



Challenges and Opportunities Subcommittee Meeting
1/28/22

The meeting was called to order at 1:02pm by Dr. Brian Payne. This meeting is being recorded, like last week's meeting, and will be available in the team's folder. Present were: Dr. Brian Payne, Dr. Melva Grant,

Collectively, we had great discussion about our process and framework. Dr. Melva Grant and I touched base a couple of times afterwards to discuss and continue to think about how we are moving forward.

One of the things I forgot to mention last week that I did allude to in the email was that out of the 24, 25, 26 of us, just six said we prefer to meet in person. And when thinking about the logistics of getting those six together in person and having 20 on zoom it seems much easier if we just continue to meet via zoom.

Before we get to the agenda, there were a couple of editorial suggestion changes to last week's minutes and those will be made. Are there any other changes to the minutes? Prof. Jin Hailstork said she was at last week's meeting – was late due to a prior commitment but attended and asked her name be added. Dr. Payne said she would be added. Anything else? Hearing no objection we will consider them approved.

As a reminder this is the same slide we saw last week that we've been identified by someone who knows us very well and respects us very much. We're the folks across campus – the leaders were asked to identify people who serve on a strategic plan subcommittee and we were identified by someone to earn that role, and we've been selected to essentially look at everything that's going on at ODU, as well as in higher ed across the country. We should figure out what the challenges and opportunities are and spend the next several weeks working fast, but that timeline just as you recall, and this is where we are right now.

Today we're planning on having baseline discussions about our subgroups and what they will be doing. We will also set aside time to break out into our subgroups and get everyone started.

You will see that next week we are going to be reviewing the external focus groups. The focus group team coming out of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness have done 12 focus groups and are doing three to five today – depending on how many show up. Some will have a total of 15 to 17 focus groups probably around 70 to 75 external partners. What I've listened to so far, the feedback that you all provided last week about changing the question some was very, very helpful. We asked, what could stop us from reaching our goals? What are you not getting from us that you need? We're getting excellent feedback there. I think it will be very useful for our group.



We ended the focus group by asking them to write down on a note card – what do they think of us. I will type them up and share them with all of you next week so you know what 70-75 think of us. Some people don't participate in focus groups and I'm willing to talk to those individually. Some will also get the questions electronically and we hope to get additional feedback from them.

Based upon our conversations about our assumptions last week, we changed our challenges/opportunities a bit. All of us matter and our voices matter. It was stressed to think Big! And when we think about opportunities, we need to think big. We are doing random samples or any type of statistical analysis. We are doing very practical efforts to identify our challenges and efforts. We also want to be open to diverse ways of knowing and finding out information realizing we're going to be flexible.

Also a reminder that we want an equal number of challenges and opportunities as we have our discussions. It is easy to talk about the roadblocks, but more important to think about how we're going to get through them.

Domain for Challenges/ Opportunities	Subgroup					
	Student Success	Research	Human Resources	Infrastructure	Community Engagement	Financial
Political						
Demographics and diversity						
Economic						
Technological						
Competition						
Global						
Local Environment						
Equity/Inclusion						
Budgetary Concerns						
Human Capital	Consider for each domain how these relate? These are inward focused. Blue are outward					
Hazard, Safety, Legal						
Operational						
Compliance/ Privacy						
Strategy						
Reputational						
Enrollment Management						

You recall that we shared with you the subgroups and the domains last week and we made a couple of little tweaks. We will break up into the subgroups and if we need to spend a half hour,



45 minutes on talking through them as a group. There are a couple of different things that we want to talk through – one is when we talk about how do we operationalize these domains? When we say that we’re interested in the challenges and opportunities from a political dimension, what exactly does that mean when we talk about demographics and diversity.

Another conversation we want to have is that we don’t want to put ourselves in a situation where the subgroups feel like they have to explore each of those domains because of them may not be relevant for your particular subgroup.

Some will be relevant for every subgroup, and we want to identify which ones these are and focus on them.

Professor Anil Nair commented that demographics certainly has an advantage as it’s a little more predictable than some of the other domains. We know what’s coming down the pike and I think we can prepare accordingly. It is a factor that will have a significant impact on enrollment, for example, so you know what we do in response to that right. Do we go more out of state, do we go international because the demographic issue seems to be a nationwide issue – it’s not just a Virginia issue the cliff that we all have talked about.

