

Following God Faithfully
...Making a Difference Globally
...Educating Students Strategically
A Strategic Plan for Lincoln Christian University: 2008-2012

[updated Fall 2009]

Introduction

Jesus told his first followers, “*Follow Me and I will make your life count for something.*” That’s a Wayne-Shaw paraphrase of Matthew 4:19 that points to LCU’s future plans. We want to follow Him so our lives will count for something—something faithful, something global, something strategic. We want to partner with the One who makes all the difference in this world so we can make a difference in this world, in His world. That may sound grandiose for a small school in central Illinois, but Lincoln Christian University’s 65 years of service are distinguished by a global mission founded upon worldview thinking and worldwide serving. Lincoln Christian has always had a heart and head for God’s global mission. We think that kind of thinking and teaching and serving is even more imperative for our future. This plan sets out four priorities focused on how we can educate a new generation of students who will follow God faithfully to make a difference globally. We seek to honor two key mandates in God’s Word: the Global Commission of Genesis 1:28 and the Great Commission of Matthew 28:18-20.

The crux of this plan is how we will educate servant leaders under those two commission mandates—for marketplace and church-based ministries. LCU began in 1944 with the rallying cry “The Preachers Are Coming.” That is still true, but today’s students are also seeking creative ways to serve God that honor both aspects of our mission “...*to serve and lead in the Church and the world.*” We are still focused on church-based ministries, but we are also exploring ways to expand our marketplace ministries in selected areas within our mission—whether around the corner or around the world. From the local church to the local school, from the church world to the business world, from the counseling center to the community center, LCU desires to make a difference globally.

This plan is offered in support of the Board of Trustees’ vision of “a national leader in Christian education.” The strategic initiatives described below align with the Board’s “visioning layers” from their October 2007 retreat (see last column in chart on pages 7-8). We still seek to fulfill that Board vision, but we now see that vision more as result than goal. Put differently, ***this plan’s focus is more on following than leading because we believe that if we follow God faithfully He will increase our influence as a leader, not only nationally but even internationally.*** Our dreams are no less grand, but they are more focused. In addition, this plan, unlike earlier plans, is not based on significant enrollment growth but envisions instead significant growth in our circles of influence and our international outreach. We have spent this past year listening quietly, conversing communally, and praying fervently for God’s guiding. We believe we have heard His voice (and many campus voices), and we are now ready to begin anew a future that is faithful to our God, to our past, and to our promise.

We recognize that this plan has only ten strategic initiatives under only four planning priorities. While many things are important, not everything is strategic. This very focused plan must be supplemented with annual, operational plans that address the school’s ***four broad institutional goals*** of developing a mission-minded: 1) *community of servant leaders* with engaged students, staff, and faculty, 2) *culture of learning* with appropriate academic programs and support services, 3) *campus of quality* with enhanced facilities and finances, and 4) *connectivity with others* through alumni, churches, and other key constituents. Those four institutional goals encompass the whole of our campus, while our four planning priorities and ten strategic initiatives target our most pressing issues.

Executive Summary of Our 2008-12 Plan

*Lincoln Christian University will follow God faithfully so we can make a difference globally by educating students strategically. To do that this plan focuses on **four planning priorities** during the next four years: expressing our distinctive identity, enriching our educational quality, expanding our servant-leader community, and enhancing our financial stability. We know our future depends more on God's guiding than our planning. This plan, therefore, functions more as a compass than roadmap, always pointing us back to the true north of following God faithfully. We offer this plan in prayerful humility.*

<p>ue North: Following God Faithfully Expressing Our Distinctive Identity</p>  <p>y leader Community</p>
--

Enhancing Our Financial Stability

Mission Statement

Lincoln Christian University is a Christian higher education community whose mission is to nurture and equip Christians with a Biblical worldview to serve and lead in the church and the world.

Visioning Statement

Lincoln Christian University will be a Christian university noted for servant leaders who follow God faithfully to make a difference globally in the church and in the world. LCU will be distinguished by a *Biblically-based education* that is affordable, accessible, and exceptional in its focus on service learning, worldview thinking, global engagement, and character development.

