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Introduction
A workshop on Collaborative Strategic Planning was held in the Multipurpose Room at the University Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES) on September 9-10, 2010 attended by 33 members of UMES 2011-2016 Strategic Plan Steering Committee members including the Chair and Co-Chairs, Vice Presidents, Deans, Professors, Directors, Members of the Board of Visitors, the President of the Student Government Association, and staff (see Appendix 1). The workshop was facilitated by Dr. Patrick Sanaghan, President, the Sanaghan Group. The purpose was to prepare members for the task of designing the 2011-2016 UMES Strategic Plan. Summary notes from the workshop proceedings are provided in the sections below.

A. LOOKING AT OUR RECENT PAST-THE ACCOMPLISHMENT DESIGN

The accomplishment design was used to determine the successes and/or accomplishments that UMES has experienced over the past three/five years. Simultaneously, participants were also encouraged to bring strategic lessons forward that can be applied to future planning processes. The following is the list of lessons brought forward for consideration when formulating the next strategic plan.

LESSONS TO BRING FORWARD

• Meeting the workforce needs in the program area & satisfying one of the institutional goals
• Currently offer 50% of the required courses - therefore program adaptable
• Open to change & innovation
• Being aware & receptive of the new trends
• Carnegie re-classification of UMES
• Perception of UMES
• Team work
• Team work and collaborative efforts are critical
• Continue with faculty development to "Tell Our Success Story"
• Strengthen efforts-graduates
• Upfront commitment of resources
• External expertise required
• External expertise (leadership in charge)
• Authority, responsibility, accountability
• Efficient management of university resources
• Deliberate cooperation & collaboration across the university
• Change in university culture in getting things done & researched
• Emphasis on scholarships
• Commitment by the institution, state, community & industry yield great results
• Working together with students, departments have made a difference in perception of library
• Satisfactory student study abroad, globalization effort (e.g., curriculum)
• Faculty international professional development
• Continue marketing successful programs with needed appropriate staff
• Shared governance works
• Technology infrastructure must be in place
• Accountability produces results
CONTRIBUTING FACTORS TO ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Participants identified the following contributing factors for the accomplishments and the lessons brought forward as mentioned above.

- Campus-wide commitment is vital
- Good communication among stakeholders is necessary
- Persist, Persist, Persist
- Data is critical
- Champions with authority, responsibility, and accountability
- Resource commitment - up front and realistic
- Administrative commitment
- Resource availability (human, physical, and fiscal)
- President has articulated a clear vision - acts as a cheerleader - gives credit, and empowers others
- Marketing strategy for successful UMES programs
- Placing the right people in the right positions, and empowering them
- Vision and leadership
- Innovation/cultural change
- Collaboration
- Resource commitment
- Shared vision
- Shared governance

B. LOOKING AT CURRENT REALITY - S.W.O.T. ANALYSIS

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (S.W.O.T.) analysis was conducted using the Carousel design. Participants were divided into four small groups in order to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to ongoing activities. Each group was asked to discuss and list the core issues pertaining to the groups’ discussion. Thereafter, each group was assigned to read and review the identified issues by other groups and contribute, if any issues were overlooked. Thus, every group/individual openly
shared ideas and no one could dominate in the discussion or control the outcome. Finally, respective groups prioritized the issues. The following is the list of issues according to priority order.

STRENGTHS

1. Academic programs
2. Dedicated faculty
3. UMES has strong visionary leadership
4. Facilitation of external funds to support academic programs
5. Faculty, staff, and student diversity
6. Student centeredness
7. Retention plan/closing achievement gap plan
8. No land mass/expansion potential/purchase additional land
9. Ability to implement innovative programs & projects quickly
10. Commitment of faculty to the university/goals & mission
11. Physical facilities
12. Doing a lot with little; better mentoring; faculty & students
13. Pride
14. Size
15. Family centered
16. Location
17. Mission

WEAKNESSES

1. Poor customer service focus
2. Limited resources for operation
3. Marketing strategy lacking for advertising excellent programs
4. Lack of incentives to write grants
5. Philanthropic commitment
6. Poor/lack of structured communication
7. Budgetary process
8. Lack of faculty/staff positions
9. Location
10. Lack of advising
11. Cost of books
12. Aid to students
13. Often required to wear too many hats
14. Infrastructure for ongoing, sustained support for access, training, maintenance
15. Low morale amongst faculty/staff
16. Library funding
17. Centralized budget
18. Leadership matters choose wisely
19. Inclusion takes time but helps with implementation
20. Try & Learn, Try & Learn, Try & Learn
OPPORTUNITIES

