

**Strategic Planning Special Meeting with Consultant Dennis Jones (President of NCHEMS)
September 8, 2004**

Attendees: Beth Applebee, Diane Bellock, Sarah Bickel, David Bousquet, David Camacho, Fred Estrella, Marcus Ford, Bruce Fox, Carl Fox, Mason Gerety, Liz Grobsmith, Pat Haeuser, Lawrence Mohrweis, Karen Pugliesi, Diane Verkest, Eric Yordy, Christy Arazan
Guest: Dennis Jones

Open Forum to discuss progress the Strategic Planning Council has made since January 2003:

Consensus about goals: General agreement that while there has been a consensus within the council, communicating this with the larger campus community still needs work.

- Progress has been made requiring each VP to demonstrate how the Strategic Planning goals are addressed within their units
- The need still exists to operationalize the goals and clearly define the indicators of these goals and what the goals mean.
- In addition to measuring these goals, there is a need to identify what the outcomes of these goals would look like on campus.
- As part of consensus building, the strategic planning process again needs to take the goals to faculty and staff, and they should be asked what these goals would look like across campus if they were realized.

Funding planning priorities: Currently, the Strategic Planning Council recommends University Planning Priorities. All funding decisions are made by the President and Cabinet; and the past two years have seen significant funding decisions that directly address the University Planning Priorities. It is not unusual, though, for Strategic Planning Councils to make recommendations for one-time funding of strategic planning initiatives. Most of the NAU priorities that have received funding are structural assets of the university such as faculty and staff salaries, recruiting minority faculty members, staffing the Gateway Advising Center, and funding for enrollment management as opposed to funding projects for idea development.

Other issues concerning NAU's strategic planning or Strategic Planning Council

- Council needs to begin by identifying who we serve and who are our clients. Council needs to define the audience.
- All goals, except serving a greater proportion of the Native American population and perhaps addressing the state's nursing needs, are internally focused.
- The plan may be missing linkages across goals.

Strategic Planning Council Minutes

September 17, 2004

BAC 206

Attendees: Beth Applebee, Sharon Young (sitting in for Diane Bellock), Sarah Bickel, Fred Estrella, Marcus Ford, Bruce Fox, Mason Gerety, Liz Grobsmith, John Haeger, Pat Haeuser, Josie Hutchinson, Fred Hurst, MJ McMahon, Lawrence Mohrweis, Karen Pugliesi, Eric Yordy, Christy Arazan

1. **Introductions/Welcome to new 2004-2005 Strategic Planning Council members/Strategic Planning Council Binder and Materials.** Binders contain membership list, dates of scheduled Strategic Planning meetings, and outline of the strategic planning process at NAU. Also discussed or included:
 - a. STAMATS web-conference provided several key points including the notion of being future oriented which has been difficult at NAU being faced with budget crises and enrollment drops. Binders include a handout from STAMATS summarizing highlights from the web conference.
 - b. Strategic Planning Documents summarize the focus of the council's work for the fall 2004. Primary goal is to elicit campus feedback on priorities. Last year's council material is included in the current binder as a guide and outline of the work that will need to be accomplished this semester.
 - c. 2005 Draft Plan is included in the binder for questions, comments, concerns, feedback. It should be noted that the accomplishments are mainly narrative, whereas in the future we may want to change our accomplishments to "dashboard" indicators or empirical measurements.
 - d. Draft of the Five-Year Plan that is provided to the Regents, Governor, and the Legislature. This document is in a format required by the state and as such focuses on 5-6 strategic issues. The main focus of this document is to address resource issues for the next 5 years.
 - e. The 2005 Priorities are a draft set of planning priorities that the council will be taking to the campus this fall. Members were asked to look at the University Planning Priorities and provide revisions, changes, feedback so that these priorities are cleaned up internally before taking them to the wider campus. Members were also asked to think about their schedules and the groups they represent as to appropriate times to schedule planning sessions.
2. **Strategic Planning Process; Budget and Planning Process/University Priorities.** Suggestions from Council members:
 - a. Align the Five Year Plan Issues with the Goals on page 2.
 - b. When distributing the published 2005 Strategic Plan, should check into the feasibility of a non-glossy book on recycled paper that would be provided to faculty, staff, and students; whereas the flashier version can be saved for outside constituencies.
 - c. There was a discussion about NAU accomplishing the priority of salary increases, however, these increases were across the board and do not solve merit, market, and equity issues across campus. These are all aspects of accomplishing the strategic plan goal that need to be flushed out.
 - d. Adding the 48% RAM measure that causes concern
 - e. When prioritizing the FY06 plan will, the issues of Faculty and Staff compensation and Infrastructure will likely be priorities 1 and 2.
 - f. The second bullet on the 2005 Priorities needs to be reworded so that it does not begin with "Update."
 - g. Again on the 2005 Priorities, under Northern Arizona University Identity, 2nd bullet should simply read: "Implement marketing plan."
3. **Other.** Planning Council invited to meet with Lipman Hearne on Monday, September 20 at 2:00. Next regularly scheduled meeting is on October 15.

