

**Strategic Planning Team
Work Team One Report
Culture and Identity
June 6, 2011**

Team Members

Julius Bianchi, Lisa Buono, Veronica Guerrero, Juanita Hall, Kapp Johnson, Sally Lorentson, Susan Lundeen-Smuck, Gretchen Serrano, Bruce Stevenson, and Melissa Maxwell-Doherty

Summary of the Process

Work Team One began its work by reviewing the outcomes and questions that would guide our deliberations. We developed a list of campus resources with which we needed to engage, developed a list of questions to ask faculty and students, and planned focus groups across the campus community.

Our Work Team divided into three sub-teams to investigate the three foci of our work: Comprehensive University, Inclusive Community, and Community of Faith. Each group analyzed current data, held focus groups, and gathered campus resources to deliberate together. The Comprehensive University sub-team refined the guiding questions that would direct the focus of their work. The entire work team continued to meet to discuss our findings and worked to answer our guiding questions together.

Mini Table of Contents

Guiding Questions	2-3
Work Team and Sub-Team Meetings	4
Data	5
Work Team One Overall Impressions	6-7
Sub-Team One: Comprehensiveness	8-12
Sub-Team Two: Inclusive Community	13-16
Sub-Team Three: Community of Faith	17-19
“Appendices”	20

Outcomes/Questions for Work Group One:

a. Determine how we are going to live out our comprehensiveness as a university (showing equal quality/value to both undergraduate and graduate).

Guiding Questions:

- a. What does it mean for CLU to be a comprehensive university?
 - i) What does it mean to offer both undergraduate and graduate degrees, how do programs relate to one another, and fit with our mission?
 - ii) How can we promote a seamless education for all? What's the appropriate mix and balance for the next five years?
 - iii) What are we as a university? What does it mean to be integrated?
 - b. Do we want to provide student life opportunities for all students? If so, what does that look like? What do we need to be able to do so?
 - c. How can we better work together between graduate, undergraduate, and ADEP programs to have maximum cohesiveness?
 - d. Are there gaps in resources for graduate/ADEP/international students (food, meeting space, library resources, tech resources, campus ministry, student handbook, etc.)? What resources would we need to address the gaps?
 - e. What changes are needed in faculty governance to embrace being a comprehensive university?
 - f. What changes are needed in student governance to embrace being a comprehensive university?
- ** How does technology/online activities inform this discussion?

b. Determine how CLU can become a stronger and more inclusive community?

Guiding Questions (consider students, faculty, staff, administration, regents, convocators, volunteer groups, and underrepresented groups):

- a. What does it mean for CLU to be inclusive?
- b. What does CLU currently do to promote inclusivity?
- c. What are the gaps in our inclusivity?
- d. What initiatives or programs should we strengthen or add?

c. Determine how CLU can strengthen its commitment as an institution of the ELCA and simultaneously reach out to serve and interact with people of all faiths and no faith?

Guiding Questions:

- a. What does it mean to be a community of faith at CLU? What on campus resources are available to students in terms of their religious and/or spiritual life? What are the gaps in our life as a community of faith?
- b. What are the values of our Lutheran identity that can serve as common ground for our community?
- c. How can we more fully express our welcome and inclusion of diverse religious faith traditions on campus?

- d. How can we enhance practices that encourage the expression of CLU as a community of faith?
- e. How can we strengthen our role as an institution of the ELCA (should we)?
- f. How do adult and grad programs connect to or reflect the Lutheran tradition?

Refined questions for sub-team one – (comprehensive university):

- 1. What do we want CLU to look like in 5 years?
- 2. What do we need to do to value TUG, ADEP, and Grad students (services and governance structure)? What should the balance between graduate, ADEP, and undergraduate resources be?
- 3. What is a good framework for CLU (i.e. structurally remain the same; become an integrated institution; formally split undergrad and grad, etc.)? Where do the Oxnard, Woodland Hills, and future off-site campuses fall into the mix?
- 4. What do we need to do to better value all employees at CLU?

