

Strategic Planning Council Minutes

October 3, 2003

BAC 206

Attending: John Haeger, Chair. Janessa Bailey, Sarah Bickel, David Bousquet, John Burton, Charles Connell, Jack Dustman, Pamela Eibeck, Carl Fox, Liz Grobsmith, Fred Hurst, Dave Lorenz, MJ McMahon, Ramona Mellott, Larry Mohrweis, Sam Wheeler, Pat Haeuser

1. Introductions/Welcome to new 2003-2004 Strategic Planning Council (SPC) members and Review of Strategic Planning Materials

Members reviewed materials in the new Strategic Planning 3-ring binders including the schedule of meetings, and planning documents developed in 2002-2003. A question was raised about the role of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee. Jack Dustman represents this committee on the Council, but there was interest to increase the involvement of this committee with the Council and planning process. One suggestion was to ask them to help garner input for University Priorities/Strategic Plan update sessions.

2. Campus Participation and Communications In Updating the Strategic Planning Process/ Refined Budget and Planning Processes

Pam Eibeck reviewed the updating process suggested by a SPC subcommittee in February, 2003. It was agreed that a subcommittee (Sarah Bickel, Pam Eibeck, Pat Haeuser, Chuck Connell, Ramona Mellott) would meet to develop implementation procedures so the Council could gather input from faculty and staff this fall. MJ McMahon reviewed a draft "Refined Budget and Planning Processes" document that sets a timeline and process to regularize the planning and budget interface.

3. Enrollment and Budget Situation

P. Haeuser reviewed what had been projected for enrollment for budget purposes and what actual enrollment is. A conservative increase of 30 students had been projected, and actual enrollment shows a decline of 1,083 students. The president discussed budget implications of the enrollment shortfall. For this year the problem appears to \$5 million. He reviewed a list of actions that could be taken to balance the budget for FY04. Discussion occurred about the actions on the list and ideas that were not on the list in preparation for a campus forum that afternoon.

4. Reconsideration of Strategic Plan Priorities and Goals (Enrollment and Budget Situation)

The Council briefly discussed the university mission and university priorities and agreed that they continue to be critical issues, even as we develop strategies to restructure the institution to ensure quality and financial stability. The Council discussed the need for a systematic process, for principles governing restructuring decisions, and the need for frequent communication with faculty and staff.

5. Unfinished / Potential Work

P. Haeuser reviewed the list of next steps the Strategic Planning Council might take on. The president emphasized the importance of developing a process to align college and unit planning

Strategic Planning Council Minutes

October 24, 2003

BAC 206

Attending: Janessa Bailey, David Bousquet, Charles Connell, Jack Dustman, Pamela Eibeck, Fred Estrella, Carl Fox, Mason Gerety, Liz Grobsmith, Fred Hurst, Dave Lorenz, MJ McMahon, Tom McPoil, Ramona Mellott, Mischa Willet, Pat Haeuser

1. Faculty Senate Planning and Budget Council Report – Jack Dustman

Representatives of the Faculty Senate Planning and Budget Council will be attending the Strategic Planning Council meetings. Jack provided a short report outlining issues of interest to the faculty council.

2. Strategic Planning University Priorities Input Session Procedures and Assignments

Pat Haeuser distributed draft documents outlining how the University Priorities input sessions might be structured and identifying Planning Council member teams of three to organize and facilitate the sessions. Members offered suggestions for the sessions and, with minor scheduling changes, agreed to organize their sessions.

3. Restructuring Planning – MJ McMahon, Liz Grobsmith

Members discussed the enrollment and collections situation and an initial draft of a restructuring plan that might be used to address the budget situation. A suggestion was made to develop some talking points concerning restructuring for the upcoming campus feedback sessions.

4. Update on published Strategic Plan

Plan should be delivered by late November—not in time for the feedback sessions with the campus.

