

**Oregon Tech Strategic Planning Steering Committee
Meeting #6 Notes**

July 11, 2019

2:00pm – 5:00pm

Sunset Conference Room, Klamath Falls campus

Room 225, Portland-Metro campus

Attendees:

Steve Addison (via Skype)	Jack Kegg	Tony Richey
Jessyca Chosy	Tom Keyser	Di Saunders
Anna Clark	Bobbi Kowash	Lindy Stewart (via Skype)
Mandi Clark	Amber Lancaster (via Skype)	Farooq Sultan
Sandra Fox	Ginny Lang	Ken Vandehey
Kathleen Hill	Justin Laughlin	Chitra Venugopal (via skype)
Suzanne Hopper (via Skype)	Joel McPherson	
Jennifer Kass (via Skype)	Nagi Naganathan	

Guests:

Craig Campbell (via phone)	Mark Clark	Joanna Mott
----------------------------	------------	-------------

Unable to Attend:

Aja Bettencourt-McCarthy	Jim Jones	Wakaya Wells
John Davis	Roger Lindgren	
Joyce Hollander-Rodriguez	Alan Polaski	

Recap and Review

Ginny opened the meeting with a recap of the previous meeting noting files were posted on Teams and it is helpful to have all of the information in one place, and she reviewed today's agenda. Dr. Joanna Mott, incoming Provost, was welcomed to the meeting.

Locations

Mark gave an overview of the history of Oregon Tech and the various locations. He stated the information is preliminary as he still needs to interview people on the establishment of locations.

- Klamath Falls: The ideal location for the school was at the Marine Barracks and was established based on efforts to develop more comprehensive education offerings in Oregon in the late 1950s. It wasn't until the 80s that we had campuses outside of Klamath Falls. The Oregon University System didn't want OTI to expand; we were forced on higher ed and they didn't want us, because we only offered Associate degrees and many faculty held only Bachelor's degrees. In 1947 Klamath Falls was the 4th largest city in Oregon and the biggest industrial counties were Multnomah and Klamath. In 1998 applied psychology was the first degree that wasn't either engineering or health. OSU and UO had a foothold in Bend. **Di** gave some history on Bend and campuses there and then how we got to just OSU.
- Portland-Metro: There was a burgeoning tech industry in Portland and a need for further education for tech workers. Early on the university moved around a lot: in 1988 we were at the Harmony Road campus and up to four different locations. In 2012 we purchased the InFocus building in Wilsonville to consolidate and move away from PSU. There was no

traffic and the location was easy to get to from community colleges. There are now more traditional freshman students than in the beginning. People in KF were skeptical of the metro-area consolidated campus; and the Wilsonville location was seen as far away from Portland. The lack of public transportation was another issue for the P-M campus; there was doubt whether students would follow. The consolidation was during a recession and buildings were less expensive. The strategic part of this was that being outside of Portland we wouldn't compete with PSU which is one of the reasons we don't have certain degrees at the P-M campus. Because of cuts with Measure 5 we got rid of associate degrees. There was a clearly articulated goal to get 1000 students at P-M and the move to Wilsonville was to get different state reps on our side.

- Seattle: Boeing is the result of the university responding to a Request for Proposals. Boeing wanted to give opportunities to employees to obtain higher qualifications. We had associate and bachelor degrees in the beginning and taught with three faculty members. Boeing was happy with our graduates so they chose us. Since 2005 we have offered an MS in Manufacturing and since 2012 a BS in Mechanical.
- La Grande: The dental hygiene program was offered at a building constructed by Moda, and in conjunction with Moda and EOU. Moda saw a lack of access to dental healthcare in the area. Over time the market became saturated and enrollment dropped to half capacity eventually. The tuition was extremely high to compensate Moda. With the Klamath Falls campus and Chemeketa Community College (Salem) being the other two locations that students could choose for the program at a lesser costs, enrollment in La Grande dropped. In 2015 the decision was made to close that campus.
- Salem: Partnership with Chemeketa Community College for dental hygiene program.

Craig provided history on Scappoose: Oregon Manufacturing and Innovation Center's R&D facility opened in 2017 and was started out of a metals consortium. It started with seven industry partners and 3 universities (Oregon Tech, OSU and PSU). Oregon Tech also acts as host and there are now 26 members. The facility is on 10 acres with faculty and students doing onsite research in metals manufacturing starting in subtractive manufacturing. The group decides on new members and the OMIC Board determines research projects, proper equipment, and needed staffing. Dues are paid by members and they fund research. Construction grants were received from the state. Portland Community College is building a training center near OMIC. Oregon Tech is host for OMIC; and OMIC pays funds for services to OT. Boeing was in a leadership role to have something in US, in Oregon, modeled on the successful partnership in Sheffield, England that propelled the University of Sheffield. Boeing has 14 other innovation centers in other parts of the world. We and Sheffield are unique in that we define our own research. We are also the best capitalized of all the centers.