Work Team and Sub Team Meetings

Work Team One Meeting Dates:

March 8, 21, 28

April 11, 26

May 2, 9, and 19

Sub-team: Comprehensiveness/Question One (Meetings on April 26 & 27)

- Faculty/Staff/Regent Focus Group (April 26)
George Petersen, Gerhard Apfelthaler, Joan Griffin, Eileen Leese, Susan Tolle, Lorraine Purmort, Tom Hoener, Gail Uellendahl, Randy Foster, Darla Arcuri, Ineke Dyer, Linda Boberg, and Karissa Oien (led by Sally Lorentson & Lisa Buono)
- Faculty Focus Group (April 27)
Adina Nack, Jose Marichal, Michael Cosenza, Edlyn Pena, Herb Gooch, Sam Thomas, and Veronica Guerrero (led by Sally Lorentson & Lisa Buono)

Sub-team: Inclusive Community/Question Two (Meetings on April 21 and May 5)

- Juanita Hall, Gretchen Serrano, Julius Bianchi, Christine Paul, Erashel Vaiz, Colleen McCarthy, Alan Goodwin, Scott Maxwell-Doherty, Sergio Galvez, Anna Calderon, Diana Stephens, Jose Marichal, and Tom McCambridge

Sub-team: Community of Faith/Question Three (Meetings on April 18, 27, and May 4)

- Kapp Johnson, Bruce Stevenson, Susan Lundeen Smuck, Ashley Patterson, Carla Walter, Colleen Windham-Hughes, Arne Bergland, Frank Nausin, Rahuldeep Gil, Cynthia Jew, Melissa Maxwell-Doherty, Michaela Reaves and Kirk Lesh

Data Reviewed

Surveys:

- Spring 2011 Student Survey (TUG, ADEP, and Grad students)
- Spring 2011 Adjunct Faculty Survey
- Multiple years Noel Levitz (Undergraduate, Graduate and Adult)
- Fall 2004, 2007, & 2010 How are you doing? Surveys
- March 2009 Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership
- Spring 2010 Multicultural Survey
- Spring 2011 Culture and Diversity Values Analysis
- Spring Faculty Attendance Survey (administered by FEC)
- Residential Student Survey Chart
- Toward a Stronger and More Inclusive Community Survey March 23
- Culture and Diversity Values Analysis (System for Multi-Level Observation of Groups; SYMLOG)
- CLU Familiarity Data

Focus Groups:

- ADEP March 23
- School of Management student representatives March 23
- Transfer Students April 8
- International Students Focus Group Survey April 12
- Commuter Students April 13
- Graduate and Adult Student Council April 16
- Deans Council April 19
- Satellite Campus Focus Groups --Grad Students (April 20 Oxnard, April 21 Woodland Hills)
- Professional Development Day Sessions (May 18)
- Faculty and Staff (Inclusive Work Team)
- International students (Inclusive Work Team)

Additional Resource:

- Van Der Werf, M., & Sabatier, G. (2009). The college of 2020: Students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Work Team One Overall Impressions

Summary of the Findings

A version of the following analogy was discussed at the very first meeting of Work Team One, and remained viable throughout the process. CLU is like a large ranch house. The original structure was built to focus on undergraduate education. Over time, additions were erected to house professional programs and graduate schools. While the additions enhanced the ranch house, they were not as thoughtfully constructed as the main house, causing fissures. The ranch hands work incredibly hard to patch the fractures, but new cracks open each time.

Overwhelmingly, focus group participants and survey respondents have suggested it is time to better integrate the additions with the main ranch house.

Work Team One believes it is not a question of who we are (a Lutheran university that grants baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral degrees, as well as credentials) or what we value; the challenge is in how we *operationalize* our mission, identity and values. We need to explore how we strengthen behaviors which contribute to an inclusive community, and how we value all students equitably. Furthermore we need to more consistently operationalize our values with our staff and adjunct faculty. *CLU needs to become who we are and live out who we say we are.* As we move from critical reasoning to practical implementation we can fortify a much larger and more inclusive ranch house where all are welcomed and valued.

CLU needs to catch up to the growth we have experienced in our student body. This does not simply refer to the number of students who attend CLU, but to the diverse student populations they represent. While there will always be room for improvement, we live out our mission and values with the majority of our traditional undergraduate population. However, it appears we do not apply our values as consistently with our transfer and commuter students. The perception is that we do not attend to and we provide less for our graduate and ADEP students. *CLU needs to live out who we are with all of our students.*

Finally, we need to claim our Lutheran identity, “own” that we are a university built on a community of faith.