5. Unfinished / Potential Work – did not get to this item

Strategic Planning Council Minutes

November 7, 2003

BAC 206

Attending: John Haeger, Janessa Bailey, Sarah Bickel, Charles Connell, Pamela Eibeck, Carl Fox, Mason Gerety, Liz Grobsmith, Fred Hurst, Dave Lorenz, Ramona Mellott, Lawrence Mohrweis, Pat Haeuser

1. Campus Planning Sessions

The Council spent most of the meeting discussing the Planning and Budget Sessions which were set to begin November 10th, with several other sessions that week. Pat distributed materials that are proposed to be used at the sessions, and members discussed how to facilitate the sessions. A special concern was how to avoid making restructuring the focus of the sessions, when the purpose is to collect input on the planning priorities. The web site to collect comments anonymously has been activated. Publicity about the sessions has been sent out from the President's office to an all staff list, and there will be reminders in the NAU-Today.

2. Restructuring

John discussed the draft institutional reorganization and budget restructuring document which includes a commitment to fund the Senate's plan for faculty salary increases in FY05. Members had questions about how the restructuring would be done and the timetable.

3. Characteristics of Excellence in Undergraduate Education

Members deferred examining this document because time was short. This will be on the agenda of the next meeting.

Strategic Planning Council Minutes

December 5, 2003

BAC 206

Attending: John Haeger, Josh Allen, Janessa Bailey, Sarah Bickel, Charles Connell, Jack Dustman, Pamela Eibeck, Fred Estrella, Kathy Cruz-Uribe, Ramona Mellott, Tom McPoil, Lawrence Mohrweis, Pat Haeuser
Guest: Karen Underhill

1. 2004-2009 Strategic Plan

Pat distributed copies of the new Strategic Plan. The Council discussed distribution of the Plan and decided to wait until January to send it out.

2. Campus Planning Sessions

The Council discussed the campus planning sessions – a couple more will be held in the next week. Pat distributed copies of the comments (50 pages todate!) and scoring of priorities. She also distributed a draft Executive Summary. Each council member talked about their sessions and provided additional comments for the executive summary. Members also discussed how to distribute the comments to the campus.

3. Restructuring

Members received a brief update on the restructuring committee.

4. Characteristics of Excellence in Undergraduate Education

Members discussed identifying how we can determine we are providing an excellent undergraduate education. Edits to this document were suggested.

Strategic Planning Council Minutes

January 9, 2004

BAC 206

Attending: John Haeger, Josh Allen, Sarah Bickel, David Bousquet, Charles Connell, Jack Dustman, Fred Estrella, Liz Grobsmith, Fred Hurst, Dave Lorenz, MJ McMahon, Ramona Mellott, Tom McPoil, Lawrence Mohrweis, Pat Haeuser
Guest: Karen Underhill

1. Current Issues – Funding Formula Changes, Restructuring...

The Council discussed various issues including the desirability of charging fees versus tuition, and the draft of a new position paper on the difficult position NAU faces because of the 22:1 enrollment growth formula. The Council also received a brief update on the restructuring committee and discussed the contribution of being a college for clearly identifying areas of excellence or uniqueness. The Council is invited to a focus group session with Lipman Hearne, the marketing/communications firm that was hired to help NAU with its image. The letter that will accompany distribution of the Strategic Plan was circulated.

2. Campus Planning Sessions

The sessions were completed in mid-December and all the feedback is now available on line. The comments run to 63 pages, but because they are broken down by session, people can sample the comments they are most interested in reading. The Council gave final approval for the Executive Summary and discussed distribution of the comments to the campus. It was felt that using the President's page, or at least a memo from the President might get more attention.

Sarah Bickel, Chuck Connell, David Bousquet and Pat Haeuser will form a work group to begin to propose a process and materials for beginning the new round of updating the Strategic Plan and Priorities. The goal should be to get something out to the campus that allows the campus time to react before leaving for summer.

3. 2004-2009 Strategic Plan – letter; Bulla suggestions for 2005-2010 revision

Some additional areas to include in next year's strategic plan were identified.

4. Characteristics of Excellence in Undergraduate Education

Pat distributed a copy of last year's Undergraduate Consolidated Accountability Report showing common measures for the three universities. Further edits of the Characteristics document were briefly discussed.

