



One University-One Vision:  
Completing the Journey to World-  
Class Status.

KIMEP University Strategy  
AY 2015-16 through AY 2017-18

# Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| I. A Letter from President Dr Chan Young Bang..... | 2  |
| II. Mission and Core Values.....                   | 4  |
| III. A Vision for the Future.....                  | 5  |
| IV. TOWS Analysis.....                             | 6  |
| V. Goals and Objectives .....                      | 13 |
| VI. Conclusion.....                                | 19 |
| VII. References.....                               | 19 |

## **I. A Letter from Dr. Chan Young Bang**

Dear KIMEP University Stakeholders,

In the course of its 22 years of existence, KIMEP University has periodically examined its mission, programs, sense of community, and engagement in Kazakhstan and the world. We continue to strive for ultimate goal of World-Class status, doing so within the context of an environment of financial and regulatory constraints which require a sharp focus on how to meet the challenges before us and how to sustain our strengths.

We are increasingly aware that the challenges and opportunities confronting higher education in the 21st century are quite different from those that have preceded it. Our students are preparing for an era characterized by global connections, filled with diverse peoples and perspectives, and dominated by the acceleration of technological change. I believe that the challenge of preparing students to think creatively and critically so they may become agents of change makes this one of the most exciting times in the history of KIMEP University.

This academic year will be the turning point for our university. Although declining student numbers have had a profound effect on our operations, seven and a half percent annual growth in enrollment will allow the university to achieve the strategic target of 3,500 students by the 2017-18 academic year. Improving the size, quality and diversity of our student body is our number one strategic priority.

The size of the student body is influenced by a growth in new student enrollment, the effects of graduating students and the negative effects of attrition. The introduction of our new Learning Support Center should stabilize and subsequently reduce academic related attrition while increased efforts to obtain external scholarship funding will be a source of relief to financial related attrition. A substantial number of new students will serve as the final piece of student growth and we continue to examine the factors that influence our first year enrollment. This includes marketing, recruitment efforts, tuition fee policy, financial aid programs as well as external factors like inflation and GDP growth rate. These combined factors give us a generally favorable operating environment, supporting my optimistic outlook.

Quality students are but one component of a world class university. We also need a faculty who will be devoted to our students by providing a quality educational experience. KIMEP University must continue to attract and retain a diverse faculty willing to keep pace with the changes both in the delivery of academic programs, including an embracement of distance learning models. Our support for faculty will need to be sufficient to enhance to how they teach, serve students and conduct research.

KIMEP University is committed to meeting the challenges facing universities in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Our dedicated faculty and students will continue to raise the quality of learning, teaching, and research. We want to ensure that KIMEP University continues its legacy of teaching people to think critically and to ensure that our students will develop into creative and ethical leaders.

In addition to our continuing and growing interactions with the business community the university will place an increased emphasis on alumni support. We look to our alumni to increasingly engage with their alma mater in meaningful and substantive ways.

The previous strategic plan was a bold step forward for the university and KIMEP has made impressive strides towards fulfilling the goals of that plan. Along the way, the university has substantially improved in a variety of ways and we should all be proud of these efforts. This current strategy can be considered the next step in development of an internationally recognized (world-class) university in the next three years. I look forward to taking on this challenge, and I hope you're as excited as I am for the upcoming planning period.

Sincerely,

Dr Chan Young Bang, President  
KIMEP University

## **II. KIMEP's Mission and Core Values**

### ***Mission***

The mission of KIMEP has been consistent since the founding of the university. It reflects our core values. The current mission is:

to develop well-educated citizens and to improve the quality of life in Kazakhstan and the Central Asian region through teaching, learning, community service and the advancement of knowledge in the fields of business administration and social sciences. To fulfill this mission, we offer graduate and undergraduate degree programs at the highest level of international educational standards in business, economics, finance, accounting, public administration, political science, international relations, law, pedagogy, journalism and mass communication to outstanding students, who will become equals to graduates of universities anywhere in the world. We seek to select students from among those who demonstrate leadership, talent and language capabilities, irrespective of their financial means, gender or ethnic origin, or any other subjective criteria.

The mission statement aims to bring the core values to life, setting a practical goal for the operations of the community. The expectations we have of our stakeholders draw on our core values and mission.