Mark noted that none of the relocations were internal initiatives but driven from the outside. The move to the second (current) Klamath Falls campus was accelerated because the old campus was not built well and had issues. Longstanding relationships became partnerships. He discussed the genesis of Klamath Community College: Oregon Tech did not have a strategic plan in late 1980s and with the state budget slashed by the passage of Measure 5 we gutted athletics programs and all associates degrees including diesel mechanics. KCC opened in the late 1990s to fill the need for associate's degrees. Oregon Tech alumni pushed to drop associate's degrees to raise the school's profile with just offering bachelor's degrees. President Larry Wolfe also pushed the dropping of

associate's degrees. Mark stated we used to have a niche with engineering technology and as we moved to just engineering there became more competition so we diversified by offering master's degrees.

Discussion: **Jennifer** observed that there is a disconnect between P-M and KF campuses. P-M is often forgotten and there are conflicting attitudes on the P-M campus - some people want to be left alone and treated as a separate university and others who want to leverage the fact that we are a larger university and are unified. **Lindy** acknowledged the culture is different as are the students; the communities view the university differently; facilities, resources, and work load are handled differently; and there is disinformation and misinformation between and about the campuses. **Jessica** clarified that we are looking at Oregon Tech as a whole and making a plan for all of the modalities and how we can incorporate all locales into a single plan; but that each modality can have a unique identity.

Group A shared its notes on competitive landscape and locations. Group C mentioned different economics in various regions, different student demographics, but commonalities across campuses aligned with market sectors, and suggested looking at both local market and industry needs. Discussion regarding the degree approval process and the need to justify there is a market for the new degree. There are industry groups that help us determine if our programs are relevant. **Bobbi** stated she gets calls to start specialized areas and she noted physicians want MIT training.

Ginny clarified that we don't want to have a strategic plan for every modality but we need to know the implications of managing human, financial and other resources. We need to have cohesive goals and direction is crucial, but must be mindful of the implications an action can have on other sites, and make conscious, deliberate decisions on each of the modalities. It was suggested to have broad strokes of the plan apply everywhere but also recommend specific goals or operational plans for some of the campuses. **Tom** suggested having specific growth goals for each campus/site.

Mark explained that when comparator schools for the salary studies were identified, we couldn't really find another school like ours because we are so focused on STEM+M, and others have a much higher percent of students in social sciences and other programs. He mentioned that since 1998 we have tried to start those other programs. He posed the question of whether we want to continue our niche focus or try to expand into other areas that historically we haven't focused on. In the early 1990s it was decided not to do other things. We look at things through the filter of whether our students can get jobs. **Jack** mentioned that some of this is due to our mission statement - we say applied science, not science for example. Question was raised of whether our direction is to stay on the mission or move further out. **Ginny** agreed that the mission is the filter that we need to send all of this through.

PILLARS

The groups reviewed their proposed amendments, goals and action steps to the pillars.

Group D: Student access and success - make sure students have access and tools so they can be successful; improve retention and graduation for 1st, 2nd and 4th years. Inclusion and diversity - have early and interim grades for students like is done with TOP students for early warning;

interdepartmental collaboration for accessibility for students; if interactions with other departments could help facilitate a student moving around it could bring increased retention and graduation. Assist students in first year to adjust to and succeed in university environment. Increased participation in student learning communities, more involvement in clubs and activities; make sure students and faculty know what services exist. How to measure: career opportunities after graduation; in-house data collection to find out if there is a disconnect from institutional goals and if we are doing what we need to create the community for students. This goes with pillar of Oregon Tech pride. Diversity and inclusion – make sure we respect individuality; supportive of inclusive environment for students, faculty and staff; promote diverse perspectives in the classroom and increase underrepresented students. Establish diversity website, ensure equal access to facilities so all know that the community is there to support them. Evidence of accomplishments: do we have the diversity that industry is looking for?

The group had the most trouble with the pillar of innovation and if there is a difference between innovation and ingenuity, so they tabled it; but liked what other groups defined.

