

STRATEGIC PLANNING TASK FORCE 2012-17
Meeting #15 November 3, 2011
Student Center, Room 310
8-9:30 a.m.

Members Present: C. Alexander, K. Bales, J. Bott, P. Gestwicki, M. Holtzman, R. Howard, E. Kelly, T. King, T. Lauer, K. McGeary, R. Morris, J. Obrycki, J. Palilonis, T. Proudfoot, P. Repp, F. Sabatine, J. Scheib, L. Siktberg, T. Taylor, G. Vasquez de Velasco

Members absent: H. Akin, M. Goldsby, B. Hannon, W. Knight, K. Lee, B. McNely, C. Sullivan

Provost Terry King convened the meeting at 8:00 a.m.

No meeting on Nov. 17. Half-day work session set for Nov. 18.

1. Differentiation is the Strategy to be adopted. Three to six themes should emerge from this with outcomes and targets from these.

To implement the themes, initiatives and resource allocation for the initiatives must be developed.

2. Discussion about communications followed. Our challenge is to try to distill that all down and capture the essence, the color, and texture of what was discussed in a relatively simple and easy to consume document.

Tony Proudfoot presented his 19-page draft article, and discussion about the graphics and information ensued.

Key goals in first communication need to be coherence and clarity to show how we will get to the next step. Many people just want a short summary; others will want to read all the details. We want to meet the needs of both groups. We want to be sure everyone feels heard.

Graphic should be shaped like an hourglass or an upside down pyramid atop a pyramid to show how large amounts of information are distilled into themes then broadened out into targets and outcomes.

3. Discussion moved toward where themes come from: Do they come up from the data gathered in stakeholder sessions? Do they come down from trustees and the president? (With the stakeholder data being used for targets and outcomes.) Do themes come from other information we know about the legislature and other external elements?
 - Who sets the strategic direction for the university? Trustees and president. We have to make sure we understand what's happening in a global sense.
 - There may be a disconnect between what trustees and president want and building themes from the bottom up.
 - Current themes don't mesh well with all of the data points.

- Faculty need to have their own theme (separate from the mention of high quality programs) because of the disconnect they feel with administration.
- How does a theme like faculty development relate to the strategy of differentiation?
- There was no stakeholder group for professional employees, but they would say similar things as faculty. Way understaffed on professional staff, almost to the level of being humorous compared to other universities.
- How does addressing some of those concerns match up with the themes and strategy? We have highly relevant and powerful student experiences listed as a theme: Those happen with faculty.
- It is okay to say that the data does not support what we heard from people in stakeholder groups (i.e. if complaints about salaries are not supported by actual data comparing salaries here with those elsewhere.)
- Communications can help bring everyone together so everyone feels like we're all pulling together and working in the same direction to achieve strategic goals.
- Morale might not be a theme, but it might be more of an operational outcome or target. Maybe it fits under vibrant campus.
- Need to know what the themes are and to understand the definitions of themes.
- Not sure themes come from data. Stakeholder groups are not the ones setting the direction for the university.
- To have the vibrant campus, we need the staff, we need the facilities, etc. That should be a theme.
- Do we need to add a theme or two?
- Need to be explicit that to have high quality, nationally ranked programs, we need faculty.
- "Data" doesn't have to mean just the stakeholder data; it can mean adding other things we know like legislative direction.
- Stakeholders – legislature, Indiana Commission for Higher Education – didn't have data gathering sessions with them, but they are stakeholders – need to capture that. We have considered these stakeholder perspectives.
- Most themes are going to be accomplished with faculty and students. The role of the institution is to facilitate these things happening. To provide the resources, etc. To be a catalyst.
- Concerned that the data looks negative, and if we don't do anything about morale issues, it will look bad and cause negativity.
- Need to be sure that communications explain that this is what we heard, not necessarily what we believe. "We did hear you, stay tuned." Frame the communications as an update, note that we are on a point along a continuum.

- Staff Council didn't feel appreciated – by faculty – who don't feel appreciated by administration ... this is a fundamental problem of a university.
- What happens if we break the linear process and jump to initiatives and see if that generates themes. Change our strategy. Many people probably have ideas about what operational changes would improve their work.
- If people define a problem differently, their solutions will be different. Need to have a guiding plan.

4. To do list:

Create a narrative around planning assumptions

Define our themes.

Figure out what is missing.

Add new themes if necessary.

- Which process: write themes, then go for outcomes? Or outcomes first, then find themes?
- Do both.
- Use all available data. Current strategic plan. Legislative information. Other data we know. Plus stakeholder data.
- Let's look at the themes we think the trustees would want, the themes the legislature would want, the themes the stakeholders would want. They will probably be similar. But then we will understand them.
- There is a time element involved. We need a strong push to get more done.
- Where will new elements of distinctiveness come from?

5. Broke into three small groups to discuss and define the existing six themes.

No meeting on Nov. 17. Half-day work session set for Nov. 18.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.