

### 5 Year Strategic Framework - Member Consultation Results

Is there anything in the Strategic Framework that you think shouldn't be there?	Is there anything in the Strategic Framework that you were expecting which is not there?	Is the Strategic Framework clear and concise? If not please state why.	Do you think it is fit for purpose and will provide the EAUC what is required for the future 5 years? If not please state why.	Any other comments?	EAUC Board Response
Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response	
No. Except clarity could be brought to page 1, para 3, which asks what EAUC means by sustainability. The first sentence introduces the idea of ESD (in fact before talking about what sustainability is), and the educational side doesn't belong here.	No.	Yes - very clear. Except - again - the first two sentences of page 1, para 3 - Just delete them, and begin with "The EAUC recognises the diverse range of definitions of sustainability. The most frequently quoted definition is..."	The strategy offers a powerful vision for the future of the EAUC, and is fit for purpose - if it is put into practice. However, Implementation Themes A3, D1 and 2 - listening to Member voices, giving feedback to stakeholders, and operating a financially sustainable organisation - have not been in evidence during my two-year membership of the EAUC. The organisation has always demonstrated a closed and non-transparent approach to leadership and financial management, an unwillingness to communicate or listen to the Membership, and short-sighted financial planning. If the EAUC begins to enact the strategy and avoids the pitfalls above, it will no doubt be highly successful.		The Board have included a new objective under the Business Theme "Measure, monitor, evaluate and feed back to stakeholders on our interactions and impacts" and "Encourage and channel Member feedback to improve and grow the organisation" and will be a focus for 2013 actions. Board responses to this consultation will be available to Members via the website.
Overarching strategic aims'. Point 5, 'to run a sustainable business'. I've never considered the EAUC to be a business. More of a membership organisation.	There is no explicit mention of business links or links with business organisations. This may be inferred throughout the text, when relationships and strategic alliances are noted. But I feel that there should be clear reference between the two. I know this is a personal feeling but I've never felt that the EAUC has challenged unsustainable practice (Our Values - leadership and service for sustainability). Possibly in areas we, as members don't see. But as a member organisation, the EAUC could possibly do more to challenge institutional practice, backed by good case studies etc. from other organisations.	Yes, the main strategic points are clear.	I think the comments are generic enough to fit over the next five years.	D4. Should be first place in the list? Very strong message of partnership and collaboration. But no feeling or real mention of the EAUC itself measuring or reducing its environmental footprint. There is good practice within the EAUC, considerations made at the annual conference and Food for Life Gold level meal at the Green Gown Awards so could make explicit mention of this i.e. the EAUC itself will practice what it preaches through the core team but also all organised meetings and events.	The Board reviewed Strategic Aim 5 and updated to "To run EAUC sustainably supporting the sector for long term benefit". A Board KPI on environmental footprint is to be included in 2013 and our first year of measuring carbon will be reported in the Annual Report.
Not sure if the word 'embedded' gets across the holistic approach needed to 'integrate' sustainability in TE. In 'Overarching Strategic Aims' 2. I feel it's much stronger than 'promote the benefits...' if we are to have any kind of worthwhile future	following from Vandana Shiva's work) Something like this [see email for diagram] to show the relationships and that both societal & economic are predicated on environmental. Bit more clarity on what EAUC will do to model excellence - eg adopt and implement a sustainability policy and promote this good practice. I've attached our Sust. Policy FY [see email] A4 - something about defining 'good sustainability practice'	Yes	Yes - would be great to see even 1/2 of this happen	Yes - perhaps a bit more clarity on the difference between sustainability & SD on 1st page	The Board reviewed Strategic Aim 2 and updated to "To promote and advocate the embedding of Education for Sustainable Development as a core graduate attribute across tertiary education". A Board KPI on environmental footprint is to be included in 2013 and our first year of measuring carbon will be reported in the Annual Report.