Core Values

We believe our highest privilege is to glorify God, serve His Son, and rely upon His Holy Spirit. To that end we pledge ourselves to these core values:

1. *Authentic community* that fosters Christian character, conduct, accountability, and unity amidst growing diversity.
2. *Holistic development* of students in and out of the classroom as spiritually mature and academically prepared lifelong learners.
3. *Servant leadership* and its focus on leading and learning through serving, based on one's gifts, passion, and sense of calling.
4. *Responsible stewardship* of the abilities and resources that God provides for and through His people.
5. *Our Restoration heritage* and its plea for Christian unity and Biblical authority in carrying out God's global mission.

Planning Assumptions

This strategic plan was developed during the 2007-08 academic year by a taskforce of staff, faculty, and administrators. Their work was based upon an earlier planning taskforce that developed the four institutional goals listed above in the introduction. The taskforce made some strategic assumptions in their work that are foundational to this plan. Those assumptions are listed below, all of which assume that God will guide us as long as we faithfully follow:

- 1) LCU's greatest strength—besides God—is its people, not only students and alumni, but especially its faculty and staff. Their acceptance of this plan and their involvement in its implementation is critical, though levels of involvement will vary from group to group.
- 2) LCU's planning efforts are built on a solid past and a challenging present. As we approach our 65th year, we stand on the solid ground of generations past, but we also recognize some financial and enrollment challenges over the last few years and for a few years to come.
- 3) LCU is entering an era of uncertainty regarding economic and demographic factors, especially enrollment trends in a tuition-financed school such as ours. This plan assumes that maintaining the status quo is inadequate and inappropriate for the times we are facing.
- 4) LCU's planning efforts assume that only a few things are strategic, though many things are important. We have focused on four planning priorities critical to our future, though we must remain flexible and adaptable to our unfolding conditions and to God's daily guiding.
- 5) LCU's plan depends significantly on the generosity of God's people to invest in this ministry's strategic initiatives. To that end, this plan is accompanied by a three-year comprehensive campaign to raise several million dollars. This plan is not totally dependent upon new money from a campaign, but this plan will require more than we have now to accomplish it all.

Planning Context: SWOT Analysis

As the assumptions above imply, we are facing our future plans aware of our present problems, both internally and externally. The planning taskforce has devoted considerable thought to our *internal* strengths and weaknesses and to our *external* opportunities and threats. The strategic initiatives described in this plan arise in large measure from our SWOT analysis, which was the subject of a day-long retreat in January of 2008, plus numerous campus conversations this spring. That analysis was based on interactions with many studies and publications (see “Works Consulted” addendum), as well as on our own ongoing assessment of what we are doing well and not so well at Lincoln. A summary of our SWOT analysis is provided below.

SWOT Analysis: Strengths

- 1) ***Our Mission:*** Every self-study, every visiting team, every external consultant, and multitudes of conversations on and off campus affirm that our mission is a key strength. We believe we know whose we are, who we are, and what we are called to be and do. Our current challenge is to explore how our mission meets today's marketplace, especially in terms of curricular offerings and delivery methods.
- 2) ***Our People:*** Our faculty and staff—along with our students, alumni, and supporters—are godly, gracious, giving people who desire to make a difference in this place for the good of God's Kingdom. While institutional loyalty has never been a core value for us, our people's sacrificial commitment to our mission and ministry is exemplary and critical to any kind of future with promise. Recent student satisfaction surveys also attest to our students' high regard for LCU, especially our faculty and staff (LCU ranks in the top 10% nationally in “supportive campus environment,” which deals with how our students relate to our people—based on the 2008 *National Survey of Student Engagement* from Indiana University).
- 3) ***Our Heritage:*** Our Restoration history is a heritage noted at its best for promoting world evangelism through Christian unity, Biblical authority, and the essential elements of New Testament Christianity. In these postmodern times of ambiguity and uncertainty, coupled with increasing spiritual sensitivity, our Restoration Plea is more engaging, empowering, and appealing than perhaps ever before—as both mega-churches and emerging churches testify.
- 4) ***Our Global Network:*** Thomas Friedman notwithstanding, the world has always been flat from a Lincoln perspective. That's not because of our topography but because of our theology. We have always set our sights on God's global mission and over seven decades have developed personal and professional networks that are truly global in outreach—from Austria to Zambia.