Community pillar – developing partnerships that are cohesive for each location, so they know what we do their feedback; be present, work with the high schools. Getting our name out there in the Portland area; make sure we reach out to the local area, high schools; establish our presence near and far. Measure success through feedback from community, recognition, funding opportunities. Participate in community college fairs, community coalitions; connect with industry, they love our students and we can make connections on other programs to make sure they know what we offer; capitalize on connections we have. We will increase enrollment when students know what we have. More brand awareness. More donor support, increased attendance at events, sports and other; anchor for community, be proud of our community, a college town. Challenge ourselves to inspire and connect with community, so they know who we are; more media exposure. Support campus engagement in regional initiatives. Point of Care Ultra Sound training for physicians; they are interested in increasing their knowledge of this.

Oregon Tech pride – a brand identity; develop plans to develop pride areas, include alumni. All students, faculty, staff feel connected through common connections. How to engage students? Design recruitment plan for diverse faculty, staff; expand professional development. Infrastructure of campus facilities and beautification. **Chitra** – everything student centered. Got stuck on how we measure innovation.

Group C: The group agreed with the original headings.

Group B: The group spent time on the headings and had a similar discussion to Group D and added Access to student success on the first. Under each pillar give a description of it before you get into the goals. Want to fine tune the descriptions as we move along.

Like idea of student access and success as a heading. In coming up with goals, not fully fleshed out yet but put in some potential goals; some of it is short term action plan and current plan; important to look at those previous goals and determine if we can move on or still need to include those in

new plan. In 2020 plan lots on underserved populations and that would be worth talking about; grow student and campus diversity.

Second one, like Ingenuity and Innovation, but need to make sure that this is defined well; fine tune the description. Underneath that, extend academic goals; could also talk about physical resources, how we solve problems.

Liked commitment to community as it can be both internal and external community; partnerships and building and expanding our presence.

Like title Institutional Excellence and can fold a lot into that. Community – tying it to places that we work in. Industry piece also ties to our mission, and make sure that we are following it. Areas like “professionally focused.”

Group A: The group spent time on values and pillars without talking about goals and what they mean in context of strategic goals. They viewed the strategic plan resting on top of the pillars, with goals and action items falling underneath the pillars. They noted the pillars also can stand alone and be meaningful even before you get to the goal part. Discussed whether “a commitment to” be there and they decided to keep it in. Noted the pillar is the commitment not the outcome. The uniqueness of OT is addressed in the pillar descriptions; what parts of our uniqueness are central, and what differentiates us.

Improve student access and diversity - plan to increase equal access to facilities like gender neutral restrooms; prepare students to succeed. Added mental health goal and how to address it holistically.

Commitment to learning and innovation. Create comprehensive policies and procedures; this pillar would create the groundwork for what people are doing; help to build capacity; mentorship programs.

Commitment to Community – this could be a lot of different things; each unit could develop their own community outreach plan and determine appropriate level of engagement. Goals of transforming KF campus as anchor for the city. May not work as well for P-M campus.

Commitment to Institutional Excellence – culture of pride, process improvement; goals – decrease reliance on state funding. A multitude of things that increase our pride.

Another look at Values

Group A: Shared four values and descriptions of each: integrity, respect, diversity-equity-and-inclusion, and service.

Group B: Added two values, Excellence and Accountability, and did some wordsmithing. They explained at Oregon Tech there is always a sense of excellence behind what we are doing, an ingrained value, whether it is teaching or anything else. Accountability and taking ownership. The group changed Integrity quite a bit. Under Diversity, Equity, Inclusion – welcoming broad ideas and making sure whatever we say about this value is backed up and evident on our website.

Group C: Stated they were okay with the values as proposed.

Group D: Added Excellence.

External and campus community outreach

Suggestions included letting the campuses know what we've been working on and finding out if it covers what they are interested in; trying to get external partners to think about larger opportunities given the tremendous changes in higher education; using the internal opportunities to take questions, discuss the process and details, and then making a commitment to having a straw proposal in fall; holding a series of meetings and town halls in addition to using regular staff meetings, retreats, etc.; getting feedback on goals and seeing what others are thinking about; ask if we're missing anything, and if it encompasses everything; and giving a presentation during convocation. **Joanna** stated the more feedback we ask for the more invested people will be.

Ginny reviewed the next steps: no formal SPSC or work group meetings during August; the ex-officio members will begin to parse the information; others will need to volunteer to be drafters to form a writing team; and later others will be asked to review and edit. The game plan is to have a straw proposal by the second week in September. Next meeting is July 23.