Strategic Planning at the Division Level

Erica Eckert, Assistant Dean, Assessment and Accreditation, Kent State University at Kent
AGENDA

- Introduction (this)
- SCUP Integrated Planning Model
- KSU’s EHHS Strategic Planning Process
- Communication Planning
- Scenario Planning Activity
- Questions?
Learning Outcomes

(Participants will be able to...)

1. Plan an inclusive and thoughtful strategic planning sequence (pre-planning through implementation).

2. Identify stakeholders to include in the pre-planning, early-planning, intermediate-planning, late-planning, and implementation stages.

3. Identify and prepare facilitators to engage strategic planning retreat participants in productive, imaginative, and open brainstorming and planning conversations.

4. Match communication planning about the planning process with institutional culture, norms, and expectations.
SCUP Integrated Planning Model

https://www.scup.org/planning-type/integrated-planning/
8-Campus system with approximately 39,000 students
Operates in northeastern quadrant of Ohio – many IHEs
University-wide strategic plan unveiled late 2015 (18 months into president’s term); 5 priorities:
- Students First
- Distinctive Kent State
- Global Competitiveness
- Regional Impact
- Organizational Stewardship
Dean of College of EHHS departs July 2015... two years with interim dean, new dean starts July 2017
Education, Health, and Human Service disciplines:
- **Educator preparation** (teacher licensure, K12 professionals)
- **Human services** (counseling, ASL/English interpreting human development, educational and school psychology)
- **Administration** (HIED administration, research methods, hospitality management, sport administration, recreation, park, and tourism management)
- **Health disciplines** (nutrition, exercise science, athletic training, speech language pathology & audiology)

- Second largest college at Kent State University
- KSU was founded as normal college, 1910
Comprised of 4 (fiercely independent) schools
Undergraduate and graduate programs
Declining enrollment in many programs
Responsibility-Centered budget model
Faculty contract upcoming (collective-bargaining)
Many competing institutions in area
Strengths in internationalization, student services, many programs recognized as “best in area”
Our Process

EHHS Self-Study (2017-2018)
- Critical data, documents
- Stakeholder survey/SOAR
- Alignment to KSU Strategic Priorities
- Review by external team

Planning Retreat (August 2018)
- 97 participants across 6 teams
- 11 PSD identified (24 w/overlap)

Feedback Cycle 1 (September 2018)
- 233 full responses to survey
- 20-50 comments per PSD
- 8 PSD after collapsing themes

Feedback Cycle 2 (Oct/Nov 2018)
- 79 participants additional feedback; 38 in person, 41 via survey

Refinement and Actions (2019)
- 4 Priorities emerged from feedback (formerly PSD)
- Priorities assigned strategies and action steps
Self Study & External Review

- College wide information
  - History/context
  - Enrollment trends
  - Counts of faculty, staff, students
  - Resources/budget
  - Organization structure, reporting units,
  - Committees and governance
  - Research funding, faculty support,
  - Survey results (climate, students, stakeholders (SOAR))
School and Administrative Unit Sections

- Focused version of college section, plus highlights, alignment to KSU priorities, school-specific policies
- Strengths, challenges, opportunities, and accomplishments

Review team of 3 deans from aspirant institutions

- Final report highlighted constraints and future concerns (RCM, KSU deficit, interim leadership, hiring restrictions)
- Focused on finances/sustainability, faculty workload, online education prospects, organizational structure, communications and marketing, research support, technology, student services
## Selecting Planning Retreat Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KSU Priority Area</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Participant Type</th>
<th>~%</th>
<th>EHHS Home</th>
<th>~%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students First</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EHHS Faculty</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>School – FLA</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>EHHS Admin.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>School – LDES</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>EHHS Student</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>School – HS</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Competitiveness*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EHHS Friend/Alumni</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>School – TLC</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Impact</td>
<td>20</td>
<td><em>External/Other</em></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Stewardship</td>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>KSU Partner</strong></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>~ Due to role overlap, these percentages are approximate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Planning team changed name to “Global and International Engagement”</td>
<td></td>
<td>~ Due to shifting roles/interactions, these percentages are approximate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning for Retreat (Leadership Retreat)

- Development of mission
- Issuing “the charge” (purpose, on/off table items)
- Evaluation of readiness for change
- Determination of planning structures, groups
- Discussion of modes of communication, expectations for documentation and participation
- Miniature SP retreat (stakeholder, STEEP, and SWOT analysis at high level)
Balance and invitation of participants
Identification of important issues to study (via interviews, readings; informed by Leadership Retreat)
Extensive training of facilitators (6)
Gathering of supplies, claiming space (logistics!)
Communication Planning

Goal: Reinforcing the idea that this truly is an open process through transparency and wide inclusion.