### ***Core Values***

Our core values remain the heart of all activities at KIMEP. Adopted in November 2009 by the KIMEP Board of Trustees, these values codify the key principals that have guided the university since its founding. These values are:

- We value the well-being of our students, faculty, and staff.
- We encourage personal and professional development in an environment of collegiality and trust.
- We value quality in our education programs and research activities.
- We value the holistic development of our students, instilling in them a questioning spirit and the ability and desire to learn throughout life.
- We value our responsibility to develop the future leaders of society who will embrace the highest ethical standards.
- We value the creation, application, and dissemination of knowledge in a culture which fully supports the freedom of inquiry and speech.
- We value fairness and integrity and will not tolerate favoritism, nepotism or corruption.
- We value open, honest communications and transparent and accountable decision-making.

- We value partnerships with our community, including the parents of our students, business, government, and non-government organizations, within The Republic of Kazakhstan and throughout the world.
- We value the high reputation of our Institute in the Republic of Kazakhstan and beyond, and also its important contribution to the growth of society
- We value all people both within and outside our organization, regardless of their nationality, religion, gender or other factors not related to the purposes of the Institution.

KIMEP expects all members of the community to act with respect, openness, honesty and integrity. We have a commitment to quality and intolerance of nepotism, corruption and discrimination.

### **III. A Vision for the Future**

KIMEP University is determined to achieve its goal of becoming recognized as a world class university by the end of the 2017-18 academic year. This strategy is designed to capture the university's definition of *world-class*, a term that KIMEP collectively defined to capture the spirit of its future goals. According to the university's strategy:

A world-class university produces eminently qualified graduates with the values, expertise, skills and knowledge which are consistent with, and relevant to, the society in which they intend to serve.

The key to the definition was a focus on students, on their success and on their outcomes. KIMEP is a student-centered learning environment, and our fundamental commitment to the well-being of our students manifests itself throughout our operations. It can be found in our core values, and it can be found in our institutional culture. KIMEP is a community consisting of interdependent individuals. Together we must act to achieve our common goals and continue to develop the four key areas that make a university world class: students, academic programs, faculty and student centered campus environment.

In recent years all core KIMEP University faculty were required to meet international standards of academic or professional qualification. We will increase Kazakhstan's international profile through a sustained research output, and we will continue to produce eminently qualified graduates in the fields of business, the social sciences, pedagogy and law.

KIMEP University is a partnership between a large number of stakeholders, which include professors, administrators, students, alumni, parents, the Kazakhstani government and the community at large. This remarkable partnership, uniting so many different facets of Kazakhstani society, has been chiefly responsible for the success we've achieved so far. KIMEP University is a national treasure that belongs to all of Kazakhstan, and we are deeply appreciative of the incredible support we have received from numerous Ministers of Education and other national and local government officials.

As we look towards the future, this partnership will prove to be one of the most powerful forces for the further development of this great country. Kazakhstan and KIMEP

University have achieved so much over the last twenty plus years, and together, we will do so much more in the coming years. To achieve these goals, we will need to rely on the support of our friends throughout Kazakhstani society. Their investment in our university has yielded untold opportunities to thousands of families throughout this country and the rest of the region. KIMEP has helped them achieve a quality of life that they could have only dreamed of. This is a remarkable achievement in every sense of the word, and it is evidence of how, when united in purpose, we can all contribute to the betterment of this great nation.

#### **IV. TOWS Analysis**

The progress made during the previous four year period has positioned the university for the final push towards the ultimate goal; recognition as a world-class university. The next three years should culminate in achieving this desired end, but, despite our strengths and opportunities, we must be aware of our weaknesses and threats. We must also acknowledge that our strengths are not carved in stone and therefore require constant vigilance to maintain and improve these areas as well.

As Michael Watkins (2005) notes, the acronym SWOT implies an inverse order of the analytical process and is therefore, misleading. The appropriate approach is to first identify the external environment (Threats and Opportunities) and then examine how internal factors (Strengths and Weaknesses) relate. Essentially every internal factor can be paired with at least one external factor and vice versa. By comparing the internal characteristics of the organization to the external environment an organization can develop four categories of strategic actions:

1. WT (mini-min) strategies are designed to minimize both external threats and their corresponding internal weakness
2. WO (mini-max) strategies are designed to minimize internal weaknesses by maximizing corresponding external opportunities.
3. ST (maxi-min) strategies maximize strengths which, in turn, minimize external threats.
4. SO (maxi-max) strategies maximize internal strengths in order to maximize opportunities.  
(Wehrich, 1982)

The strategies are then grouped according to their relevant key area: Students, Faculty, Academic Programs and Campus Environment.

