

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
3:00 p.m., Tuesday, May 13, 2008
Council Room, 250 Student Union

AGENDA:

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of the April 8, 2008, Minutes
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Special Report: Overview of Programs and Objectives in the Office of Institutional Diversity — Cornell Thomas (10 minutes)
Special Report: Recommendations from the Wellness Summit — Robin Purdie (10 minutes)
5. Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations:
President Hargis, Provost Strathe, and/or Vice Presidents
6. (a) Report of Response to OSU-Tulsa Degree Program Request – Carol Moder
(b) OSU-Tulsa Degree Programs – Gary Trennepohl
7. Reports of Standing Committees:
 - a. Academic Standards and Policies: Brad Bays – Year-End Report
 - b. Athletics: Kris Giles – Year-End Report
 - c. Budget: John Veenstra – Year-End Report
 - d. Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security: Ken Clinkenbeard – Year-End Report
 - e. Faculty: David Yellin – Year-End Report
 - f. Long-Range Planning and Information Technology: Khaled Gasem – Year-End Report
Recommendation: Development of an OSU Strategic Planning Process*
 - g. Research: Joe Bidwell – Year-End Report
 - h. Retirement and Fringe Benefits: Bruce Russell – Update and Year-End Report
 - i. Rules and Procedures: Brian Carter – Year-End Report
 - j. Student Affairs and Learning Resources: Beulah Hirschlein – Year-End Report
8. Reports of Liaison Representatives
9. Old Business
Conflict of Commitment Ad Hoc Report
10. New Business
Introduction of New Faculty Council Members who take office June 1
11. Adjournment

Refreshments will be served at 2:45 p.m.

***LRPIT Recommendation below**

	Amended By	Passed	Failed
Recommendation No. <u>08-05-01-LRPIT</u>	1. _____	_____	_____
Moved By: <u>Long-Range Planning & IT Committee</u>	2. _____	_____	_____
Seconded By: _____	3. _____	_____	_____
<u> </u> Passed <u> </u> Tabled <u> </u> Failed	4. _____	_____	_____
Title: <u>Development of an OSU Strategic Planning Process</u>			

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Hargis that: OSU develop a strategic planning process that:

1. Articulates broad institutional goals that are formulated collectively by all the stakeholders -- **(themes)**
2. Requires the colleges in consultation with their respective units to develop goals and priorities to actualize the articulated goals of OSU -- **(implementation plans)**
3. Reconciles (realistically balances) OSU resources with the strategic planning priorities -- **(resources)**
4. Maintains an academic ledger that reflects the strategic planning deliverables -- **(monitoring)**
5. Informs the stakeholders and the public through the OSU Annual Report on strategic planning milestones and accomplishments -- **(accountability)**
6. Enhances the visibility of our institution -- **(visibility)**

Rationale

Discussions with faculty and members of the OSU administration lead us to conclude that the current strategic planning process is ineffective. Following are some of the contributing factors:

1. The external facilitator for the planning process did not fully appreciate the academic environment at OSU.
2. Although some time was allotted for plans to be developed at the unit and college level, the final product was a narrative developed by the President's office to be adopted at all levels. As such, the strategic plan lacked sense of ownership by the faculty. Their input was perceived by many as token participation for a set agenda.
3. The planning process did not specify the planning period nor did it provide any projections for the resources that would be available for that period.
4. The academic ledger, which was developed to monitor progress, has poor connectivity with the mission and goals of the units and the strategic planning deliverables. Further, many of the metrics used in the ledger are in need of some revision. Nevertheless, the academic ledger was used by the Provost and the Vice Presidents to monitor trends and in some aspects of budget planning.

5. Lacking an effective strategic plan and implementation plans across all levels, OSU activities and budget allocation beyond routine operations were guided by the President's directives. Specifically, the strategic plans had little, if any, influence on decision making on the unit level.

The call for strategic planning was a wise decision to fulfill a pressing need. As an institution, OSU cannot afford random-walk type processes for achieving its mission as a land-grant university. However, the approach undertaken and the structure adopted for the OSU strategic plans were both lacking.

Effective strategic planning demands strategic thinking that leads to strategic management. We have had some elements of strategic thinking; however, we still need to develop the processes for strategic management.

Therefore, the LRP&IT Committee decided to offer its recommendations on how best to evolve our current planning process to one that meets the following general guidelines:

1. Strategic planning should be viewed as a continuous institutional process.
2. Strategic planning is a collective process based on honest and open dialog among all the stakeholders.
3. Strategic planning should be conducted for a definite time period and a projected resource amount.
4. Implementation plans should evolve *upwardly* from the unit, to the college, then to the institution.
5. Clear procedures for accountability should be in place. Performance metrics for evaluating progress toward specific unit goals should be proposed by the relevant units, in consultation with the appropriate college and university officers.
6. The strategic plans and the outcomes should be evaluated systematically to assure continuous improvement.

Some examples for the broad institutional themes may include:

1. A land-grant university mission that promotes access to a high-quality, empowering education.
2. A scholarly mission that permeates all disciplines across all levels of academe: undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate.
3. A service mission of a land-grant university in all pertinent fields, including agriculture, engineering, human development, education, information technology.
4. A diversity mission encompassing all aspects of the enterprise: people, ideas, methods, etc.
5. A mission that calls for OSU to be a catalyst for economic growth in Oklahoma.