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MANDATE FOR THE FOCUSED VISIT

The most recent comprehensive visit to Maharishi University of Management took place in October 2009. The team’s January 28, 2010 report recommended a focused visit “on leadership, planning, compensation, and assessment” to take place during 2012–2013. The team stated its rationale and expectations as follows:

A limited number of processes need substantial improvement in the next few years for Maharishi University of Management to reach mature status. Regular performance reviews need to be initiated for the president, administrators, faculty and staff.

Compensation practices need to address inequities among faculty and staff. Strategic planning needs to be renewed, updated, communicated and coordinated in all aspects of the University, especially in the areas of faculty recruitment/replacement and information technology. Assessment of student learning has started at the course level but not yet at the program level. The use of multiple measures, data analysis, and feedback loops is not universally present particularly for general education outcomes.

The report for the focused visit should contain the following elements:

a. Approved mission statement

b. Updated strategic plan and multi-year budget

c. Evidence that general education and program assessment has been gathered, analyzed and used systematically to inform strategic planning and to shape budget allocations in ways that have been demonstrated to improve student learning and success (closing the loop)

d. Evidence that strategic planning for human resourcing includes regular performance reviews for staff, faculty and administration, as well as compensation and benefits planning at all levels to assure ability to replace retiring staff and faculty

e. Includes plan for recruitment, hiring and development of new faculty and staff to assure replacement of retiring faculty/staff and necessary capacity for growth
f. Evidence that strategic plan includes widespread community participation and communication and use

g. Evidence that strategic plan has been put into use and evaluated

If these elements are not in place at the time of the focused visit, then consideration should be given to moving the comprehensive review to an earlier time.

This report addresses each of these topics in sequence.
A.

APPROVED MISSION STATEMENT

This section addresses the following point from the 2009 team’s report:

a. Approved mission statement

At its meeting on October 6, 2012 (minutes available in the Resource Room), the University’s Board of Trustees:

- Approved retaining the original founding goals
- Approved retaining the currently published mission statement
- Approved the core values statement with some small changes that had been proposed.

These items are as follows:

FOUNDING GOALS

1) To develop the full potential of the individual
2) To realize the highest ideal of education
3) To improve governmental achievements
4) To solve the age-old problem of crime and all behavior that brings unhappiness to our world family
5) To bring fulfillment to the economic aspirations of individuals and society
6) To maximize the intelligent use of the environment
7) To achieve the spiritual goals of humanity in this generation

MISSION STATEMENT

Maharishi University of Management was founded in 1971 by Maharishi Mahesh Yogi to fulfill the highest ideals of education. Foremost among these ideals is developing the full potential of consciousness in every student — to help students develop the ability to think and act in accord with the laws of nature and to live fulfilled and successful lives. This fulfills the long-sought goal of education: to produce fully developed individuals, citizens
who can fulfill their own aspirations while promoting all good in society.

We have pioneered a unique system of higher education, Consciousness-Based education, that systematically cultures students’ full creative intelligence, the basis of learning. Consciousness-Based education gives traditional academic study the foundation of complete knowledge of consciousness coupled with simple, natural, scientifically validated technologies for developing consciousness.

These technologies are the Transcendental Meditation and TM-Sidhi programs, including Yogic Flying. This integrated approach develops students’ ability to manage their lives successfully, to grow steadily in health, happiness, and wisdom, and to achieve professional success and personal fulfillment.

Our unique educational programs fulfill a commitment to four broad areas of responsibility:

1) Holistic development of students — cultivation of consciousness, mind, body, and behavior

2) Academic excellence — training at the forefront of knowledge in each discipline and in the ability to think critically and act effectively and ethically

3) Scholarship that expands the domains of knowledge, expressed in all four areas of scholarship — discovery, teaching and learning, integration, and application

4) Improved quality of life for the individual, the community, the nation, and the world.

**CORE VALUES**

These shared values characterize our campus culture and guide University decision-making:

1) *Development of consciousness* — We are committed to developing our full potential — intellectual, emotional, physical, and spiritual — through the Transcendental Meditation and TM-Sidhi programs, including Yogic Flying. Development of consciousness is the foundation of Consciousness-Based education and of success in all aspects of life.

2) *Academic excellence* — We promote engaged learning and intellectual inquiry and growth, within a framework that connects the parts of knowledge to the wholeness of knowledge and the wholeness of knowledge to the Self — so that students never feel lost.
3) **Health and happiness** — We value a campus culture that promotes health and well-being, safety, enjoyment, positivity, and a spirit of fun.

4) **Sustainability** — We are committed to creating a campus in harmony with natural law and a new model of sustainability that includes inner as well as outer sustainability.

5) **Unity within diversity** — We celebrate a rich diversity of cultures, backgrounds, and values in our students, faculty, and staff, unified by the shared experience of the field of pure consciousness underlying all of life.

6) **Community** — We value kindness, respect, honesty, friendliness, and mutual support — byproducts of growth of consciousness.

7) **Excellence** — We are committed to achieving excellence in all aspects of University life through continuous improvement.

8) **World peace** — We are dedicated to creating national invincibility and world peace through the group practice of the Transcendental Meditation and TM-Sidhi programs, including Yogic Flying.

**RESOURCE ROOM:**
- Minutes of the Board of Trustees’ approval of the mission statement
B. UPDATED STRATEGIC PLAN AND MULTI-YEAR BUDGET

This section addresses the following point from the 2009 team’s report:

b. Updated strategic plan, and multi-year budget

The updated 5-year Strategic Plan, which is to be completed and published in May, includes a 5-year budget projection and is submitted in a separate document. We are also submitting the earlier version, published in 2011.

Background on the strategic planning process

In the summer of 2009 we began a new process of strategic planning. On the basis of the University’s founding goals, mission statement, and core values, we created a vision for the University in 2015, identifying strategic priorities in seven areas:

- Increased enrollment
- Increased financial resources for expansion
- Education and academics
- Student and alumni support
- Campus culture
- Campus in harmony with nature
- Collective consciousness

Within each of the seven areas, we created a primary goal and a set of specific objectives or actions steps aimed at achieving the goal, 38 in all. Appendices included an outline for a capital campaign with five tiers of funding opportunities, a campus master plan, and a plan to raise and standardize faculty and staff compensation.

At the time of the HLC comprehensive visit in 2009, the plan was only partially matured. But by the fall of 2010, after many iterations involving input from a wide range of University constituents, we created a final draft. In the spring of 2011 we printed the plan in booklet form and distributed it publicly.
At this point we adopted a “rolling” five-year model for the strategic planning process: updating our five-year Strategic Plan approximately every two years based on assessing the progress in achieving the previous version’s strategic priorities, re-evaluating and restating our priorities, and extending the planning horizon to maintain the five-year time frame of our forward-looking plan. In this way, the plan would serve as a constant guidepost for resource allocation and unification of University activities.

Accordingly, we initiated another in-depth round of planning in 2012. A draft of the first revision was presented to the Board of Trustees for their review and discussion in December of 2012, with the goal of completing and printing this first revision of the Strategic Plan in May 2013. The process to generate a revised plan has followed much the same steps as developing the initial Strategic Plan. We conducted a comprehensive review and evaluation of all seven strategic priorities and corresponding 38 objectives.

In support of this process, we added a new business program graduate, Patrik Siljestam, to the planning department. He is now taking a lead role in revising the Strategic Plan while participating in our MBA intern program.

In addition, we developed a dashboard website that enables real-time reporting on all of the key initiatives contained in the new Strategic Plan, updated at appropriate intervals. This better enables us to track progress in achieving the strategic goals, easily access key information, and ensure that everyone is using the same figures on important metrics.

NOTE: We will provide login information to the HLC team members in a separate communication.

The revised 5-year Strategic Plan has the important distinction of presenting a more focused prioritization of strategic goals. The number of primary goals was reduced from seven to four:

- Increased enrollment
- Financial sustainability
- Student learning
- Growth of consciousness

We also defined targeted metrics for each primary goal.

To help reach these goals we set out a number of initiatives, distinguished as follows:
• Strategic initiatives:
  o are financed through annual budget expenditures that are new or significantly higher than the previous year.
  o typically represent significant programs of coherent activity that are meant to drive the “dials on the dashboard” by which we measure our progress toward strategic goals.
  o have a minimum planned lifetime during which we would not substantially alter their funding.
  o drive one or more of the four Strategic Priorities: student learning, increased enrollment, financial stability, and growth of consciousness.
• Operational initiatives may have been strategic initiatives previously and due to their successful implementation are now permanent activities fully integrated into our ongoing administrative or academic routine.
• Contingent initiatives require additional funding beyond our operational budget commitments, either from unexpected donation support or unexpected windfall operating surpluses — that is, initiatives we will implement as resources become available.

The Strategic Plan includes a five-year budget combining planned results of strategic and operational initiatives with projections for on-going activities. (Please see the next page for a summary.) Charts comparing actual results with the five-year budgets from both the 2011 Strategic Plan and the 2013 revision were incorporated in the March 2013 report to the Trustees. These charts highlight key areas of interest: enrollment, recruiting, student fees, revenue per student, the endowment fund, and online education. They are attached as Appendix 1 to this report.

The table on the next page shows the five-year budget projections from the updated five-year Strategic Plan.
Strategic Plan — Five-Year Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actuals 2011</th>
<th>Actuals 2012</th>
<th>Budget 2013</th>
<th>Year 1 2014</th>
<th>Year 2 2015</th>
<th>Year 3 2016</th>
<th>Year 4 2017</th>
<th>Year 5 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years Ended June 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Faculty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Staff</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>2,387</td>
<td>2,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in Fairfield</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>1196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Students</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop Students</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop Off Campus</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Sites</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE – Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ALL NUMBERS BELOW ARE IN THOUSANDS)

**Revenues:**

- Student Fees: 10,743
- Endowment Income: 603
- Annual Fund: 2,335
- Other Revenue: 1,406
- Auxiliary Enterprises: 353

**Total Revenues:** 15,440

**Expenditures:**

- Instruction & Academic Support: 2,782
- Student Recruiting: 1,463
- Annual Fund: 143
- Food Service: 2,396
- Public Service: 573
- Fixed & Semi-Variable Costs: 7,044

**Total Expenses:** 14,401

**Net Cash Flow:** 1,039
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Ended June 30</th>
<th>Actuasl 1</th>
<th>Actuasl 2</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Investments included in Expenditures above:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Reserves</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>1,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions for World Peace</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Compensation</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>2,234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Deferred Maintenance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Flow before Strategic Investments:</strong></td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>3,825</td>
<td>4,554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESOURCE ROOM:**

Copies of successive generations of the five-year Strategic Plan and related documents:

- 5-Year Strategic Plan – November 20, 2009
- Strategic Goals – February 20, 2010
- New Strategic Plan with charts – September 11, 2010
- Strategic Plan with new charts – January 23, 2011
- Strategic goals #20 – May 18, 2011
- First public printing of the Strategic Plan – June 18, 2011
- Draft of the revised Strategic Plan presented to Executive Council (September 2012)
- Draft of the revised Strategic Plan presented to the Board of Trustees (December 2012)
This section addresses the following point from the 2009 team’s report:

(c) Evidence that general education and program assessment has been gathered, analyzed and used systematically to inform strategic planning and to shape budget allocations in ways that have been demonstrated to improve student learning and success (closing the loop).

From inception Maharishi University of Management has gathered data to verify the achievement of its goals. This includes measuring outcomes rarely measured on college campuses, such as brain integration, practical intelligence, and ego development, to monitor students’ personal development. Since 2009 we have re-focused this data gathering around measuring student learning and growth across the curriculum and placed measurement of student learning at the center of planning and budgeting.

RESTRUCTURING ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

In 2009, following the HLC comprehensive visit, we created a new body, the Deans Council, to bring greater focus to assessment, planning, and budgeting and to focus this process more on student learning and growth. Until that time, there had been no single person or group responsible for all these processes. After a few months of operation, it became clear that the relation between the Deans Council and other governance structures had to be clarified.

