Strategic Planning Committee Notes
October 7, 2016
Columbia Room, WUC
7:30 am – 8:00 am Continental breakfast
8:00 am – 11:00 am Meeting

Present: Rex Fuller (Co-Chair), Laurie Burton (Co-Chair), Adry Clark, Betty Crawford, Paul Disney, David Foster, Camila Gabaldon, Corbin Garner, Megan Habermann, Mark Henkels, Ivan Hurtado, Cec Koontz, Paul Kyllo, Melanie Landon-Hays, Randi Lydum, Dave McDonald, Peggy Pedersen, Adele Schepige, Chris Solario, Linda Stonecipher, Dan Tankersley, Ella Taylor, Steve Taylor, Shelby Worthing

Staff: Ginny Lang (Facilitator), Reina Morgan (Assistant)

Absent: Alma Pacheco

Recap and review

Ginny said that a chunk of the time for today will focus on the town halls: perceptions, what we learned, how much of the feedback that has been received will be incorporated into the document, etc. The meeting will also cover the structure and layout of the draft, ways we're going to present the information, who is going to be presenting, which groups, and what the homework assignment is.

President Fuller shared the idea of having an evening town hall for citizens. An insert can be put in the utility bills that go out to Monmouth and Independence residents. It will be a chance to invite the public in to give comments since the last two town halls weren't widely announced to the community and many people can't make it during work hours. Having community input is particularly important for the community engagement pillar. We will shoot for the evening of November 16th for this meeting. SPC members should email Rex directly if they have suggestions of people/groups to invite.

Ginny revisited Kotter's eight steps from the presentation Paul Disney gave in the spring. We have gotten a lot done, but still have a lot left. Where we really need to focus right now is on communicating the vision for buy in, empowering broad based action, removing obstacles to change, and changing systems or structures that undermine the mission. The essential question is if we could be truly excellent at only one thing, what would it be? We need to implement carefully and thoughtfully and have the notion of ruthless patience, never letting up and understanding that it isn't going to be fixed overnight.

<u>Town Halls</u>

Dan got the impression that people felt the MVVP was about right, just small tweaks that they suggested. He enjoyed being able to direct people to other posters that addressed things that people were interested in. Dave McDonald felt that the general theme regarding student success is that people wanted to know where their area was. He didn't see push back on the ideas but there were questions on the terminology so we should be thoughtful about what we include in the glossary. He was surprised by the level of high engagement and constructive comments.

Adry said people questioned what we mean by things like diversity and community and people were unsure of how some of it fit together. Ginny suggested including a description in the body of the section so that our view of the word is there. Adry said that people talked about engagement beyond the classroom or beyond the world of WOU. Maybe we shouldn't stick with the term "community." Ella said that in regards to the diversity piece, others are using the word equity.

Chair Burton shared her excitement about how pumped everyone in the room was and how many people had things to say. She suggested having the experts for each area make sure we are using the right terminology, so Bill for example would look through the IT stuff.

Dave Foster commented that people are looking for themselves in the plan and it's not necessarily a bad thing if community is interpreted differently by people because then they can apply it to themselves, but at the same time they do need to know what we're talking about. Megan added that some people were inspired by it and were able to see how it works for them and we don't want people to feel limited by over specifying things.

Melanie said that a major critique she heard is that there is nothing really in the accountability pillar that is about accountability. It is the elephant in the room and there is no way of measuring it. We need a shared culture of responsibility. There were many comments regarding advising. Not all faculty are good at advising and staff feel they bear the brunt of terrible advising after it's over. We need clearer expectations of what advising should look like. It needs to be more equitable. Lots of people are tired of some doing most of the work with the only reward being more work, while others are doing very little work. There should be an intervention if someone is doing poorly.

Dan said that faculty have time in class, office hours, and advising appointments, and there's no guarantee that any given student will be free during their teacher's office hours. Professors could be more productive with research and creative efforts if advisors were separate from the faculty. Chair Burton shared that tenure track faculty only have a 12 credit load instead of 15 because of the advising buy out. Maybe if people aren't doing the advising then those hours should go back to teaching another class instead of having that time free for advising that isn't happening.

