

## **APLU SELF-STUDY SURVEY: ANALYSES**

### **Methods:**

The SIU survey team chose to follow the protocol established by the APLU CECEP with the purpose of generating data and outcomes derived from an objective tool. The team used both the internal and external assessment tools. The survey was distributed on March 27<sup>th</sup>. One week later, on April 3<sup>rd</sup>, every individual who had been asked to participate was sent a reminder email. The data were collected for analysis on April 14<sup>th</sup>. This results in a total of 18 days during which participants had the opportunity to participate. The survey was digitized using the website *surveymonkey.com*. It was sent internally to deans, associate deans, research personnel, individuals within the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute, the Imagining Geographies Board, the Dunn Richmond Economic Development Center, and other selected faculty and staff. In total, 110 total internal stakeholders were directly contacted. This number represents the number of individuals that the survey group directly contacted via email. Some individuals who were invited to participate forwarded the message within their departments. 45 internal stakeholders answered at least one question. Externally, invitations were sent to 301 individuals from agencies within the federal government (such as the EDA), within the state government, regional planning commissions, community colleges, local chambers of commerce, local economic development corporations and several local businesses and organizations. As with the internal stakeholders, this number represents individuals who the survey group contacted directly, and these may have been invitation forwarding from some participants. 67 individuals answered at least one question. In total, we received 112 individuals responding to at least one question from the 411 invitations that we directly sent out, a 27% response rate.

All surveys were completed online via *surveymoney.com*. All participants were first asked to state their position within their organization for context. All participants were asked 39 questions on a number of measures related to regional economic development. The 39 Questions were divided amongst the following 7 different categories:

- 1) Southern Illinois University engages and asserts institutional leadership by:  
(6 questions)
- 2) Southern Illinois University creates a supportive culture by:  
(8 questions)
- 3) Southern Illinois University ensures that university activities benefit the public  
by:  
(4 questions)

- 4) Southern Illinois University contributes to the development of an innovation economy by:  
(8 questions)
- 5) Southern Illinois University provides relevant educational opportunities and programs by:  
(7 questions)
- 6) Southern Illinois University promotes openness, accessibility, and responsiveness by:  
(4 questions)
- 7) Southern Illinois University communicates contributions, successes and achievements that benefit the region by:  
(2 questions)

For each and every question, participants were asked to rank on a scale of 0 – 7 how important a certain measure was for regional economic development and separately rank on a scale of 0 – 7 how well SIU is doing to accomplish this goal. For both scores, 7 was the highest score, 0 was the lowest score and there was an option to respond N/A. Among the groups (internal and external) the average values for “importance” and “SIU performance” were recorded for each question. For each question, a gap score was generated which represents the difference between the average importance value and the average SIU performance. Within each of the 7 question categories, an average value for importance, SIU performance and gap score were calculated.

### **Results:**

The following discussion will analyze the total results and then results within each of the 7 question group. Comparisons of the averages between the internal and external groups will be addressed. A list of questions is attached to this document for reference.

It is important when looking at any value from an individual question to compare these with the averages within the category as well as the overall average responses. It is also important to compare the average of one category to the overall average. The overall average response value is a measure of the total average, within one group (internal or external) of one response measure (importance, SIU performance or gap score). Also important to consider is that the response rate declines from beginning to end of the survey. So for each category, there is an average respondent rate which represents the average number of respondents in a group to answer the questions within a category.

## **Total Average Values:**

### Internal

Importance: **5.97**  
SIU Performance: **3.56**  
Gap score: **2.41**

### External

Importance: **5.93**  
SIU Performance: **4.27**  
Gap score: **1.66**

From observing the total average values, we can see that both the internal and external groups believe that the measures proposed within the survey are on average of high importance. Because the scale within the survey went from 0 - 7 for both importance and performance, **3.5** represents a middle point. Both groups find the measures presented to be nearly 1.5 points higher than that middle point.

Internal stakeholders found the performance of SIU to be on average right around that middle point, with an overall average score of **3.56**. This total value tells us fairly little without investigating in which areas the group believed SIU was performing poorly, average or well.

External stakeholders found the performance of SIU to be on average slightly above the middle point with an overall average score of **4.27**. Again, this values tells us fairly little. However, it does tell us that on average, external stakeholders believe that the university is performing at a higher level than is believed by the internal stakeholders.