In the spring of 2012, in perhaps the most ambitious of the many Lean projects we had undertaken to date, the Executive Vice-President and a group of deans spent five consecutive mornings in a Lean process on academic governance. The goals:

- To bring maximum focus and coherence to academic planning, budgeting, and assessment
- To streamline academic governance — for example, by reducing the number of committees, reducing the size of committees, reducing the number of deans and
associate deans

• To enable deans to give more full-time attention to their areas of responsibility
• To streamline decision-making and eliminate issues falling between the cracks
• To better manage such new outreach initiatives as international collaborations, study abroad opportunities, distance education, and continuing education
• To improve communication with faculty regarding academic issues.

The process was successful in each respect. The main outcomes:

• We clarified the roles of the deans most central to academic decision-making (including creating a new deanship) and eliminated all but one of the associate deans. We began reducing the deans’ teaching loads so that, after two years, they would be teaching just 1–2 courses per year and would be able to focus nearly full-time on leadership responsibilities.

• We created a new central body, the Academic Planning Council, to oversee planning, budgeting, and assessment, as well as continuous improvement of academic quality. The Academic Planning Council consists of the Executive Vice-President, the four academic committee chairs (deans), and the head of the college of computer science (who oversees our largest academic program).

• We simplified and reorganized the academic committee structure, resulting in four committees, each chaired by a dean. Every academic activity is covered by one of these deans and committees, assuring accountability and coordination for all academic functions. The new structure of deans and major committees looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Committee (chaired by the dean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Academic Programs</td>
<td>Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty Personnel Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Global Development</td>
<td>Global Development Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each academic dean, with his or her committee, is now responsible for gathering data, analyzing that data, and strategic planning in the area governed by the committee. Each dean brings those results to the Academic Planning Council for
planning; resulting initiatives go to the Academic Council for implementation.

Note — Several additional faculty members retained the title of dean in their specific academic areas, for example, Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of the College of Computer Science, and Dean of the Business College. The Dean of the Computer Science College is a member of APC, and the Dean of the Graduate School and Dean of the Business College are regular visitors to this council.

- The roles of the four deans are as follows:
  - Dean of Academic Programs — Oversees academic functions, including strategic planning for and evaluation of academic programs, review and development of academic policies, and (with the dean of the graduate school) review and development of research. Evaluation includes development and administration of assessment measures and collection of assessment data for general education. Monitors such indices as class size, enrollment by major, and graduates of each program. Writes the undergraduate report on the majors, used for setting strategic priorities.
  - Dean of Faculty — Oversees recruiting, hiring, compensation/benefits, and orientation of faculty. Oversees faculty performance reviews and, with the Dean of Academic Programs, monitors teaching loads, class sizes per course and per program, and other measures of department efficiency, etc. Chairs the Faculty Personnel Committee, responsible for quality of faculty life, including policies related to individual faculty hiring and compensation.
  - Dean of Teaching and Learning — Collects data relative to faculty classroom teaching performance, especially the indicators of student satisfaction embedded in the monthly end-of-course student survey. Visits classrooms to help faculty improve teaching. Monitors students’ end-of-course feedback surveys. Manages the training of new and continuing faculty.
  - Dean of Global Development — A new position and committee. Oversees international collaborations, study abroad opportunities, online education, and continuing education. Collects data and proposes initiatives related to off-campus University courses.

- We consolidated several committees.
- We standardized dates and protocols for committee meetings and arranged to have all meeting minutes posted online and available to the faculty (in process).
The new structure has been functioning as planned. The Academic Planning Council in particular has proven valuable as a central coordinating body overseeing all academic strategic issues and moving them forward, with assessment, planning, and budgeting at the center. The addition of a Dean of Global Development and his associated committee has also proven valuable in bringing greater attention and quality control to an important group of University activities and initiatives.

See Appendix 2 for an organizational chart showing the new governance structure.

* * *

The remainder of this report is divided into these sections:

(1) Academic Assessment — Sources of Data

(2) General Education — Findings and Results, 2010–2012

(3) General Education — Analysis of Data and Actions Taken

(4) General Education — Results of Actions Taken

(5) Individual Programs — Assessments, Results, and Actions, 2010–2012

(6) The New Academic Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting Cycle

---

**(1)**

**ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT — SOURCES OF DATA**

We assess academic effectiveness in these ways:

• **INDIVIDUAL COURSES** —

  Faculty evaluate the success of their courses using such traditional indicators of student performance as exams, quizzes, essays and other student writing, individual and group projects, and student presentations.

  In addition, at the end of each course, each student is asked to complete an end-of-course feedback questionnaire, anonymously. The form includes the following statements, with which students may strongly agree, agree, remain undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree
— for example, “I gained valuable knowledge from this class,” “The course seemed organized and well-prepared,” “The knowledge presented in this course was appropriately challenging for me,” “There was a good balance for me between gaining knowledge and working with it,” “I was able to obtain clear and satisfying answers to my questions,” “We had fulfilling class discussions,” and more.

In the spring semester 2012, we piloted the use of SmartEvals, a highly-ranked national student online evaluation system that provides a wide variety of reports to university administrators. SmartEvals is provided by an outside vendor, Gap Technologies. This system of collecting student feedback electronically offered many advantages over the previous paper and pencil system:

- Greater anonymity of student responders (no handwriting to be recognized)
- Faster feedback to the faculty (faculty who have turned in their grades can see their feedback one day after grades are due, compared to longer lapses created by the paper system)
- Online record keeping allows comparisons of feedback among separate courses taught by one faculty member or among sections of one course at the same time
- Program and department chairs as well as deans can access reports at the same time as teaching faculty (no need to pass forms from person to person or make photocopies)
- Deans can also easily access the reports

We fully implemented the system in the fall of 2012 and have expanded it to our distance education students in South Africa. Student response rates have exceeded 80%.

Another important quality assurance procedure is visits by the academic deans to individual classrooms.

At the end of each course they teach, the faculty reflect on their classroom assessments and other sources of feedback, evaluating the extent to which the course met its goals as well as program and general education goals. Then they write down their plans for how they will improve the course next time they teach it. These “Closing-the-Loop” reports are given to the department chair.
• INDIVIDUAL ACADEMIC PROGRAMS —

Department chairs draw assessment data from sources that include Closing-the-Loop reports on individual courses, classroom observations, capstone assessments, alumni surveys, records of faculty service and scholarship, results from the five-year program review cycle, data on departmental efficiency, assessment measures specific to the department, and discussions with departmental faculty.

Additionally, at the end of each academic year the faculty in each academic program meet with all graduating students — and sometimes all students in the program — to reflect together on how well the program has succeeded in achieving its learning goals and what might be done for improvement.

From these assessments, the department chairs write a Department Review of Student Learning Outcomes at the end of each year. Undergraduate program reports go to the Dean of Academic Programs, graduate program reports to the Dean of the Graduate School.

As part of the planning and budgeting process, the deans analyze indicators of efficiency for each academic department: student credit hours taught by each department, contribution to overhead, contribution to overhead as a percent of revenues, average number of students per class, total expense per student credit hour, payroll per student credit hour, and non-payroll expense per student credit hour (see Appendix 3).

Finally, each academic program undergoes a formal internal review process every five years. This process includes an assessment of each program by an outside evaluator and a curriculum comparison, in addition to the measures typically reviewed at the end of every year. See Appendix 4 for a schedule of these reviews.

• THE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM AS A WHOLE —

The primary data source here is a set of general education assessments, described in the next section.
The table below lists the general education assessment measures we use, reflecting our general education goals:

1) Student engagement
2) Development of consciousness
3) Growth of practical intelligence
4) High levels of health
5) Improved reading, critical thinking, and information literacy
6) Improved writing
7) Understanding of the interdisciplinary nature of knowledge

This table also shows the results from the past two academic years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>National Survey of Student Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What it measures</strong></td>
<td>This survey, created and administered by the Indiana University School of Education, is used by hundreds of four-year colleges and universities to gather data about undergraduate student participation in programs and activities that schools provide for their learning and personal development. The results provide an estimate of how undergraduates spend their time and what they gain from attending college. The NSSE is used to assess the extent to which students engage in proven educational practices that correspond to desirable learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How often we use it</strong></td>
<td>We have given this survey approximately every three years for the past dozen years or so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Development of Consciousness index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What it measures</strong></td>
<td>This instrument, developed here at Maharishi University of Management by Robert Cranson in 1987, measures by self-report a student’s experience of certain milestones associated with the theory of self-development that informs Consciousness-Based education. Each experience is checked for authenticity by a trained scorer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How often we use it</strong></td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **2010–2011 results** | Both longitudinal and cross-sectional data showed practical significance in change from first to senior years, suggesting that students who complete their undergraduate education here experience growth in development of consciousness. Cross-sectional analysis confirms this conclusion. These findings support the thesis that students are developing their ability to experience consciousness in its pure, least-excited, unbounded state — an experience that has been associated with numerous practical benefits, including increased intelligence, increased creativity, improved field independence, improved moral maturity, improved ego development, and improved academic performance (measured by higher grade point average). |
| **2011–2012 results** | The NSSE was not administered during this year. |
### 2011–2012 results
As in previous years, longitudinal analysis of senior student scores showed a positive change (from first year to senior year) in two of the four categories of development of consciousness (“transcending” and “witnessing during waking”), suggesting that this group of seniors experienced some growth in the development of consciousness.

### Measure
**Perception of Happiness scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it measures</th>
<th>Self-reported levels of state and trait happiness. Developed in 1983 by Richard Kammann and Ross Flett.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often we use it</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2010–2011 results
Results so far show that while our students reported higher levels of happiness compared to other college students, there was no difference in happiness scores between first-year and senior students. Over the next few years, as we collect more longitudinal data, we will be better able to see whether this finding is anomalous or consistent across entering cohorts.

### 2011–2012 results
Longitudinal analysis of senior student scores showed a positive increase in happiness scores (from first year to senior year); however, the difference was not statistically significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Constructive Thinking Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What it measures</td>
<td>Developed by Seymour Epstein at the University of Massachusetts, the CTI measures “common sense” or practical, social, and emotional intelligence, as distinct from intellectual intelligence. Practical intelligence refers to the ability to solve problems in everyday living with minimum stress. The CTI is strongly associated with academic and workplace achievement, social skills, leadership ability, ability to cope with stress, and mental and physical well-being. Practical intelligence does not typically develop during the college years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often we use it</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2010–2011 results       | • **Seniors** — Those who graduated in 2011 showed a positive change in all four subscales compared to their first-year scores, suggesting an overall growth in practical intelligence from first year to senior year.  
                          • **First-year** — Entering students in 2010–2011 showed scores comparable to seniors’ scores and above the adult norms in all four subscales.                                                                 |
| 2011–2012 results       | • **Seniors** — Unlike previous years, longitudinal analysis of senior student scores showed little to no change in all four subscales. Emotional coping showed a small positive change (approaching a small effect size) while the other categories were close to zero change. These results suggest that this group of MUM seniors did not change significantly in practical intelligence over the course of their education.  
                          • **First-year** — First-year student mean scores were similar to the senior mean scores in all four subscales. Also, first-year student mean scores were more favorable in Emotional Coping and categorical thinking and significantly lower in Behavioral Coping compared to adult mean scores. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Measure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Duke Health Profile</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What it measures</strong></td>
<td>Developed at Duke University Medical School, this self-report instrument contains six health measures (physical, mental, social, general, perceived health, and self-esteem) and four dysfunction measures (anxiety, depression, pain, and disability).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How often we use it</strong></td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010–2011 results</strong></td>
<td>Our students showed increases in health from the first to fourth years and generally higher levels of overall health than an adult patient population, consistent with our predicted outcome that students grow to a higher level of health during their years here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **2011–2012 results** | • **Seniors** — As before, longitudinal analysis of senior student scores showed positive changes in 3 of the 10 Duke Health subscales (increase in Mental Health score, decrease of Anxiety and Depression scores). No significant changes were observed in the other 7 health subscales. Cross-sectional data showed that senior students had significantly better scores than first year entering students on mental health, perceived health, self-esteem, reduced anxiety, depression, and pain scores.  
  • **First-year student** — Had a significantly better mean score on physical health than adult norms. Yet the data still suggested that senior students have a higher health-related quality of life than first-year students. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Measure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Educational Testing Service Proficiency Profile</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What it measures</strong></td>
<td>Skills in reading, critical thinking (the most advanced level of reading), writing, and mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often we use it</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **2010–2011 results** | • MUM has a greater percent of its students performing proficiently in the four core skill areas (reading, critical thinking, writing, and math) compared to students at other universities with the same Carnegie classification.  
• Cross-sectional analysis showed that first-year and senior average scaled scores were not statistically different in most skill areas. Further analysis is warranted for this finding.  
• Only half of the majors used the newly created Information Literacy rubric to assess their information literacy-intensive courses. The data indicated that nearly one-third of the students need more instruction to satisfactorily meet our informational literacy goals. |
| **2011–2012 results** | • Longitudinal analysis of senior student scores in reading, writing, math, and critical thinking showed no significant differences (from first year to senior year).  
• Cross-sectional analysis showed that first-year and senior students’ mean scores were not statistically different. In other words, both first-year and senior students had similar mean scores in reading, writing, math, and critical thinking.  
• Senior student mean scores were below national norms in 7 of 8 categories. First-year student mean scores were above national norms in 6 of 8 categories. It appeared that the entering students represented a significantly more academically able group than previous entering classes.  
• Review of prior years’ performance show that our students come in at generally higher levels than students at other institutions in our Carnegie classification. But cross-sectional analyses the last two years and longitudinal analysis last year (the first year this data was available) suggest that students’ performance does not improve while at the University. Future data will show whether this is a |
trend (see note below this table). In any case, these findings form part of the rationale for creating the new Creative and Critical Thinking Seminars (see the following section).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Ability to use interdisciplinary principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What it measures</td>
<td>Seniors self-report their ability to apply the University’s interdisciplinary core principles. These principles, such as the principle of least action in natural phenomena or the principle that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts, are identified in different forms in every academic discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often we use it</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2011 results</td>
<td>On a Likert scale of 5, seniors report their ability to apply the interdisciplinary core principles at 3.8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012 results</td>
<td>29 seniors (the total number taking the assessment) rated their understanding of interdisciplinary knowledge they gained at 4.1 out of 5 possible points during the Senior Capstone Seminar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though there were no changes in several general education measures over the last two years, this data needs to be viewed alongside data gathered over the last six years. Here is what we found during this period:

- **Constructive Thinking Inventory (CTI), a measure of “practical intelligence”** — We found longitudinal change from entrance to graduation on the four of the five times it was measured.

- **Critical thinking (ETC Proficiency Profile)** — We found longitudinal improvement in critical thinking two of the three times it was measured, along with cross-sectional differences between entering and graduating students two of the three times it was measured in this way.

- **Development of Consciousness Index** — We found positive change in the experience of higher states of consciousness in some or all of the scales measured all six times it was measured.
• **Perception of Happiness Scale** — The findings have been somewhat mixed. One year we found both longitudinal and cross-sectional change between the first year and the senior year. Another year, though there was no difference in scores between first-year and senior students, we found that seniors scored at a higher level than students at other colleges and universities.

• **Duke Health Profile** — We found cross-sectional difference between graduating students and adult norms on some of the scales of the Duke Health Profile, once on all the scales. The last time we administered it, as noted above, we also found improvements on three of the ten scales from entrance to graduation.

Therefore the lack of significant change in recent measurements on the CTI, the happiness scale, and the Academic Profile does not constitute a trend. We will of course continue to monitor these measures and, as the following section indicates, several of our new initiatives are aimed at enhancing outcomes in at least two of them.

**GROWTH IN OTHER MEASURES OF INNER DEVELOPMENT**

From time to time we look at student growth using other measures.

• **Intelligence** — Three published studies have shown that Maharishi University of Management students increased significantly in intelligence as measured by standardized, culture-fair IQ tests — notable findings in light of the fact that intelligence normally plateaus in adolescence.

• **Creativity** — There has been no systematic way to cultivate growth of creativity. But MUM students demonstrated significant increases in their scores on the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking over three and four years at MUM. These changes in students’ scores were significantly higher than national norms, suggesting that the Maharishi University of Management educational environment contributed to a higher growth of creativity.

• **Field independence** — Field independence refers to the ability to maintain broad comprehension while focusing on details — to see the forest while studying the trees. It usually levels off in adolescence. But Maharishi University of Management students showed growth of field independence from their first to fourth years. Field independence is also a measure of internal stability — the ability to solve problems independent of a complex background environment. People with greater field independence have a greater ability to assimilate and structure experience, improved memory, and greater creative expression. Thus our students’ performance
on field independence tests indicates growth in abilities basic to success in school, on the job, and in other areas of life.

Two studies looked at *ego development*, a holistic measure of overall maturity, character, and sense of self. This dimension of development ordinarily plateaus by about age 18 and does not change thereafter; even a college education has no effect on it. In 2008 a University PhD student completed a research study of 140 undergraduate students, tracking their growth from their first year to their senior year using a standardized test of ego development, the Washington University Sentence Completion Test. She also used two measures mentioned above, the Constructive Thinking Inventory and self-reported experiences of growth of consciousness. The results were as follows:

- *Ego development* — Students showed a significant increase in ego development, with the mean shifting from the “self-aware” stage (first-year students) to the “conscientious” stage (fourth-year students) — a full stage on the nine-stage scale. As seniors, 29.2% of the students had reached post-conventional ego developmental stages (the top three stages). In contrast, only about 10% of the general population reaches this level. This finding among college students is unprecedented.

- *Constructive Thinking Inventory* — Students increased significantly on three sub-scales: global constructive thinking, behavioral coping, and emotional coping.

- *Experiences of growth of consciousness* — Students grew significantly in two subscales of experiences associated with higher stages of human development.

These measures, taken together, are indicators of maturity, wisdom, and effective action.
This study extended earlier research, also conducted by a PhD student. In this study, published in 2005 in the *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, the same ego development measure was given to Maharishi University of Management students and to students at three other colleges during their senior year. Then, ten years later, it was given again to the same subjects, now well into their careers. This study measured the percentage who scored in the top two stages, “autonomous” and “integrated”; typically only 1-3% of the population scores at the two highest levels of this test.

- **Pretest** – Of seniors at the control universities, 1-3% scored at the two highest levels — typical of the national adult population. Among MUM seniors, 9% scored at the two highest levels; they had been practicing the Transcendental Meditation technique an average of four years at that point.

- **Posttest** – Ten years later, among the alumni from the control universities, 1-3% scored at the two highest levels — as expected. Among MUM seniors, the number scoring at the autonomous and integrated levels had risen to 38% — unprecedented in the scientific literature.

This data on ego development supports the hypothesis that Consciousness-Based education promotes fundamental inner growth, helping young people grow in wisdom, capacity for leadership, and the ability to live balanced, peaceful, and productive lives.

At this time of rapid change, when college graduates can expect to have several careers and many different jobs over their lifespan — and when many of these careers and jobs will be unrelated to what graduates studied in college — it is important for leaders in higher education to consider what a college or university education can give students that will
benefit them throughout their lives. Until now the discussion has been largely about such values as critical thinking, communication skills, information and computer literacy, and so on. The research studies described here indicate that a college education can give students a technology of personal development that systematically expands their capacities at a very fundamental level — and that this growth continues years after students have graduated, regardless of their career paths, supporting their professional success and personal fulfillment.

Other sources of information

Several other sources provided information about the effectiveness of the academic program as a whole. These included:

THE END-OF-COURSE FEEDBACK FORMS —

The end-of-course feedback forms, while primarily useful for assessing and improving individual courses, also provide data which, when aggregated, gives a sense of the student experience as a whole. The scores represent a Likert scale of 1 to 5. The table below displays the undergraduate data for the last three semesters, 71% of the students on average responding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Spring</th>
<th>2012 Fall</th>
<th>2013 Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I gained valuable knowledge</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course was well organized</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course was challenging</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good balance between theory and application</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received clear answers to my questions</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received timely feedback</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The application of SCI was valuable</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUDENT SATISFACTION INVENTORY —

The Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), developed by Noel-Levitz and used by hundreds of schools nationally, surveys students on all aspects of their university experience. Along with satisfaction, the SSI assesses the importance of each questionnaire item to students. This yields a picture of an institution’s strengths (areas of high satisfaction and high student
importance) and challenges (areas of lower satisfaction and high importance), as well as areas of high satisfaction/low importance and low satisfaction/low importance. This information enables the institution to prioritize resources in addressing challenges.

We administer this survey every two to three years. One theme emerging from the questions related to students’ academic experience is the need for continued faculty focus on improving academic rigor. While the SSI reveals a number of good strengths — in students’ feeling of safety and security on campus, their sense of intellectual growth, their enjoyment of their experience here, their perception of the faculty’s expertise in their fields, and more — there are also some challenges relating to their perception of the quality of academic instruction and their sense of the University’s commitment to academic excellence. (See the following section, “General Education – Analysis of Data and Actions Taken,” for a discussion of what the University is doing to meet these challenges.)

MEETINGS WITH SENIOR CAPSTONE STUDENTS —
Each year the Executive Vice-President and Dean of Faculty visit each Senior Capstone course to speak with students about their experiences at the University, hearing about what has worked well for the students and what they feel could benefit from improvement.

In addition, University leaders also attended open forum meetings with students to discuss their experiences.

BRAIN INTEGRATION PROGRESS REPORT —
This involves using the EEG to measure the degree of integration of brain functioning, particularly in the pre-frontal cortex, the brain’s “executive control center” or “CEO.” A considerable body of research shows that during practice of the Transcendental Meditation technique, brain functioning becomes highly integrated across all brain areas — and that with regular meditation practice, this integrated functioning becomes the brain’s habitual style of functioning outside of meditation.

Another sizeable body of research shows that regular Transcendental Meditation practice leads to significant growth of intelligence (IQ), creativity, field independence, moral maturity, academic performance, and other measures — and that this growth is significantly correlated with growth of brain integration. In other words, the greater one’s brain integration, the higher one’s intelligence, creativity, etc. It should be noted that intelligence, field independence, and moral maturity normally level off in adolescence and do not develop further after that.
Still other research indicates that what distinguishes top leaders from lower level managers, and world-class athletes from athletes who are professionals but not world class, is the level of brain integration.

The brain integration is a measure of great interest at Maharishi University of Management, as increased brain integration is a predicted outcome of our Consciousness-Based educational approach.

All students have the option to have their brain integration assessed, but neither the original or the follow-up session is required. The assessment is done by Dr. Fred Travis and his staff in our Center for Brain, Consciousness, and Cognition. About 25-30% of incoming first-year students take advantage of the Brain Integration Progress Report. As this assessment is relatively recent, only a few thus far who have done the BIPR as first-year students have done so again as seniors, so it has not been possible to determine whether these results will be similar to the results of earlier studies.

---
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GENERAL EDUCATION —
ANALYSIS OF DATA AND ACTIONS TAKEN

In the period 2010-2011, analysis of the data and information from all of these sources had revealed some clear challenges along with a variety of strengths. The challenges centered around:

• increasing student engagement and academic rigor — fostering more “stretch” without “stress.” Despite a focus since the mid-1990s on active learning across the curriculum, it was clear that more was needed. Because we have a relatively liberal admissions policy, faculty are often faced with a wide range of entering abilities in the courses. This range notwithstanding, it is clear that both advanced and novice students must feel challenged and rewarded for their effort.

• promoting growth in such areas as critical thinking and writing and increasing the amount of writing and revising that students do

• addressing the experience that students often confuse the University’s focus on a scientifically grounded unified field theory of consciousness with a philosophy or a dogma
As the result of discussions with various faculty committees, we developed an interrelated series of initiatives that were planned in 2011–2012 and implemented at the beginning of 2012–2013, all geared toward improving student engagement, learning, and success:

**CREATIVE AND CRITICAL THINKING SEMINARS —**

This new component of the undergraduate general education program involved creating a set of courses that were required of all new undergraduates starting in the fall of 2012. Faculty in eight departments created courses: Art, Literature, Music, Sustainable Living, Mathematics, Management, Physiology & Health, and Education.

These courses are designed to support development of students’ critical thinking abilities as well as to promote a critical and scientific attitude toward all topics of academic study.

The content of the seminars focuses on issues in the discipline, but the approach to the discipline content allows faculty to introduce students to — and have them practice using — the vocabulary and thinking skills associated with deep thinking in the discipline.

In each seminar, students were introduced to specific themes and issues in the discipline. But they also stepped back and learned how knowledge in each discipline progresses — namely through ongoing conversations between experts in the fields. During these conversations, the experts take a particular position in support of which they provide a series of reasons and evidence.