- 5) ***Our Christian Worldview:*** Many espouse the concept but few equip Christian leaders with worldview thinking the way we do. It's in our mission and in our DNA—not to mention our AA, our BA, and our MA (as well as our BS, MRE, MAC, MDiv, DMin, and IDS). You cannot be a student here and not understand that worldview matters. It is both a way of thinking and a way of living for us. And it begins with the Bible, God's great story that gives our stories meaning and allows us to engage other stories/worldviews. Related to this strength is Lincoln's focus on critical thinking. A Christian worldview requires "taking every thought captive to make it obedient to Christ," a key verse in our history.

SWOT Analysis: Weaknesses

- 1) ***Our Recruitment and Retention:*** LCU is mission-driven but tuition-financed. Student income (tuition and room/board) comprises 72% of our revenues. While enrollment trends for higher education are generally still positive, this year will begin a decade-long decline in Midwestern, middle-class, white high school seniors, which has been the core of our traditional enrollment. In just the last two years, our fall FTE has declined 8%, from a peak of 836 in Fall 2006 to an FTE of 770 in the fall of 2008. Because of fewer freshmen and fewer full-time seminarians, we will receive as much as \$1 million less in tuition this year than we would have had with stable enrollment. Compounding the problem is a low first-year retention rate that means the loss of one of every three students we recruit—in both schools (LincUp—now the Hargrove School of Adult & Graduate Studies—retention has declined from 72% during its first four years to 60% during the last three years). While that rate is common among Bible colleges and seminaries, we nonetheless regard that as an area to improve. Among the contributing factors for these losses are limited academic programs (and delivery systems), first-year experiences of our students, rising cost of our education, and few endowed scholarships. Those are concerns we've targeted in this plan. While this plan is not grounded in significant growth, we also don't want an empty dorm.
- 2) ***Our Financial Stability:*** While many financial indicators are positive, our decline in enrollment has led to a less than strong financial picture. The clearest indicator of that may be the US Department of Education's Composite Financial Index, which is a single numeric score indicating a school's overall financial health. The CFI ranges from +3.0 to -1.0, with +1.5 marking the border between financially healthy and not. In FY04 our score was a very healthy 2.66, but it dropped steadily over the next three years to just above 1.5 a year ago, though it was up this past year to 1.8. We have also tended to rely too much on our total gift income (restricted and unrestricted) to balance our budget, which has led to deficits in our unrestricted bottom-line of \$1.5 million in FY06 and nearly \$500,000 in FY07 (though our budget totals for each year showed surpluses). However, because of more conservative budgeting this past year, the unrestricted spending total improved significantly in FY08 to a surplus of around \$850,000 (though our total surplus was a very tenuous \$25,000). Still, we have some years of "make up" ahead, which, coupled with enrollment declines, will test us in the near term. More unrestricted gifts (i.e. increasing our annual fund) is one of the emphases of the proposed comprehensive campaign (see last initiative).
- 3) ***Our Marketing Strategy:*** One of the things the planning taskforce heard clearly and consistently throughout this past year was this recurring theme: "we need to tell our story better." We took a major step forward several years ago with the hiring of a full-time marketing director, but his leaving has left a hole that we need to fill. We believe our 65th anniversary and our renaming as Lincoln Christian University is an ideal time to fill that hole and improve our marketing.
- 4) ***Our Complexity/Ambiguity:*** While we are distinctive, we are not easily defined. That can actually be a strength, until it comes to "telling our story" to people who don't know us. We have to explain ourselves just to get a hearing ("What do you mean by 4th way school?"). Our undergraduate school is and is not a Bible college. We're adding programs similar to a Christian liberal arts school, but our Bible major clearly differentiates us. We educate for church-based ministry and we educate for marketplace ministry. At the Seminary level, we are and we are not a denominational school. We are and we are not a traditional seminary (clergy preparation?). We are and we are not a typical research-oriented graduate school (for us it's more often "publish or 'parish'"). Regarding LincUp, it is both an adult degree