1. Distance learning
2. Funding opportunities
3. Use of higher education center at Chesapeake
4. Proximity to federal government (Washington, D.C.)
5. More articulation agreements with Wor-Wic Community College/Salisbury University
6. Better relationships with National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and other hi-tech industries
7. Expand globalization opportunities
8. Recruitment of "smarter" students
9. Diverse background of staff, faculty, and students
10. Henson, Hazel and HRM endowments
11. Merging marketing functions under one department
12. Working with Lower Eastern Shore local school boards
13. Quality of academic programs
14. Faculty expertise/research
15. Ability to grow
16. Better marketing of unique programs (e.g., HRM, Physician Assistant, Physical Therapy)
17. Library partnerships throughout, with local institutions/organizations, state, and region
18. Real love for our campus - student potential
19. Knowledge to work with diverse students
20. Funding opportunities, specifically for technology, coordination of access, training, and maintenance of information technology

THREATS

1. Loss of state funding due to low graduation and retention rates
2. Continued justification of the need of HBCUs
3. Retention/graduation rates
4. Perception of institution within USM
5. Loss of federal funding for HBCUs
6. Need for match funding for federal programs
7. Racism
8. Reallocation of 20% of education budget based on performance (retention & graduation rates)
9. Emphasis on talk/show rather than action
10. Lack of positive press on great accomplishments
11. Keeping pace with technology (face book, recruitment, online classes, etc.)
12. Funding cuts
13. Lack of vision
14. Failure of interest
15. Lack of commitment
16. Duplication of programs
17. Low performing programs
18. Inadequate preparation of incoming students
C. TOP STRATEGIC ISSUES

The participants were divided into four small groups and asked to discuss and figure out some of the most important strategic issues relevant to UMES’ upcoming strategic plan development process. The following were the major issues reported by respective groups.

1. Competition for the best students
2. Competition with on-line institutions
3. Uncertainty of state support/resources
4. Aging leadership at every level/president/faculty (change in leadership – president, chancellor, and governor)
5. High academic standards
6. Internal /building capacity
7. Diversified funding
8. Enrollment management (e.g., retention, graduation rates)
9. More facilities (e.g., buildings)
10. Meeting the white house initiative for 2020 and standard of graduation and retention rates - closing the achievement gap
11. Succession plan
12. Increase competition through accreditation
13. Increase competition in research intensity

D. DISCOVERIES & SURPRISES

The participants were given a brainstorming task to identify whether there were any discoveries and or surprises that appeared while stating top strategic issues to be considered during the upcoming strategic planning process - the following were listed as the discoveries and surprises:

• Equity of salary
• Competition with on-line universities
• Goal of becoming a top tier research institution

E. PLANNING AUDIT

As an exercise, a survey called the “Planning Audit” was conducted anonymously to ensure honest answers from participants. The purpose behind this survey was to capture and convey information regarding UMES’ current capacity that may be helpful in the process of gathering the next strategic plan’s (2011-2016) data effectively and collaboratively. This survey consisted of 10 statements designed by the facilitator. The scale of responses for each statement ranged from 1 to 10, one being “very poor,” five “average,” and 10 being “excellent.” Twenty three participants (74%) completed the survey (see Table 1).
According to the facilitator, UMES’ ratings of eight and above by 51% of the participants for the “commitment of the senior management team including the president to do collaborative strategic planning” was above the average of ratings by other institutions familiar to the facilitator. This confirms that UMES’ strategic planning process has strong leadership support behind it and consequently, has great potential for success. Similarly, significant numbers of participants gave ratings of eight and above for “institution’s ability to plan effectively” (46%); “our ability to execute and get things done as an institution” (46%); effectiveness of past planning efforts” (38%), and “the institution’s willingness to ask tough questions” (38%). In short, UMES has the essential components for a successful strategic planning initiative based on the planning audit conducted at the workshop.
Table 1: Summary results of the Planning Audit of the Collaborative Strategic Planning workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement/Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>10 Excellent</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5 Average</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1 Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the quality of communication throughout the campus?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the commitment of the senior management team including the president to do collaborative strategic planning?</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 (21%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the organization's ability to collect meaningful information from stakeholders?</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7 (29%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the quality of the decisions made by cabinet in moving the institution forward?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the effectiveness of past planning efforts?</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the institution's willingness to ask tough questions?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 (21%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe the level of collaboration across the institution?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you rate the institution's internal ability to plan effectively?</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 (21%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you rate our ability to execute and get things done as an institution?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you rate our ability to measure performance towards stated goals?</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR COLLABORATIVE STRATEGIC PLANNING