Yes. I am not sure why in the strategic aims section, point 2, that education for sustainability is singled out. Should this be about promoting sustainability as a whole? For me this is one specific strand of my work, like sustainable travel, sustainable construction, sustainable food etc. It is not clear why this subject is mentioned here and not others.	Yes. On the whole it seems to capture all the core themes I was expecting. However there is not enough for me about 'innovation', for example how the EAUC offers a source of new ideas which are taken up by 'early adopters' keen to advance and trial new ideas in practice, and how innovative ideas are exchanged to solve longstanding problems. For me this is something different to sharing best practice, as innovative ideas can be experimental, risky, ahead of their time or still evolving, rather than sound, established ways of doing things that are recommended by others.	Yes, it is a good length and very readable. Terms such as 'education for sustainability' should perhaps be capitalised, to indicate it is a specific term, otherwise sentences can be interpreted in different ways, which would be confusing for anyone outside the sector.	Yes	In the strategic aims section, point 2 on promoting education for sustainability seems a little weak and I don't think it encompasses everything the EAUC does or probably intends to do over the next 5 years in this area. I think this point needs to align more with the types of things covered in the 'learning theme' later on. 'To promote' seems a little passive and flat on its own and I think this aim should also allude to things like generating active interest and appetite for, inspiring activity in this area and helping to advance the integration of sustainability into education.	The Board reviewed Strategic Aim 2 and updated to "To promote and advocate the embedding of Education for Sustainable Development as a core graduate attribute across tertiary education".
No all seemed appropriate		Yes	Yes - it has good clear outcome statements that can be matched against achievement		None required.
		Yes	Yes		None required.
No.	No.	Yes.	Yes.	Your outline Strategic Frameworks looks fine to me, just one request however, can you please add something about reducing the number of e-mails sent out by EAUC to members at times it's just far too often. Many thanks	Communications to Members will be reviewed as an action in 2013.
See 3, below,	See 3, below.	Too much is in generic "strategic" language. I see EAUC as having a focus on two elements, the curriculum-based and the estates/services-based, linked by an overarching concern for the embedding of sustainability in decision-making at all levels. This does not come through clearly in the Strategy. I think that these roles should be clearer in the document, as opposed to being implicit within the focus on institutional change.			The Board reviewed the language and agreed it had to be generic to ensure all stakeholders were able to understand it.
No	A better definition of what sustainability means to varied interests	Yes	Yes	I believe that the "limits to growth" is something that needs to be interwoven into the conversations. We need to redefine what "economic growth" is and exclude GDP as a measure for growth as this measures so many negative things. We need to define growth as a qualitative entity, rather than excess of material goods. Every politician adopts the economic growth mantra as a given starting point, and it is fundamentally flawed. We do not need to grow material output. We need to grow quality of life for the greatest number of people.	None required.
	The values are not reflected in the themes. There is no strategic theme for ascertaining what your members actually want, yet listening, understanding and learning is a value - surely two-way communication is an important theme?	Concise yes, clear no. It is very woolly.	It is far too vague to be able to answer this question. The objectives would have to be far more specific for members to comment on what you're actually planning to do.	This is the sort of paper I would write if I didn't want to be tied down to any specific actions or targets that I could be held accountable for. It's far too vague to be of any practical use.	The Board have included a new objective under the Business Theme "Measure, monitor, evaluate and feed back to stakeholders on our interactions and impacts" and will be a focus for 2013 actions. An outline of high level actions for 2013 will be communicated with Members. The Board set KPI's and targets per year which are reporting on at each Board meeting.
No	No	No	Yes		None required.