NOAA posted some of this data, we also looked at it in our department strategic plan so I posted it on teams – it’s interesting to see the shift that is coming in our next five or six years. So I wonder whether we should expand our international presence.

Demographics is one that we all have to be concerned about. Political is something we all have don’t have to focus on – you know that policies just sharpen one administration that comes in. Those are contingencies that we will have to plan for and what if there is a flip and no differentiation comes in, with a different approach to higher ed and which believes in a bigger role for prioritization. What do we do in response to that? I think the purpose of a plan is to kind of consider all these issues so definitely they all matter.

Professor Jin Hailstork said we may need to further define what the political means. It’s not clear at all, what do we mean by political in terms of student’s exercise in the research or human resources. We need to think more clearly about what political means.

Ms. Nadine Faulcon-Johnson commented that in terms of political, one aspect is from you know the legislation like a Anil stated that may be coming down the line in the implications of any type of legislation on a university as it relates to each one of these sub groups so that’s one way to look at it. If we’re going to look to define what political means it can mean a different thing.

Dr. Stuart Henderson mentioned on of the key things on the political is the category of legislation is in terms of federal research dollars. I’m think specifically about the research



column. There are trends that drive research investment across federal agencies and that's key for us to think about likewise. As we speak there are a number of very significant pieces of legislation on the hill being debated around like massive increases in the National Science Foundation, Department of Energy and other agencies.

Dr. Nair said some of that also reflects socio cultural kind of trends. We don't have that as a domain, but I think some of the political shifts is also a reflection of the control solution shifts so sustainability is an issue that seems to be very strongly trending and an environmental issue when corporations are not concerned about environment governance and the political, mental health implications eventually play out in form of legislation but also research dollars – watching these big trends and how we can consider those as opportunities, I think, is the way to go. I think our university has done a good job in watching some of these trends like sea level rise, we did a pretty good job of being there and establishing our presence so likewise looking at some big trends impact and politics and there an impact on resource allocation and legislation will help us prepare for each of these opportunities and challenges.

I think for example polarization may also mean when it's not my area of concern, but you know some debates become very sensitive and how is the university going to be prepared for those kinds of issues, the challenges that may post for academic freedom I don't now that may come into some of the research and community engagement categories.

Dean Khan Iftakharuddin wondered if politics also has implications in student enrollment, finance, and all other domains. Just to give an example, last week The Center made a case for H and B visa for stem graduates to be able to stay for three years in this country after graduation – that will definitely affect international enrollment in graduate programs across the U.S.

Politics also definitely know each year how the budget affects us every year that then that, in turn affects every operation of the University, any university. Politics affects you and how funding will be allocated to different target groups across the U.S. and within the state.

Dr. Nair said he doesn't think that we're looking at five years, at least, it will be one change in the federal level, possibly, and one at the state level. There is a new angle that we see in the U.S. right now because of the political parties now being what they are – a shift that happens each time during the tenure of this strategic plan, we can anticipate. Are we going to be more in a deprived situation or in terms of resources or enrich your situation, so I think we need to be prepared for that and have contingencies in place.

Dr. Payne encouraged the group to think about, too, is it just a little bigger than the laws and the legislation and that but just the political atmosphere and attitude and philosophy about higher ed and it's been changing and higher ed isn't because of that philosophy. Because of that philosophy we hear different discussions about retention progression graduation, and the

importance of graduation rates and which degrees matter and all of those sorts of things I think if we operationalize the political to pinpoint question it's about legislation, it's about federal trends in terms of research dollars, and just overall political fault philosophy. I wonder if there's other ones that you look at and wonder what the heck does that mean for my particular group.

Dr. Henderson mentioned the one labeled trends is potentially all encompassing because, of course, there's social trends, and there's all the things we were talking about in the political realm that can mean many, many things I assume we take that one in that spirit.

Dr. Payne said he'd defer to others.

Dr. Nancy Vandecar-Burdin agreed and thought maybe for the psychological benefit of reducing a domain we should obviously think all of these things include trends so maybe that kind of is what Dr. Henderson was saying.

One question I had for the others is just a little bit more about what people think for operational. That seems kind of very big, broad and vague to me – that may just be me.

