



Strategic Planning Committee Notes
November 4, 2016
Werner University Center, Willamette Room
9:00 am – 11:00 am Meeting

Present: Laurie Burton (Co-Chair), Adry Clark, Betty Crawford, Paul Disney, Camila Gabaldon, Corbin Garner, Megan Habermann, Mark Henkels, Ivan Hurtado, Paul Kyllö, Randi Lydum, Dave McDonald, Adele Schepige, Chris Solario, Linda Stonecipher, Dan Tankersley, Ella Taylor, Shelby Worthing

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

Absent: Rex Fuller (Co-Chair), Melanie Landon-Hays, Cec Koontz, Alma Pacheco, Peggy Pedersen, Steve Taylor

Review

Today's agenda includes checking in on how members are doing with department and small group presentations, figuring out odds and ends for communication, thinking about an implementation document, and discussing the work yet to be done.

Dave said he was asked if the plan tells us what we're going to look like in 2023. He thinks a reader can make guesses, but it doesn't explicitly enough say what WOU will look like or what we're striving to reach. The mission indicates we want to prepare professionals and leaders, but beyond that it's hard to look at the plan and say "Oh, that's what we're going to look like in the future."

Linda shared a vision plan for Bay Path University, work that resulted in adding 14 graduate programs, 1,000 graduate students, and a Saturday program for working women. It was very powerful. They are still the same type of college--that did not change--but they made things better.

Laurie explained that President Fuller is working on a new draft and has moved the sample outcomes and metrics out of the document. Those may end up in an appendix or implementation document. We want to give people ownership of the plan and have them take it and apply it to their units. The plan is more streamlined with room for people to make decisions on how to move forward rather than being overly prescriptive and telling them what to do. The new draft will be available for members next week.

Dave McDonald said that there are some pieces missing in terms of gaining vision. We have great people to figure out the "how," but it's the "what" that we need to be really clear about. What are we going to look like or aspire to look like? We're missing that spark of what we're going to be. Tell us where to go and then we can figure out how to

get there. We need to say how this institution is going to be different. The environment has changed radically so we have to change with it.

Megan said that one concern is if people are unwilling or don't know how to get to the "how." If we identify a great "what" then we should provide help with the "how" for those who need it. Ginny reminded the group that previously some people thought the plan was too prescriptive so there's a real balancing act to get just the right level of detail.

Mark commented that he likes Rex's idea for the plan to allow for people to figure out how they fit into the overarching goals. Dave Foster said he isn't proposing that we say here are specific things we should do—that needs to come up organically--but right now we don't even have clear statements of "this is what we're shooting for." Dan added that it kind of says that we're going to continue doing what we already are, but we're going to be well known for it. Linda pointed out that a lot of institutions have decided to change the ratio of graduate students and have been very intentional about that because they see it as a growth opportunity. We need to have broad goals to work towards. Ginny suggested a more in depth discussion of concerns about the vision at the next meeting.

Communicating X10

What are committee members hearing that are new ideas to be brought forward or other things of significance that have been overlooked? Laurie put together a document that has some of these things in bullet points. Laurie met with the humanities division and they asked if the faculty senate will vote on the strategic plan. Rex has been clear that shared governance calls for the faculty senate to write a letter in support of the plan.

Megan met with ASWOU and they want clearer language on hiring diverse faculty and staff (specifically of color) and mandated cultural competency training for faculty and staff. The group that Mark met with thinks it is a good idea to set forth the core values, and move the specific details out of the plan.

Laurie described the presentation that she and Rex led during the October BOT meeting. Some critiques included not enough detail about the importance of IR and not enough recruitment and retention drivers. Ella commented that the Board Chair focused on exactly what is our vision. She noted that if the Board is asking that when the Board understands and knows who we are, that is something that needs more attention.

Ginny thanked Randi for drafting the co-chair update and suggested having one monthly over the next 6 to 12 months. The November 16th community town hall will be a poster session and Dave Foster will print updated posters. There will also be a town hall for students put on by ASWOU on November 15th in the Mt. Jefferson room in Valsetz.

Laurie shared that all feedback is now available on the website for people to see. Mark recommended adding the meeting highlights to the website as well. Reina will post them. Dan and Megan will select photos to add to the website.