Students learned such critical thinking skills as the ability to locate, in a reading or lecture, the structure of an argument for specific conclusions or positions presented, including the logic, evidence, and any other reasons given to support the conclusion or position. They also discussed alternate explanations or positions presented in the argument — and if there weren’t any, they created and evaluated such alternatives.

Students read books and articles by experts in the discipline. Then they practiced locating the thesis or conclusion of the text and the reasons and evidence given in their support. Then they began practicing evaluating these reasons and evidence in terms of their logic, research design (if applicable), and completeness. They also learned about the specific kinds of evidence that are accepted in support of theses in the discipline they were studying (textual elements in Literature, for example, versus scientific research in Physiology and Health).

General elements of the Creative and Critical Thinking Seminars:

- Seminar sections are limited to 15 students to ensure small class size.
• The seminars require no previous knowledge of the discipline.

• They are reading-, writing-, and research-intensive, focusing on specific, fascinating topics in the discipline, rather than introductory survey courses.

• They give priority to process issues in the discipline (i.e., the analytic and evaluative skills associated with the use of knowledge in the discipline) rather than coverage of a wide range of content.

• They introduce students to a realistic experience of academic research and writing in these disciplines and focus on the critical thinking skills utilized by experts.

• All seminars use the same rubric as the basis for assessing students’ critical thinking abilities. However, the specific assessment strategy for each seminar is up to the teachers. For example, such assessments can take the form of submitting at least two short position papers (5-8 pages) or presenting two short oral arguments (5-8 minutes). Students submit their work in draft form for feedback by the faculty and then revise it before submitting it for final grading.

The project, led by Dr. Sam Boothby, involved two weeks of training for an initial group of eight faculty in the concepts and methods of education for critical thinking and creating the new Creative and Critical Thinking seminars.

In addition, because we want the values of creative and critical thinking to permeate the curriculum, all faculty received two days of preliminary training in incorporating these principles and practices in their courses. This training took place during the annual Faculty Development Seminar in August 2012. As part of this training, all faculty received a copy of the book by John Bean, Engaging Ideas: The Professor’s Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom (2011), which the faculty read and discussed.

In the future, additional faculty will receive the more in-depth training, to further support the goal of enhancing the principles and practices of creative and critical thinking across the curriculum.

• RENEWED FOCUS ON WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM —

This initiative went hand in hand with the new focus on critical thinking. Writing is a fundamental mode of learning and communicating. It involves deep engagement with knowledge and promotes learning and growth of critical thinking, particularly when students
are asked to revise their work based on feedback. Introductory training was also part of the August faculty training workshops. John Bean’s *Engaging Ideas* was a valuable resource in this as well.

In the fall of 2012, we established a writing center, clearing and renovating space in the Library. We hired a full-time writing center director, and we organized training for about 10 students as peer writing tutors in the writing center.

For further training, we will bring in a nationally known consultant, Dr. Kathleen Yancey, a professor at Florida State University, for a day during the Faculty Development Seminar in August 2013. (We tried to bring her here on two occasions this year, but flight connections and inclement weather prevented her coming.)

**• ENHANCED FACULTY TRAINING IN THE CLASSROOM STRATEGIES OF CONSCIOUSNESS-BASED EDUCATION —**

Our approach to education includes a body of classroom teaching strategies specifically designed to promote holistic development, or development of consciousness as a whole. These strategies include connecting all disciplines to a unifying framework of knowledge, enabling students to connect pieces of knowledge to a larger wholeness of knowledge and then to connect that wholeness to their own meditation experience, and utilizing wall charts to display and summarize the main points of learning at a glance.

Training in these strategies has always been an aspect of faculty development, but during the past two years it has received additional emphasis with the leadership of Dr. Susan Dillbeck, formerly professor of education, chair of the Education Department, and Dean of the Graduate School, and currently a member of the Board of Trustees. Assisting Dr. Dillbeck was Dr. Jane Schmidt-Wilk, Dean of Teaching and Learning, and Dr. Chris Jones, former chair of the Education Department and now Dean of Academic Programs.

Training took place in the August Faculty Development Seminar as well as in many of the monthly Faculty Development Workshops during the year.

These workshops address a concern from the ongoing classroom observation process and end-of-course feedback forms, which indicated that students do not always understand or appreciate the purpose or benefits of the Consciousness-Based teaching practices. Subsequent faculty discussions and visits to classrooms confirm that faculty are beginning to use these strategies more effectively. One way we will monitor the outcomes of these initiatives is with new question of the end-of-course feedback surveys: “How valuable was
the use of SCI (the Science of Creative Intelligence, Maharishi’s contribution to the science of consciousness) in this class?” We predict that, as we employ these methods more effectively, student agreement with this statement will rise.

By December 2013 we will have completed a more extensive video-based plan for training faculty in effectively using Consciousness-Based classroom teaching strategies.

• CAMPUS-WIDE UNDERGRADUATE SENIOR PROJECT PROGRAM —

Our academic programs have had a variety of end-of-program activities, including theses, exit exams, portfolios, and projects. Starting in 2012–2013, we re-framed this as a university-wide program with consistent features and standards. All departments will require a senior project of their majors. Ideally taking place across two academic blocks, this will be the culminating experience for all undergraduate students. It will involve a written component and a public presentation as well as a written self-reflection by each student on what worked, what didn’t work and why, and how the student grew as a learner. This new initiative aims to bring greater consistency to senior projects across the curriculum, as well as deepen student learning by giving students the opportunity to integrate what they have learned, encourage creative problem-solving skills, enable independent work, and increase academic rigor.

• ENHANCING FACULTY RESEARCH AND PUBLISHING —

It is part of the University’s mission to expand the domains of knowledge through scholarship — and we recognize that faculty scholarship, by supporting faculty to be active at the forefront of their disciplines, can enrich teaching and lead to a richer student experience. To enhance faculty research and publishing, we took these measures in 2011–2012:

• New symposia and colloquia — The Education and Maharishi Vedic Science departments hosted a series of colloquia on topics in their respective fields. The year’s highlight was a three-day all-faculty symposium conceived and chaired by Dr. Tony Nader, a noted research scientist in neuroscience and medicine. A long-time friend of the University and leader of the worldwide Transcendental Meditation organization, Dr. Nader invited all academic departments to present the cutting-edge developments in their fields and discuss them in relation to the science of consciousness. The presentations and discussions were profound, engaging, and inspiring to all faculty.
• *Monthly research presentations* — During the Faculty Development Seminar in August 2012 and during each monthly Faculty Development Workshop and Faculty Senate meeting, a faculty member gave a presentation on his or her research.

NOTE ON BUDGETING TO SUPPORT THESE PLANS — These initiatives involved very little expense. The primary resource involved has been faculty time. The modest expenses involved — for renovating space for the writing center and hiring a writing center director, books for the faculty, the writing-across-the-curriculum consultant now planned for August — have all been readily accommodated within the University’s operating budget.

---
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GENERAL EDUCATION:  
RESULTS OF ACTIONS TAKEN

The initiatives described above grew out of a several-year process of assessing the data, developing plans for responding to the challenges, and implementing those plans. Likewise, because of the longer-term growth we are seeking to cultivate, it will be several years before we will be able to measure the results objectively — only as the undergraduate students entering in 2012 reach the end of their academic programs here, three or four years from now.

With regard to the Creative and Critical Thinking Seminars, however, initial observations by the Dean of Teaching and Learning and assessments by the faculty are encouraging. The faculty reported that in all seminars held in these last two semesters the students demonstrated mastery of the ability to distinguish the thesis of a reading from its topic and to list the author’s reasons in support of the thesis. In addition, students developed the ability to generate alternative explanations for a thesis as well as creative solutions to problems. They also wrote a paper that was required to have a clearly stated thesis and a series of reasons to support it. Mastery of evaluation abilities varied across the seminars. Faculty reported that in six of the eight seminars, the students developed the ability to recognize incomplete or missing parts of an argument. In five seminars they gained the ability to locate discipline-specific evidence. Only half of the seminars taught students the ability to locate formal or informal logical fallacies.

Feedback from the students in the CCT Seminars has also been encouraging. As one student wrote on the end-of-course feedback form,
Learning how to think critically and assess claims that people make to see if they’re legitimate is such a valuable skill to have. I’m so glad MUM has classes like this.

The CCT Seminars, as hoped, also helped address the challenge of some students in perceiving the University’s unifying framework of knowledge as a dogma, for these principles were subjected to the same critical thinking procedures as the principles in the various disciplines being studied. A faculty member who developed and taught one of the seminars wrote the following:

I have to say that I’m a fan of this technique. Students are given a chance to work with the new concepts and paradigms of SCI [the Science of Creative Intelligence]. They’re given a forum for expressing their questions and concerns and furthering their understanding. . . . Now they feel heard. That takes the edge off their complaints, and then they can allow themselves to integrate the knowledge and move forward.

I very much appreciate how I, as a teacher, have a tool to allow students the safety to express any objections, and I don’t have to take those objections personally or feel guarded about being defensive. It’s all within an academic setting, so my response is concerned with their depth of understanding and their ability to write logically, and that’s it.

**Strategic initiatives planned for implementation in 2013–2014**

To build on the above initiatives, we will pilot the following measures starting in the fall semester of the next academic year, 2013–2014:

- **WRITING PORTFOLIO FOR ALL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS**

  This initiative is aimed at (a) helping students put the pieces of their learning together into larger wholes and reflect on that, and (b) increasing the visibility and sense of importance of writing across the curriculum. All students, sometime before their senior year, will submit a portfolio of their writing. The portfolio will contain four pieces of writing, plus a brief reflective essay discussing how the pieces in the portfolio illustrate their growth as a writer and their development as a whole. Students may include whatever writing they feel best demonstrates their intellectual and personal growth. All pieces must be at least 500 words long, at least one must be at least 1,500 words, and at least one must be a research paper demonstrating the student’s ability to use secondary sources and document them properly.
• **GRADUATION PORTFOLIO FOR ALL UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS**

Students will begin building this online portfolio starting from their first course at the University. They will post papers and projects from each course, a resume they will update periodically, a journal in which they reflect on how they are growing, and their Writing Portfolio and Senior Project. Thus the Graduation Portfolio is the ultimate “deliverable” in the student’s career. The Graduation Portfolio will also be a valuable means of assessing student progress and the undergraduate curriculum as a whole.

---
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**INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS — ASSESSMENTS, RESULTS, AND ACTIONS, 2010–2012**

The following table summarizes the variables, measures, and analyses of undergraduate program-level outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Quality and originality of student artwork</td>
<td>A visiting artist from another college evaluates graduating students’ work using a questionnaire</td>
<td>Department looks for convergence of ratings and qualitative comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Management</td>
<td>Analytic problem solving using knowledge of business functions</td>
<td>Rubric-based assessment of business plans submitted in capstone course</td>
<td>The department looks at the number of students attaining “B” or better rating on each of six criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Ability to teach in real classroom</td>
<td>Three measures are used: a narrative report by cooperating teacher, a rating form filled out by student and cooperating teacher, and teacher end-of-program portfolio</td>
<td>All students must receive an acceptable rating on every competency associated with effective teaching and have two opportunities to demonstrate proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Ability to write literary interpretation and analysis</td>
<td>Students complete a “final project” in which they write a longer research and analysis paper of two or more literary works by the same author</td>
<td>Department faculty read and evaluate the strengths and weakness of the final papers according to six criteria set in the evaluation. They use performance of the group to determine which criteria have been adequately taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharishi Vedic Science</td>
<td>Each of seven learning objectives is measured in different courses</td>
<td>A variety of measures are used, from journals to exams</td>
<td>The department faculty evaluate the courses using percentages of students receiving different grade levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Knowledge of mathematics and problem solving abilities</td>
<td>The Putnam national exam, the math field placement test of the Educational Testing Service, and the GRE mathematical reasoning subscale</td>
<td>The department reports scores for each of the tests and interviews students to see which sections they found most difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Communication</td>
<td>Students’ ability to create well-crafted and appealing media projects of lasting value</td>
<td>Students complete a final project over one or two months that is evaluated by department faculty</td>
<td>The department rates the final project with a rubric in keeping with the goals of the program and notes strengths and weaknesses over the graduating cohort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology and Health</td>
<td>Skill in diagnosing one’s own pulse and knowledge of chemistry</td>
<td>Faculty conduct performance assessments of student self-pulse assessments and use the American Chemical Society’s undergraduate chemistry exam</td>
<td>The department keeps records of the number of students able to accurately identify qualities in their own pulse and compares their students’ performance on the ACS exam with national norms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Living</td>
<td>Knowledge of a set of sustainability concepts posted publicly on a department wall. Students are expected to be able to define each concept (e.g., wind power) and relate it to the overarching concept of sustainability. They are also expected to be able to complete a project that contributes to our knowledge and technology of sustainability.</td>
<td>Over two months, students research, plan, and carry out an independent project that draws upon all of their coursework. They have to submit any design or physical creation together with a 15-page paper explaining the design plus its benefits. The exit exam has three parts: an oral exam, a short answer section, and an essay.</td>
<td>The paper is evaluated against 10 criteria on a rubric that students are given at the start of the project. Average performance of each graduating group is recorded and used to evaluate the strengths and weakness of the program. On the exit exam, the department calculates an average performance on each of 11 areas of sustainability covered in the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here are some examples of actions taken by academic programs as a result of their internal assessments:

• ART —

The visiting evaluator in 2011, Laurel Farrin, Head of Painting at the University of Iowa, looked at paintings, sculpture, and ceramics by undergraduate students at various levels, discussed art works with painting students, and read art history essays. Overall she assessed the BA students as in the top 30% of all the BA students she has seen. She commented:
Even though the faculty is too small, they are strong, teach to their strengths and give the students superb and supportive instruction. Students in general seem involved and eager. The work produced in the classes I saw was on a par with similar classes at other institutions. The faculty has made the best use of the facilities possible.

• BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION —

Business majors prepare business plans in their capstone course. These plans are evaluated in five areas. Data from the business plans written by the 21 students in MGT 430 showed that more than 70% of the students achieved a satisfactory performance (A- or B-level work) in three components of their business plans — business concept, marketing, and finance. The percentage of satisfactory work fell to 60-69% in two areas, human resources and operations; these require a more precise vision of the company and its strategy. Students’ placement statistics showed that 94% of 2010 graduates had a job or were in graduate school one year after their graduation. The low pass rate on the human resource component of the business plans led the department faculty to work more closely together in planning and delivering the capstone course, so that the topics from human resource management and operations were reviewed during this course.

• EDUCATION —

The department divided a course on curriculum and evaluation into two courses, one on curriculum building, the other on assessment and evaluation. This change was prompted by analyzing the quality of student portfolios against the standards for student performance determined by the department. Initial results show improved quality of student-created unit designs and assessment measures.

• LITERATURE —

Students write a senior thesis at the completion of the major. Analysis of these theses showed that students were strongest in analytical reading and interpretation and weakest in connecting their discipline to the Science and Technology of Consciousness. The latter finding, when combined with that of other departments (see Sustainable Living below) contributed to the increased attention in faculty development on integrating subject matter with the Science and Technology of Consciousness.

• SUSTAINABLE LIVING —

The program has continued its Senior Project requirement for all students and instituted an
exit exam for a subset of students. On the Senior Project, students received highest marks for “Choice of topic,” “Command of context,” and “Connection of self to world,” three dimensions indicating awareness of broader sustainable living concerns. The weakest areas were “Execution” (project management) and “Use of Maharishi Vedic Science.” The department has addressed these weaknesses by increasing faculty time and attention on the final project and creating more precise policies governing it. They also developed training to enable faculty to teach students project management skills as part of the final project course. The concerns about the use of the Science and Technology of Consciousness, as mentioned above, have been addressed by all-faculty workshops and increased focus during the faculty orientation course on using this interdisciplinary framework.

- PHYSIOLOGY AND HEALTH —

The department sent one of its faculty to a training program for a new experiment-based approach to teaching college physics. Faculty and students in this course reported a new level of engagement and learning.

The department faculty reviewed students’ final projects and determined that too many students were taking incompletes in this project and not graduating on time.

**Rubric for undergraduate program assessment**

We have also developed a rubric to indicate our goals for each undergraduate academic program, and we rate each of the departments on seven criteria:

- developing and publishing a mission statement
- developing and publishing a manageable set of learning objectives or competencies
- developing and updating an assessment plan and publishing the chief measures on the departmental web page
- providing evidence from the assessment plan that has integrity (reliability and validity)
- measuring and improving department efficiency in delivering their courses within their personnel and budgetary resources
- developing and providing the administration with a detailed budget
- giving evidence of using data in strategic planning

This next table shows how each department rates on these seven measures, according to a four-point rubric (see key at the bottom of the table).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Assmt Plan</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharishi Vedic Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Communications</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology and Health</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Living</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Not yet started • 2 = In progress • 3 = Fully functional • 4 = Exemplary

Details on the above chart:

- **Mission statements** — All departments have mission statements and summaries of the knowledge and competencies students will master. Some departments still need to publish their mission statements on their web pages. Some need to relate the objectives to their course offerings in a course-by-objectives table and to publish this table on their web pages.

- **Assessment plan** — All departments have a fully functional assessment plan, on file with the Dean of Academic Programs (column “Assmt Plan”). Some departments need to do a better job in aligning learning goals, findings, and improvements.

- **Integrity of the evidence gathered** — Most departments have internal expertise in assessment processes and have learned to gather reliable and useful data. Some are
still working with the reliability and validity of their assessments, but all are aware of their shortcomings and working to overcome these.

- **Efficiency** — All departments are aware of one or two efficiency measures, of the four presented in Appendix 3. Some have been more proactive than others in striving to improve efficiency.

- **Budgeting** — All departments have submitted their budgets; some are more detailed than others.

- **Strategic planning** — All departments have begun to use their assessment data in planning. In the next round of reports, due at the end of July, all programs will have documented changes they have made based on data they have gathered. The undergraduate report of student learning outcomes contains a more detailed analysis of each department’s data gathering techniques and plans.

### Graduate program assessment

Four departments offer graduate degree programs: Business Administration, Computer Science, Education, and Maharishi Vedic Science. The first two also offer PhD programs. Major achievements and issues for each of the programs, based on a summary of student learning outcomes filed at the end of 2011–2012, are as follows:

- **Business Administration** —
  
  - **Achievements** — the department’s recent IACBE accreditation renewal and their good use of rubrics and reports in their student outcomes measures
  
  - **Main issue** — how to keep up with their expansive vision, which takes them into online education, especially in South Africa, where the MBA is being offered to managers in a leading telecommunications firm

- **Maharishi Vedic Science** —
  
  - **Achievements** — increasing enrollment, stimulated largely by word of mouth among graduating students. They are working to improve the objectivity of the ratings of students’ final projects.
  
  - **Main issues** — (1) the increased time students need to complete the final project; they have added an extra month for this project and will pilot this adjustment this summer; (2) defining the job outcomes for the program, which is more life-oriented than job-oriented
• **Computer Science** —
  o *Achievements* — rising enrollments and the success of their admissions team; placing 90% of their graduates in practicums within six months of graduation, reflecting the graduates’ perceived value in the current economy
  o *Main issues* — better measurement of learning outcomes — they have clear learning goals but rely too heavily on grades as indicators of success. They have been mandated to develop such measures, possibly using a revised version of their “triannual graduate survey.”

• **Education** —
  o *Achievements* — has a well-designed program overall with a handbook for its candidates and clear objectives and assessment measures
  o *Main issues* — enrollment and adequate faculty expertise. This latter issue was largely resolved in 2012 by hiring a second full-time PhD in science education.

In the area of faculty research, this year 24 faculty were involved in publications, up from 10 last year. Research presentations by faculty at monthly Faculty Senate meetings will boost the visibility of research, as will a new symposium planned for April 2013. We will continue monitoring research activity to see if this trend continues.

---

(6)

**THE NEW ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT, PLANNING, AND BUDGETING CYCLE**

Over the past three years we have more tightly linked assessment, planning, and budgeting. We have also given more attention to departmental efficiency and given the departments more responsibility for strategic thinking and ownership of the budgeting process.

The new planning cycle follows a year-long process of data gathering, analysis, and reporting, followed by a second year of setting strategic priorities, planning, and budgeting. While gathering data for the current year, departments plan the next year’s budget. For details, see Appendix 5, “Annual Academic Assessment, Reporting, Planning, and Budgeting Process.”

Although planning and budgeting for 2013–2014 is still in process, several themes are clear,
representing the next steps in continuous improvement of instruction:

- **Continue to focus on academic quality** — All aspects of planning focus on a single goal: improving student learning and growth. All measures of efficiency, faculty research, student learning, and enrollment growth need to support this focus. For example, enrollment growth that jeopardizes quality is not desirable. See Appendix 6, “Diagram of Academic Assessment and Planning System for 2013–2014” for a summary of our assessment and planning system.

- **Supervise the publishing of all program level frameworks** — By the end of this academic year, all academic programs will publish their mission statements, learning objectives, assessment measures, and course-by-objective tables on their website for prospective and current students to see.

- **Implement a cycle for assessing general education outcomes** — By the end of this coming August we will have developed a six-year cycle for measuring each of the general education outcomes the faculty have identified as crucial for all programs. This will provide a systematic, manageable way of gathering reliable and practical data to be used in improving general education across the curriculum. As part of this, we will develop uniform rubrics for all courses and programs, based on the general education outcomes, similar to what has been created for information literacy (e.g., in writing, reading, critical thinking, knowledge presentations, and small group work), an important step for focusing on these outcomes across the undergraduate curriculum.

- **Complete and implement the plan for faculty development** — By December 2013 we will complete our plan for training faculty in effectively using the range of Consciousness-Based classroom teaching strategies. It will take several years to prepare the video training packages for this. The Dean of Teaching and Learning is responsible for these initiatives, with support of the Academic Committee of the Trustees.

- **Apply the standards of planning and assessment to continuing education and online degree-oriented education** — By the end of August we will have developed a set of standards for online courses, consistent with national standards. Bill Goldstein, Dean of Global Development, is responsible for this initiative, with the support of the Academic Planning Council.

- **Support increased faculty research and publishing** — Building on the symposia held last year, the graduate school dean has scheduled another symposium in April
of this year that will give faculty an opportunity to present their ideas to the larger community of scholars at the University, and we will schedule at least one such symposium annually.

APPENDICES FOR THIS SECTION:

- Appendix 2 – Restructured Academic Governance
- Appendix 3 – Academic Department Metrics, 2011-2012 Academic Year
- Appendix 4 – Academic Program Review Schedule
- Appendix 5 – Annual Academic Assessment, Reporting, Planning, and Budgeting Process
- Appendix 6 – Diagram of Academic Assessment and Planning System for 2013–2014

RESOURCE ROOM:

- Copies of selected Closing-the-Loop reports from 2010, 2011, 2012
- Copies of the General Education Assessment Reports for 2009-2012
- Copies of all annual Undergraduate and Graduate Student Learning Outcomes Summaries from 2010, 2011, 2012
- 2010 Iowa Department of Education report
- 2011 IACBE Self-study for the Business Administration department
- Minutes of Executive Council meetings at which assessment reports were discussed in the context of budgeting
D. STRATEGIC PLANNING FOR HUMAN RESSOURCING: PERFORMANCE REVIEWS AND COMPENSATION PLANNING

This section addresses the following point from the 2009 team’s report:

(d) Evidence that strategic planning for human resourcing includes regular performance reviews for staff, faculty, and administration, as well as compensation and benefits planning at all levels to assure ability to replace retiring staff and faculty

PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

We have established a performance review process at every level of University governance and functioning. This performance review process has the following goals:

- to promote goal setting and foster alignment between individual, departmental, and organizational goals and priorities
- to promote performance improvement at all levels
- to support a culture of responsibility and accountability at all levels
- to support good communication at all levels
- to identify training and mentoring needs
- to identify any other issues that may need attention and resolution
- to provide a regular mechanism for appreciating the good work people do at every level of the organization.

Beneath the Board level, we have adopted a two-step feedback and review process.

- In the first step, employees complete a self-evaluation form and return it to their manager several days before their performance review. We have created several versions of this form according to the category of person using it (e.g., faculty, staff member, department head). The self-evaluation form offers each individual an opportunity to identify their personal achievements and goals, their most significant job responsibilities, their progress in achieving these goals, and areas where the employee sees a need for improvement and training. This is in addition to any
written or verbal status reports from employees on their projects and goals throughout the year.