Dr. Payne deferred to Mr. Rob Wells, saying this is one that Risk Management uses and it may be one that doesn't apply to everyone, but how we might make it apply to several of the areas. Could you talk a little about that?

Mr. Wells defined operational as anything that's within your normal practice of how things go. Whether it's your buses moving around campus, or how you onboard new employees, how you onboard new students – all of those operational aspects that come into play here.

While Mr. Wells was looking for more information Dr. Payne asked competition – what does that mean?

Professor Helen Crompton mentioned it's kind of clear like research what's our competition, who are we kind of – for all the others as well as student success, how do we get students in against other universities. So it kind of fits clearly to me, but what do other people think.

Dr. Henderson agreed saying you have to understand the competitive environment I which you're operating in order to think about strategy because there's competition in all of these categories.

Professor Crompton stated which then goes into the one I've been looking at strategy that can be read in so many different ways. It can be strategies and political strategy and strategy for demographics and diversity. It could be another one like trends – should it be a separate one?



Dr. Nair said it makes sense, though, because strategy would be our response to all of these domains, we look at the political changes, we look at the competition, we look at our operations issues all the way up to say student place when you look at the entire spectrum of operation. Here is how we are going to respond to changes in the environment and our own internal capabilities and weaknesses, so the strategy becomes like our response to these domains. That's the way I look at it and we can, of course, assess the current reputation and the current strategy.

Professor Crompton said so when we do each of these we are providing those challenges and recommendations, and the recommendations would be our strategy. So do we need strategy as a separate one in that case?

Dr Nair said one possibility could be to assess the current strategy that we have for student success. We say okay how successful have we been with that strategy, does it need to be revised? So then our strategic plan would be building on whatever we had, whatever strategy maybe that is the way we look at it. But eventually the outcome of both the blue and the green should be our strategic plan.

Mr. Wells agreed with that and mentioned as he looks at the compliance category that there are a lot that ends to fall into the political realm as well, because there are a lot of agency requirement in those types of situations. Political can probably be broken down into the political environment and also what types of compliance issues fall within that, but compliance isn't necessarily just political, there are also campus compliance issues that you have to deal with as well.

So getting back to the operational, just to give you an example, one of the operations risks that we had challenges that we identified earlier in my groups work was event safety spectator control and we had to try to come up with a plan to manage it. That's with whether it be with Spectra managing our football operations and basketball operations down to as much as when we have somebody doing a 5K on the campus. So those are types of operational challenges that we have and then we have building access and security challenges, you know we are behind in our security process, you know we don't have card swipes on all of our buildings. That's another operational challenge that we identified. There's a multitude but that's just to give you an example of the things that we've identified in the past.

More discussion was held on the subgroups and domains and Dr. Nair thought the green area should be considered for each domain and how they relate. These are inward focused. The blue area is outward focused (as noted on chart above).

The committee was broken into subgroups as noted below and asked to continue the discussion

1-Community Engagement	2-Human Resources	3-Infrastructure	4-Finance	5-Student Success	6-Research
David Bowles	Anil Nair	Annamarie Ginder	Harry Smithson	Christian Wilson	Helen Crompton
Deborah Krzyzaniak	Nadine Johnson	John Hasher	John Nunnery	Chris Fleming	Krzysztof Rechowicz
Jess Whitehead	Tancy Burdin	Rachel Asare	Khan Iftekharuddin	Deondre Wise	Jin Hailstork
Malissa Beall		Rob Wells	Teresa Kissel	Sam Palmucci	Stuart Henderson
				Vicki Carnegie	John Nunnery

as far as the domains and which ones would be most relevant for your particular subgroup.

The committee regrouped at approximately 2:30pm and Dr. Grant asked who the meetings went, were they fairly productive, did you work out the whole dimensions thing, were you able to make heads or tails of that? I'm sure it made a lot more sense in your groups. Discussion was held on subgroup progress.

Dr. Grant asked if anyone had any additional data needs they could help address. Subgroups will contact Dr. Grant and/or Dr. Payne separately for data needs.

We are putting information in the teams folder. Please visit the folder. It would be helpful to have it there for everyone to read.

Dr. Grant and Dr. Payne will come up with a template for each of the subgroups so that the feedback will be consistent.

Meeting ended at 2:53pm.