

Template for College of Engineering Performance Planning Process

The bullets below describe the College of Engineering (CoE) strategic/business planning process that resulted in the development of the *CoE Performance Plan 2007*, entitled “*Excellence, Impact and Innovation – Advancing a Legacy of Learning and Leadership.*” This 3-5 year rolling plan provides a detailed roadmap for advancing the CoE’s vision and mission in support of the University’s *Academic Plan*.

- A “Portfolio Assessment” was developed by each academic unit that summarized key information about the unit. This self-study/assessment included an overview of the unit, a situation analysis (mission and vision, 5 year summary of key metrics and an analysis of strengths/weaknesses/ opportunities/threats (SWOT) for primary unit enterprises). In addition, five directive questions were answered regarding unit core competencies and strategic directions (see detailed outline below).
- A Leadership Retreat of CoE Executive Committee (EC) was held during which the following activities were performed.
 - A tutorial/discussion on strategic planning concepts and processes, innovation and creativity, and on leading change was facilitated by the Dean utilizing materials from previous academic, non-profit, and industry strategic planning processes and from leadership/planning seminars presented by the Dean. Additional information incorporated into the tutorial was obtained from *Built to Last* and *Good to Great* by Jim Collins, *The Art of the Long View* by Peter Schwartz, *Leading Change* by John Kotter and *The Engineer of 2020* by the National Academy of Engineering.
 - In the context of the University’s *Academic Plan*, the Executive Committee reviewed and revised the CoE vision and mission, and defined six overarching goals that would provide the framework for the planning process and ultimately for the *CoE Performance Plan*.
 - The Executive Committee also discussed the establishment of major “stakes in the ground” for the CoE; ultimately, these evolved into signature, interdisciplinary research focus areas.
- Six working groups comprised of CoE faculty and staff were established for each overarching goal (e.g., growing research, increasing diversity, optimizing administration and operations). Each group was led by a faculty member and closely supported by a senior staff member from the Dean’s Office. For each overarching goal, the working groups performed a SWOT analysis and identified, articulated and prioritized specific sub-goals, strategies, implementation actions, metrics and internal and external funding/resource requirements (human resources, programs and facilities) to accomplish each goal in a 3-5 year time frame, with a strong contextual emphasis on innovation, globalization and non-incremental advancement. The Dean met with each group at the onset of the process in order to review the overall planning process, and subsequently met with the committee chairs, support staff, and group members on an as-required basis to review progress. Each group developed a

10/1/07

written report and a Powerpoint presentation that described their analysis and recommendations. Note that the Research working group, which identified and developed comprehensive plans for CoE Key Research Focus Areas, performed their activity in parallel with the University Targeted Investment in Excellence proposal development activity.

- The six working groups met collectively in a one-day “cross-cutting” session at which each group presented their analysis and recommendations, discussed joint activities, common issues, etc., and constructively critiqued the analyses and recommendations of other groups. Through coordination with the TIE activity, collaborations with other colleges across campus were incorporated into the recommendations.
- The Dean met with each academic unit faculty and staff, in a faculty meeting, to review the CoE vision and mission, planning process and the recommendations of each working group. Powerpoint presentations of each working group were made available to all faculty, staff, students and other stakeholders on the CoE web page. Feedback on the draft recommendations was incorporated into the draft working group reports.
- Working group chairs presented their draft analysis and recommendations to the Dean’s External Strategy Council, which provided significant feedback and input, particularly regarding the need to schedule and expedite implementation and to develop detailed metrics.
- The draft *Performance Plan*, with a focus on analysis and recommendations related to Undergraduate Education, was presented to leaders of CoE student organizations for their discussion and input. The *Plan* provided specific information supporting benefits of implementing a CoE Program Fee that would begin in Fall, 2007.
- Working with a communications consultant, the working group reports were consolidated and refined into a comprehensive *Performance Plan* document for both internal use and external distribution. Progress in implementation of the *Plan* is provided quarterly through the CoE web page in the *Performance Plan Update*, (<http://www.eng.ohio-state.edu/performanceplan/>) and will be annually described in a *Performance Planning Report Card*.
- As a 3-5 year rolling plan, the *Performance Plan* is reviewed each Fall, updated, reviewed by the faculty and staff, and utilized to drive the subsequent fiscal year budget process. The Dean meets with each unit to review *Plan* progress, proposed updates, etc., in late Fall Quarter or early Winter Quarter.
- During AY07/08, the CoE is requiring all of its units to develop strategic/performance plans that define a specific unit vision and mission, and that develops and describes unit goals, strategies, actions and metrics/schedule that align with and support the CoE *Performance Plan* and University *Academic Plan*. This faculty-engaged process, which is being conducted during fall and winter quarters, will include a cross-cutting meeting where unit leaders present their draft plans to each other in order to identify opportunities for collaboration, gaining of efficiencies, etc.. The draft unit plans will also be reviewed by external stakeholders.

Department of (Unit Name)

Portfolio Assessment

1. Introduction and Overview of Unit Portfolio

2. Situation Analysis

Mission and Vision (*if they exist*), Overarching Goals/Objectives (5)

Scope and Metrics (Refer to Table) (*5 year summary: degree programs - enrollment/ graduation information; FTE faculty, FTE staff; research expenditures; PBA. This summary table will be provided by the College Office.*)

Strengths, Weaknesses, Preliminary Goals (5-10 years) of Unit Enterprises

- Undergraduate Education
- Research and Graduate Education
- Fostering Scientific and Technological Innovation
- Outreach and Engagement
- Other (Education of the Working Professional)

Competition (*Discuss ranking and reputation, including changes*)

Challenges: Cultural, Organizational, Operational, Political, Fiscal (*e.g., imparting sense of urgency, value in strategic planning/implementation, achieving proper faculty and staff size, infrastructure requirements, etc.*)

3. Directive Questions (*Think strategically, 5+ year time frame*)

Define the intellectual/operational core(s) in your overall discipline or unit. (*e.g., in ECE, microelectronics, communications, control and automation, etc., in CEE, structures, geotechnical, computational mechanics, ITS*). *Could be cross-cutting, (e.g., computational modeling and simulation, innovation in educational pedagogies, etc.)*

In which core areas are we in a national leadership position, and set the standard?

In which core areas of importance and priority do we have the strengths necessary to move to leadership?

What core areas (particularly new areas) are so vital that we must create a presence and leadership?

What areas must we be willing to transform or give up in order to focus resources?

10/1/07