Strategic Planning Council Minutes

February 6, 2004

BAC 206

Attending: Pat Haeuser, Janessa Bailey, Sarah Bickel, Charles Connell, Jack Dustman, Fred Estrella, Mason Gerety, Fred Hurst, Stan Lindstedt, Dave Lorenz, MJ McMahon, Ramona Mellott
Guest: Karen Underhill

- 1. Planning Environment Update.** MJ briefed the Council on the plans for increasing tuition. After much discussion NAU decided not to request fees for the health center, IT, etc. There was discussion of student concerns about last year's tuition increase, and how the additional revenue was used. The Council heard a short update on the Restructuring Committee's timetable for releasing their report, and an overview on the Regents' timetable for considering changes in the funding formula. NAU will be requesting changes that provide "catch up" or disproportionate funding for the next budget request and increased funding for lower division undergraduate enrollments thereafter. The Council briefly discussed the Environmental Sustainability Plan and saw it as a good example of the type of planning which the Council can integrate with university-level planning.
- 2. Action plan for Strategic Planning Council Work.** Pat distributed a proposal for Strategic Planning Council work for the rest of the year, and an outline of what might be accomplished next year. It was suggested that the Council's immediate task is to focus on revising the goals, strategic directions and university priorities. A proposed timeline is to distribute Strategic Plan revisions to the university in April through regular governance and administrative channels, giving faculty, staff and students one more opportunity to comment on changes. The Council would then finalize changes by the end of May.

The action plan also proposed that the Council begin a process asking responsible units to identify initiatives/actions/objectives to achieve the goals and strategic directions. For example, asking the Vice President of Enrollment Management to identify the more detailed plans to increase and management enrollment, and asking the Provost and Deans to develop an academic plan. This needs further discussion at upcoming meetings. Also on the task list is further development of the outcome/accountability measures for the Strategic Plan goals and priorities.

- 3. Updating the Strategic Plan Goals.** Pat distributed a document title Current Goals/Strategic Directions/University Priorities with definitions and color coding to show the relationships between these elements of strategic planning. The Council concentrated first on suggestions for revising the eight goals. One of the issues voiced is whether the goals should be generic enough to be inclusive of the whole university or should focus on unique NAU strengths. Pat will outline the questions/concerns as a starting point for the next meeting.

Strategic Planning Council Minutes

February 27, 2004

BAC 206

Attending: John Haeger, Chair; Pat Haeuser, Joshua Allen, David Bousquet, Charles Connell, Jack Dustman, Mason Gerety, Liz Grobsmith, Fred Hurst, Stan Lindstedt, Dave Lorenz, MJ McMahon, Tom McPoil, Ramona Mellott
Guests: Karen Underhill, Marsha Yowell, Sam Wheeler

- 1. Planning Environment Update.** NAU's students have proposed a tuition increase of \$350, and John outlined reasons why NAU needs the full \$475 increase. Also upcoming at the Board meeting in March will be another study session on funding. The recovery of Spring Distributed Learning enrollments (up over fall and up over last spring) is good news.
- 2. Restructuring Plan.** The restructuring plan is now public, and the series of meetings with the campus to discuss the plans have begun. Four member of the Council served on the Restructuring task force (Mason Gerety, Stan Lindstedt, Ramona Mellott, and Tom McPoil).

The Council discussed questions of concern. Some of the questions discussed included which plan best supported our undergraduate education mission, what has been the experience of other institutions merging colleges, and how will individuals from the proposed merged colleges will explore merger implications. A set of *frequently asked questions* is being developed and should be available by the first campus forum on March 5th. Council members who served on the restructuring committee talked about the committee's research and rationales for the plans. Members discussed possible management efficiencies, interdisciplinary benefits, and how the restructuring fits into overall enrollment planning for the university.

It was decided that the Strategic Planning Council would present recommendations to the Provost and President, but not formally endorse one plan or the other. A meeting was set for Friday, March 5th to hold a special session to develop the recommendations. *This meeting was later cancelled because so few members could attend.*

- 3. Updating the Strategic Plan Goals/Strategic Directions/University Priorities.** The Council decided to make only minor changes in the Strategic Plan Goals and Strategic Directions for 2005, and focus on updating the University Priorities and developing reports and measures of what has been accomplished.