Overall Issues

- Numerous participants suggested that at CLU we talk a good talk, come up with great ideas, but our follow-through is not as strong as it could be. This is an issue to be conscious of as a strategic plan is developed.
- There is a perception of a lack of equity across the institution. This includes equity among our student populations (TUG, Commuter, Transfer, ADEP, Grad, & International), faculty, as well as financial structures.
- We rely heavily on our adjunct faculty, and yet we do little to value them. We need to examine how we can be more inclusive of our adjunct faculty.
- Investigate how we can be more inclusive of the cultural diversity of all of our stakeholders (students, staff, faculty, and administration).
- Communication across programs, between departments, and to our various student populations is inconsistent. Information is not flowing fluidly and prevents us from performing efficiently.

Areas That Were Not Covered

- Administration and staff perceptions were minimally examined.
- Educational technology use (online/blended learning) was minimally explored; how we use technology was completely neglected in terms of various departments on campus (admissions, res life, student affairs, etc.).
- Student and adjunct survey data should be further disaggregated to obtain a more thorough story.
- We need to look at the “inclusivity” issues and develop more concrete recommendations.

Major Recommendations

- Provide equitable services for all students; invest in appropriate student facilities and services.
- Explore where best to integrate the university and where best to specialize (programs, services, faculty governance and committees).
- Develop, adopt, and “live out” an inclusivity statement.
- Reinstate the Associate Provost position to articulate and communicate persuasively the relationship between organizational mission, culture, and identity, as well as to oversee the integration of graduate and ADEP programs.

Sub-Team One: Comprehensiveness

Summary of the Observations and Findings

Work Team One began our exploration process by discussing what it means to be “comprehensive.” We soon discovered that exploring definitions/examples of “comprehensiveness” was not going to help us move forward. Instead, we opted to explore who we are, what the existing gaps are, and what do we hope to “look like” in five years. The following describes the sub-team’s findings.

Integration

Focus group respondents suggested we need to become more integrated as an institution; presently it feels like there is an unhelpful “split” between our undergraduate and graduate programs. We are a very successful liberal arts school, but we need to move beyond that and claim who we are. There needs to be better integration of our graduate programs into university governance, services, staffing, and culture. This is true of ADEP as well. However, we need to integrate in a “smart” way; there are offices, departments, services, and committees that could be integrated, and there are some that should be specialized. This integration and specialization includes faculty governance and faculty committees; they need to be reviewed to better represent who we are as a university. Equity needs to be achieved across all stakeholders.

Some focus group respondents described a desire to become more integrated by being able to teach across programs (undergraduate and graduate) more easily. They also suggested we could look at models of better integrating our students by allowing undergraduates to take certain graduate courses.

Many contend the campus calendar does not reflect the needs of various students (evening students, commuter students), and is not centralized in a way that allows those interested to find out about events or opportunities. Participants specifically referenced “missed opportunities” due to lack of communication, central hubs for finding information, etc.

Students/Student Services

It was noted that we are not keeping up with our ever-changing student body. Our undergraduate population is becoming more non-traditional (commuter/transfer students). Our graduate students can no longer be simply described as “working adults”; many are entering our graduate programs straight from their undergraduate programs. We have a growing international student population with very specific needs. Our changing student profile suggests we need to review/rethink the support systems we offer our students.

Many campus services are not currently serving student sub-populations (grad, ADEP, commuter, transfer, etc.), or are not serving them well. In contrast, many offices do not believe it is their mission/objective to serve those students.

Graduate and ADEP participants indicated they are connected to CLU via faculty and staff, but they are seeking ways to become more connected to CLU. There is an interest in some sort of graduate student governance structure as well as access to more services. Graduate and ADEP students appear to desire an orientation to the university (similar in scope to the undergraduate orientation, but tailored to Grad/ADEP needs). Participants also felt networking opportunities (across programs and schools) were important to them.

Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty are generally disconnected from the campus, unless they are currently holding another role at the institution (alumni, staff, etc.); but they are seeking opportunities to learn more, be a better resource for their students, and be engaged in the campus. Some of this disconnect comes from inadequate outreach, lack of pay, and attitudes on the campus (treating adjuncts as “second rate” or “a necessary evil”).

Focus group respondents described adjunct faculty as undervalued and underpaid. There was a general feeling that we need to do more to include adjuncts on our campus.

Services/Staff

We try very hard to meet the needs of all of our student populations. The perception is that our good intentions often leads to “patching” together services as well as adding responsibilities to already overworked staff, instead of bringing on the staff we need. The result is that we are not able to deliver the excellent services we desire to deliver.

