

Oregon Tech Strategic Planning Steering Committee

Kick-off Meeting Notes

May 2, 2019

2:00pm – 5:00pm

Sunset Conference Room, Klamath Falls campus

Attendees:

Steve Addison	Jennifer Kass	Stephanie Pope (for Anna Clark)
Aja Bettencourt-McCarthy	Jack Kegg	
Jessyca Chosy	Bobbi Kowash	Tony Richey
Mandi Clark	Amber Lancaster	Di Saunders
John Davis (via skype)	Ginny Lang	Farooq Sultan
Sandra Fox	Justin Laughlin (via skype)	Ken Vandehey (via phone)
Kathleen Hill	Roger Lindgren	Chitra Venugopal
Suzanne Hopper (via skype)	Joel McPherson	Wakaya Wells
Erik Johnson	Dr. Naganathan	
Jim Jones	Mike Pierce (via skype)	

Unable to Attend:

Anna Clark	Tom Keyser
Joyce Hollander-Rodriguez	Alan Polaski

President Naganathan gave an overview of the university retreat that was held in the spring of 2017 that resulted in the Short-Term Action Plan with eleven goals. The majority of goals will be completed by June 30, 2019. We are now moving onto long-term planning and goals and have the ability to map out what we want to do/be over the next five years. He explained that we are still migrating from operating under a university system to independent boards and campuses. He posed questions for the committee to consider: “Who do we want to be in 10 years?”, “What are the possibilities and gaps for Oregon Tech?”, “How do we want to go to the next level of student success, e.g., how many Rhodes scholars will we have in our future?” and “What kind of experiential learning can we offer and how do we get to that next level?” He asked the committee to be pragmatic yet to think big and not be constrained by our current position. He stated this is not about how we will exist in Oregon, but how we will excel in Oregon. He added that we will present our strategic plan to the Board of Trustees next spring. SPSC Members introduced themselves and noted their affiliation with the university and length of service with the university. President Naganathan noted the various areas represented and the range of tenure of members at Oregon Tech, which varied from less than one year to more than 20 years. He encouraged members to provide and receive guidance to and from each other. He shared his expectations for the document and process: the vision, mission and pillars are to guide the process. He would like the document to establish university values, objectives, and clear supporting goals. The document itself should be succinct and able to be recalibrated occasionally as opportunities arise. He explained there will be opportunities for the SPSC to identify and engage other stakeholder groups in the process; it is important to engage the rest of the university in this process. He is beginning to speak with

corporate CEOs and would like to invite them to the process, also. He encouraged the committee to be prepared to share a skeleton of the plan with the campus in the fall.

Ginny Lang provided an overview of the agenda for the day, an overview of the strategic planning process, importance of participation from students, staff, and faculty; the role of the SPSC; expectations of the group to meet and complete homework assignments; and the outcomes of the process. She reminded the committee that this plan is the university's and is not associated with just one of the many constituent groups. She reviewed a general timeline:

Date	Stage	Description
Early Spring 2019	Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC) formed	Finalize SPSC membership Review of amendments to our Mission Statement for President's recommendation to the Board
Tasks: Develop outline of the planning process and timetable. Develop plans to facilitate communication with internal and external stakeholders. Establish working groups: data needs, identification of external groups for inclusion in the process.		
Late Spring 2019	SPSC collects input and feedback from campus & external groups	Input/Engagement: Environmental scans and SWOT: internal groups (students, faculty, staff, governance groups) and external groups (PK-12, non-profit, business, elected officials, others?).
Tasks: Collect and summarize stakeholder data. Rough outline of the document.		
Summer 2019 (no meetings in August)	SPSC, possibly a subgroup, evaluates and summarizes data— develops initial goals	Synthesis: Evaluate feedback from focus groups, evaluate data related to Oregon Tech, Oregon and national trends.
Tasks: Analyze challenges and conflicts. Develop priorities and greatest opportunities. Develop measures and metrics for evaluation. Develop draft plan.		
Fall 2019	SPSC reviews findings with campus and stakeholders	Feedback/Synthesis: Town hall meetings to review initial findings, goals, opportunities and plan. Review by governance groups (Faculty Senate, Administrative Council, ASOIT and the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees). Preliminary plan for review.
December 2019 January 2020	SPSC develops final draft	
March 2020	Final review/comment by governance and presentation of a draft to the BOT	
May 2020	Board of Trustees review and approval	

She explained the SPSC will likely meet every two weeks, likely on Thursday afternoons. The larger group will be broken into five smaller work groups that will have assignments between meetings. By the end of July the SPSC will have seven meetings.