Strategic Planning Council Minutes

March 26, 2004

BAC 206

Attending: John Haeger, Chair; Pat Haeuser, Joshua Allen, Janessa Bailey, Charles Connell, Jack Dustman, Fred Estrella, Mason Gerety, Liz Grobsmith, Fred Hurst, Stan Lindstedt, MJ McMahon, Ramona Mellott
Guests: Karen Underhill, Sam Wheeler, Regent Calderon

- 1. Planning Environment Update.** The tuition proposal for an increase of \$475 was approved at the Board of Regents meeting. Regent Calderon attended part of the Council meeting and said he hoped this was the last of the large tuition increases. The Council discussed various “truth in tuition” plans that other states and universities are trying, with an interest to analyze the implications and outcomes of some of the plans. The Board of Regents also considered possible funding formula changes, and John distributed a copy of the powerpoint that NAU presented. The State’s funding of NAU and pay plans are still unclear for FY05.
- 2. Restructuring Plan.** The Council spent the remainder of the meeting discussing its recommendation for restructuring. The easel notes from that discussion follow. A small group composed of Josh Allen, Chuck Connell, and Fred Estrella will meet with Pat to develop a draft set of recommendations for Council revisions.
- 3. Updating the University Priorities.** Pat distributed a draft of what might become the updated university priorities. It is very sketchy and Council members are asked to work on it for the next meeting.

Strategic Planning Easel Notes March 26, 2004

Two camps on professional schools – that the schools have unique demands and that they share common issues, requirements and learning processes.

Plan A could be modified so a consortium of professional schools is combined for a short list of functions

Merger of professional schools works on the notion of the “whole person”; students see what they have in common, as well as the differences from other professions.

Difficult because it means combining schools with very different missions – graduate/undergraduate, research versus teaching, etc.

Students in the school of Communication are against the restructuring; so we need to explain what issues will affect students and how far down the restructuring will go.
Concern that faculty will affect student morale; if we force the faculty, they will retaliate and pass bad feelings onto students, which will effect enrollment and student morale.

Culture change is a hurdle.

Restructuring is a way to solve the underlying problem of variance; all faculties do not have access to the same resources

Restructuring will not mean necessarily that programs will get more resources, if a state budget cut happens, it will happen regardless of restructuring

Structure we have now is arbitrary and does not reflect a thoughtful structure

Restructuring plans do not consider that some of the colleges and schools are seen as effectively managed now

--but restructuring does not mean that the effective management will change.

Restructuring gets at the variances in fundraising, IT, etc.

One alternative is no academic restructuring; instead look to reducing middle managers, and let faculty suggest grouping plans that make sense to them. Let units merge if they want; get faculty buy-in. Do we want to chance enrollment declines because of mergers? We should want to do it with faculty saying this is the best for them, and is not imposed.

Regardless of the plan, the president and provost should use a convergence of feedback to tailor the ultimate plan.

Any plan needs to be looked at in relation to what the Strategic Plan says we should be doing

What will happen to “stepchild” school in mega-merges?

If there is a little savings, everyone will be better off in the long run

Where does the \$500,000 saved in the first year go?

Any restructuring plan should be used to identify what should colleges have in terms of

-development

-IT

-central planning

-good practices and effective organization

-quality of programs

Could address what colleges need by restructuring the central functions before doing academic restructuring.

We should identify what we are trying to accomplish, before just moving ahead.

The institution is affected by decentralization, with people focusing on what is good for their unit, and not what is good for the university. Restructuring can help us move to focusing on the whole university and university priorities. We can use resources more effectively.

Resources must be found to provide the support needed; there will be reallocations over time, and economies of scale.

We must ask, what will give us the best chance to move in the right directions, and restructuring will do that.

Need more information before we commit; should be able to address how various elements will work

Opportunities for feedback and fine-tuning will be there.