Discussion focused on a perceived lack of respect for how hard the staff work and how dedicated they are. There has been a growing “suck it up” mentality instead of acknowledging that while the university has increased in size, we have not increased staffing in many departments.

Facilities

Our satellite “campuses” were described as buildings with rooms, not campuses. Graduate and ADEP students desire a “CLU student experience” at these sites, not just when they are on the main campus. This experience includes cultural markers as well as offering services at the satellite campuses. (Some participants wondered why there were no traditional undergraduate offerings at these campuses.)

Many groups expressed the desire for lounges/communal spaces. Graduate/ADEP students articulated they would like to have a student lounge(s). Faculty and staff desired lounges as well (communal gathering places more conducive of interaction than the Centrum).

Areas That Were Not Covered

- Administration and staff perceptions of these issues were not assessed.
- Full time faculty perceptions were not sufficiently assessed.

Issues/Recommendations

- *Treat all students with equity*
 - Graduate and ADEP student should have appropriate access to student employment, and a more formalized system to access and apply for graduate assistantships
 - Consideration of fundraising towards scholarships for graduate and ADEP students
 - Tutoring services (writing center, math center, etc.) with staffing of appropriate competencies to help with graduate level work, and age differentials
 - Graduate student fee for activities/governed by graduate students
 - Institutional investment/funding to allow all eligible First Generation students to participate in SSS programs
 - Identification and development of services that should have centralized offices for all students and those who should have decentralized services by enrollment program
 - Create flexible schedules for staff in order to keep offices open longer for graduate/ADEP students
 - Campus education to promote and inform staff of diverse needs of students across enrollment type
 - Campus-wide Orientation for grad students
 - Include graduate/ADEP students in our literature on the website. Much of the website (including offices/departments that service all students) is directed toward our undergraduates. (This includes our vision statement.)
 - Create networking opportunities for Graduate/ADEP students
 - Give awards/recognition to graduate students

- *Lack of oversight/accountability for Graduate/ADEP programs*
 - Reinststitute the Associate Provost whose responsibility, among other duties, is to oversee the integration of graduate and ADEP programs (see additional suggestions under “Community of Faith”)

- *Investment in appropriate student facilities and services*
 - Turn Woodland Hills/Oxnard “campuses” into actual campuses with faculty offices and resources for students (offer undergraduate courses as well)
 - Food services (diversity of dietary needs, hours, calendar)
 - Student Union Building/Student Center (commuter students, grad students)
 - Undergraduate academic advising program (consistency among faculty, CAAR, Registrar)
 - Develop a quality/customer service assessment for student services offices to allow students to express concerns, and use it to improve student quality of experience (various offices received extremely negative marks consistently from students)

- *Calendar and Scheduling*
 - Development of a true “university master calendar” that is utilized as a central clearing house to learn about any campus events, important registration dates by term, etc.
 - Consideration of diverse enrollment schedules (16 week, 15 week, 11 week, summer terms, online) in development of university calendar, major academic events, and availability of student services
 - Development of programming schedules and student services office hours that are reflective of the various student subpopulations (TUG commuters, ADEP, Grad, etc.)

- *Communication*
 - Publicity/promotion of events to all students
 - Campus understanding of what other offices do in order to help students reach the right place
 - Increased digital signage (across main campus, at satellite locations)
 - Inclusive messaging in campus alerts, emails, handbooks to consider all student populations
 - Create opt-in section of listservs on blackboard to allow students to sign up for various campus alerts by event/alert type (ie. TUG registration deadlines, student clubs, etc.) Consider linked options with social media sites.
 - Develop consistent communication for incoming students during fall and spring semesters for TUG (spring semester students do not receive the same information/alerts from many campus offices)
 - Develop consistent communication for incoming students during fall and spring (and summer) semesters/terms for Grad/ADEP students
 - Electronic alert system for cancelled classes, alerting students who commute to the campus before they’ve actually arrived (versus putting a sign on the door of the classroom)

- *Adjunct Faculty*
 - Develop, implement and assess training/orientation to campus, policies, resources, values, and norms. Explore making training mandatory and compensating instructors for their time.
 - Reach clarity on eligibility of adjunct faculty to participate in various “faculty” functions (faculty lunch, campus committees, faculty meeting, professional development day, etc)
 - Consider adjunct faculty role in faculty governance
 - Evaluate current adjunct pay rate in comparison to other institutions and consider appropriate pay increases
 - Develop campus norms that value adjunct faculty and eliminate feeling of adjuncts as “a necessary evil.”
 - Develop an adjunct-specific website within academic affairs that provides resources, policies, links to helpful campus websites, etc. through the lens of an adjunct faculty member.