Strategic Planning Council Minutes

October 15, 2004 BAC206

Attendees: Beth Applebee, Diane Bellock, Sarah Bickel, David Bousquet, David Camacho, Bruce Fox, Mason Gerety, Liz Grobsmith, Pat Haeuser, Josie Hutchinson, Stand Lindstedt, MJ McMahon, Lawrence Mohrweis, Karen Pugliesi, Eric Yordy, Christy Arazan

An Updated Draft Plan that incorporated feedback from members was provided to replace the older version of the plan. It was recommended that everything in the Draft Plan be restated for the new units.

1. November Strategic Planning Sessions with the Broader NAU Community to Obtain Feedback on the University Priorities

- a. Ideally at these sessions there will be three participants from SPC – one lead and two supports to take notes. However, if necessary, two members will suffice.
- b. The lead is responsible for scheduling the session and contacting Christy Arazan by October 29th as to the date, time, and place of the session. Any additional materials that are required should also be requested via Christy.
- c. The Strategic Plan Draft, Survey, and Universities Priorities will be sent to the council via email so that electronic versions of these documents can be sent to session attendees prior to meeting.
- d. Session lead should spend some time outlining what was done with the feedback from last year; refer to page #7 of the draft plan for specific examples of initiatives that were funded on campus due to the NAU Community's feedback. Explain and provide specific examples of how the involvement and opinions from the campus resulted in specific actions.
- e. Effort should be made to keep the conversation on a macro-level and try not to allow the attendees to get caught up in details and specifics
- f. At the end of the session, need to hand out paper survey for the ratings and feedback.

Pat will send out the feedback report on the linkage between planning and budget that was provided by Dennis Jones.

- 2. Long Range Planning Subcommittee Report.** The formal charge from President John Haeger needs to be distributed to the whole Planning Commission.
 - a. This charge is very future oriented, looking out 25 years
 - b. Report needs to begin by brainstorming so that the context and influencing factors from a global, regional and local context are all considered
 - c. This long range planning subcommittee report will also consider how NAU's mission as an institute relates to the 25 yr goals

3. Refining the Strategic Planning Process

- a. *Budget and Planning Process Timeline and Guidelines.* Agreed that planning needs to occur before budgeting. Members are asked to review the process to determine whether

the flow is logical, if the order reflects reality, ascertain whether details or clarification need to be added, and generally provide feedback on the principles.