completion program and also a comprehensive adult education program for non-traditional undergraduates. (LincUp was replaced by the Hargrove School of Adult & Graduate Studies in 2009.) Clarifying our complexity is a significant challenge in telling our story.

- 5) **Our “Silo-ization”:** Despite our current enrollment challenges, the campus has grown significantly over the last decade. We have nearly 200 more students in ten years, up 22% (from 864 students in Fall 1998 to 1,053 this fall). FTE is up 15%, from 667 to 770, though down from 2007’s 802 FTE. We also have 30 more employees, up 29% in a decade (from 105 to 135, with 12 more faculty and 18 more staff—though we will have 2 fewer faculty and 5 fewer staff after budget reductions in fall 2008). In addition, we have started new programs and departments in several areas (e.g. Adult & Graduate Studies, DMin, education, technology), plus extension centers in Las Vegas and Danville. All that to say, communication is not as easy as it once was. As we move from family to community and from college to university, we are no longer a place “where everybody knows your name.” This plan’s focus on our distinctive identity attempts to address this concern, with more than a third of our people (50 of 135) are new to us within the last five years.

SWOT Analysis: Opportunities

- 1) **Millennial Students:** While most labels are over-simplifications, it does seem that we are facing a new kind of student, with opportunities to “nurture and equip” them in new ways as we seek to better marry our mission with our marketplace. The Millennials began arriving in college a few years ago and are now starting to graduate into the workforce and into graduate school (and, for many, “move back home”). Howe and Strauss identify “seven core traits” of this generation of students, ranging from feeling special and sheltered and pressured, to being more conventional, confident, team oriented, and achieving. Other studies have discussed the “delayed adolescence” of the so-called “twixers” generation of twenty-somethings that are somewhere betwixt and between adolescence and adulthood. Smith’s massive study of American teenagers revealed a new religion he calls “moralistic therapeutic deism,” though teenagers are most like their parents in their religious views. Beyond the Millennials, however, are the non-traditional, older adults who are coming (back) to college and seminary in record numbers. How we reach out to all these students—or how we focus on “our market”—may well determine our future. Three planning efforts are focused on this opportunity: improving first-year experiences, increasing work-study (service learning) opportunities, and expanding our educational delivery systems through academic reorganization (i.e. a third school for non-traditional students with non-traditional programming).
- 2) **Internationalization of Education:** The number of international students studying in the U.S. reached nearly 600,000 in 2007, or about 1 in 25 students. That same year, we saw a 10% increase in the number of new international students, the first major increase since 9/11, and the numbers are predicted to jump even more in the next few years, especially from India, China, and Korea (note our recent cooperative discussions with Christian leaders in two of these countries). American students studying abroad are also at an all-time high, with nearly 250,000 doing so in 2007, up 150% in the last decade. Congress is even considering legislation calling for 1 million American students annually to study abroad within the next ten years. Higher education research repeatedly indicates that students need international experience and exposure to function effectively in the 21st century. The church also needs global Christians. Given our global mission and ever increasing global network, not to mention increasing immigrant populations within our own country, this opportunity, though not without challenges, seems divinely timed.
- 3) **Alternative Delivery of Education:** With as many as 3 million online learners in 2007, it is clear that educational delivery systems are changing radically and rapidly. The “dot com bust” has happened as much in education as in business, reinforcing the reality that technology is a better servant than master. Lincoln’s missional focus on formation and ministry does not call for us to become an online school, but neither does it forbid finding creative ways to marry our mission with our marketplace—whether that be increased online education (our distance learning tuition revenues in 2007 totaled nearly \$500,000), various hybrid uses of technology in both online and on-campus settings, and/or strategic exploration of extension sites (e.g. Las Vegas, Danville, and a pilot extension course in Colorado). Perhaps our most strategic opportunity is the creation of a “third school” with online degree programs.