We believe that one of the leading reasons that this disparity exists is due to the involvement of internal stakeholders in the university – essentially they are likely to be more involved in the processes that are leading regional economic development. Because they have a closer relationship to the process, they are more likely to understand not only what the university is doing well, but also what the university could be doing better. Contrarily, external stakeholders are only likely to see the results of the universities involvement in regional economic development and may be more likely to see any level of involvement by the university to be good.

## **Individual Categories:**

For each individual category, the SIU performance values for each question were compared with the total average value. If the value was higher than the *total* average, it was highlighted in green. If it was lower, it was highlighted in red.

### 1) Southern Illinois University engages and asserts institutional leadership

Engages and Asserts Institutional Leadership By:	Internal			External		
	Important	SIU	Gap	Important	SIU	Gap
Emphasizing contributions to economic growth as one of its priorities.	6.03	4.03	2	6.04	4.06	1.98
Assessing the strengths and needs of regional industry and aligning Southern Illinois University's key research assets with these strengths and needs.	5.76	3.76	2	6.02	4.16	1.86
Working with government and community leaders in the region and/or state to identify economic development priorities and aligning key research strengths with these priorities.	6.03	3.79	2.24	6.04	4.45	1.59
Working alongside business and community leaders to identify actionable economic growth priorities.	5.92	3.73	2.19	6.05	4.57	1.48
Working alongside government officials to determine actionable economic growth priorities.	5.95	3.59	2.36	5.83	4.31	1.52
Actively engaging senior campus leadership in regional economic growth initiatives.	5.86	3.28	2.58	5.81	4.23	1.58
AVG	5.925	3.70	2.228333	5.965	4.30	1.668333
<b>Total Avg</b>	<b>5.97</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>5.93</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>1.66</b>

#### Average response rate:

Internal – 41

External – 62

Internal stakeholders viewed the importance of measures within this category to be near the total average importance value of 5.97. For SIU performance, 5 of the 6 measure within this category were rated to be above the total average value and the category average was also higher than the total average (3.70 compared to 3.56). The results show that the internal group found that SIU performance in the area of *actively engaging senior campus leadership in regional economic growth initiatives* to be the lowest of any performance

measure in this category. This may suggest that as university staff members reach higher positions with more authority and power, they find less of a need to work towards economic growth initiatives. This could suggest that roles of senior leadership offer the individual in that position more job security and thus less of a need to work towards such initiatives. However, it could also suggest that individuals in these positions have more responsibility to the university and therefore less time to spend working with the community.

On average, internal stakeholders found SIU performance on *emphasizing contributions to economic growth as one of its priorities* to be the highest in this category and also above the total average. This may suggest that while the senior leadership of the university may be performing to a substandard level, the university on average makes contributing to economic growth a priority. Every other prompt assessing SIU performance in the area of engaging and asserting leadership aside from senior leadership also scored above the total average, suggesting that internal stakeholders find SIU to be doing an above average job at working with the community to lead the way for regional economic development.

External stakeholders similarly viewed the importance of measures within this category to be near the total average importance value of 5.97. For SIU performance, 3 of the 6 measure were rated above the total average and 3 of the 6 were rated below. Interestingly, the three measure that external stakeholders rated SIU performance to be above average all had to do with SIU working alongside either government, community or business leaders. This fact, when taken with the fact that internal stakeholders similarly viewed SIU performance in these measure to be above average, seems to strongly suggest that as an institution, SIU is doing a good job working with different members of the community to promote regional economic development

2) *Southern Illinois University creates a supportive culture by*

Creates a Supportive Culture By:	Internal			External		
	Important	SIU	Gap	Important	SIU	Gap
Recognizing and promoting faculty and staff involvement in an array of economic development activities, community partnerships, and business assistance.	5.95	3.18	2.77	5.94	4.68	1.26
Actively promoting faculty research collaborations with industry.	5.86	3.7	2.16	5.98	4.19	1.79
making available cooperative research centers and/or laboratory facilities to external partners	5.62	3.62	2	5.88	4.16	1.72
Supporting consulting/exchange programs for faculty that foster personal interactions between the university and community partners.	5.89	3.11	2.78	5.78	4.43	1.35
Promoting problem-solving for community or industry needs.	5.97	3.36	2.61	5.9	4.24	1.66
Implementing efficient procedures for securing contracts, licenses, and other agreements with industry.	6.03	2.89	3.14	5.73	3.83	1.9
Ensuring that faculty are knowledgeable about opportunities and benefits related to participation in regional economic development activities.	6.08	2.82	3.26	5.74	3.67	2.07
Promoting linkages between faculty and regional companies seeking access to expertise, and working to simplify and accelerate connections.	6.03	3.18	2.85	5.98	3.96	2.02
AVG	5.93	3.23	2.70	5.87	4.15	1.72
<b>Total Avg</b>	<b>5.97</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>5.93</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>1.66</b>