- *Staff and Faculty Recognition*
 - Revive staff and faculty recognition awards
 - Allow departments flexibility to appropriately recognize/award outstanding work
 - Create more flexibility in hours and scheduling to better meet both student needs and staff/faculty needs

Sub-Team Two: Inclusive Community

Summary of the Observations and Findings:

The inquiry into answering the question “What should CLU do to become a stronger and more inclusive community?” included reviewing existing data, administering surveys and holding focus groups (centering on gaps in the existing data), analyzing all of the data, and developing a set of recommendations. This is an area that stirred tremendous debate and discussion. The following describes the sub-teams’ findings.

Overall, much has been done to increase student, faculty, and staff diversity to make CLU a more inclusive community. Much is in place, however, gaps continue to exist, and more work remains.

In the process of examining the data, two broad areas of inclusivity were examined: issues related to religious, cultural, racial, ethnic, and sexual diversity; and contextual diversity which included such things as residential, commuter, and program levels (TUG, transfers, grad, doctoral, faculty, adjunct faculty, and staff). We discovered that there are varying levels of inclusivity within these two domains.

We found that efforts have been made to address inclusivity with various contextual groups within the University community however more remains to be done. We observed that traditional, residential undergraduate students have different needs than non-residential ADEP students, versus commuter graduate students. Ranked faculty have differing needs from adjunct faculty. Staff and Regents have needs that differ from all of the other groups. The same is true for providing services based on ability, cultural, ethnic, and sexual diversity. Rather than the same service or initiative for each category of students, services need to address the particular needs of those students.

Three themes emerged around inclusivity on campus:

- As a campus community we need to develop a common language about what it means for CLU to be an inclusive community
- To be an inclusive community, we need to re-visit our core values and ensure that the language in those core values demonstrate our inclusivity; and
- We need to have a focus on equity of services provided versus creating equal services. By this we mean that to strive to provide the appropriate services for each constituent group.

Ultimately the university needs to be intentional in providing services that are equitable for all students rather than equal, specifically, address the gaps identified in the issues section of this report.

Issues

- *Campus Climate*
 - Insufficient visible symbols that support diversity and inclusion on campus
 - Inclusivity in the sense that no one group seems to “own” the campus
- *1st Generation Students*
 - Only a limited number have access to Student Support Services
 - Limited access to costly co-curricular activities
 - Policies that are sensitive to their financial challenges and decrease their financial anxiety
 - Practices that recognize their need for fuller information because they are the first to attend college
- *Commuter Students*
 - Harder to connect to the University
 - Need co-curricular programming during the day-- too difficult to come back for evening programs
 - Need secure storage (lockers) for personal items while on campus
 - Need good “hang out” area
 - Need better access to information
- *Black Students*
 - Lower GPAs
 - Lower graduation rates
 - Lower utilization of faculty, peer and SSS resources for academic support
 - Need strategies for encouraging these students to seek academic support
- *International Students*
 - Lower graduation rates
 - Feel less safe from violence and acts of intolerance on campus
 - Policies and practices need to accommodate their newness to U.S. culture, language, and processes
 - Shuttle to get around Thousand Oaks
 - Winter commencement ceremony
- *GLBTQ*
 - Feel less safe from acts of intolerance on campus
 - No policies related to transgender students
- *Religion*
 - No space for other expressions of worship
 - Perceived lack of spiritual support
- *Students with Disabilities*
 - Insufficient trained tutors

- Faculty need additional skills to be of assistance
- More welcoming and helpful staff
- *ADEP, Graduate, and Doctoral Students*
 - Do not give recognition rewards
 - Lack of co-curricular programming
 - Limited communication / not geared toward ADEP, graduate and doctoral student needs
 - Lack of networking opportunities
 - No student government representation
 - No access to student activities (no student fees collected)
 - Lack of services at the off-campus locations
 - Availability of Student services limited due to hours
 - Limited financial aid
 - No student employment except TUG's
- *Adjunct Faculty*
 - Minimal involvement in decision-making
 - Undervalued: seen as "necessary evil"
 - More basic information about the University – policies and procedures
- *Ranked Faculty*
 - Need new/more required strategies for hiring diverse faculty
 - Need policies that support diverse hiring faculty
 - Required training to be more helpful to students with disabilities
 - Training for faculty to work with students with diverse backgrounds
 - Require diversity training
- *Staff and Administrators*
 - Policies that support hiring diverse staff and administration
 - Required strategies for hiring diverse staff and administration
 - Required training to be more helpful to students with disabilities
 - Require diversity training for staff