- b. Environmental Scan.* Goal is to include the environmental scan as part of the regular planning process. A group of graduate and undergraduate students from NAU will take the lead on this project. Starting point for the environmental scan will be to determine what the state of Arizona wants NAU as a university to do. Answering this question will allow the university to be more outward looking and really demonstrate that we are responding to the needs of the state. Want to be able to provide the services that Arizona needs. Every three to five years a new scan will be done in order to keep the information updated.
- c. Performance Measures.*
- d. Recommended College/Unit Planning Process.* A very basic model / outline of a unit plan was provided. This model is not meant to be proscriptive, but merely suggestive. Each VP would complete a short plan of approximately two pages that linked the strategic initiatives within that unit with the University's priorities. The detail would be provided at the unit level and becomes broader and more general as it is summarized / "reported up" through the organizations. It was suggested that an expansion of the explanation which goes with the outline may need to occur. For example, the resource implications may suggest to participants in this process that this is an opportunity to ask for more money. The main objective is to align unit's missions, values, and goals with the University's mission. The end of the academic year can serve as the goal for these plans to be submitted.

Strategic Planning Council Minutes

April 15th, 2005, BAC206

Attendees: John Haeger, Pat Haeuser, Beth Applebee, Diane Bellock, Sarah Bickel, David Camacho, Fred Estrella, Marcus Ford, Bruce Fox, Carl Fox, Liz Grobsmith, Josie Hutchinson, Stand Lindstedt, MJ McMahon, Karen Pugliesi, Eric Yordy, Christy Arazan

1. Planning Environment:

Higher Education Restructuring for the State of Arizona has been finalized and all but one recommendation from the Northern Arizona Taskforce on Higher Education was adopted.

Budget from the state for higher education will be minimal. Community colleges will most likely be allowed to award baccalaureate degrees in certain areas. A Study Committee to review this policy will likely be formed.

A partnership with Yavapai College in Prescott will likely occur in the future. The ability to develop hybrid universities that operate in partnerships will be key to NAU's growth and serving the state's needs. NAU needs to recognize and adapt to the fact that the majority of state growth will be in populations that will not be coming to a residential university. Ideally this will be driven by legislation. As there is considerable concern with hybrid endeavors (such as two year colleges expanding and taking over degree programs which would leave NAU in vulnerable positions) legal backing to protect NAU's interests will be necessary.

A name change, that more accurately reflects NAU's statewide presence, was also mentioned and discussed.

Karen Pugliesi provided a quick overview of the 2007 accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission. The Council was provided the Commission's criteria and a broad outline. There will be a focused visit for on-line degrees and certificate programs occurring in early May. The 2007 accreditation visit will require a comprehensive self-study with a self-study report as the final product. The organizational and leadership structure on NAU's campus is already in place to begin preparing for this upcoming accreditation. Five subgroups are still to be formed. There are several themes that are important when developing our Mission documents that are directly related to this upcoming accreditation. These themes include: future oriented, learning oriented, connected organization, distinctive organization as embodied in the mission and values. A website for accreditation information is in place: www.nau.edu/accreditation

2. Long Range Planning Subcommittee Report:

This subcommittee hopes to have a document that they can bring to the Council that may contain recommendations. The committee is taking several long term external factors

into consideration while creating this document. These factors include: demographic shifts, global economies, increased information and technology, and climate change.

3. Mission:

The Council will take our mission and goals out to the campus to get feedback and buy-in from the larger community. There is a great need to make our mission documents reflect NAU's distinctiveness. While the Mission Subcommittee felt that a Vision statement or statements would not be necessary nor prudent, there was a recommendation that a future discussion regarding Vision statements be added to the Council's agenda for consideration. Liz Grobsmith will work on some changes to the subcommittee's proposed mission statement(s) and bring them back to the council for feedback.

4. Goals:

A preliminary document outlining four potential goals based upon the Council's retreat and last planning meeting was developing and provided to all attendees. The addition of a 5th goal that deals with the ability to generate new knowledge in a knowledge based economy needs to be added. A subcommittee (Sarah Bickel, David Camacho, Bruce Fox, Marcus Ford, and Christy Arazan) was developed to review the current goal document, propose changes, and develop a general plan for developing the goals to bring to the campus community for feedback.