

Oregon Tech Strategic Planning Steering Committee
Meeting #4 Notes
June 13, 2019
2:00pm – 5:00pm
Mt. McLoughlin Conference Room, Klamath Falls campus
Room 225, Portland-Metro campus

Attendees:

Steve Addison	Erik Johnson	Tony Richey
Aja Bettencourt-McCarthy	Jennifer Kass (via Skype)	Di Saunders (via Skype)
Jessyca Chosy	Jack Kegg	Lindy Stewart (via Skype)
Anna Clark	Ginny Lang (via Skype)	Farooq Sultan
Mandi Clark	Justin Laughlin (via Skype)	Chitra Venugopal (via skype)
John Davis (via Skype)	Joel McPherson	Wakaya Wells
Sandra Fox	Alan Polaski (via phone)	
Suzanne Hopper (via Skype)		

Unable to Attend:

Kathleen Hill	Tom Keyser	Nagi Naganathan
Joyce Hollander-Rodriguez	Bobbi Kowash	Ken Vandehey
Jim Jones	Amber Lancaster	
	Roger Lindgren	

Ginny gave an overview of the agenda and requested the groups share their SWOT analysis results.

SWOT

Group A reviewed Strengths and clustered them into categories similar to the pillars:

- Commitment to Students
 - Student experience
 - Increasing avail. Of student research and opportunities
 - Diverse group
 - Access to faculty
- ROI value proposition
 - Career focused
 - High ROI
 - Industry connections, hands on learning
- Growth in PM/Online
 - Focus on SEM
 - Facilities improvement
 - Growing diversity
- Commitment to Community
 - Partnerships
 - Building local comm., alumni, partner relationship
 - Start. Located campuses and proximate to sky
- Pride
 - Athletics getting national recognition

Group B focused on Weaknesses:

- Processes/governance: lack of data driven operational policies and processes; data quality needs improvement; need decision making processes and accountability; every process needs an owner and accountability
- Faculty unionization: happening concurrently with this planning
- Perception of inefficient organizational structure at PM campus: lack of transparency about who is running the campus
- Unrefined definition and ineffective admissions standards, faculty recruitment; unclear performance expectations
- Affordability: programs are expensive to offer to students; fiscal stability for equipment support; dependence on state funding (the group moved 'state funding reliance' to the Threats as it is an outside influence)
- Improved development and fundraising requires culture change
- Not enough people/time for grants
- Culture of pride
 - Lack of diversity across the board
 - Perceptions about racism and discrimination
 - Lack of trust
 - Lack of deep institutional pride
- Too much committee and not enough real work Inconsistent course quality; students don't get enough experiential work
- Uneven skills across programs
- Not enough interdisciplinary work
- Student experience: ours is not better than it is nationwide; even though we tout that
- Communication: we need improved marketing and outreach
- Facilities/infrastructure

It was asked if these weaknesses are unique to Oregon Tech and if they are mission critical.

Discussion about how to turn what is heard about student experience into goals, action steps, etc.

Suggested that the group should identify things to work on under the student experience category.

Group C reviewed Opportunities:

There was a question as to which of these opportunities were really weaknesses or external, unique or key opportunities. The group stated they may move some of the opportunities to weaknesses or other areas.

- Student success: offer excellent value proposition; but state funding will put pressure on tuition; but we can offer great ROI so it balances those.
- Discounts, more scholarships, more retention: probably needs to be moved to enrollment growth
- Faculty/Staff: enabling development, professional successes, create community
- Enrollment, recruitment, retention: mission to grow enrollment in current environment
- Redefine what it means to be polytechnic; integrate international; access to international; enrollment growth needs to be front and center

- Strategic locations: what do they offer; desirable
- Ability to move enrollment direction we feel will be beneficial, have access to employers in metro areas
- Capitalize on our uniqueness on polytechnic tradition
- Industry: good opportunity to expand enrollment and program opportunities
- Locations: REE, a lot of resources in KF

The Portland-Metro Group reviewed Threats

VALUES

Sandra reviewed the board values and explained the process the board went through to draft them. It was noted there are similarities between the new mission statement and the board values: innovation, professional focus, hands-on, and project based learning. It was suggested that many of the Board values align with the pillars. **Ginny** reviewed that values are the principles that guide our daily work, are our cultural cornerstones, and can never be compromised. Committee members shared their thoughts on what values Oregon Tech has and/or should have (where we want to be):

- Commitment to students
- Respect, trust, professionalism: how we treat each other (faculty, staff, and students); as members of our community
- Excellence in teaching
- High standards and expectations for students (for all)
- Quality of teaching
- Appreciation for inclusion, diversity, equity in some areas (take to the next level?)
- Polytechnic
- Social mobility – providing an excellent education AND skills/attitude for a rewarding, satisfying life
- Sense of community; community building; community engagement to make students feel comfortable; a lot of areas do a good job
- Social mobility; giving students a leg up, lifting them up
- Student learning experience cannot be compromised
- Making sure we have relevant degree programs, skill relevant
- Faculty and staff very supportive, excellent teachers and very understanding, see students as people
- TOP program best on campus; Weakness – we don't have a TOP mentor for every student; not enough counselors
- What about innovation - people value it, feeds into having relevant programs
- Entrepreneurial approach - that is a core value; ok to start something even if it doesn't succeed; dedication to working with HSs with STEM; forward thinking.
- Important to turnout people prepared to be good citizens of the world
- Sustainability – environmentally but also is it sustainable to run low enrollment classes?
- Listening to all voices; get diverse perspectives

Ginny asked the committee to be prepared to present the groups' ideas on changes, refinements, and descriptions to and of the values.

KEY TOPIC UPDATES

Short presentations were given by subject matter experts: **Stephanie Pope**, AVP Financial Operations talked about the budget; **Erik Johnson**, Director of Admissions gave an overview of a book he impact population changes might have on higher education and information received on admissions from consultant, RNL; **Dr. Seth Anthony**, Director of the Office of Academic Excellence, presented on accreditation; **Dr. Erika Veth**, AVP of Strategic Enrollment Management discussed enrollment trends and issues; and **Tracy Ricketts**, AVP of Alumni Relations and Development spoke about fundraising, philanthropy, and cultivating donors.

FOUR PILLARS

Ginny restated the four pillars on which our future rests: our commitment to 1. students, 2. innovation, 3. Community, and 4. ourselves. She asked the members, for homework, to work in their groups to look at all of the pillars and ask what each means and then identify goals, commitments, initiatives that result from that. She suggested looking at other schools' plans to help with this. These are overarching big ideas; she reminded the committee that we are not looking at "how are we going to do this?" right now. She asked each group to identify key initiatives or measurable action items under each pillar. She gave an example of the commitment to students; a key initiative could be streamlining pathways to graduation.

It was suggested that the group engage the industry advisory boards to assist with strategic planning this summer.

Ginny outlined upcoming meeting topics, including looking at Oregon Tech's locations (Klamath, Portland-Metro, Boeing, Chemeketa, on-line, Scappoose/OMIC) and discuss the impact on the university. She also stated we would work on framing stakeholder conversations; blocking out what those will look like.