- 4) **Collaboration with Others:** No man—and no mission—is an island. Our mission calls us to do many things that we can do with others better than with just ourselves. Partnerships with entities as wide-ranging as a Las Vegas megachurch and a rural home missionary agency attest to LCU's increased collaboration. With increased financial and demographic pressures upon us, the onus is on us to collaborate even more to enhance our mission. The corollary of this is also the need for a “stop doing” list that ameliorates the momentum toward trying to be all things to all people.
- 5) **Changing Nature of the Church:** Whether the church is emerging, evolving, revolutionizing, regressing, struggling, growing, engaging, or disengaging, is not quite clear. Probably some of all. Regardless, the church is changing. As a church-based school, our health depends on her health. Our balancing act between marketplace ministry and church-based ministry—the “in-the-church-and-in-the-world” part of our mission—will require creative conversations about what that means in the 21st century.

SWOT Analysis: Threats

- 1) **Economic Challenges:** We have weathered enrollment downturns before, much worse, but not often have we faced the accompanying challenge of an economic downturn of the current magnitude. From health insurance premiums on their way to a \$1 million bite out of our budget to gasoline dancing around \$4 per gallon (in a school where 60% of our students commute), we know we are “not in economic Kansas anymore.” With Wall Street and Main Street in financial turmoil (perceived or real), these economic times can be threat to any school with limited revenue streams. We added a student fee of \$125 this year for traditional undergraduates and \$75 for seminarians, but the increase in gas alone since last year will add at least that much to our commuting students' annual costs. For anyone living more than 13 miles from campus (using the current IRS mileage rate of 58.5 cents per mile), it is cheaper to pay our \$225 distance learning fee than to commute to campus to sit in class—and that's most of our students. The good news is that our economic challenges can also be an opportunity to rethink how we do and deliver things.
- 2) **Government Intrusion:** One of the disadvantages of living in Illinois is that government can be threatening. From moral issues (homosexuality's legal status) to the minimum wage (which Illinois sets at almost \$1.00 higher than the federal requirement), from a bloated state bureaucracy (e.g. teacher certification in Illinois compared to many other states) to a state budget and state economy that is losing billions, government here seems increasingly not necessarily of the people, by the people, and for the people. We are not fearful and we trust God to bless us, but as in ancient Rome, the government at least needs our prayers. Amidst this threat, there is good news: Illinois is one of the most generous states in providing aid for college students. For the last three years our students have received more than \$1 million each year in state aid, with no indication of that declining. That is considerably above peer schools in other states.
- 3) **Current Culture:** We are not of this world, but we are in it. And sometimes the current culture (or better, cultures) can be threatening to us. Our postmodern world does not typically value the things we value: objective truth, absolutes, reason, a Christian worldview, the Lordship of Christ. Our students have immediate access to more of the worst of our culture than previous generations ever thought possible. Yet, there are marvelous opportunities as well, as noted above. How we engage our world could well determine whether we fulfill our mission.
- 4) **The Competition:** While collaboration is an opportunity, competition is a threat. Just how many schools can one faith group support, especially amidst enrollment declines? In 2007, our faith group spent \$175 million to support 33 schools, ranging in size from 5 to 1,500. As for our Seminary, its competition is no longer simply CBS and ESR. It competes with scores of other programs—online and on-campus, not to mention larger churches who prefer to “hire from within.” And when half of all college freshmen attend a community college, how can we compete with that in terms of economics or convenience? Only one in ten students attended a private college in fall 2008; one in 50 will attend a Christian university; but only one in 500 will attend a Bible college. And the largest college in this country is not a public university, but a for-profit school in Phoenix (and 199 other places) with more than 200,000 students—almost all online.