## External Environment

### *Threats:*

#### **T-1 Declining number of students enrolled in higher education**

Canning (2014) notes that over a two year period, the number of students enrolled in higher education institutions has decreased by 110,000. Current HEI enrollment represents 24.4% of 18-24 year olds.

#### **T-2 More competition in Kazakhstan and internationally: more English taught programs with more international links and accreditation**

We must acknowledge that the playing field has changed from three years ago, with additional competition in the delivery of programs in English, specifically the MBA program at KBTU. Additionally, KazEU and Map are offering some business courses in English.

Although KIMEP was the first university to receive international program accreditation for all bachelors and masters programs that have produced graduates, several other universities have made significant strides in this area:

**Karaganda Economic University** has 12 accredited programs, 3 master and 3 bachelor programs by AQAAA and 3 bachelor and 3 master programs by IQAA.

**Kazakh National University** has 10 international accreditations (5 bachelors and 5 masters) all of which are in math and science. The bachelor programs are AQAAA and the master programs are ASIIN.

**Eurasian National University** also has 5 bachelor and 5 masters programs with ACQUIN accreditation. The programs areas are International Relations, Economics, Management, International Law as well as Political Science.

**Pavlodar State University** has 6 bachelor and 2 master program accreditations from ACQUIN. Economics and Management have both bachelor and master level accreditation and Accounting, Finance, State and Local Government and Tourism have bachelor level accreditation.

**UIB** has 2 bachelors (economics and finance) and 2 masters (economics and finance) from AQAAA

**Almaty Management University** (formally International Academy of Business) has AMBA accreditation for the MBA program

We cannot simply promote the accreditations alone. Rather, we must be able to clearly demonstrate to potential students and their parents that we make constant efforts to maintain program quality. We are better than the competition but we are no longer in a



position to ignore them. To this extent, our commitment to Quality Assurance is a key to maintaining program superiority over other institutions.

Universities in Singapore and Malaysia attract students with dual and joint degree programs with affiliated UK universities. International students have a less expensive avenue to obtaining a UK degree. In meeting with representatives of universities from these countries they admitted that students come from Kazakhstan for the UK degree.

### **T-3 Secondary students having an increased interest in the study of science and technology.**

For AY 2014-15 only 15% of students taking the UNT chose an elective component suitable for admission to one of KIMEP's programs. For AY 2014-15, the pool of secondary school graduates passing the UNT with an elective portion appropriate for admission to KIMEP University decreased by 20% from AY 2013-14.

### **T-4 Increased competition for foreign faculty both domestically and internationally**

Several local universities, notably KBTU, ALMA and KazEU, are working to increase their foreign faculty numbers. In some cases this involves recruiting current faculty members at KIMEP University. Additionally KIMEP is at a competitive disadvantage against universities in locations like the Middle East in terms of compensation packages.

### **T-5 Increasing government support for vocational and technical institutions as well as regional universities.**

Canning (2014) notes that the government supports students attending regional universities by providing a stipend of KZT 700,000. This amount equals approximately 50% of one year's tuition at KIMEP. Additionally, the government has budgeted 49 billion tenge for research and development with 70% earmarked for higher education institutions. Funding for research related capital investment is 14% of the total.

### ***Opportunities:***

#### **O-1 Growing demand for graduate programs**

There is growing interest in specialized masters' degrees in business as well as increased interest in obtaining professional certification, especially in accounting. Canning (2014) reported a 130% increase in graduate enrollment between 2009 and 2013.

#### **O-2 Stronger links and collaboration with vocational and secondary schools**

Improved links with secondary, especially private English instruction secondary schools will help the university's overall recruiting efforts.

### **O-3 Growing interest in international of education through exchange programs, dual degree programs and the recruitment of international degree students**

In meeting with representatives of universities in Malaysia it was discovered that many students from Kazakhstan go there because they offer joint degrees with UK universities.

### **O-4 Growing market for inexpensive on-line and distance education**

Despite regulations that limit the use of on-line and distance learning methods, potential students do express an interest in “attending” KIMEP with limited travel to Almaty. There is interest in our Executive MBA program in regions outside of Almaty that can be partially satisfied through on-line and distance learning approaches.

### **O-5 Growing public and private funds for education**

The university is now eligible to apply for state research grants.

### **O-6 Growing body of successful alumni**

Nearly 10,000 KIMEP alumni, many holding prominent positions in business and academia, can serve as ambassadors for the university and assist in private fund raising and marketing.