Dan suggested having alternative formats for the material we produce. It isn't clear and concise enough when we hand people a 20-page document and then ask what they

think. Something that is easier to read would be helpful. Betty recommended that people consider the audience they are presenting to and pick out points that pertain most to that particular group so they can easily see what matters to them.

The committee decided to wait to meet with more groups until a new draft is available.

Thinking ahead about an implementation plan

To ensure that this plan goes somewhere and we accomplish what we set out to do, we need to start thinking about an implementation plan. Dan suggested having a digital format that allows multi directional movement that can link to more things as they are added. Dave McDonald said the plan only works if it is tied to the budget, otherwise it is just a pretty document that no one cares about. Once budgetary and personnel matters are decided based on the plan, it will become real to people. They will see that this is what we said we were going to do and it is what we did.

Information at the front end of the document should include who is responsible for which pieces of the plan, expectations and available support, and a timeline so people can see that by xx date they can expect to see certain changes.

Paul Disney pointed out that there will be some things that won't be funded because they have no link to the strategic plan. Why pay for things that don't support our mission? We don't have money for everything, especially depending on whether Measure 97 passes or not.

Betty asked if there will be an implementation team that meets periodically to verify that things are being done. Paul Disney recommended that there should at a minimum be an annual review, report or update from the people who are responsible for it. This will help to make it real and add some accountability. Mark voiced concern and suggested this should replace something else rather than being another layer of reporting.

Ella brought up the complexity of compiling this information when there are so many things to keep in mind simultaneously--the master plan, facilities plan, enrollment management plan, others--that all need to fit with the strategic plan and then throw a budget committee into the mix on top of that. It would be beneficial to see how other institutions manage this and how the faculty reports feed into the department reports, to the division report, and to the college report so there is minimal repeated work.

Dan pointed out that we are recommending a system that requires resources. We have presented what our vision is but now we need to state how we will get there. Unless we have the resources and people whose sole job is putting this system together, we're not going to design a new world because all of these things require funding.

Ginny suggested brainstorming a series of questions or considerations for implementation. Dave Foster said we will need to figure out what it is going to mean once the strategic plan is done and rolled out. People are going to want to know if there will be extra work and more layers of things to do and what will happen to their budget. In other words, what is the plan going to do to me? We should start to prepare answers

for these frequently asked questions (FAQs). Megan recommended getting feedback on what people expect from the implementation so we can figure out what the questions are before answering them. Some anticipated questions include:

- How will it be implemented?
- Who is going to set priorities?
- How are things going to be reported?
- What will be different?
- What does this mean for my unit?
- Will there be an annual review?
- What does this mean for me?
- Will this go on my performance evaluation?
- How do we keep student success as the central component of what we do?
- How will this help students?
- Is this another document just to go on a shelf?
- If someone doesn't follow the plan what's the consequence?
- How do students share concerns when they feel someone isn't following the plan?
- How will we communicate this to students?
- How do they take ownership of it too?
- Are these going to be funded mandates?
- How will this help the university grow?
- Will there be a fact sheet where we can measure metrics?
- When is this going to happen?
- Will there be a more effective forum to design decisions for the future?

Ginny asked what the optimum or targeted size of the university is. Dave McDonald said that the reality is that with rising costs, if we raise tuition too much it will lower enrollment. Linda pointed out that there isn't enough funding for Dave's work to bring in enough students. Ella suggested that the answer might not be getting more students. Downsizing might be a choice, if that is what we want and it allows us to do well. Linda recalled Betty Youngblood's state of the university address when she said WOU should grow to 7,500 students. Enrollment is higher now than at the time, but over the last several years it has dropped about 10%. Paul Disney added that when people see new buildings going up they don't get the impression that we are downsizing so they don't see the reality that enrollment is down and they don't understand the different funding sources that allow for the new buildings.

Dan asked about priorities for campus. Is the committee responsible for determining what those priorities are? It seems like people expect us to tell them that, but we haven't had that conversation ourselves. Do we want higher enrollment or lower? More international students? More grad programs or less? Someone has to answer these questions in order to design the system and appropriately allocate money.

Ginny suggested that with so many pop-up topics during this meeting committee members let Laurie know one or two things that they would like to spend more time on at the next meeting.