**Average response rate:**

Internal – 39

External – 56

The Results from this category create serve as an interesting contrast to the previous one. While the previous category of *engages and asserts institutional leadership* yielded mostly above average scores, *creates a supportive culture* resulted in the opposite. Both internal

and external stakeholders rated SIU performance on 6 of the 8 areas to be below average and the average for this category for both groups was rated below the total average.

Internal stakeholders rated two of the areas to be quite significantly (nearly 20%) below the total average values for SIU performance. The first of these, *implementing efficient procedures for securing contracts, licenses, and other agreements with industry*, seems to suggest that there are several hurdles to overcome in terms of the legal framework of the collaboration of the university and outside entities. This type of barrier to an effective partnership between the university and the community could certainly be a detriment to regional economic development. This is certainly an area that could be improved upon. The second area that was far below the total average in this category as rated by internal stakeholders was *ensuring that faculty are knowledgeable about opportunities and benefits related to participation in regional economic development activities*. This could be the case for several reasons. Perhaps there are not many benefits for faculty to get engaged in the development of the community, outside of the fulfillment of a personal sense of civic duty. Perhaps they are simply ill informed about these benefits. If either of the former are the case, perhaps it ought to be a goal of the university to make create benefits, or if the benefits already exist to make them more clear.

External stakeholders also rated the two areas mentioned above (*implementing efficient procedures for securing contracts, licenses, and other agreements with industry* and *ensuring that faculty are knowledgeable about opportunities and benefits related to participation in regional economic development activities*) as the two areas where SIU was performing the poorest within this category. This would seem to strengthen the claims made above.

The area that external stakeholders believed that SIU was performing at the highest level was *recognizing and promoting faculty and staff involvement in an array of economic development activities, community partnerships, and business assistance*. This seems to correlate nicely with the data from category 1) *engages and asserts institutional leadership* – especially considering the high scores from that category in the questions related to SIU working alongside either government, community or business leaders discussed above. In order to work well with different community leaders, recognizing and promoting faculty and staff involvement would likely have to be a high priority.

Aside from the high scores in that area of recognizing and promoting faculty and staff involvement, though, it seems that creating a more supportive culture ought to be something that the university takes more seriously in the future. Creating a supportive culture in which members of the community *want* to work with the university and vice versa is essential moving forward.

**3) Southern Illinois University ensures that university activities benefit the public**

Ensures that University Activities Benefit the Public By:	Internal			External		
	Important	SIU	Gap	Important	SIU	Gap
Seeking partnerships with government at federal, state, and local levels to create and attract new businesses and industry clusters.	5.91	3.46	2.45	6.02	4.13	1.89
Maintaining technology transfer capacity for licensing/patenting university discoveries.	5.97	4.29	1.68	5.97	4	1.97
Contributing to an infrastructure that supports early-stage innovation and entrepreneurship (i.e., proof-of-concept, R&D, pilot facilities, venture capital, startup and spin-out businesses).	6.16	4	2.16	6	4.81	1.19
Working with regional leaders to capitalize on the university's cultural and athletic activities to cultivate a dynamic local environment to attract a highly-skilled workforce.	6.2	3.66	2.54	5.35	4.31	1.04
AVG	6.06	3.85	2.21	5.84	4.31	1.52
<b>Total Avg</b>	<b>5.97</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>5.93</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>1.66</b>

**Average response rate:**

Internal – 38

External – 54

Internal stakeholders found SIU performance in the area of *maintaining technology transfer capacity for licensing/patenting university discoveries* to be significantly (20%) higher than the total average value. SIU places great value in its technology transfer capacities, re: <http://techtransfer.siu.edu/>.

Both internal and external stakeholders rated SIU performance to be a good deal above average in the area of *contributing to an infrastructure that supports early-stage innovation and entrepreneurship (i.e., proof-of-concept, R&D, pilot facilities, venture capital, startup and spin-out businesses)*. The reason for this may have due in large part to the Small Business Development Center (SBDC), specifically the Small Business Incubator (which is managed by the SBDC) and its role in entrepreneurship within the region. According to the small business incubator's website, it has assisted more than 50 organizations start and expand



their operations since its inception in 1990. According to their mission statement, the function of the small business incubator is to accelerate the start-up and expansion of small businesses in southern Illinois. This is clearly a strength in terms of SIU acting as an agent of regional economic development, and the high ratings by both groups of respondents would seem to support this. For more information about the Small Business Incubator, please visit <http://incubator.siu.edu/>.