Utilizing the Cascading Agreement Design discussed during the session, the participants were encouraged to come up with a shared set of guiding principles that foster the future planning process for UMES. Accordingly, the following sets of guiding principles were proposed by participants:

- Share information (principles) collected widely by stakeholders
- Use of data driven (when) research (based) information
- Develop well focused (outcome) goals
- Clearly define uniqueness (outcome)
- Preserve integrity of the process & transparency (don't allow process to be hijacked)
- Respectful/open environment for stakeholders
- Look at the very best for standards of excellence

G. LOOKING TOWARD THE FUTURE – THE FUTURE TIMELINE DESIGN

In designing a future timeline, participants identified numerous events, issues, and trends that could potentially impact or influence UMES over the next 8-10 years. The future timeline design was conducted to enable participants to look at external realities and to create possible future scenarios that may be helpful for the strategic planning process (see Table 2).
### Table 2: Looking Toward the Future – The Future Timeline Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Stagnant economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More foreclosures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase in IT staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Massive retirement in higher education (10 -12 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 125th anniversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Electronic communications/social networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Online education will be a threat to UMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Equity (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Balancing the out of class experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technology and distance education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Capital campaign goal reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Senior leadership turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Age of students coming to college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Generation gap in technology between students and faculty (ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Middle States periodic review report due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Federal /State financial aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students coming to college with mental issues following the war (special need)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Budget cuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Foundation money/grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stock market instability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Translations - culture of student centeredness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Customer service - student first mentality, coordinated UMES annual report for Clary Act Compliance (image for a safe campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Staff development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decline in student preparedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Remedial needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- External funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More accountability for our existence (HBCU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use of adjunct faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student engagement in selecting colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementation of new programs (annual) - need more dollars, too much borrowing from programs to fund another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Graduation &amp; retention rates are threats to UMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Growth at wallops will create opportunities for UMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Race to the top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Regional economy slows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Producing a more job ready entrepreneurial thinking student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More Hispanics in general population &amp; on Delmarva (ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State assembly election (2 - 4 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gubernatorial election (4 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business spin off opportunities will be encouraged at university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trend prosperity in MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Post-secondary education not a high priority with state government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on student leadership building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Office of Civil Rights (OCR) decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shift in emphasis from 6 year graduation rate to 4 year graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aging faculty causing brain drain of institutional memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New technology (ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trend student demographics (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Linking student performance to teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase in student enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Common core standards (2 + years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National, state standards in math, writing, and reading for high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trend/aging faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More minority students entering college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retirement of current president Dr. Thelma B. Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retirement of Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding on completers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State of Maryland budgets will not be the same as in the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have proven to the Maryland legislature that we can do more with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for new building for student recreation/health center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reaccreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aging of populations (more retiring than entering labor market)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Redistribution of limited resources for greatest good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change in leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State support for higher education will diminish and universities will need to become more entrepreneurial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enrollment growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Competition for students (ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Short student attention span due to social networking/technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More out-of-state Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) &amp; alternative providers (ongoing) for instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change in administration system/campus/state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changing funding legislation issue (e.g., Title III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building new dorms to accommodate enrollment growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distance learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Carnegie status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Doctoral research institutional status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delivery of institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program accreditation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H. EDITING MISSION STATEMENT (2005-2006)

Participants were divided into four groups and requested to review and suggest changes to the current mission statement of UMES. Suggestions by groups were as follows:

Group #1
- Shorten to eliminate laundry list of programs
- Represent the schools
- Organize by themes (i.e., Hazel Hall banners)
- Standardize format
- What the program is and levels
- Customers & partners
- Outcomes

Group #2
- Include University of MD extension on page 2, paragraph 2
- Include Pharmacy Doctoral Program established on page 3, paragraph 3 and delete last sentence
- Include free standing Toxicology MS- page 3, paragraph 1
- Update continued Education & Elder Hostel on page 2, paragraph 6
- Change aims to "Continues" on page 2, paragraph 2
- Add Professional Science Master’s Program (PSM)
- Add Professional Golf Management Program (PGM)
- Include Emergency Management
- Include Urban Forestry

