

Oregon Tech Strategic Planning Steering Committee

Meeting #9 Notes

October 10, 2019

2:00pm – 5:00pm

Sunset Conference Room, Klamath Falls campus

Room 225, Portland-Metro campus

Attendees:

Steve Addison (via skype)	Erik Johnson	Joanna Mott
Aja Bettencourt-McCarthy	Jennifer Kass (via skype)	Dr. Naganathan
Jessyca Chosy	Jack Kegg	Alan Polaski (via skype)
Anna Clark	Tom Keyser	Di Saunders (via skype)
Mandi Clark	Amber Lancaster	Lindy Stewart (via skype)
John Davis	Ginny Lang	Ken Vandehey (via skype)
Sandra Fox	Justin Laughlin (via skype)	Chitra Venugopal (via
Suzanne Hopper (via skype)	Joel McPherson	skype)

Unable to Attend:

John Davis	Bobbi Kowash	Farooq Sultan
Kathleen Hill	Roger Lindgren	Wakaya Wells
Joyce Hollander-Rodriguez	Tony Richey	

Recap and Review

Ginny opened the meeting with a recap of the Group's work to date and reviewed what is scheduled for today's meeting. **Tony** will send out dates/times for TEAMS training.

Steve reviewed the document he created outlining the taxonomy and language structures, and pros and cons of strategic plans from various universities. The universities chosen either are approved through NWCCU and/or have applied technology in their missions. The purpose is to identify our taxonomy so it is clear what the terms and levels of the document mean. The committee should each look at these and settle on a common list of goals or themes, or projects and what will be under each of these and then what measurements to use. **Ginny** noted that Washington State University has multiple satellite campuses and required each of those to have its own strategic plan; the committee has not identified an approach for Oregon Tech's different sites yet. The groups were requested to review the structures and identify what they think works for Oregon Tech.

Joel shared a draft of a proposed graphic to work-in through the plan to show readers a higher level visual of the framework. Suggestions included changing 'Institutional Goals' to 'Pillars'. **Dr. Nagi** stated the group might add measurable objectives to the goals. He suggested including an executive summary in the document. **Ginny** suggested creating a table of contents for an upcoming meeting to see the sequence of information and what might be missing.

Group Work

Groups worked on their assigned sections and presented proposed changes.

The Draft

The committee groups reviewed their respective sections and commented on others proposals. Sections of the draft include:

- Values
- Student Success
- Institutional Excellence
- Entrepreneurial Innovation
- Administrative Fundamentals
- Community Connections

Group C considered the taxonomy of the document and identified goals, objectives and measures, with desired outcomes at the end of the section. The group wants to include the proper divisions and departments to obtain specific measurements.

Group A noted it changed to ‘respect civility in all interactions’; everything else stayed the same but respect can go beyond civility so ideas on this were welcomed. **Joel** explained that each goal has a one or two sentence long description as part of the taxonomy to give the goal context; followed by objectives and one or two measures to each objective. The title Student Success was kept but a few changes were made under increase retention and graduation rates which were in the wrong area. He noted an explanation is needed ‘high impact co-curricular activities’ and ‘career-ready’. The group added pillars back into the document and distilled the vision into three major goals. They associated pillars and strategic goals to each of the focus areas/goals. “Focus Area” was changed to “Goals” and Administrative Fundamentals was absorbed into Institutional Excellence. **Dr. Nagi** identified that enrollment growth should be an objective in the plan somewhere so it cannot be totally absorbed. **Ginny** suggested there could be a handful of overarching goals where things like enrollment fit; things that cut across a number of different areas of the university. **Joel** suggested of thinking of the strategic goals as themes for the overall plan. **Chitra** suggested moving ‘project based learning’ and ‘hands on learning’ under Institutional Excellence.

Group B discussed Entrepreneurial Innovation and collaborating with industries. They added measurable goals that are actions on how to complete the goal. “Create an open platform to engage in innovative discovery” needs more detail under it. Discussion regarding where “Aligning facilities and technology....” belongs - should it move to Student Success or Institutional Excellence. The committee agreed to change “Administrative Fundamentals” to “University Financial Success” and move parts of enrollment growth to Student Success and Institutional Excellence

Consensus on Goal #4 to delete “Fully support aggressive, aspirational”; move “Develop location specific” and “recruit not only to retain” to Student Success; and move “Promote Oregon Tech’s culture” to Institutional Excellence.

Discussion on Goal #5 Community Engagement regarding athletics being placed under Student Success as a segment of student life or if it fits under Community Connections. Discussion regarding ‘external community’ and if it includes professional community/societies.

Discussion of hierarchy of goals and what follows the mission, vision, and values and how the pillars might fit in. **Amber** and **Aja** will work with **Ginny** to combine the three documents into one and format it similar to OSU's as it is most like our current draft structure: Institutional goals with desired outcomes, four pillars, objectives, strategies to achieve objectives, and measurability.

Campus Town Halls

The committee agreed that on November 19 it will announce focus group dates and explain the next steps.

Campus Communicating

Committee agreed to schedule presentations at divisions, staff units, leadership teams, etc. Aja created a list of possibilities for people to review and sign-up for. The campus needs a general orientation to the strategic planning process, the opportunities to become more fully engaged in the conversation, and a progress report including appropriate expectations. **Ginny** suggested a typed one-pager for people to use as a jump start to talk about what the committee has been doing the past few months. This could come from the co-chairs of the work groups. Discussion regarding obtaining feedback on the content of the plan versus disseminating information on what the group has accomplished. It was suggested to do an update for dissemination for campus consumption. The plan is to have one draft plan for review at the November 14 SPSC meeting, to make announcements at the November 19 Town Hall, and provide an update at the November 21 Board of Trustees meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.