**4) Southern Illinois University contributes to the development of an innovation economy**

Contributes to the Development of an Innovation Economy By:	Internal			External		
	Important	SIU	Gap	Important	SIU	Gap
Fostering public-private partnerships and programs, including those with national laboratories and local and regional industry.	6.13	3.54	2.59	5.9	4.04	1.86
Maintaining technology transfer capacity for licensing/patenting university discoveries.	6.04	4.14	1.9	6.07	4.26	1.81
Identifying and tracking statutes, mandates, and governmental policies related to economic development, and informing colleagues and partners of relevant issues.	5.9	3.21	2.69	5.67	4.64	1.03
Partnering with community members to define public and private investments that catalyze economic and innovative growth.	6.13	3.43	2.7	5.79	4.27	1.52
Analyzing local and regional industry studies and data to inform decision-making regarding university research, education, and outreach/engagement efforts.	6	3.48	2.52	5.95	4.35	1.6
Developing partnerships with government at federal, state, and local levels to retain and grow existing businesses.	5.94	3.21	2.73	6.02	4.19	1.83
Enhancing small business development with supportive programs (i.e., seed funding, incubators, technical assistance, etc.).	5.97	4.65	1.32	6.13	4.85	1.28
Connecting economic actors across organizational boundaries to facilitate collaborations that otherwise might not occur.	5.84	2.95	2.89	5.85	4.11	1.74
AVG	5.99	3.58	2.42	5.92	4.34	1.58
<b>Total Avg</b>	<b>5.97</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>5.93</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>1.66</b>

### **Average response rate:**

Internal – 36

External – 48

The average scores for this entire category, among both internal and external stakeholders, was measured at just slightly above average. Interestingly though, both groups rated more than half of the areas in this category to be below average. One of the reasons that the average values remain high despite the majority below average area rating is due to the high scores for the area *enhancing small business development with supportive programs (i.e., seed funding, incubators, technical assistance, etc.)*. There is a strong likelihood that high scores in that area are due to the existence of the SBDC and the Small Business Incubator as discussed above in section 3.

Among internal stakeholders, the area *connecting economic actors across organizational boundaries to facilitate collaborations that otherwise might not occur* received the lowest score, a score that was also a good deal lower than the total average value. This might suggest that within the university, there is a general sense that there is a disconnect between the university and other entities within the regional economic network. Perhaps it is an ideological divide between the university and the community. OR perhaps this relates back to the idea that there are legal and contractual hurdles to overcome for the university and industry to work together. Whatever the reason, the strengthening of the relationship between the university and industries within the region would certainly be beneficial for economic development.

External stakeholders scored the area *identifying and tracking statutes, mandates, and governmental policies related to economic development, and informing colleagues and partners of relevant issues* the second highest in this category. The presence of the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute may be playing a role in the high scoring of this area. Their website features publications, initiatives and other forms of information that may provide the local community with knowledge that is beneficial to them. Furthermore, the presence of the institute alone may provide a sense among the community that information is more readily accessible.

One theme that arose among external stakeholders in written responses was that the prosperity of the local rural and poorer communities was essential to regional economic development, and that the university, while it was to some degree successful at aiding and promoting rural prosperity, was also focused to a large degree on competition with other national research universities and that in doing so had less resources for the local communities. External stakeholders seem to believe to some extent that the university could serve the region better and create a more innovative and stronger economy by placing a larger emphasis on the local rural and poorer communities. Furthermore, some

external stakeholders also described the need to focus on more forward thinking economic activities and move away from some of the more old-fashioned industries, such as the coal industry.