Group #3
- Update the document
- Use concise sentences
- Avoid repetitions (e.g., 1st and 2nd paragraphs)
- Use headings only on pages 3, 4, and 5
- Put descriptions elsewhere
- Remove redundancies (e.g., health profession paragraph)
- Avoid repetitions and long sentences in 2nd paragraph
- Update documents
- Use more concise wording

Group #4
- Page 1/paragraph 3 - add support/enhance institutional identity, change number of years to 124 years
- Page 2- add programs: Pharmacy, Technology Education at BMI, Construction Management at Shady Grove, Elder Hostel McCready Hospital Teacher Education, update Hospitality-Use/Add
- Page 3 - Pharmacy-correct name of school Golf Management; Professional Science Master’s Program
I. SUPPORT NEEDED

In line with the guiding principles and strategic questions, participants were also asked to identify the resources needed in order to implement the planned activities effectively and in a timely manner. The following is the list of resources presented by the participants:

RESOURCES/INFORMATION/TECHNOLOGY

- Meeting rooms
- Statistical support
- What staff support is there to convene meetings? Take notes, etc.
- Will there be a website?
- IT
- Staff
- Operational funds
- Equipment
- Scholarship funds
- Editorial
- Guidelines for number of objectives
- Funding for goals
- Database
- Food
- Technology that works consistently
- Dedicated facilitators (inside or outside)
- Administrative assistant
- Good editor
- Technology that works consistently w/and IT available
- Timeline with deadlines
- Make sure appropriate people are on committees
- Food/refreshments at meeting
- Research on peer institutions and non peer institutions
- Statistical data on UMES students
- Space to meet and spread out
- Meeting times that do not conflict with class times of faculty
- A dedicated person (support) to take minutes at all meetings
- Clerical support - funds for food/refreshments (mealtime meetings)
- Will there be a definite schedule for taskforce meetings? Refreshments?
- UMES aspirational institution lists
- Release time for leadership/reports
- Financial
- Communication between groups - other campuses
J. LARGE GROUP AFFINITY DESIGN

Participants created a range of strategic questions/themes using Affinity Group Design that UMES might need to consider for future planning. The purpose behind this design was to let individuals assimilate in a particular group for a common cause. Participants were divided into three groups. The first group was assigned to cluster as many strategic questions/issues/themes as they could in a given period of time but without any consultation within the group. The second group was assigned to organize the clustered questions into different sub-groups based on their nature and characteristics. Finally, the third group was asked to write suitable titles for each clustered group of strategic questions. The following is the outcome of this Affinity Group exercise:

THE/OUR "PRODUCT"

- How do we create a more polished, work ready student?
- Where are our graduates employed?
- What are the three most important areas that UMES should provide training in over the next ten years?
- What measures need to be implemented to acquire the Carnegie research classification?

IMAGE

Questions to ask include but are not limited to:
- If you were King what would UMES look like in 2020?
- How do we improve UMES’ image?
- What do we need to do better?
- Why would you pick us again?
- How do we improve customer service?
- How do you envision change at UMES for the next five years?
- How do we improve the image of UMES?
- How can the success of a few be extended campus-wide?
- What is the SWOT analysis for UMES marketing?

RECRUITMENT & RETENTION OF STUDENTS

- UMES to admit new class! Who should they be?
- Should new admission standards be implemented at UMES?
- What at UMES attracts (ed) you most? Incoming students; Returning students; Faculty; Staff; Administrators
- Why did you leave UMES?
- Why did you not enroll at UMES?
- Should UMES continue elevating it's admissions bar from year to year?
- What is the best and worst experience you have had at UMES?
- What initiatives will be beneficial to non-traditional students?
- What can we do to help students to persist to graduate in four years?
• What services do we need to offer to attract students?

THE FUTURE OF UMES

• How do we become a world ready university?
• Do you foresee UMES changing its focus from a residential campus to a mix of residential, commuter and internet student center?
• What niche in education should UMES pursue?
• How can faculty and staff be inspired to buy-in UMES’ transformation?
• How do we accelerate time to graduation?
• How do we increase graduation rates?
• How do you perceive your role in meeting the mission of UMES?
• How much are you willing to pay for excellence?

FACULTY

• What specific incentives (i.e., reward structure) is needed to recruit and maintain high quality faculty?

EXTERNAL & ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

• What should the UMES physical footprints look like, five years forward?
• What community needs can UMES meet?