- **The second step** consists of a more formal review with the individual’s immediate supervisor. During this meeting the employee and the supervisor review and discuss the form together. Employees are invited to share their desires and plans for their career growth and longer-term professional objectives, including new responsibilities and projects that will help to achieve their goals.

Employees are accountable for their own progress towards meeting goals, with support from their department head. This requires regular (and more informal) status reports throughout the year.

The University-wide performance review process began formally for the Board of Trustees in May 2011 and for other levels in 2011–2012:

- **Board of Trustees** — The Board has established an annual system of self-assessment conducted principally through an anonymous survey, with data gathered by the Governance Committee of the board (which includes the Chair and Vice-Chair), and with responses shared and discussed with the Board as a whole. In addition, individual Trustees being considered for re-election are assessed at the end of their terms by the other Trustees.

- **President and Executive Vice-President** — The Board has also established a system of performance evaluation for these two chief officers. The President and Executive Vice-President submit their goals annually to the Trustee Compensation and Evaluation Committee. The Committee then interviews the President and Executive Vice-President after the end of the academic year to discuss the extent to which these goals were achieved, to look at the alignment between these goals and those of the University as a whole, and to give feedback. The results of this interview are then reported at a meeting of the Board as a whole, at which time the entire Board has the opportunity to discuss the goals and their achievement and to give input to the President and Executive Vice-President.

- **Executive Council** — The President and Executive Vice-President meet annually (at minimum) with each member of the Executive Council. Prior to this meeting the Executive Council member completes a self-evaluation form that becomes the basis for discussion in the meeting.
• **Administrative department heads** — The respective member of the Executive Council (e.g., the Chief Administrative Officer) meets at least annually with the head of each administrative department, using the process described above.

• **Administrative staff** — The department heads meet at least annually with the individual members of their departments, following this same procedure. The self-evaluation reports go into the individuals’ files in the Human Resource office.

• **Academic department chairs** — The Dean of Faculty meets individually with each department chair, annually and sometimes more often, following this same process. She does so after the department chairs have met individually with the faculty in their departments, so that any issues resulting from these meetings can be discussed as well.

• **Faculty** — The academic department chairs meet individually with the faculty in their departments. The written reports go into the faculty member’s file in the Dean of Faculty office.

This process has proven quite satisfying and rewarding at all levels. People have appreciated the opportunity for these meetings. We are now considering twice-yearly reviews for individual faculty and staff.

**RESOURCE ROOM:**

• Folder containing a list of all faculty and staff for whom performance reviews were conducted in 2012, to guide the visitors in selecting specific ones for review.

• Minutes of the Board of Trustees’ evaluation of the President and Executive Vice-President

• Self-evaluation forms used for faculty and staff as well as the summary form used by the department chairs.

**Compensation and benefits planning**

Maharishi University of Management was founded without an endowment. In its place we have had the benefit of a “human endowment” — dedicated and skilled faculty and staff who have been willing to work for less than market salaries. This has enabled the University to function and expand in the years since it was founded.

We always have recognized, however, that to attract and maintain the highest-quality faculty
and staff over time, we need to move towards compensation closer to the market standard. Our compensation plan consists of defining pay grades based on ranks of both faculty and staff and then setting compensation targets for those pay grades. There are both short-term and intermediate-term targets, though these remain below market wages. Our revised five-year Strategic Plan projects sufficient revenues to reach these intermediate goals by 2016–2017, including filling needed new positions and replacing retiring or departing employees.

The chart below shows the short-term and intermediate-term goals for the various pay categories. *Base Stipends* are the cash amount received. *Total Package Value* for faculty and monthly staff includes the base stipend plus $1,100 worth of benefits that most people receive, including housing, food, and health insurance. For hourly employees, the total package cost is based on a 36-hour-work week plus lunches valued at $125/month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Compensation plan 2013</th>
<th>Short-term goal</th>
<th>Intermediate-term goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Package Value</td>
<td>Base Stipends</td>
<td>Total Package Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$ 1,900</td>
<td>$ 800</td>
<td>$ 2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>$ 2,050</td>
<td>$ 950</td>
<td>$ 3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>$ 2,150</td>
<td>$ 1,050</td>
<td>$ 3,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$ 2,300</td>
<td>$ 1,200</td>
<td>$ 3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Department head</td>
<td>$ 2,450</td>
<td>$ 1,350</td>
<td>$ 3,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Deans and high-level administrators</td>
<td>$ 2,600</td>
<td>$ 1,500</td>
<td>$ 4,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Staff - monthly</th>
<th>Compensation plan 2013</th>
<th>Short-term goal</th>
<th>Intermediate-term goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Package Value</td>
<td>Base Stipends</td>
<td>Total Package Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Part time/student</td>
<td>$ 700</td>
<td>$ 100</td>
<td>$ 850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High-level clerical, Interns</td>
<td>$ 1,500</td>
<td>$ 400</td>
<td>$ 1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mid-level clerical, reception, entry administrative</td>
<td>$ 1,750</td>
<td>$ 650</td>
<td>$ 2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Compensation plan 2013</td>
<td>Short-term goal</td>
<td>Intermediate-term goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Package Value</td>
<td>Base Stipends</td>
<td>Total Package Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mid-level administrator, high-level Technical</td>
<td>$1,850</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High-level administrator, mid-level Technical</td>
<td>$1,950</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Top administrator, technical</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Staff – hourly</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clerk, cleaner</td>
<td>$1,224</td>
<td>$7.25</td>
<td>$1,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High-level clerical,</td>
<td>$1,337</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$1,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mid-level clerical, reception, entry administrative</td>
<td>$1,489</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$1,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mid-level administrator, high-level technical</td>
<td>$1,792</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$2,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High-level administrator, mid-level Technical</td>
<td>$2,247</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$3,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Top administrator, technical</td>
<td>$2,550</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$3,459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progress towards the compensation plan**

We can measure progress toward these goals in two ways. The first is a broad measure of how compensation has changed over the past eight years. In this period the general University payroll has more than doubled, rising from $1.9 million to about $4.4 million in the current fiscal year. This increase is due to increased rates of compensation for all faculty and staff, higher pay when necessary to attract and retain new faculty and staff, and a moderate increase in the number of employees to meet the demand of our growing enrollment.
The chart below shows how the pay distribution has been trending significantly upward during these eight years, with more people earning higher levels of compensation. These are stipends only, not total package value. (NOTE – Most of those earning under $500/month are part-time employees.)

The chart below shows the percentages of full-time employees who have met either the short-term or intermediate-term salary goals, comparing 2009 with 2012. Though the gains have been modest, the trend is moving in the right direction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time employees by category</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total In category</th>
<th>% at or above short-range goal</th>
<th>% at or above intermediate goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching faculty</td>
<td>Nov. 2009</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 2012</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All staff and administration</td>
<td>Nov. 2009</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 2012</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty and staff</td>
<td>Nov. 2009</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 2012</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second way to measure progress toward the University’s compensation goals is by specific actions we have taken to increase both compensation and pay equity. In May 2012, the Board of Trustees approved a targeted pay-raise plan that increased the pay of faculty and staff who had been working for the University for more than five years. Members of this group are often earning less than more recently hired employees, since we have in the past had to offer higher wages to attract new talent. The University established target wages for this group close to the short-term goals and increased their wages 40% of the difference between their current pay and this target. These raises went into effect in July 2012. In July 2014, 2015, and 2016, an additional 20% will be added each year so that these targets will be reached in 2016.

In addition to these targeted raises, we look carefully at all needs across the University, including the need for salary increases, as part of our annual budgeting process each year.
E. RECRUITING, HIRING, AND DEVELOPING NEW FACULTY AND STAFF

This section addresses the following point from the 2009 team’s report:

e. Includes plan for recruitment, hiring and development of new faculty and staff to assure replacement of retiring faculty/staff and necessary capacity for growth

Recruitment

Human Resources maintains a database of prospective employees that includes contact information, skill set categories, and a link to the applicant’s resume. This database contains detailed information on nearly 350 potential employees, all pre-screened by Human Resources. Of the 350 total, 95 have already been hired. As a result we have not had nor do we anticipate having any difficulty filling vacated positions or in meeting new demand generated by increased enrolment. Indeed, the University is experiencing a consistent and steady increase in the number of qualified applicants.

In the past five years, new faculty have been hired to replace turnover and expand programs. Open positions have generally been filled within a month or two; when openings needed to be advertised, it typically took about six months to fill the position. Most positions were filled by individuals who had previously expressed an interest in a position. It is reasonable to expect this will continue. Currently about 15 qualified individuals have expressed interest in working as faculty at the University, and three open faculty positions have been advertised for less than a month.

Hiring

Between July 2009 and January 2013, we hired 26 full-time and 46 part-time teaching faculty, in most cases at or below the intermediate compensation goal (see Section D, subsection “Compensation and Benefits Planning”); exceptions were in professional departments like computer science. This indicates that the University’s compensation goals in the short-to-intermediate term are sufficient to attract non-professional faculty and that the University is able to hire professional faculty as required.
FACULTY HIRING — JULY 2009 – JANUARY 2013 (includes part-time in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Intermediate term compensation goal ($ monthly)</th>
<th>Number of hires 2009–2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Below goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>8 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>8 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Chair</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 (33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAFF HIRING — JULY 2009 – JANUARY 2013

This first chart shows hiring for staff paid on a monthly basis. The target values are base stipends and do not include non-cash benefits or cash amounts allowed for off campus housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees paid monthly</th>
<th>Intermediate-term goal ($ monthly)</th>
<th>Number of hires 2009–2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Below goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry level clerical</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-level clerical, reception, entry administrative</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-level administrative, entry-level technical</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level administrator, mid-level technical</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Employees paid monthly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees paid monthly</th>
<th>Intermediate-term goal ($ monthly)</th>
<th>Number of hires 2009–2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Below goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top administrator, technical</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next table shows the new hourly employee hires with target hourly wages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hourly employees</th>
<th>Intermediate-term goal ($/hour)</th>
<th>Number of hires 2009–2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Below goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry level clerical</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-level clerical, reception, entry administrative</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-level administrative, entry-level technical</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level administrator, mid-level technical</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top administrator, technical</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 106 new hires listed above, 38 were for new positions. Of these, 30 were hired below the Intermediate Term Target wages and 8 were at or above these targets.

*Note on retirements* — In the next five years, we anticipate seven full-time and two part-time faculty retirements, as well as 46 staff retirements. Based on our hiring experience of the last three years, we do not anticipate a difficulty in filling these positions.
**Development — faculty**

For many years, each August during the week before classes start, we have had a four-day Faculty Development Seminar in which all faculty participate. Its purpose is to enhance faculty teaching skills and update faculty on any changes in policies and procedures. In addition, all faculty take part in half-day workshops during the break after each academic block. All new faculty participate in an additional two-week training course early after their arrival.

This course introduces new faculty to the guidelines for teaching at the University level in a Consciousness-Based institution. In the higher education community it is generally appreciated that it takes three to four years for any faculty to gain full control of all the skills of planning, teaching, and assessing. This timeframe applies here as well.

If a faculty member has had higher education teaching experience prior to coming to the University, the training period is substantially less than for inexperienced faculty. The Consciousness-Based pedagogical methods are all mostly intuitive and easy to apply. Some practices — such as writing statements that illuminate the main points of a lecture with the knowledge of the dynamics of consciousness — while simple in principle, are an art that requires several years to master.

In light of this developmental perspective, all new faculty are assigned mentors in their departments and help teach one of the foundational courses — the Science of Creative Intelligence course or the Science and Technology of Consciousness course — during the first year of their employment at the University. New faculty also have their course syllabi carefully reviewed by their department chair prior to teaching. Where faculty resources permit, new faculty teach their first courses with co-teachers or co-teach some of the foundational courses in the department.