## **Internal Environment**

### ***Weaknesses:***

### **W-1 Declining number of students, especially in most graduate programs**

#### **Intake**

The following table shows the number of new students for each academic year from AY 2009-10 through AY 2013-14. The numbers in parentheses are the percentage change from the previous year:

| Academic Year | New Undergraduates | New Graduates | Total New Students |
|---------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| 2009-10       | 838                | 255           | 1093               |
| 2010-11       | 599 (-28.5)        | 215 (-15.7)   | 814 (-25.5)        |
| 2011-12       | 641 (7.0)          | 251 (16.7)    | 892 (9.6)          |
| 2012-13       | 753 (17.5)         | 219 (-12.7)   | 972 (9.0)          |
| 2013-14       | 722 (-4.1)         | 193 (-13.5)   | 915 (-5.9)         |
| 2014-15       | 626 (-13.3%)       | 158 (-18.1%)  | 784 (14.2%)        |

The previous strategic plan overestimated the number of new students by 200 for AY 2012-13 and by 325 for AY 2013-14. However the actual numbers for newly admitted

undergraduates represented a marked improvement over the previous two years despite the 4% decline from AY 2012-13 to AY 2013-14. Unfortunately, for AY 2014-15 the number of available students (passed UNT with appropriate elective) falls by 20% resulting in a 13.3% decrease in the number of new undergraduate students. Much of the decline in new undergraduates can be related to a decline in the number of eligible students due to an increase in the UNT failure rate. However the trend in new graduate students is disturbing. While rethinking how we promote programs is clearly needed, we also need to reconsider what programs we are trying to promote.

The downward trend in graduate admissions was realized even though the university had established a separate Graduate Admissions Office. The reorganization to take effect in November 2014 will place all recruiting activity under one office. Additionally the university will be promoting three new graduate programs in AY 2014-15 with one more planned for either AY 2015-16 or AY 2016-17.

The following table shows the average UNT score for a new undergraduate relative to the overall score in Kazakhstan:

| Year    | UNT for KIMEP | Overall UNT | Percent Difference |
|---------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 2011-12 | 80.1          | 70.4        | + 13.78            |
| 2012-13 | 76.6          | 70.9        | + 8.04             |
| 2013-14 | 73.6          | 74.5        | - 1.2              |

In 2013-14 the average new undergraduate had a UNT score that was 8.1% lower than the average for 2011-12. This occurred even though for all students taking the UNT the average score increased 5.8%. One critical result is that for AY 2013-14 the average new student at KIMEP has a score that is 1.2% below the national average. The university has gone from having students with scores that were 13.78% above the national average to slightly below. Although the student body remains exceptional, the university needs to examine the reasons why many top students are not choosing KIMEP. Quality of the student body is an important factor in determining the academic reputation of a university.

Another factor related to the UNT exam is the elective component. This portion of the exam determines what program a student may apply for. Currently, only 15% of UNT exam takers take an elective component that would allow them to enter one of KIMEP's degree programs. Clearly there needs to be a focus on 10<sup>th</sup> year students, to encourage them to take an elective component relative to the university's degree offerings.

Traditional recruitment can focus more on regions in Kazakhstan with the highest real income growth, but more explicit exposure in the Almaty region cannot be overemphasized. The assistance of our students, alumni and partners is crucial in this mission. International recruitment is also generating more incoming students, but a more effective approach towards geographical segmentation and Central Asia in particular needs to be considered.

While the growing interest and activity on our corporate website, You-Tube pages and social networks appear to demonstrate the validity of the combination of a traditional approach to recruitment with new digital tools, it should be pointed out that 80% of our followers on social media are people with KIMEP connections (students, alumni, employees)

### **Retention**

The next table shows the one-year retention levels for new students from AY 2009-10 through AY 2012-13

| Academic Year | New Undergrad Students | Returned the following fall | New Grad Students | Returned the following fall | Total New students | Returned the following fall |
|---------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| 2009-10       | 838                    | 710                         | 255               | 186                         | 1093               | 896                         |
| 2010-11       | 599                    | 507                         | 215               | 129                         | 814                | 636                         |
| 2011-12       | 641                    | 550                         | 251               | 166                         | 892                | 716                         |
| 2012-13       | 753                    | 671                         | 219               | 141                         | 972                | 821                         |

Over this period an average of 18.62% of new students failed to return for the following academic year. For undergraduates the average first year attrition rate is 13.9% and for graduates it is 33.8%. Here attrition means either formal withdrawal or simply becoming inactive. For undergraduates the number of students in their second year who return for the third or have completed their degree is 91.3% (77.3% of those who entered) and the percentage of undergraduates in the third year who return for the fourth year or have completed their degree is 93.6% (71% of those who entered).