**5) Southern Illinois University provides relevant educational opportunities and programs**

Provides Relevant Educational Opportunities and Programs By:	Internal			External		
	Important	SIU	Gap	Important	SIU	Gap
Creating a culture of entrepreneurship across Southern Illinois University, including training and mentoring opportunities for students and faculty.	6.03	3.52	2.51	5.93	4.46	1.47
Supporting alignment of traditional undergraduate curricula across disciplines with 21st century workplace skills development.	6.15	3.31	2.84	6.18	4.17	2.01
Delivering courses and programs in a manner flexible enough to enable students and community workforce members to update their skills and credentials.	6.13	3.58	2.55	6.29	4.39	1.9
Supporting alignment of graduate and continuing education curricula with needs of industry.	5.76	3.72	2.04	6	4	2
Providing structured experiential learning opportunities to students through innovative internships and co-op experiences across a wide range of academic programs.	6.26	3.94	2.32	5.97	4.42	1.55
Ensuring that career/recruiting services highlight professional opportunities in the region.	5.87	3.93	1.94	6.25	4.08	2.17
Aligning education and talent development (undergraduate and graduate; degree, certificate, and continuing education) programs with regional needs.	5.79	3.88	1.91	6.12	3.8	2.32
AVG	6.00	3.70	2.30	6.11	4.19	1.92
<b>Total Avg</b>	<b>5.97</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>5.93</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>1.66</b>

**Average response rate:**

Internal – 36

External – 47

The results of this category seem to suggest a good deal about the how the quality of education is perceived in terms of 1) how it prepares students to enter the workforce anywhere and 2) how it develops a workforce that is contributes to the economic development of the southern Illinois region. Below, areas of this category have been organized to reflect this distinction.

**Prepares students to enter the workforce anywhere**

Provides Relevant Educational Opportunities and Programs By:	Internal			External		
	Important	SIU	Gap	Important	SIU	Gap
Creating a culture of entrepreneurship across Southern Illinois University, including training and mentoring opportunities for students and faculty.	6.03	3.52	2.51	5.93	4.46	1.47
Supporting alignment of traditional undergraduate curricula across disciplines with 21st century workplace skills development.	6.15	3.31	2.84	6.18	4.17	2.01
Delivering courses and programs in a manner flexible enough to enable students and community workforce members to update their skills and credentials.	6.13	3.58	2.55	6.29	4.39	1.9
Supporting alignment of graduate and continuing education curricula with needs of industry.	5.76	3.72	2.04	6	4	2
Providing structured experiential learning opportunities to students through innovative internships and co-op experiences across a wide range of academic programs.	6.26	3.94	2.32	5.97	4.42	1.55
AVG	6.07	3.61	2.45	6.07	4.29	1.79
<b>Total Avg</b>	<b>5.97</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>5.93</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>1.66</b>

Internal and external stakeholders alike rated SIU performance in 3 of these 5 areas to be the total average values. This seems to suggest that all stakeholders in general feel that the university does an above average job at preparing students to enter the workforce *anywhere*. However, the results suggest that both groups also feel as though there is some room for improvement.

**Develops a workforce that is contributes to the economic development of the southern Illinois region**

Provides Relevant Educational Opportunities and Programs By:	Internal			External		
	Important	SIU	Gap	Important	SIU	Gap
Ensuring that career/recruiting services highlight professional opportunities in the region.	5.87	3.93	1.94	6.25	4.08	2.17
Aligning education and talent development (undergraduate and graduate; degree, certificate, and continuing education) programs with regional needs.	5.79	3.88	1.91	6.12	3.8	2.32
AVG	5.92	3.91	2.18	6.09	3.94	1.98
<b>Total Avg</b>	<b>5.97</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>5.93</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>1.66</b>

In terms of SIU performance in developing a workforce that contributes to the economic development of the southern Illinois region, we see a divide in the ratings. Internal stakeholders on average rated SIU performance in both areas here to be above the total average, while external stakeholders conversely rated SIU performance in both to be below total average. By splitting up this category to reflect opinions about how well SIU prepares a workforce that is **valuable to the southern Illinois region**, we can see that internal stakeholders and external stakeholders opinions follow a certain trend – Internal stakeholders on average feel that the university is doing an above average job preparing a workforce that will be beneficial to the regional economy, while external stakeholders feel the university is doing a below average job.

It is positive that within the university there is the perception that a good job is being done to develop a workforce that will benefit the regional economic landscape. But it may be more telling that among entities outside of the university, it is the general feeling that the university could be doing a better job. Perhaps more engagement with external stakeholders is needed in creating curriculum that can be a larger benefit to the regional

economy. Several written responses offer the opinion that, in order for the region to be economically prosperous, it is essential to retain a skilled work force, which some believe is currently not happening to a large enough degree. Furthermore, some suggest that the lack of economic prosperity in the region is one reason why it is difficult to retain workers. In a way, it can be thought of as a circle of economic prosperity – as the economic prosperity improves, more workers are attracted to the region, further improving prosperity and so on.