**Development — staff**

We have identified a number of key positions currently occupied by some of our older staff members and have hired (or are in the process of hiring) additional staff who are being trained to fill these important roles. For example, we have hired Dan Steinke to work in the Enrollment Center, learning Financial Aid and now Student Accounts — two critical areas that have been filled by long-term older employees. We have also placed a young staff person, Diana Rivera, in the International Student Advisors office to train under our senior advisor, Nancy Watkins. In Facilities Management, we have reduced risk considerably by outsourcing to Aramark; in addition to providing new management, they have hired experts
in various maintenance areas who will help replace our own long-term staff. We have also hired a new controller, Prajwal Pradhan, who is being trained in the duties of the treasurer.

In a similar fashion we are identifying other key positions where this kind of succession planning is necessary — legal counsel, IT director, and HR director, for example — where we are looking for younger talent to train as future leaders.

To cultivate our younger staff and faculty for leadership roles, we have developed the Enlightened Leadership Program (ELP). The first ELP course began in January 2013 with 21 participants. Participants meet every Saturday afternoon for three hours as well as for lunch on Thursdays. On Saturday afternoons they hear presentations on leadership from senior University faculty and administrators and business leaders in the community. The program also involves readings and discussions on leadership, workshops and team-building activities, mentoring with leaders, and internship projects. It will run for eight months, at which time another group of 20–25 will begin, with 65 current staff members eligible for future courses.
F.

STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS:
COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

This section addresses the following point from the 2009 team’s report:

f. Evidence that strategic plan includes widespread community participation and communication and use

The process of strategic planning that began in the summer of 2009 involved gathering input from all University constituents through meetings with representative groups — trustees, faculty, administrators, donors, students, alumni, and parents. This included a two-day planning session with members from all of the groups, led by Dr. Warren Blank, president of The Leadership Group and an internationally recognized strategic planning consultant.

Examples of community participation

We prepared many presentations for meetings with specific constituent groups throughout this two-year process. Copies of these documents are in the Resource Room. Each of these meetings involved in-depth discussions of a variety of issues specific to the Strategic Plan. Feedback from these meetings was then used to redraft the working document of the Strategic Plan.

Here are a few examples of these meetings and their dates, along with the names of the respective documents prepared for them:

- **Board of Trustees** – September 27, 2009 | **Document** – Incremental Analysis.3.doc
  This was for a meeting with a subcommittee of the Board of Trustees to discuss the financial implications of increases in enrollment, including compensation issues pertinent to attracting and retaining additional faculty. Feedback from this meeting resulted in budgeting for additional expenses for academic expansion in our forward looking projections and expanding our planning horizons from two years to five years, in addition to other improvements.

- **Admissions Office representatives** – September 28, 2009 | **Document** – Admissions presentation2.ppt
  This presentation was for a focused meeting with representatives of the Admissions
Office on recruiting strategies and enrollment projections. Comments from this meeting broadened our planning discussions to include many factors that affect student experience, including campus culture, teaching methodologies, etc.

- **Board of Trustees, November 18, 2009 | Document – Trustees Presentation.ppt**
  This was used during a Board meeting to discuss a variety of issues pertinent to the Strategic Plan, including cash flow issues related to our graduate program in Computer Science, working capital and liquidity, financial statement ratios, investment in capital assets, growth of enrollment, changing dynamics of the popularity of our undergraduate programs, further discussion of the financial impact of growth of enrollment including specific analysis of several growth areas, ROI on recruiting expenditures, and the impact on compensation of enrollment growth and endowment growth.

- **Student Government, November 18, 2009 | Document – Student Gov.ppt**
  This presentation was used during a meeting with student government representatives. Topics included enrollment growth, investment in capital assets, student fees, operating expenses, fund raising, cash flow from the graduate program in Computer Science, financial impact of growth of enrollment, and changing dynamics of the popularity of our undergraduate programs.

- **Donors, December 5, 2009 | Document – Donor2.ppt**
  This presentation was used during a meeting with donors. Topics included student fees, operating expenses, fund raising, working capital and liquidity, financial statement ratios, emphasis on strategic planning, investment in capital assets, growth of enrollment, further discussion of the financial impact of growth of enrollment including specific analysis of several growth areas, the impact on compensation of enrollment growth and endowment growth, and ROI on strategic priorities.

- **University staff members – January 15, 2010 | Document – Staff leadership.ppt**
  This presentation was used in a meeting with staff members to discuss a variety of issues related to the Strategic Plan, including; growth of enrollment, student fees, operating expenses, fund raising, working capital and liquidity, financial statement ratios, emphasis on strategic planning, investment in capital assets, changing dynamics of the popularity of our undergraduate programs, further discussion of the financial impact of growth of enrollment including specific analysis of several
growth areas, ROI on recruiting expenditures, and the impact on compensation of enrollment growth and endowment growth.

- *Faculty, staff, and trustees* – February 7, 2010 | *Document* – 2010-01 Campus Plan.pdf
  This document was used in several meetings with faculty, staff, and trustees to discuss capital asset expansion and campus master planning.

- *All University stakeholders* – February 20, 2010 | *Document* – Strategic planning meeting.doc
  This document served as the basis of the two-day strategic planning session mentioned above, with 40 people representing all of the constituent groups and led by Dr. Warren Blank.

- *Members of the Board of Trustees* – March 4, 2010 | *Document* – Ramani follow up meeting.doc
  This document notes discussion points from several board members in follow-up meetings after the larger group planning session.

- *Members of the Board of Trustees* – April 1, 2010 | *Document* – Revised priority chart.doc
  This document was used in follow-up meetings with board members to discuss prioritization of key goals.

- *University leaders with student representative groups* – April 26, 2010 | *Document* – Core Values.doc
  This document was prepared for several meetings to discuss campus culture.

  This document was used in a meeting with the Academic Council to discuss goals for key metrics such as average students per class and academic expenses per student.

- *Faculty Senate* – March 27, 2011 | *Document* – Faculty Senate Notes.doc (notes from meeting)
  Notes from meeting with the faculty senate relating to compensation and hiring additional faculty to accommodate growth.
• Faculty and staff, May 19, 2011 | Document – Staff May 2011.ppt

This presentation was used in a meeting with staff and faculty to discuss the proposed five-year vision statement and seven strategic priorities with related objectives, financial impact of enrollment growth, strategic investment of net operating surplus, retention, increased compensation, draft compensation plan, attracting new faculty and staff, and specific academic programs.

• Individual academic departments, 2012

Meetings were also held with each academic department. The faculty reviewed a chart giving specific enrollment projections for their department. These documents served as the basis for a discussion of resource needs: faculty, staff, equipment, and facilities. Samples of these documents are also available.

Communicating the plan

After we completed the final version of the Strategic Plan, we had it designed and printed in a four-color booklet. We communicated the plan to our constituents in these ways:

• We held a series of meetings with University trustees, faculty, staff, and donors/alumni to give them copies of the booklet and explain it.
• We also posted the document for viewing on the University’s web site.
• We printed a summary of the plan in the last two issues of the annual University Report, a magazine mailed to more than 5,000 donors and alumni.

Revising the plan

As noted earlier, the process of revising this plan, which began in December 2011, followed the same steps. This included meetings with every academic department and most administrative departments. Our purpose in these meetings was to gather data on what they needed by way of resources — faculty, staff, equipment, and financial — to help achieve the revised enrollment growth projections. We also held meetings with the Faculty Senate and University administrators and staff.

RESOURCE ROOM:

• Minutes of various meetings where the strategic planning process was presented and input was solicited, including meetings of the Board of Trustees, Executive Council, Faculty Senate, and Academic Council
G. STRATEGIC PLAN: USE AND EVALUATION

This section addresses the following point from the 2009 team’s report:

g. Evidence that strategic plan has been put into use and evaluated

The strategic planning process has given rise in the last few years to the following actual initiatives:

• **Student Life initiative** — To further the strategic goal of increased enrollment through increased student satisfaction and retention, we tripled the budget of our Student Life departments between 2005 and 2009. In November 2009 we created a new position, Dean of Student Life, re-organized the area, and added an office assistant, Director of Residential Life, a counselor, and also the Student Success Center director. These represent a budget increment of over $200,000 per year since 2005. We attribute our increased retention in large measure to this investment, and the investment has been justified by the resulting increased tuition revenues.

• **Sustainable Living Center** — With the goal of attracting more students, the University instituted the Sustainable Living academic program in 2002. In further support of this popular program as well as the University’s commitment to sustainability, the Sustainable Living Center was constructed in 2010–2012 through $1.5 million in institutionally prioritized donation support coupled with a financial commitment of $1.2 million in borrowed funds.

• **Dorm renovations** — These were planned to improve student satisfaction and retention with the goal of increasing enrollment. Expenditures in 2009 were $1,792,000, in 2010 $256,000, in 2011 $1,338,000, in 2012 $1,094,000, and budgeted for 2013, $1,440,000. These expenditures were largely financed by donations and a multi-year commitment of long-term borrowing, and also by about $350,000 in operating funds.

• **Marketing** – web content management system — In 2010, as an initiative in our enrollment growth strategy, we decided to upgrade our website to include a content management system (CMS). This is now providing tools for web marketing and
enabling departments to update their own web pages regularly. (Previously all changes to the website needed to be done by a single Webmaster). This investment included a one-time payment of $20,000, plus a fee of $9,000 per month, plus an additional one-time fee for database integration elements that are yet to be launched due to IT staffing limitations. We also invested in an analytics package at a startup cost of $40,000 plus $30,000 annually. We may soon discontinue that relationship due to increased internal analytics capabilities. The new CMS system required the hire of a CMS manager to serve MUM-internal departmental needs.

• **Endowment Campaign and Institutional Advancement** — In the fall of 2010, we launched a five-year endowment and capital campaign with the goals of supporting enrollment growth through increased scholarships, enhancing student satisfaction and retention through an upgraded campus, and supporting faculty and staff recruiting and retention through increasing compensation. We hired a consulting firm, Graham-Pelton, Inc., to conduct a feasibility study, and then we engaged the firm for six months. We restructured our fundraising department, renamed it Institutional Advancement, gave it an expanded set of responsibilities in the form of new departments within it, and expanded personnel resources significantly. The new departments include:

  o Major Campaigns
  o Corporate and Foundation Relations
  o Alumni Relations
  o Public Relations
  o Planned Giving.

We established the new positions of major gifts officer and co-directors of Institutional Advancement and added two full-time staff to the Alumni Office. In addition, we reassigned three senior administrators to assist with the new endowment campaign, public relations, and planned giving. We also increased the budget for travel and printing. Expenditures for the newly expanded department were $550,000 in 2011 and $330,000 in 2012, and they are projected to be $350,000 in each of the next three years.
• *Online education* — A University goal since its inception has been to offer its programs globally. In light of increasing interest in our programs nationwide and worldwide, we decided to invest in this area. In December 2009 we hired a director for online education, Perry Bedinger, who built a department consisting of an administrative assistant, webmaster/marketer, specialist in educational technology, and three staff to help with production. Expenditures through June of 2012 amounted to $415,000, with an additional $456,000 budgeted for the current fiscal year.

• *Academic quality initiatives* — As detailed in Section C, in 2012 we began a set of related initiatives to enhance academic quality, student engagement, academic challenge, and students’ perception of the University’s commitment to academic excellence. Though not requiring significant cash expenditures, they did entail a substantial commitment of faculty time and attention. These initiatives included:
  
  o Creative and Critical Thinking Seminars required of all first-year undergraduate students, coupled with emphasis on creative and critical thinking in all courses
  
  o Enhanced faculty training in the pedagogical techniques of Consciousness-Based education
  
  o Renewed emphasis on writing across the curriculum
  
  o Campus-wide undergraduate Senior Project program

• *Faculty-staff compensation initiative* — Over a five-year period, we will raise compensation at the lower end of the range, making compensation more systematic and equitable and improving our ability to hire and retain qualified people. This was funded by $150,000 in 2012, and that amount will increase by $75,000 per year through 2016. The Endowment Campaign, described above, will help fund increased compensation.

• *Lean management initiative* — In the fall of 2011 we brought in a nationally-known expert in Lean as applied to higher education — Dr. Theresa Waterbury, from Winona State University. She conducted a four-day training program in which 22 administrators and faculty, including most of the Executive Council, were trained to facilitate Lean projects.

To administer this ongoing initiative, we established a Lean Steering Committee.
The committee consists of Dr. Craig Pearson (Executive Vice-President), Dr. David Streid (Chief Administrative Officer), Tom Hirsch (Director of Information Technology), Stan LaMothe (Director of Human Resources), Kathy Brooks (Assistant to the CAO), and Diana Rivera (Associate Director of the Office of International Students and Scholars and Associate Director of Lean Implementation).