That means 8.7% of second year students do not complete their degree yet do not return for the third year and 6.4% of third year students do not complete their degree yet do not return for the fourth year.

For graduate students, 3.5% complete their degree after one year. Of those who did not complete their degree 69.6% return for the second year. Of those students returning for the second year, 21.9% complete their degree. Those who returned for the second year but did not complete the degree 69.9% return for a third year. Of those students returning for a third year 45% complete their degree and of those who do not complete the degree 80% return for a fourth year.

### **W-2 High dependency on tuition revenue**

KIMEP University continues to be constrained by the 90-10 rule

### **W-3 Lack of adequate on-campus housing**

The dormitory has a capacity of 424 students. The conversion of faculty apartments into student housing can only add 50. With an increased focus on recruiting students from outside Almaty the current level of housing is inadequate.

### **W-4 Insufficient funding for research activities**

Although the amount budgeted for research funding has doubled from AY 2013-14 the level is still less than \$1000 per full-time faculty member.

## **Strengths:**

### **S-1 High quality programs based on international standards that have the highest ranks nationally and are accredited internationally**

During the previous three year period the university was successful in obtaining institutional accreditation from the local accreditation agency as well as international program accreditation for all masters and bachelors programs. KIMEP is ranked as the number one university in the field of Humanities and Social Sciences, well ahead of the number two school.

### **S-2 Outstanding graduate employment rates and employer satisfaction**

The university continues to have high employment rates for its graduates and employer satisfaction surveys are positive and the Internal Rates of Return for our masters programs continues to be high.

### **S-3 Highest concentration of faculty with international PhD's**

We have 67 faculty members with terminal degrees and more than 20 due to complete their terminal degrees within the next two years.

### **S-4 Best international opportunities (exchanges, dual degrees, internationally diverse student body)**

In the past three years we have more than doubled the number of dual degree programs and increased our international partnerships by 33%.

An analysis of both the external and internal environments involves the matching of our internal weaknesses and strengths with the external threats and opportunities. The number one weakness, and the main strategic initiative for the next three years, relates to the decline in enrollment. This weakness is associated with 4 threats (T-1, T-2, T-3 & T-4) but is also related to 4 opportunities (O-1, O-2, O-3 & O-4). The second weakness, dependence on tuition revenue is related to one threat (T-5) and two opportunities (O-5 & O-6). The third weakness, lack of campus housing, is related to one opportunity (O-6). The lack of research funding is related to one threat (T-4) and two opportunities (O-5 & O-6)

In terms of our internal strengths, our program quality can be used to counter threats T-1, T-2, T-3 and T-5 and relates to all opportunities except O-5. The second strength, high

levels of employment and employer satisfaction, has the same relation to the external environment as program quality. The third weakness, lack of campus housing, relates to O-6 while our final strength, international connections relates directly to O-3 and can be used to counter all threats excluding T-4. The next section will translate these pairings into strategic directives to guide the actions and plans of the university over the next three years.

## **V. Strategic Directives**

### **Introduction**

The university's strategic directives are designed to achieve the goal of becoming a world class university, focusing on the four key areas: students, faculty, academic programs and student centered campus environment. The over arching strategic directive will be related to increasing the student population, but strategic directives related to the other areas, while building towards world class recognition, will reinforce our efforts to attract more highly qualified students. This will result in higher revenues and enhance the universities financial position. In short, both our goal of achieving world class status and the future financial viability of the institution depend on one critical factor: more students.

As Mintzberg (1994) and Martin (2014) note, the concept of "strategic planning" is misleading since strategy and planning are two separate activities. Too often organizations produced highly detailed strategic planning documents that are heavy on action items and planning but lack any clear strategy that drives the various decisions. They also tend to be overly devoted to the cost side, which is easy to plan, and ignore the critical point of strategy, influencing the decisions of those who impact our revenue i.e. prospective students. This latter point is also emphasized by Raynor & Ahmed (2013). You can't plan revenue; you can only plan actions designed to generate revenue. As Martin (2014) notes, if your strategic statements (directives) are related to influencing the decisions of the revenue generators then it isn't necessary to produce a long and tedious planning document.