Is there anything in the Strategic Framework that you think shouldn't be there?	Is there anything in the Strategic Framework that you were expecting which is not there?	Is the Strategic Framework clear and concise? If not please state why.	Do you think it is fit for purpose and will provide the EAUC what is required for the future 5 years? If not please state why.	Any other comments?	EAUC Board Response
Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response	
	Seems to be missing any game-changing vision for the association and no real pointers for a change of pace / fresh thinking needed to maintain the EAUC's relevance for both practitioners and senior managers in the sector		Hope so - but not wildly impressed	Suggest you do NOT use the S- word for financial prudence / stability. Please amend the Business Theme to combine D2 and D3 into the following: "D2. Evaluate and ensure we have the governance to deliver a dynamic, responsive and financially resilient organisation"	The Board reviewed and the Business Theme objective has been amended to "Evaluate and ensure we have the governance to deliver a dynamic, responsive and financially resilient organisation"
No.	Greater clarity in respect of the issues attendant on the development of sustainability education in the tertiary sector.	Yes.	As per my answer to Question 2, I am of the view that EAUC has two distinct strands, one of which is the promotional of institutional leadership concerning sustainability in an operational sense, the other of which is to develop academic interest in and teaching materials about the sustainability agenda. I am not totally convinced that there is sufficient in the Framework to bolster the second strand mentioned.	No. My substantive opinions is as expressed in Questions 2 and 4.	The Board felt that the Strategic Aim "To promote and advocate the embedding of Education for Sustainable Development as a core graduate attribute across tertiary education" illustrates the role EAUC takes on ESD.
No - but see #3 about some phraseology.	No	1. In the Vision, I don't like the separation of "environmental, economic & social" sustainability as this implies that they can be separable in reality. What's wrong with the "principles & values of sustainable development". I wondered? 2. Don't you have to say what this embeddedness is for? For example, "... are embedded, so that..." 3. I like the Mission and Values. 4. In the Aims, can EAUC really "build capacity across the sector" - or even in one institution? Or, rather, are you trying to help institutions (and the sector) build their / its own capacity...? 5. Can you re-phrase "To run a sustainable business supporting the sector for long term benefit", as this seems to use "sustainable" in its sense of enduring, whereas I guess you mean "our" sense of sustainable, especially as you'll deal with the enduring point with the phrase "for long term benefit". How about "To run EAUC sustainably, supporting..." 6. The Themes and Objectives are pretty good.	Yes, though this will depend on how it is monitored and evaluated, etc.	No.	The Board reviewed and amended "Develop capacity building and professional development resources". The Board reviewed Strategic Aim 5 and updated to "To run EAUC sustainably supporting the sector for long term benefit". The Board set KPI's and targets per year which are reporting on at each Board meeting.
		Its concise although I'm not sure I've learnt much from reading it! Its quiet jargonistic which is OK for this audience but you could put more plain speak into it.	Its OK. It could be improved.	Could the vision be expanded and it would read better if the strategic aims could be linked to the themes... there doesn't seem to be a thread all the way through which would be a bit more joined up!	An outline of high level actions for 2013 will be communicated with Members. The Board set KPI's and targets per year which are reporting on at each Board meeting.
	There is no direct mention fo other organisations that promote sustainability. Or more specifically under A4 it could be split between working with orgs that already share our mission and influencing those that don't. In a similar vein under B1 there could be mention of env/sus related professional bodies (they don't all accredit but are interested in education). Furthermore the implication is it is all national but what about international links?	Yes	Yes		The Board reviewed and updated "Establish influential relationships and promote strategic alliances with the key research, curriculum quality and accreditation bodies". The Leadership Theme includes international and national links - "Build influential national and international strategic alliances with key sector agencies to drive policy development".
	Tertiary institutions now must have a strong employer focus and ensure our students are as far as possible, employment ready. None of you strategy touches on this. Ideally institutions need to be exemplars of practise so that students then add real value to their employers. We also need to be concerned about economic growth in our areas to support employment. We should be concerned about encouraging the growth of UK base companies supplying and installing sustainable and low energy technologies. Universities need to be leadin in this area in terms of research.	It is fairly clear but boring. Also what do you mean by a "sustainable business" and a "sustainable organisation."	It seems bland and undemanding	Sorry for my negative comments but I think you need a strategic framework that make the reader excited about the future possibilities.	The Board reviewed and the Business Theme objective has been amended to "Evaluate and ensure we have the governance to deliver a dynamic, responsive and financially resilient organisation". An outline of high level actions for 2013 will be communicated with Members. Student engagement is particularly highlighted in "Develop whole institutional change leadership models and support the capacity to implement change particularly through, regional, national and international networking; student engagement; institutional sustainability benchmarking and making the business case for sustainability"
No	No	Yes	Yes		None required.
no	no	yes	yes	very well put together, appears to cover all points	None required.