In principle we will apply the Lean methodology to every major University process. Each Lean project involves assembling a team of 4-6 individuals who are involved with the process to be streamlined, who meet over four to five consecutive half-days. Each Lean project has an “owner” who gives the project team its mission. The group maps out the current state of the process and then, using Lean tools, maps out the ideal future state and then implements it. After several years we revisit the process and repeat the steps, for systematic continuous improvement.

We undertook an ambitious range of projects in 2012, including:

- Residential life – streamlining room reservations, preparations, and assignments
- Campus-wide meeting room reservation process
- Dorm room inventory process
- Interlibrary loan process
- Student complaint process
- Academic counseling and advising
- Academic governance
- New staff and faculty orientation process
- Admissions – international admissions process
- Institutional Advancement – donations processing
- PO system and interbilling
Evaluation of the Strategic Plan

We track six key metrics on the online dashboard — enrollment, recruiting, student fees, average revenue per student, endowment fund, and online education — and we compare the projections of the 2010 Strategic Plan goals with actual results. See Appendix 1 for the comparisons of these key indicators.

The results of this comparison have been the foundation for the initiatives of the new plan and its projections.

Furthermore, the continuous process of updating and revising the Strategic Plan involves a detailed evaluation of progress to date in every area of the plan. Each objective or action step is given a color-coded evaluation: green (success), yellow (partial success), or red (failure), along with explanatory explanatory paragraph. This information is on the dashboard website.

Summary

Taken together, these initiatives and the significant related investments, coupled with the evaluation measures, are evidence that the Strategic Plan has been put into use and evaluated.
CONCLUSION

As this report indicates, we believe we have addressed the issues raised by the 2009 comprehensive visiting team.

• The strategic planning process has matured, with significantly closer integration of planning, budgeting, and academic assessment. All aspects of the wider University community have been involved. On the basis of the original planning process, revising the five-year plan is proceeding more efficiently and at a greater level of refinement. All of this has been invaluable in managing and promoting the growth of the University and the fulfillment of our goals.

• Assessment of student learning has become much better established. Assessment and planning have given rise to a rich array of initiatives that will improve student engagement, learning, and success.

• The performance review process has proven not only valuable but fulfilling.

• We have raised compensation and have developed a clear framework for continuing to do so. We have developed a basic retirement plan. And we are on the way toward gathering the financial support for more fully funding these efforts.

This work has been rewarding and energizing. Nor is it finished. We are committed to continuous improvement, and we will continue working on these areas going forward.
APPENDIX 1

STRATEGIC PLAN EVALUATION – COMPARISON WITH ACTUAL RESULTS

This series of charts, from the report for the March 2013 meeting of the Board of Trustees, compares actual results with both our original 2010 Strategic Plan and the 2013 plan revisions. It highlights six key areas of interest:

- **Enrollment** – Global Enrollment and Standard Student Enrollment has exceeded the original goals, whereas COOP enrollment has not.

- **Recruiting** – Both Standard Program and COOP recruiting are below the original goals but are exceeding the 2013 revised goals.

- **Student fees** – On track with the original 2010 goals for the first years, but didn’t reach the dramatic growth goal for 2012–13.

- **Average revenue per student** – Steady but slow increase, though not reaching the original goal.

- **Endowment fund** – After a few years of operations the goals were revised to be more realistic.

- **Online education** – Strong initial participation in courses, but decline thereafter instead of the projected growth. Gross income has increased, but net revenue stays near break-even.

![Global Student Enrollment Chart](image-url)
Note:
2013 COOP Recruiting accounts for two entries of three total, with 50 more expected in June.

### Professionals Program Recruiting

- **2010 Goals**: 183, 180, 225, 225, 300, 375, 375
- **Actuals**: 122, 288, 162, 132, 146, 146, 129
- **2013 Plan**: 145, 165, 190, 280, 280, 280, 340

### Total Student Fees

- **2010 Goals**: 8,896, 10,375, 12,192, 16,602, 20,062, 24,332, 28,360
- **Actuals**: 6,641, 8,244, 8,737, 8,896, 10,743, 11,343, 11,511
- **2013 Plan**: 11,511, 12,267, 14,186, 17,024, 19,774, 22,213

### Average Revenue per Standard Student

- **2010 Goals**: 13,538, 13,809, 14,085, 14,361, 14,638, 14,914, 15,190
- **Actuals**: 13,475, 13,186, 13,238, 13,538, 13,632, 13,743
- **2013 Plan**: 13,743, 13,836, 14,013, 14,266, 14,625, 14,989, 15,361

**Years Ended June 30**
APPENDIX 2
RESTRUCTURED ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

The organizational chart below shows the reorganized structure of academic governance.

Academic Governance • Organizational Chart

Board of Trustees
  
President
  
Executive Vice-President

FACULTY SENATE

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Academic Planning Council
Dr. Craig Pearson,
the four Academic Deans, and Dr. Greg Guthrie

Dean of Faculty
Dr. Cathy Gorini

Dean of Academic Programs
Dr. Chris Jones

Dean of Teaching & Learning
Dr. Jane Schmidt Wilk

Dean of Global Expansion
Bill Goldstein

Faculty Personnel Committee

Curriculum Committee

Teaching & Learning Committee

Global Expansion Committee

ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

INDIVIDUAL FACULTY

Academic Computing Committee

Technology Committee

Academic Standards Committee

Library Committee

Protection of Human Subjects and Animal Rights

Teacher Education Advisory Committee

Publications Committee
APPENDIX 3
ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT METRICS
2011–2012 ACADEMIC YEAR

Student Credit Hours Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science Prof.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharishi Vedic Science</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management - General</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Living</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature, Writing, and ESL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology and Health</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media &amp; Communications</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expense Per Student Credit Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Expense Per Student Credit Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media &amp; Communications</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Living</td>
<td>$225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Design</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature, Writing, and ESL</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science Prof.</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management - General</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology and Health</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharishi Vedic Science</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Contribution to Overhead

- **Computer Science Prof.**
- **Maharishi Vedic Science**
- **Management - General**
- **Physiology and Health**
- **Mathematical Sciences**
- **Literature, Writing, and ESL**
- **Sustainable Living**
- **Art and Design**
- **Media & Communications**
- **Education**

**Contribution to Overhead as a % of Revenues**

- **Maharishi Vedic Science**
- **Mathematical Sciences**
- **Computer Science Prof.**
- **Physiology and Health**
- **Management - General**
- **Literature, Writing, and ESL**
- **Education**
- **Art and Design**
- **Sustainable Living**
- **Media & Communications**

**Minimum Desired Contribution to Overhead = 60%**
Average Number of Students per Class

- Computer Science Prof.
- Physiology and Health
- Maharishi Vedic Science
- Sustainable Living
- Mathematical Sciences
- Management - General
- Media & Communications
- Literature, Writing, and ESL
- Art and Design
- Education

Target Minimum Students = 15
## APPENDIX 4
### ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major / Program</th>
<th>Chair / Director</th>
<th>Next Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Jim Shrosbree</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>Dr. Scott Herriott and Vicki Herriott</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Dr. Keith Levi</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Paula Armstrong</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Major</td>
<td>Dr. Chris Jones</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Dr. Terry Fairchild</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Dr. Anne Dow</td>
<td>December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Communications</td>
<td>Stuart Tanner and Gurdy Leete</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharishi Vedic Science</td>
<td>Dr. Fred Travis</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology and Health</td>
<td>Dr. Paul Morehead</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Living</td>
<td>Dr. David Fisher</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>Perry Bedinger</td>
<td>February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Consciousness</td>
<td>Dr. Rod Eason</td>
<td>October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Suzanne Veseley</td>
<td>February 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5
ANNUAL ACADEMIC, REPORTING, PLANNING, BUDGETING PROCESS

THE ANNUAL DATA-GATHERING AND REPORTING PROCESS

1. Data Gathering Phase: August to June

A) Evaluation Office
   • Conducts general education assessments
   • Conducts NSSE survey on biannual schedule
   • Conducts SSI survey on biannual schedule

B) Enrollment data summarized (ongoing)
   • Retention and attrition (beginning of each semester)
   • Enrollment trends (as needed)
   • Graduation rates (semi-annually)
   • GPA (as requested)
   • Exit interviews (ongoing)

C) Development of Consciousness department summaries
   • DC attendance: faculty (semi-annually)
   • DC attendance: students (annually as part of general education report)

D) Faculty: Closing-the-Loop Reports, including reflections on:
   • Program outcomes
   • Mid- and end-of-course feedback assessments
   • General education outcomes (partially established)

E) Department chair: End-of-Year report (due June 30)
   • Incorporates findings from the Closing-the-Loop reports
• Major end-of-program assessments
• Focus group reports
• Efficiency measures from Dean of Faculty office (e.g., expense-per-student credit hour)
• Alumni reports and surveys
• Record of service and scholarship
• Recommendations from program review process every five years

F) Other qualitative data sources
• Annual knowledge fair (end of year)
• Senior Capstone Seminar (each semester)
• Deans monthly meetings with Global Student Council
• Deans visits to classrooms

G) Annual program review process concludes at the end of this phase and is sent to the Dean of Academic Programs and presented to Academic Council

H) Dean of Faculty annual performance review process concludes at the end of this phase

2. Analysis and Reporting Phase: July to August 15

A) Associate Dean for General Education writes general education report from Evaluation Office general education data, with recommendations for strategic priorities and initiatives

B) Dean of Academic Programs writes summary report of outcomes in the majors, with recommendation for strategic priorities and initiatives in the academic programs

C) Graduate dean writes a summary report of outcomes, with recommendation for strategic priorities and initiatives in the academic programs

D) Recommendations to Academic Planning Council from Dean of Faculty and Dean of Teaching and Learning based on professional development plans, performance reviews, classroom observation reports, and student feedback
THE ANNUAL PLANNING AND BUDGETING PROCESS

1. Setting Priorities Phase: September to December

A) The Academic Planning Council reviews reports from deans and proposes priorities for the next year based on the assessment of student outcomes and the University’s Strategic Plan.

B) Biannually the Academic Planning Council proposes strategic priorities for the biannual update of the Strategic Plan.

C) Academic Planning Council presents its recommendations to the Academic Council.

2. Setting the Annual Budget: March 15 to end of May

A) Deans meet with department chairs individually to plan next year’s budget in each department, based on their strategic plans and the strategic priorities for the University.

B) Academic Planning Council coordinates with the treasurer and Executive Council for input on any budgetary constraints.

C) All branches of the University (including the academic branch) submit their budgets to the treasurer, who integrates them into a budget that is presented to the Executive Council for approval, then to the Trustees.

D) Trustees approve proposed budget for the following year at their May meeting.

3. Adjusting the Annual Budget: September and October

A) Actual fall semester enrollment and student receipts are compared with budgeted enrollment and student receipts and the budget is adjusted accordingly through an abbreviated version of step 2 above.

B) Trustees approve the proposed adjusted budget at their meeting in November.

NOTE — Each year departments are engaged in both data gathering and reporting, and planning and budgeting.
APPENDIX 6
DIAGRAM OF ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING SYSTEM FOR 2013–2014

The diagrams on the next two pages show our current academic assessment and planning system and the one toward which we are moving. The first diagram shows how the assessment data are currently collected, aggregated, and interpreted by the respective deans.

Starting from the bottom of the first chart: The yellow boxes show the sources of data. Up from there are the academic departments or leaders who receive the data. Each of the deans represented in the green boxes is a member of the Academic Planning Council, which oversees the academic assessment, planning, and budgeting process.

The diagram also shows how these reports are disseminated first to the Academic Planning Council and then to the Academic Council (consisting of all the academic department chairs). The Academic Planning Council is responsible for drafting the academic budget; the Academic Council reviews and approves the budget.

By contrast, the system for the 2013–2014 budget cycle

- shows the relationship of the data to the university’s learning goals at the program, course, and general education levels
- shows the aggregation, interpretation, and dissemination being conducted collectively by the academic committees chaired by the corresponding deans
- calls for an additional report on distance and continuing education to be provided by the Global Development Committee
- more clearly depicts the relationship between the Academic Planning Council and the Academic Council.