Another weakness generally associated with strategic plans is the emphasis on what Mintzberg (1994) calls deliberate strategy rather than emergent strategy. The focus on deliberate strategy, according to Mintzberg, is that it plays to the comfort zone of managers. Models and forecasts lead to highly precise and technocratic plans which, in turn, create a false sense of certainty. Emergent strategy is not based on original intentions but is a response to the changing environment. As much as boards and managers may want the world to be knowable, it isn't. That does not mean we should avoid making deliberate strategy, it simply means that we should not be locked into it if changing conditions warrant a change in strategy. Just because strategy statements are published in a document covering a 3 to 5 year horizon doesn't mean we should forever sail that course.

If, over time, strategy itself is emergent then obviously planning must be viewed as an ongoing process. This will require a standing committee to develop, implement and

monitor the various actions required to satisfy the strategic directives, ever mindful that the strategic directives may change.

Each strategic directive should be simple (Martin 2014) and involve one or more action items to be pursued over the next three years. In terms of action items, Porter (1996) states that appropriate actions require a degree of “fit” with the strategy. In terms of “fit” there are three types: 1) those actions directly consistent with the strategy statement, 2) those that reinforce the strategy statement and 3) those that optimize the effectiveness of the strategy statement.

There is also an emphasis on Blue Ocean Strategy, as described by Kim and Mauborgne (2004). Blue Ocean Strategy focuses on creating uncontested market space, creating and capturing demand and making the competition irrelevant. It also emphasizes the “breaking” of the value/cost trade-off by aligning activities designed to achieve both value differentiation and low cost.

## **Directives**

***Strategic Directive 1. Increase undergraduate enrollment to increase the student population, with a target of 3000 undergraduate degree students for Spring 2018.***

Responsibility: VP-RISA, the Director of Recruiting and Admissions and the Director of Marketing

This directive addresses weakness W-1.

For Spring 2015 the headcount was 2740 which is 2.5% below Spring 2014, 30.7% below Spring 2010 and 42% below the peak Spring headcount of 4728 in Spring 2009. If the target is achieved, revenue will be increased by \$6.6 million at current tuition rates.

Threats T-1 and T-3 indicates that to achieve this target KIMEP will need to gain a larger share of a shrinking market.

*Action 1: Direct recruiting efforts to students in their 10<sup>th</sup> year as well as those planning to graduate in the current year. (Ongoing)*

By the last year of secondary school students have determined which elective portion they will take in the UNT. The goal is to convince students in their 10<sup>th</sup> year to plan for an elective component that will make them eligible for admission into one of KIMEP’s degree programs. This is being initiated by Recruiting and Admissions during this recruiting campaign.

*Action 2. Emphasize the employment and employer satisfaction results in marketing and recruiting materials. (Ongoing)*

Other universities may attempt to mimic KIMEP in terms of program design, course offerings in English (especially business) and invest heavily in infrastructure but the one area they do not match-up is in the quality of their product. This needs to be stressed in our recruiting and marketing efforts. The message is simple: “Our programs produce

better quality graduates that are higher in demand". Using testimonials from employers and alumni will be critical to this endeavor.

*Action 3. Establish MOU's with private, English instruction secondary schools which will give us increased access to their graduates. (1 per year)*

KIMEP was one of 4 universities selected to sign an MOU with Nazarbayev Intellectual Schools. This provides the university with on campus recruiting rights at all 17 schools which collectively produce approximately 1700 graduates each year. KIMEP will pursue other such recruiting arrangements secondary institutions.

*Action 4. Increase recruiting at vocational schools. (Ongoing)*

To enhance our ability to process vocational school graduates and give them the maximum credit transfer we will need to assess courses and update our data bases to pre-determine transferability of credits.

*Action 5. Develop undergraduate dual and joint degree that will attract students.*

Currently there are two undergraduate dual degree programs in BCB, both with universities in France. However neither appears to attract student interest. Discussions with universities in Malaysia have indicated a strong interest in joint degree programs with UK universities, attracting many students from Kazakhstan and other Central Asian countries.

***Strategic Directive 2. Increase access to KIMEP programs through on-line and Distance Learning***

Uses opportunity O-4 to offset weakness W-1

Responsibility: VPAA, Dean BCB, Director of EEC, Dean of CSS, Dean of Law School, Executive Director of Language Center

*Action 6. Complete construction of the Distance Learning Center.(initiate in summer 2015 and complete by the end of the 2017-18 academic year)*

This will be a 4 phase project to begin in summer 2015. Each subsequent academic year a new phase will be completed.

