Strategic Planning Task Force Online Meeting April 8, 2020

In attendance: Stacee McIff, Carson Howell, Jay Olsen, LaFaun Barnhurst, Garth Sorenson, Lisa Jones, Katie Justesen, Marci Larsen, Alex Peterson, Andy Nogasky, Larry Smith, Ben Scheffner, Jacob Thomas, Paula Robison, Jeff Sirrine, Mike Brenchley, Karen Johnson, Ryan Yorgason, Janalee Jeffery, Kade Parry, Barbara Dalene, Melanie Jenkins, Michael Huff, Fernando Montano, Teri Clawson, Emily Peterson

Absent: Matt Green, Jeff Reynolds, and Paul Tew

The meeting was called to order at 12:30 pm.

Survey Results and Discussion

Prior to the meeting, task force members received a list of the top 20 strategies from our survey. Carson said it is not surprising, given our current situation, that the top strategy pertains to technology and IT infrastructure. Marketing was also pretty high, particularly relating to CTE programs. Other strategies that ranked highly dealt with compensation, usability issues for students (how-to videos), and delivery methods for classes.

Task force members pointed out that some of the strategies on the survey are very similar to one another, and Carson said that we will consolidate some of the similar strategies. Carson said that we will leave the strategies survey open through today and then receive an updated list from Beckie. Once this group comes up with our list of top priorities, we will do an additional survey to the broader campus community to get their thoughts.

Carson asked the group for their thoughts on the survey and responses so far, and following thoughts were shared:

- Some of the items on the survey would require lots of work and long-term change, while others could be implemented in a short period of time. Some people prioritized the long-term items over the short-term ones, even though both were important. An example of a short-term strategy was revising the College Survival class. Stacee said that this is why we need to track all of the strategies, even the ones that don't make our top 20 list, because there are smaller things that we could still do.
- It might be a good idea to discuss strategies in terms of bigger themes (like marketing, technology, etc.). Once we've identified which of these themes should take priority, we can identify action items under each theme. Some people said they didn't vote for a strategy if it was already being worked on or if they had already voted for a similar strategy. They said that ranking larger themes instead of voting for smaller strategies may reveal the big-picture items that people think are the most important.
- Some were surprised that scholarships and advancement didn't rank higher. They said that scholarships need to be greater priority and need to be in our long-term plan.
- Personal bias had an impact on the survey results. People said they were more likely to select a strategy that would be personally beneficial to them.

• Stacee, Carson, and Emily have already classified each strategy into one of 16 categories, and Jay also developed a categorization system when he was voting, so we can use these two systems to classify all of the strategies into larger themes.

The group decided to proceed as planned with a strategy survey sent to our internal stakeholders (faculty, staff, student leadership), but the survey will be different from the list of individual strategies sent to the task force. Instead, participants will be asked to rank the larger themes, and the strategies will be listed under each theme so that respondents can see examples.

It was suggested that the survey include one comment box, where respondents can mention additional items.

Carson said we will revamp the survey ASAP using these broader categories and providing individual strategies as examples.

Stacee said that since all of the strategies are already categorized, we should be able to revise the survey and distribute it to stakeholders fairly quickly. We should be able to have feedback from this survey that we can discuss at next week's meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:10 p.m.