Recommendations

Inclusivity Statement

Develop, adopt, and use a statement on what inclusivity means at CLU. A working definition to be refined includes:

1. Inclusivity is limited to those who *respect* the University's core values: Excellence, Truth, Faith, Acceptance, Respect, Nurturing, and Service (this was contested by some who wanted full inclusion)
2. Policies, programs, and practices are representative of shared ideals and values
3. Policies, programs, and practices promote access and inclusion
4. Groups and individuals feel a sense of belonging and connection to the campus community
5. Groups and individuals feel that their needs are being met

6. Groups and individuals believe they have equitable access to opportunities
7. Groups and individuals have a sense of shared power in decision making
8. Groups and individuals believe that their chances for success are not limited based on their group identity
9. Groups and individuals feel like their voices are heard

Core Values

Review, revise, adopt, and promote the university's core values. Feedback suggests that particular attention should go to defining the "we" in these statements—perhaps use "CLU". Secondly, statement three's inclusion of the word, "tolerance" is unacceptable; to be tolerated is seen as just one step above annihilation. The use of the phrase, "encourage active faith" was problematic for some faculty who do not see that as their job and would not be comfortable doing this.

- As a university – we are committed above all to academic excellence and the rigorous pursuit of truth.
- As a church-related university – we are nourished by the Christian heritage, encourage active faith, and seek to serve our neighbors.
- As a community – we embrace people of all faiths, value diversity and inclusiveness, practice tolerance and acceptance, and treat one another with respect, civility, and compassion.
- As an employer – we expect a high level of performance and nurture the professional and personal growth of our faculty, administration, and staff.
- As a civic organization – we actively promote the social, cultural and economic health of our community.

Sub-Team Three: Community of Faith

Summary of the Observations and Findings

As with our other sub-areas, there was tremendous discussion. For this sub-team, the conversation focused on what it means to be part of a “community of faith.” How inclusive is our community of faith, how inclusive should we be? Discussion ensued about the Lutheran tradition in higher education and how this informs (or does not inform) our undergraduate and graduate programs. What follows highlights the major findings of this sub-team.

The majority of respondents (students, faculty, and adjunct faculty) suggested that identifying CLU as a community of faith was not off-putting. Most notably respondents commented on chapel and its services; regular emails announcing chapel; Lenten devotions; the presence of campus pastors at public events; prayer at public events; the general ethos of the campus; the Luther statue; the middle name; Lutheran/Christian students, staff and faculty members; no class and/or meetings during chapel time, church relations office, etc.

There were a minority of those who felt, however, that these practices were not tied to a larger institutional culture and commented that for them there wasn’t a sense of a “values connection” that was identifiably linked to the Lutheran faith. With regard to values, the respondents clearly were able to identify values that they felt flowed from the institutional culture, such as: academic excellence, inclusion, tolerance, freedom, questioning, etc. However, it was also noted that these values are generic to higher education; the respondents openly wondered why there isn’t a more concerted effort to tie these values with a particular Lutheran base.

Respondents suggested providing more opportunities for diverse religious faiths to practice their faith such as alternative worship/prayer space as well as services for Roman Catholic students. Including other religious leaders speaking in chapel as well as celebrating other non-Christian holidays was also suggested.

Respondents were not clear about the diversity of Lutheranism and where the ELCA is within that diversity. The majority of respondents were not clear about the role of the Convocation/Convocators or even its existence in the governance of the University.

With regard to the adult graduate program, the majority of the respondents didn’t see a connection with the Lutheran identity. In addition, some felt that issues of faith have no place in graduate education.

Areas That Were Not Covered

- A big issue which emerged is the frustration with a lot of talk over the years and not much action. There is a sense among respondents that they would like to know, and for the University to be clear, about its Lutheran identity. Is CLU trying to be all things to all people so that everybody will like them and cause no offense? Or, in the alternative,

is CLU as committed to its Lutheran identity as it says it is? Will CLU become who it is? Or expressed in the alternative, will CLU be who it says it is?