**6) Southern Illinois University promotes openness, accessibility, and responsiveness**

	Internal			External		
<b>Promotes Openness, Accessibility and Responsiveness By:</b>	Important	SIU	Gap	Important	SIU	Gap
Maintaining user-friendly portals and web sites to search for faculty and staff expertise and R&D facilities.	5.97	3.03	2.94	5.92	4.79	1.13
Designating one entity as a first point of contact for industry and economic development agencies.	5.21	3.68	1.53	5.66	4.68	0.98
Developing structure and networks (e.g. advisory groups, forums) to facilitate interactions among key university personnel and the region’s major economic actors.	5.41	3.52	1.89	5.98	4.3	1.68
Facilitating a respectful civic discourse and contributing to community understanding of complex issues.	6	3.53	2.47	6.09	4.68	1.41
AVG	5.65	3.44	2.21	5.91	4.61	1.30
<b>Total Avg</b>	<b>5.97</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>5.93</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>1.66</b>

**Average response rate:**

Internal – 35  
 External – 46

The fact that internal stakeholders rated 3 of the 4 areas in this category to be below average is a bit misleading considering that two of those areas were only .04 and .03 points below average respectively. However, internal stakeholders did rate SIU performance on average for this category to be below the total average. The area *maintaining user-friendly*

portals and web sites to search for faculty and staff expertise and R&D facilities was a good deal (15%) below the total average. This seems to suggest that among individuals within the university, it is the general perception that the websites are difficult to navigate in order to locate relevant information. As a graduate student who has had to use the SIU websites to find information of my own, I agree with the data in saying that there is room for improvement in the SIU webpage navigation and search system. Making information harder to find on a website might discourage collaboration to a certain degree, simply because it is more difficult to find the right personnel, so improvement in this area could strengthen the relationship between the university and the community.

External stakeholders rated SIU performance in every area in this category to be above the total average value. It is certainly encouraging to see results trend in this direction. A stronger sense of connection with university felt by various entities within the region means less barriers to effective collaboration in the future. The results of this category of the survey strongly indicate that the university is serving as a unifying entity within the region.

**7) Southern Illinois University communicates contributions, successes and achievements that benefit the region**

Communicates Contributions, Successes and Achievements that Benefit the Regions By:	Internal			External		
	Important	SIU	Gap	Important	SIU	Gap
Broadly disseminating information about university-community and university-industry collaborations.	6.12	3.53	2.59	5.93	4	1.93
Reporting impact of contributions to regional innovation and economic growth to local and regional stakeholders.	6.29	3.35	2.94	5.93	4	1.93
AVG	6.21	3.44	2.77	5.93	4.00	1.93
<b>Total Avg</b>	<b>5.97</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>5.93</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>1.66</b>

**Average response rate:**

Internal – 36  
 External – 45

It is important to keep in mind the small sample size of this category, which only consisted of two areas of measurement. That being said, both groups rated SIU performance in both

areas to be below the total average. When we consider the responses from this category with responses from the previous category (6) we can develop some interesting hypotheses. While external stakeholders in (6) seemed to believe that SIU was doing an above average job promoting openness and accessibility, and in doing so may be acting as a central unifying entity within the region, the results from this category seem to suggest that SIU is not doing a good job communicating that information. So while this collaboration is being facilitated and is benefiting the community, some organizations may be missing out on the opportunity to be a part of that collaboration because the information is not being broadly disseminated. Making more public the ways in which it contributes to regional economic development and also finding ways to get more organizations involved in the collaborative process of economic development may be a key to the future of the economic development of the region.

**Additional comments:**

From an analysis of more written responses, we can develop an idea of what some individuals believe is most important for regional economic development. Tourism was a common theme, and it was believed that by making the southern Illinois region a more attractive tourist destination, the regional economy would benefit. Wineries were suggested as a strength in this regard and as one of the drivers of tourism in the area. Development of a more lively and prosperous downtown Carbondale area was suggested more than once as well, and Carbondale Main Street is seen as a key stakeholder in that process. Buckminster Fuller was also mentioned as a driver for tourism because of his national prowess and his connection with region.

Because of the importance of the agricultural industry in the region, many references were made to the importance of the agricultural sciences program at SIU in the economic prosperity of the region.

Transportation development and the development of more renewable energy within the region were both cited several times.