SPSC members were asked to identify their expectations of the process including worries and concerns, and desires and hopes, and to outline what the plan should be. Members discussed with their neighbor and shared with the group:

Concerns:

- Division of groups
- Do we have the necessary support (housing, parking, etc.) to address the proposed growth?
- Flooding unique programs; diluting or diminishing them
- Lack of follow-through after developing a plan
- Keeping the campus community informed along the way
- Making students aware of what we are planning and include them. How does it impact them?
- Discussion about details instead of being strategic
- Losing our niche programming that emphasizes hands-on education
- Large SPSC group – daunting to manage
- Consistency in message as group breaks into smaller workgroups
- Deliverables become the end
- Logistics
- Communication – how can it be done differently to grab people’s attention
- Lack of incorporation from accreditation and assessment work/processes
- Use of inaccurate data and not looking at the whole picture
- Consistent result that is representative of all users
- Need to grow enrollment; can’t weather the storm the way we are operating today; have never seen these types of demographic shifts. We have to operate more independently and quicker as we go through lowest demographics we’ve ever seen. Book referenced: The Demand for Higher Education, Nathan D. Grawe, Chapter 8

Hopes:

- Create pride in who we are. We should not focus on what we are not
- Create a clear identity for the university
- Ownership by all. Unifying
- Include a section on faculty and staff evaluations to show how an individual employed at Oregon Tech contributed towards implementing the strategic plan.
- Create community across our disparate groups; relevant to all areas so it drives the agenda; brief, transparent, actionable and inclusive; helps to have a timeline and knowing what we’re working towards
- Create activity on campus; community effort to be a part of something
- Give credibility to projects and programs
- Transparent
- Inclusive
- Brief

- Actionable/doable (have a bias towards action)
- Realistic, attainable, bold goals; quantitative measures for goals
- Plan the direction of where we are going and allow creativity on how to get there; move everyone in the same direction
- Data driven
- Growth oriented
- Give opportunity to have outcome plans be used in other department plans.
- Promote excellence and not mediocrity
- Focus on outcomes
- Have a student and alumni focus
- Good communication inside and outside committee; consistent messaging; need a plan
- International outreach, partnerships and relationships; impact on keeping existing identity of OT
- Encourage and empower mold-breaking; look at different types of student, innovative teaching, encouraging economies; new programs; changing modalities, faculty exchanges, knowledge transfer, new markets, opportunities to broaden offerings through this
- Having an impact on students and community and meeting their needs; should result in growth, professional, enrollment, etc.

Jim Jones provided insight from his experience with strategic planning. He recommended the SPSC look at the plan from an extremely high level and avoid getting into the weeds. It is important to be engaged and present in this process. The mission of the university is critical to the planning process, strategic planning is at the intersection of the mission statement, opportunities and threats, and strengths and weaknesses. If a plan is well done it will have broad impacts on the budget, accreditation, institutional culture, and internal and external relationships. He clarified that goals and objectives are not key performance indicators (KPIs) and ideally there will be 5-6 main goals with the KPIs serving as supporting goals. He recommended setting aspirational goals. The plan should be short and concise so that when it is written it is still in use. The plan must be leveraged to direct the energy of the university, budget, human resources, etc. He cautioned that communicating the progress of the SPSC can be difficult and a plan should be created as to how to best share information.

President Naganathan reviewed the current mission statement and the proposed amendments and requested input on the proposals. Comments included having consistency in referencing the name of the university (OIT v. OT), whether the reference to diversity and leadership development is for students (it is for students, faculty, and staff), whether “degree” could be deleted as it still references “programs”, concern about removal of (or different reference to) engineering technologies, concern about extending into Washington with Boeing, concern if the DPT program is considered a graduate degree and if “professional” should be added to the description of degrees. Consensus of the committee was to endorse the changes. President Naganathan shared the vision statement. SPSC discussed the use and meaning of “industry’s university”. Proposal to rearrange the items and have global prominence as a polytechnic before the reference to industry’s university. Additional discussion on the vision statement to follow. President Naganathan reviewed the four pillars he

would like the committee to consider in the strategic plan – commitments to: students, innovation, community, and ourselves (such as pride in our brand).

Ginny Lang reiterated that the larger committee will be divided into five smaller committees. Ms. Fox will send out the committee assignments and homework. Ms. Lang outlined the homework:

1. Conduct a SWOT analysis (the strengths and weaknesses are internally focused and the opportunities and threats are external),
2. Brainstorm about how this group can communicate to other stakeholders, and
3. Share any reading material.

She explained information will be sent out regarding a document sharing site and the ability for stakeholders to provide input via an email address on the strategic planning webpage.

The next meeting will be May 16, 2019.