- 5) *The Evil One*: Satan still prowls about as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour. Will we be prey or will we pray for God to deliver us? One of the greatest threats in any strategic plan for a Christian community is to believe that we wrestle against flesh and blood and that our programs and plans can defeat principalities and powers. Strategic planning arose in a military context, and like the military we are preparing for war, but with the tools of spiritual warfare. Our planning is not for the sake of our school, but for the sake of God's plan of redemption. To that end, our planning must first and forever be following, following God faithfully as we rely on Him powerfully to overcome the evil one.

Following Faithfully, Making a Difference Globally, Educating Strategically

Planning Priorities and Strategic Initiatives [updated Fall 2009]

Lincoln Christian University will follow God faithfully so we can make a difference globally by educating students strategically. To do that Lincoln's 2008-2012 plan focuses on **four planning priorities** for the next four years: expressing our distinctive identity, enriching our educational quality, expanding our servant-leader community, and enhancing our financial stability. We know our future depends more on God's guiding than our planning. This plan, therefore, functions more as a compass than roadmap, always pointing us back to the true north of following God faithfully. Still, any plan needs some details (mile markers on our journey), so we offer this fuller version:

Lincoln <u>Christian University</u> 2008-2012: Our Strategic Plan								
<i>Priorities and Strategies</i>	<i>When? How?--> Gauges</i>				<i>Who?</i>	<i>How much?</i>	<i>SWOT Issue?</i>	<i>Board Vision Layer</i>
	Done	On target	Suspect	Not on target				
1. Express our distinctive identity								
1.1a <i>Internally</i> —Rename as Lincoln Christian University (same mission)	* 2008-09: Accomplished (see 1.2)				Ray & Tanner	Marketing costs (1.2) (\$100,000 land sale) \$75,000 for 3 rd school (paid by online MA with 12 students)	Strength #1,3 Weakness #1 Opportunity #3 Threat #1	Dynamic curriculum Relevant to church
1.1b <i>Internally</i> --Reorganize with 3 rd school for non-traditional students with non-traditional programming	* 2009-10: Accomplished; launched first online MA with 15 students							
1.2 <i>Externally</i> —Tell our story more effectively with focus on our distinctives through more intensive and intentional marketing	* Summer 09: Hired marketing director Began "Red Is Everywhere" campaign * 2009-12: continue marketing focus				Venturella	\$25,000 for consulting \$75,000 for director \$75,000 for campaign \$75,000 in annual costs	Strength ? Weakness #3,4 Opportunity ? Threat #4	Renowned personnel Relevant to church
2. Enrich our educational quality								
2.3 <i>Programs</i> —Pursue new programs and strengthen existing programs that meet our mission and marketplace and that are affordable, accessible, and exceptional	* 2008-09: Established 3 rd school (1.1b) * 2008-09: Faculty explore new majors (e.g. philosophy, nursing, comm.) * 2009-12: Strengthen existing programs (e.g. youth min, business, teacher ed, info/biblical/cultural literacy)				Tanner Deans	[See 1.1b for costs] \$5,000 for philosophy \$5,000 for nursing [See 4.10 for costs]	Strength #1,5 Weakness #1 Opportunity #1 Threat #4	Dynamic curriculum Relevant to church
2.4 <i>People</i> —Enhance professional development and contributions for/by faculty and staff (including "serve abroad" opportunities listed below under 3.8)	* 2008-09: Engage Issachar Institute * 2009-10: Restore FY09 budget cuts in professional development/contribution * 2010-11: Budget \$1,000 per faculty * 2011-12: Budget \$1,500 per faculty				Ray/Kurka VPs & Deans	\$1,500 for FY09; increase to \$10,000/yr (campaign) \$30,000 (annual budget) \$25,000 (see campaign) \$25,000 (see campaign)	Strength #2 Weakness ? Opportunity #4 Threat ?	Renowned faculty Engaged staff
2.5 <i>Places</i> —Improve our learning environments in the Library, the Seminary, and Student Life facilities	* 2010-11: Launch financial campaign * 2012-15: Remodel/expand Seminary and enhance Student Life facilities * 2012-15: Expand Library facility				Ray, Venturella, Plumier	?\$ (campaign \$ not set) \$250,000 (+ \$250,000) \$1.25 million (State?) \$1.3 million (State?)	Strength ? Weakness #2 Opportunity #1 Threat#1,4	State-of-the-art campus