*Action 7. Incorporate on-line and distance learning components to Executive MBA cohorts outside Almaty (design AY 2015-16; implement AY 2016-17)*

Although regulations require a minimum percentage of contact hours for credit courses, providing on-line and distance learning access to our high quality programs, can help the university reduce the cost of providing Ex MBA education. Plans for OL and DL provision in the Executive MBA program should be finalized during the 2015-16 academic year with initial implementation no later than Fall 2016

*Action 8. Develop on-line and distance learning courses in the General Education Curriculum. (develop courses during AY 2015-16 and implement in 2016-17)*

This could allow potential students outside the Almaty region, including international students, to begin studies in a non-degree status, with credits transferable to their degree



program upon admission as a degree student. This would provide a less expensive way to begin their pursuit of a KIMEP degree.

*Action 9. Develop on-line and distance learning components for the MA in Two Foreign Language program (Develop courses during AY 2015-16, begin to implement in AY 2016-17. Have the full program developed by AY 2017-18)*

This would benefit language teachers outside the Almaty region seeking a masters degree. Combined with a summer residency, they could complete a KIMEP masters with little disruption to their professional lives outside of Almaty.

*Action 10. Develop on-line and distance learning components for the LLM and undergraduate law programs. (Develop courses during AY 2015-16 and begin offerings in AY 2016-17. Have full programs developed by AY 2017-18)*

The most popular second bachelor's degree program is in Law. Regulations permit second bachelors program to be all on-line/distance learning. This is one way to attract students to the undergraduate law program; by allowing individuals outside of Almaty, who are interested in completing second bachelors in law, to pursue the degree while working in another region.

This would also hold for the LLM program, making the degree accessible to professionals working outside of the Almaty region.

*Action 11. Develop and Expand on-line/distance learning offerings for the non-credit offerings in EEC and the Language Center*

Non-credit offerings are permitted to have 100% of coverage their coverage via on-line and distance learning delivery methods. EEC has offered some distance learning courses to cohorts in Atyrau using relatively crude delivery methods. The use of on-line/distance learning technology will allow for low cost delivery of our non-credit offerings, accessible to the market outside the Almaty region. With pay access to a web site these courses could be made available to anyone with a computer, regardless of country.

***Strategic Directive 3. Increase the level of graduate enrollment, with a target of 450 by Spring 2018***

Addresses weakness W-1

Responsibility: VPAA, Deans, Director of Recruiting and Admissions

*Action 12. Review curricula of all masters programs and restructure to make programs more marketable while retaining academic quality. (to be completed in AY 2015-16)*

One comment often received by Recruiting and Admissions is the length of a KIMEP masters program is longer than programs offered by other universities in Kazakhstan. They also received comments that indicate an interest in specialized masters in Finance that is not devoted solely to CFA preparation.

Reducing programs from 1.5 year to a 1 year format could allow for the retention of academic quality while reducing the time and money costs faced by potential students.

*Action 13. Redesign the marketing strategy for graduate programs*

Promotion of our graduate programs should rely more on employer and alumni testimonials, to sell the point that a KIMEP graduate degree gives you a better return. Increase the product value while lowering the cost.

***Strategic Directive 4. Increase external funding from corporations, alumni and public sector.***

Addresses weakness W-2

Responsibility: VPRISA, Director of Corporate Development.

*Action 14. Revitalize the KIMEP Alumni Association, similar to the Business Advisory structure developed in BCB in 2011-12. (Fall 2015)*

The KIMEP Alumni Association (KAA) will have a two-tiered structure. The General Association will be composed of all alumni and the Executive Board will be composed of 7 members chosen by the General Association. The Executive Board will meet 2-3 times per semester with the VPRISA and Director of CDD to discuss the role alumni play in upcoming events, including recruiting and fund raising.

*Action 15. Increase annual donations to the alumni scholarship fund to \$100,000 (Ongoing)*

In the current year the Rakhmet Scholarship Fund received \$16,000 from alumni. A donor structure will be developed in AY 2015-16 where benefits to alumni are tied to the amount of their annual donations to the KAA. The Executive Board will determine what percentage will be allocated to the Rakhmet Scholarship Fund and how much to other uses such as research and facilities.

