events	2100	2600-2700

Peer Benchmarks: track performance relative to peer groups.

Undergraduate cross-admit group:

Note: these data are assembled from multiple sources.

	Admit rate 2004	Yield rate 2004	Mean SAT – V+M 2004	% in top 10% of HS class 2003	1 st year retention 2003	Six year graduation rate – enter 1997
Tufts U	27%	32%	1380	70%	96%	90%
Brandeis	40%	32%	1350	69%	94%	84%
Boston U.	55%	28%	1305	60%	88%	75%
George Wash U	38%	34%	1275	65%	92%	75%
Smith College	57%	41%	1265	59%	91%	86%
Skidmore	48%	24%	1250	38%	91%	80%
American U	53%	19%	1250	36%	86%	71%
Wheaton	45%	28%	1230	43%	87%	75%
Syracuse	59%	28%	1220	44%	91%	81%
Northeastern U	42%	27%	1211	35%	84%	60%
Clark U	62%	20%	1193	30%	86%	68%
Ithaca College	63%	21%	1185	33%	87%	73%
Stonehill	57%	23%	1180	49%	90%	85%
U. Conn.	51%	35%	1180	30%	88%	70%
U. Vermont	76%	22%	1155	21%	83%	70%
U Mass Amherst	82%	29%	1130	16%	84%	64%
U. New Hamp.	69%	31%	1130	20%	85%	73%
Assumption	69%	26%	1085	n.a.	83%	69%

XI. Risk Assessment

As part of this plan update it is appropriate to consider the major risks associated with the plan and the ways in which the University will manage these risks. Among the major sources of concerns are:

- Data indicating that the number of graduating high school seniors in the North East United States will peak in 2008-09 and decline somewhat thereafter. Following the last dip in the number of graduating seniors in the early 1990s, the University went through some difficult times, reducing selectivity in an effort to maintain enrollments. This then led to a period of retrenchment.

- Concern that the capacity of households to afford the tuition of private universities may be constrained by a slow down in the US economy, rising interest rates, and slowed growth in housing equity.
- The University has benefited from low interest rates on borrowing and good returns on investment (cash balances and endowment). There is no guarantee that these positive circumstances will continue.
- The University operates in a highly competitive enrollment market for undergraduates. Many colleges and universities in Clark's overlap group spend more per student and are making major new investments in program and facilities.
- The University continues to depend on the strategic use of merit aid to attract the best students. We are not making progress in reducing tuition-discounting.
- Competition for international students is intensifying and the United States is not always viewed as an attractive place to study.
- Many of our professional graduate programs face strong competition both traditional colleges and universities and from on-line competitors.
- Demands on faculty time and resources are already high and there is little room to 'do more with less'.
- The University may not make sufficient progress in enhancing its attractiveness to prospective students and to elevate its perceived reputation. The University may misread short-lived improvements in enrollments for a more long-term improvement in market position.

Reflecting on these risks, we believe we have a relatively short window of opportunity to enhance Clark's market position with 'the wind at our backs.' Action steps to mitigate the risks identified above include:

- We need to pay careful attention to benchmarks of fundamental improvement in our market position (such as yield on high quality students) and use these benchmarks to determine our fixed cost profile.
- We will be cautious about expanding the size of tenure-line faculty as this represents a major fixed cost that is hard to shift downward.
- We will be cautious on taking on new debt to fund further facilities improvements, placing a greater emphasis on gifts as a source of funding.

- We will be careful to avoid or exit educational markets where we cannot sustain program quality, or where participation undermines the University's brand identity.

5 Year Financial Model
2005-06 Through 2009-10
Apr-05

Model II: First Year enrollments grow to 600; retention increases 1% per year beginning in Fall 2006

	Actual 2003-04	Budget 2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
<u>Undergraduate Admissions</u>							
Undergraduate Applications	3,950	4,239	4,452	4,500	4,600	4,700	4,700
Selectivity Rate	62.8%	62.5%	61.3%	58.0%	58.0%	58.0%	58.0%
Admits	2,481	2,649	2,731	2,610	2,668	2,726	2,726
Matriculation Rate	21.7%	19.9%	20.3%	21.8%	21.9%	22.0%	22.0%
First Year Enrollees	541	528	555	570	585	600	600
Transfers and Readmits	47	77	85	77	74	69	64
Returning Students (Fall -50)	1,360	1,360	1,343	1,335	1,383	1,457	1,504
Enrollment (Fall -50)	1,948	1,965	1,983	1,982	2,042	2,126	2,168
NTR Per Students (\$000)	\$ 17.2	\$ 18.0	\$ 18.6	\$ 19.1	\$ 19.6	\$ 20.2	\$ 20.7
		4.9%	3.2%	2.7%	2.7%	3.0%	2.6%
<u>Budget (000's)</u>							
<u>Revenues</u>							
Undergrad Tuition	\$ 52,002	\$ 55,020	\$ 58,102	\$ 60,451	\$ 64,731	\$ 70,158	\$ 74,362
Clark Scholarships	(18,604)	(19,670)	(21,302)	(22,686)	(24,761)	(27,281)	(29,480)
Undergrad NTR (000)	33,398	35,350	36,800	37,765	39,970	42,877	44,882
Less Allocation to Enterprises	(2,377)	(2,630)	(3,189)	(3,336)	(3,592)	(3,951)	(4,266)
Undergraduate Net Tuition	31,021	32,720	33,611	34,429	36,378	38,926	40,616
International Programs	1,712	2,022	2,464	2,746	2,951	3,267	3,603
Grad NTR (Excl 5th Year)	333	225	400	400	412	424	437
Enterprise Overhead	2,294	2,190	2,260	2,351	2,485	2,637	2,714
Enterprise Net Income	170	79	122	118	172	184	187
Investment Income	8,111	7,619	8,015	8,065	8,328	8,732	9,177
The Clark Fund (budget support)	1,923	2,000	2,100	2,250	2,400	2,550	2,750
Sponsored Research Indirect (Net)	754	700	670	723	781	843	910
Auxiliary Net Income	330	504	428	441	1,163	1,198	1,246
All Other	1,761	1,711	1,792	1,846	1,901	1,958	2,017
Total Revenues	\$ 48,409	\$ 49,770	\$ 51,862	\$ 53,369	\$ 56,971	\$ 60,720	\$ 63,657
Annual Growth Rate		2.8%	7.1%	2.9%	6.8%	6.6%	4.8%
<u>Expenditures</u>							
Current Budget	\$ 44,525	\$ 48,321	\$ 48,467	\$ 50,443	\$ 53,318	\$ 56,038	\$ 58,348
Compensation Increases			1,185	1,190	1,645	1,710	1,780
Study Abroad Expenditures	1,137	1,400	1,689	1,876	2,010	2,215	2,432
Other Strategic Initiatives (non-capital)			261	900	360	275	175
Additional Debt Service and Reserves	2,700			480	400		
Additional Facilities Costs			250	10			
Total Expenditures	\$ 48,362	\$ 49,721	\$ 51,852	\$ 54,899	\$ 57,733	\$ 60,238	\$ 62,735
<u>Additional Resources Required</u>							
			\$ -	\$ 1,550	\$ 800		
Net Income (Loss)	47	\$ 49	\$ 10	\$ 20	\$ 38	\$ 482	\$ 922