- What is the relationship between Lutheran identity and CLU culture? This is an important question because there is an essential connection between mission and culture. How mission is understood *and* implemented is greatly affected by the culture from which it emerges and the breadth and depth of the Lutheran character of that culture. To speak of Lutheran identity without acknowledging this connection is to give lip service to Lutheran identity.
- Pope John Paul II speaking as a Lutheran ☺ from *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, 235.
 - *it is evident that besides teaching, research and services common to all universities, a Lutheran university, by institutional commitment, brings to its task the inspiration and light of the Gospel. In a Lutheran university, therefore, Lutheran ideals, attitudes and principles penetrate and inform university activity in accordance with proper nature and autonomy of these activities. In a word, being both a university and Lutheran, it must be both a community of scholars representing various branches of human knowledge, and academic institution in which the Gospel is vitally present and operative.*

Recommendations

a. Goals

- Clearly articulate Lutheran higher education within the framework of Lutheran theology and practices.
- Articulate the relationship between CLU and the ELCA.
- Operationalize what CLU already says about itself with regard to Lutheran identity, particularly as it is already articulated in current documents. (See Mission, Identity, and Values statement and Strategy Map)
- Hire, recruit and staff for mission, this includes students.
- Tie CLU Core Values to Lutheran theology, particularly Vocation and Vocation to God.
- Express the relationship between the ELCA and CLU more publically.
- Increase the participation of Bishops, Pastors and staff members of the Region II synods in appropriate CLU events.
- Integrate the ADEP and Graduate student populations into the identity and mission of CLU.
- Increase faculty integration of Lutheran attitudes and practices into the class/program as is appropriate to the call/program.
- Establish living/learning communities around the theme of spirituality.
- Provide Roman Catholic worship services.
- Expand CLU's relationship with the Jewish community.
- Expand CLU's relationship with the Muslim community.
- Expand CLU's relationship with the Asian and Southeast Asian communities.

b. Tactics

- Reinststitute the Associate Provost Office whose responsibility, among other duties, is to articulate and communicate persuasively the relationship between organizational mission, culture and identity (see additional suggestions under Comprehensive University)
- Use clear language: *As a University of the Church CLU*
- Articulate CLU's Vocation as God's call. That CLU did not come into existence through the will of any person but the Church's response to the call of God.
- Provide ongoing learning opportunities for faculty, staff, students, Regents and Convocators which articulates the role and governance of the Convocators and teach and use the language of the ELCA Social Statement on Education as an expression of articulating the relationship.
- Make mission and identity a key element in new student, faculty and employee orientation.
- Have, as part of the hiring/staffing/recruiting, mission-fit as one of the hiring criteria.
- Organize Freshman seminar around mission and vocation.
- Use Founder's Day Convocation as an opportunity to have the Bishops, Pastors and congregational members of region II present where CLU's relationship to the ELCA is front and center. Highlight that this celebration of CLU's birth is the celebration of the call of God answered referencing language of the ELCA Social Statement on Education.
- Develop orientation programs for Graduate and ADEP students which introduce these students to CLU's identity, mission and relationship to the ELCA.
- Provide interactive events which allow interested faculty to explore the place and expression of Lutheran attitudes and practices in their respective classes/programs.
- Work with the Student Life Committee to develop a living learning community around the theme of Spirituality, integrating all units of the University in the delivery, e.g. academic, student life, campus ministry, and resident life.
- Establish a relationship with a Roman Catholic Priest who is also academically qualified to provide a class in Catholic Studies and offer mass to the Roman Catholic constituents.
- Establish a relationship with a Rabbi who is academically qualified to provide a class in Jewish studies and offer worship opportunities for Jewish students.
- Establish a relationship with a Muslim scholar who is academically qualified to provide a class in Muslim studies and offer worship opportunities to Muslim students.
- Determine the religious needs for international students, particularly graduate MBA students, for religious services in their respective traditions.

“Appendices”

Surveys & Other Documents -- See Work Team One Support Documents Folder on Blackboard for more documents that we reviewed.

Items that may be of particular interest to the Strategic Planning Team:

CLU Diversity Initiatives

Culture and Diversity Values Analysis (Climate study)

Student Survey Summary

Adjunct Faculty Survey Summary

Strategic Plan Student Survey Data

Adjunct Survey Data

Strategic Plan Student Survey Data categories

Summary of Observations Inclusivity