***Strategic Directive 5. Improve and expand housing facilities for students residing on campus***

Addresses weakness W-3

Responsibility: VPAF, Director of SSD, VPRISA, Director of CDD

*Action 16. Complete the renovation of the current dormitory.*

Hopefully the final phase of the dormitory construction will be completed prior to the start of classes but there will still be a need for further furniture replacement to have all rooms with bunk beds, new desks, chairs and wardrobes. The construction is due to begin during the summer of 2015.

*Action 17. Complete the conversion of on-campus faculty housing to student housing*

As faculty apartments become vacant we will convert them to accommodate 4 students per apartment. The process will begin during the summer of 2015 and should be completed by the end of Fall 2015.

*Action 18. Develop a capital campaign to finance the cost of dormitory construction.*

With alumni assistance we will develop a campaign in Fall 2015 to raise money towards the construction of a dormitory. A campaign can be developed during AY 2015-16 and

launched in summer 2016. KIMEP can obtain a 10 year loan from international development banks. However financing the payback out of dormitory revenues would make the dormitory cost prohibitive to students. Plans for construction can be made in Fall 2017 after one year of fund raising. The campaign will be designed to provide at least 50% of the loan payments, so the campaign will be a traditional 10 year effort. The role of alumni and corporate friends will be critical in selling the concept to potential donors.

***Strategic Directive 6. Increase internal and external support for faculty research***

Addresses weakness W-4

Responsibility: VPAA, VPRISA, Director of CDD, Director of DIAM

***Action 19. Increase internal funding for direct research by 25% per year through AY 2017-18***

At the current exchange rate internal funding for direct research support is \$81,000. This is funding for conference travel or research assistants and journal fees and does not include the university's expenditures on library resources or course rereleases. Never the less the level is well under \$1000 per full time faculty member could be almost doubled by AY 2017-18. This would represent an intermediate goal with a longer term goal of \$2000 per faculty member. Clearly there must be strict scrutiny on the use of the money, to prevent going to a conference just to go to a conference. There must always be clear value added to the faculty member's intellectual capital.

***Action 20. Reactivate existing research funding MOU's***

There are two dormant MOU's that provide research funding opportunities for faculty members. One is with Coca-Cola and the other is with the Institute for Emerging Market Studies which is based in Moscow and funded by Deloitte. The organizations are being contacted to renew the agreements. The opportunities will gain be explained to the faculty members in Fall 2015 and the deans will encourage their faculty to develop plans that will fit into the research interests of these two organizations.

***Action 21. Develop additional research funding MOUs, with a goal of per year through AY 2017-18***

Often MOU's that offer funding opportunities for research have narrow research parameters. To broaden the external funding opportunities for all members of the faculty it would be beneficial to have at least three additional research centers willing to provide funding for research related to that institution's research plan. Both CDD and DIAM will be responsible for making contacts for VPRISA to follow up.

## **VI. Conclusion**

The current strategy is a departure from past strategic plans, reflecting issues and concerns expressed in current literature. This strategy uses TOWS to determine the relationship between the external (threats and opportunities) and internal (weaknesses and strengths) environments. The approach used in this strategy is to establish strategic directives addressing the weaknesses and, for each directive, develop a set of actions designed to use strengths to either maximize opportunities or minimize threats related to that specific weakness.

The focus is on strategic direction, with the knowledge that planning the actions and in some cases modifying the actions or directives, will be an on-going process to be supervised by the VPRISA and a standing Planning Committee. As always an underlying imperative is to maintain strengths as strengths

## **VII. References**

Canning, Mary (2014) “Higher Education: Progress and Issues” presentation for the Road Map Project of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Astana, June

Canning, Mary; Joni Finney; Dennis Jones and Aims McGuinness (2013) “Road Map for the Development of Higher Education in Kazakhstan” report for the Road Map Project of Kazakhstan, November

Kim, W. Chan & Renee Mauborgne (2004) “Blue Ocean Strategy” *Harvard Business Review*, October

Martin, Roger (2014) “The Big Lie of Strategic Planning” *Harvard Business Review*, January

Mintzberg, Henry (1994) *Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning*, New York: The Free Press

Porter, Michael (1996) “What is Strategy?” *Harvard Business Review*, November

Raynor, Micheal and Mumtaz Ahmed (2014) “Three Rules for Making a Company Great” *Harvard Business Review*

Watkins, Michael (2005) “From SWOT to TOWS”, Newton Center, MA: Genesis Advisors report

Weihrich, Heinz (1982) “The TOWS Matrix-A Tool for Situational Analysis”, *Long Range Planning*, 15 (2), pp.54-66