- Identify expectations within organization’s culture
- Email messaging to invitees, whole college
- Web presence (even if nobody goes to the site)
- Thank you notes, calls
- *Balancing anonymity and authorship*
August Retreat

- All the details matter: Nametags, labeling, food
- Kickoff: Clarifying purpose, ground rules
  - Positive interaction ground rules, dominance management
  - Informing vs. writing the plan
  - Group ideas move forward, not individual ideas
- All-day activities with variety
  - Pre-retreat reading critical for productivity
  - Brainstorming, games, expertise, creativity, and stickies
DISTILLING INFORMATION

- Post-retreat (within a week)
  - The power of artifact-generation
  - The power of immediate notetaking
  - The power of cross-pollination

- 6 teams generated 24 “potential strategic directions”

- The 24 PSDs became 11, then 8

- Member-checking the outcomes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Teams’ Aligned Potential Strategic Directions (24 Original Proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11 Potential Strategic Directions</strong>&lt;br&gt;(from original 24 by planning teams)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability for Student Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration (Internal, External)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (Internal, External)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship, Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Being</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal: Getting the maximum amount of authentic engagement possible from faculty, staff, partners, friends, etc.

- Personalized emails for survey invitations
- Feedback sessions at multiple locations/times
- The power of yanking people out of their offices
- *Balancing anonymity and authorship*
**Feedback Cycle 1 (September)**

- **Survey:** 233 responses, 20-50 comments per PSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Strategic Direction (11 Presented on Survey)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability for Student Success</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration (Internal, External)</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Culture</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (Internal, External)</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship, Sustainability</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Excellence</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Infrastructure</td>
<td>4.02 (Faculty)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Being</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 11 Potential Strategic Directions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8 Potential Strategic Directions (from 11 on survey; combinations and College Culture absorption)</th>
<th>Students First</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Global and International Engagement</th>
<th>Regional Impact</th>
<th>Organizational Stewardship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration and Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (Internal, External)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship, Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Excellence and Accountability for Success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback Cycle 2 (October/November)

- Four in-person sessions (38 participants); posters, notes, cards
- Cycle 2: Survey used as backup to in-person sessions (41 participants)

Research Infrastructure

In order to enhance the research climate, the planning team identified a need for additional infrastructure as well as the reconsideration of existing structures. Team members described a need for more resources (more funding, along with pre-award and post-award support), a formal mechanism for collaboration and mentoring (interdisciplinary, intercolleague, intracolleague), as well as looking at the structure of faculty roles to enable greater success.

Survey feedback indicated specific concerns about workload and competing priorities, and a desire for more support for grants, mid-career faculty, and travel. The survey responses indicated concern around removal of GA support, the reward structure for interdisciplinary research, IRB and Research Bureau infrastructure, and feeling undervalued.

Most of the survey feedback centered on workload concerns (teaching loads and a lack of reward for advising doctoral students) and competing priorities. By focusing resources and energy in this direction, the college can identify and implement additional mechanisms to support faculty as they increase faculty research productivity and raise the research profile of the college.
Goal: Getting people excited about the plan by seeing their involvement reflected in the plan.

- Public release at college-wide meeting
- Visually-pleasing documents
- Executive summary vs. details
Leadership Team Theme Reduction (Jan-April)

Values vs. Priorities (working in concert)

4 Priorities (from 8 PSDs):
1. Students First
2. Communications and Community-Building
3. Global Engagement
4. Research Stature and Reputation

Announced at college-wide meeting May 10, 2019
Goal: Getting the word out, accomplishing plan

- Work still ongoing – website: https://www.kent.edu/ehhs/ehhs-strategic-plan
- Hotcards/graphics, long-form booklet in process
- Discussion of plan with advancement personnel
- Creation of reporting templates to keep the plan in the minds of offices, committees, programs
Strategic Planning
Activity Scenarios

The Society for College and University Planning
1. Community college with multiple sites; serves minority, adult, and first-generation populations and also serves as primary feeder to another institution

2. Small, private liberal arts college with strong traditions, active alumni, and in major financial trouble and suffering from declining enrollment

3. Nursing College (stand-alone) that recently changed leaders, received transformational gift

4. Regional public university that is focused on teaching, serving area employers, and is saddled with extreme deferred maintenance
1. How will you organize your planning team(s)? How large?
2. Who should you invite? Who or what groups are “must-have?” Think internally and externally.
3. How will you organize the process? (Theme/priority groupings, open structure?)
4. How much guidance will you give the planning team(s)?
5. How will you solicit input from wider range of stakeholders? When will you solicit that input?
6. How do you identify the best mode of communication?
7. How will you communicate ongoing work to community (however defined)?
Where KSU Could Have Improved

1. More email communication
2. More personal contact
3. Newsletters or bulletins
4. Greater inclusion of students
5. Stronger self-study advice from visiting team
Please email me at eeckert@kent.edu (or leave a card) for templates and document ideas

- Readiness for change questions
- Survey collection format
- Documents related to retreat planning

Questions, comments?