Adele added that she got the impression from the feedback that people don't want to have to wait until the end of November to see if we got it right and then not have much time to make changes.

Peggy said that everyone wants to make it a division or unit strategic plan, especially because the metrics were specific examples. They wanted themselves in there too. Part of our culture is in some areas we have never completed the circle of accountability so if something is not working we might know it's not working but never do anything about it. It is a culture of doing very little different over time. Ella said that it goes both ways. We don't hold people responsible when performing poorly but also don't reward those who perform well. It is hard to get people to have trust when there has been little reward for trust. Mark said that he has seen a good amount of change. People are doing things differently with classes, constantly adapting them, and programs have moved more towards community projects. It's not because they are told to but because they see how it would be a good thing to do. You can look at programs like SEP and see how much more integrated it has become on campus. The people doing this are doing it because they care about it and enjoy it. Faculty come here because they have the ability to influence what they do here.

Steve commented that the strategic plan is an overarching framework that can guide everything else. We don't have the greatest way to go about budget requests for faculty. It's sort of ad hoc. We are simply giving examples that individual units can take and run with. We are not going to prescribe that for them. Steve said that the last time we did this process all of the units had a strategic plan that informed their area.

Homework

Chair Burton explained the homework assignment. There is a document in Google drive with instructions. The feedback has been divided up by the five pillars and the MVVP. Groups should look through the feedback to see what the plan is missing. Find things that can be distilled down and see where we might need to make changes to the draft that we currently have. The deadline is by the end of the day October 17th so that the information can be sent out to the whole group by Tuesday, October 18 for people to think about and process.

Steve said that he gave the draft to his division to look over for people who couldn't make it to the town halls or couldn't think in that environment to provide feedback. Ginny said we expect comment to continue to come in as we communicate with more people. President Fuller encouraged others to share it with their departments as well and said that he will be presenting it to the foundation board and alumni board.

Peggy said that we should clarify for people as they provide feedback that this is a *university* strategic plan. We have all of this specific stuff coming in and then people will be upset when they don't see it included in the final document because they thought their input was going to be used. Ginny suggested using an update from the co-chairs to provide that kind of information so people know where we are and what to expect.

Structure and layout of the draft

Ginny asked if anyone has second thoughts about how the sections ended up being divided up and how the outcomes and metrics are paired with each item. Dave Foster said that when he looks at the mission statement and sees the things that it says, those phrases seem like our key mission drivers. A strategic initiative is designed to enhance one or more of these key drivers and then people can see how what they're doing plays into it. It strengthens our drivers of success because these are the values that are associated with these initiatives, increasing community engagement because it fits with the things that we see as important. Envision student success in the middle with all of the mission drivers surrounding it. The strategic initiatives would be touching on the things that they go with to demonstrate that they are associated with multiple drivers.

Dan suggested listing the mission drivers in a text format rather than the visual. Steve suggested doing it in a matrix, like is done for assessment. Dave clarified that he is suggesting a change to the pillars so that they come right out of the mission statement and provide more direct alignment. We are saying that those are the things that matter to us, but then we list initiatives that are different from it. Steve added that we originally had all of these things in the mission statement, but then distilled it down because there isn't room to include everything if we want a mission statement that is short and memorable. That is why some of the things aren't included in the mission statement but are still important to talk about later in the pillars. Cec recommended having the MVVP team consider this idea since they have the least amount of feedback to go through.

Communicating X10 continued

Ginny checked in regarding communicating with other groups. Megan pointed out that there is a diverse group of people on the SPC and everyone should be using their own networks. We can also send out an allfacstaff invite for people to request time to talk about the plan with a member. Coffee talks are another idea. Members could sign up for shifts to be at Cafe Allegro or the Press and announce those times for people to stop by and ask questions. President Fuller said that he will send out a call for groups that want a presentation and then see which group members can make it. President Fuller will also come up with wording to use as a template so it all has a consistent language and people will know it's part of the same thing. Steve raised a concern about the limited student representation and President Fuller said that it will be presented to ASWOU. Ginny asked the group to think about how to get people to see the plan as it will work over the long term. Just because something is in the plan doesn't mean it will be fixed next month or next year. Maybe that should be included in the November 29th town hall.