Following Faithfully, Making a Difference Globally, Educating Strategically

Lincoln Christian University 2008-2012: Our Strategic Plan [continued]					
<i>Priorities and Strategies</i>	<i>When? and How?</i>	<i>Who?</i>	<i>How much?</i>	<i>SWOT Issue?</i>	<i>Board Vision Layer</i>
			[all costs are estimates]		
3. Expand our servant-leader community					
3.6 <i>Recruitment</i> —Hire director of college admissions to improve new student enrollment from 115 to 165 (plus new programs/marketing)	* Spring 09: Hired admissions director * 2009-12: Add average of 15 more new students per year in the School of Undergraduate Studies (ask Seminary to set goals for Masters/DMin)	Mills & Laughlin	[currently in budget]	Strength #3 Weakness #1 Opportunity #1 Threat#1,4	Exemplary students
3.7 <i>Retention</i> —Create a “first-year experience” for freshmen to improve freshman retention by 10%	* 2008-10: Undergraduate Studies faculty taskforce develop/implement first-year experience * 2009-12: Improve freshman to sophomore retention rate from 65% to 75%	Diefendorf & Mills with faculty taskforce	Cost unknown until taskforce work done Increase student advisors by 5-10 per year	Strength #3 Weakness #1 Opportunity #1 Threat#1,4	Exemplary students
3.8 <i>International Outreach</i> —Pursue goal of 10% international enrollment; expand “study abroad” options for students and “serve abroad” opportunities for faculty and staff	* 2008-09: Pilot with 3 internationals; part-time Office of Internationals * 2009-12: Expand with 15 more internationals per year (to reach 60+) * 2009-12: Budget “study abroad” and “serve abroad” opportunities for students and for faculty/staff respectively	Mills with faculty/staff taskforce All VPs	No cash outlay, but will “lose” \$10-12,000 per student in tuition; offset by \$5,000 in R/B and fellowships \$25,000/year for students \$25,000/yr faculty/staff	Strength #4 Weakness #5 Opportunity #2 Threat#3	Exemplary students Renowned faculty Engaged staff Relevant to church Dynamic curriculum
3.9 <i>Work Study</i> —Expand <i>iServe</i> program from 200 students receiving \$430,000/year to 250 students receiving \$550,000/year	* 2009-12: Increase <i>iServe</i> budget by \$30,000 per year * 2009-12: Expand “mentoring” part to address student development concerns	Plumier & VPs	\$30,000/year (budget as part of annual tuition increases?)	Strength #2 Weakness #1,2 Opportunity #1 Threat#1	Exemplary students Engaged staff Appropriate finances
4. Enhance our financial stability					
4.10 <i>New and Ongoing Funds</i> —Launch 3-year comprehensive campaign to fund strategic initiatives (2.3-5 and 3.7-9) and strengthen annual fund for ongoing needs	* 2008-09: Conduct feasibility study and initiate “quiet phase” of campaign * 2010-11: Launch campaign publicly * 2012-15: Collect contributions and implement initiatives	Ray & Venturella	Cost of campaign unknown Goal for campaign not yet set (perhaps \$5 million)	Strength #1 Weakness #2 Opportunity #2-4 Threat#1	Appropriate finances [+ other 6 “layers”]
NOTE: This plan focuses on a few priorities and initiatives, while the institutional goals address every employee and every area of campus. While the plan’s four priorities <u>may</u> form a basis for annual assessment for any one person or area, the four institutional goals <u>must</u> be used that way. The four institutional goals are: Developing a mission-minded 1) community of servant leaders, 2) culture of learning, 3) campus of quality, and 4) connectivity with others.					