RESOURCES

• Will the University commit resources to graduate education in order to reach the goal of the Doctoral Research University according to Carnegie reclassification?
• What does UMES do well? Why does UMES not do so well?
• How do we do a fantastic job of getting the word out about the uniqueness of UMES?
• Given the ever declining state funding, what should the university do to ensure sustainability?
• How do we capitalize on all available resources to improve the university?
• How will we fund programs that are responsive to change in the region/state/nation?
• How do we improve our grant writing opportunities and award success?

K. QUESTIONS PARTICIPANTS STILL HAVE

Towards the end of the workshop, participants were encouraged to come forward if they still had any questions in relation to the workshop, strategic planning, or UMES’ events and activities. The following is the list of open questions presented by the participants for further consideration:

• What services do we need to offer to attract students?
What is the timeline for achieving the Doctoral Research University classification?
Will the University find the resources to support the Carnegie reclassification? (e.g., (1) Removal of $18,000 ceiling for Ph.D. assistantships (2) Additional assistantship provisions of a research building for researchers).
What are the assigned duties for this training? Next step, timeline, hours of commitment, anticipated outcomes, who will call meetings, clerical support, etc.?
Is there a current UMES community outreach statement?
Will there be a template for mission, goals, and timeline?
How will we be able to integrate - synthesize this commitment with current work?

L. DEVELOPING A COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

Considering the impact of poor communication that may cripple a process and negatively impact campus climate and community – the mind mapping technique was used to carry out key stakeholder analysis throughout UMES that need to be engaged in the planning effort. Everyone contributed to the list of potential stakeholders. Once participants identified the potential key stakeholders, voting was conducted, using colored dots to prioritize the key stakeholders (see Figure 1) that need to be engaged and informed throughout the strategic planning process. Faculty received the highest votes, followed by students, UMES administration, funding agencies, alumni, employees, and staff. The numbers in the boxes in the figure indicate the number of respondents/votes applicable to respective stakeholders.
What key stakeholders must we successfully engage in our strategic planning process?

- Feeder High School
- Community Students
- Other HBCUs
- International Faculty
- BMI/Shady Grove (offsite)
- Greek Organizations
- Students
- News & Media
- Faculty Assembly
- Faculty
- Adjuncts
- UMES Senate
- UMES
- USM
- MHEC
- Parents
- Board of Regents
- Students
- Honor Students
- Special Needs Students
- Aspirational Institutions
- Service Employees and Staff
- Elected Officials
- Civic Leaders
- Community Leaders
- Donors
- Partner Universities
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Funding Agencies
- MSG
- Athens
- 1890's Commission
- Funding Agencies
- Right Corporations (e.g., Microsoft)
- Right Employers
- Employer
- Summer Programs and Corporations
- Non Completer Students
- International Leaders
- Graduate
- Donors
- Community College
- MSDE
- Board of Regents
- Unions
- NGO's
- Armed Forces
- Community College
- Federal
- State
- Local
- Elected Officials
- MSDE
- Partner Universities
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
- Alumni
- Armed Forces
- Business Leaders
Appendix: 1 Participants’ list

1. Dr. Emmanuel Acquah, Senior Executive Assistant to the President, Office of the President – Chair
2. Dr. Charles Williams, Vice President, Academic Affairs – Co-Chair
3. Dr. Stanley Nyirenda, Director, Institutional Research, Planning & Assessment – Co-Chair
4. Dr. Ronnie Holden, Vice President, Administrative Affairs
5. Dr. Ron Forsythe, Vice President, Information Technology & Commercialization
6. Mr. Gains Hawkins, Vice President, Institutional Advancement
7. Mr. Quentin Johnson, Acting Vice President Student Life and Enrollment Management
8. Dr. Julius Alade, Dean, School of Business and Technology
9. Dr. Rita Lamb, Interim Dean, School of Arts and Professions
10. Dr. Jennifer Kean-Dawes, Interim Dean, School of Graduate Studies
11. Dr. James Heimdal, Associate Professor, and Chairperson, Department of Exercise Science and Chairperson, UMES Senate
12. Dr. Joseph Okoh, Chairperson and Professor, Department of Natural Sciences
13. Dr. Mark Williams, Associate Professor and Chairperson, UMES Faculty Assembly
14. Dr. Edward Chapin, Assistant Professor and Member of Council of University System Faculty Executive Committee
15. Dr. Lila Karki, Planning Analyst, Institutional Research, Planning & Assessment
16. Dr. Leon Copeland, Chairperson and Professor, Department of Technology
17. Dr. Bryant Mitchell, Associate Professor, Department of Business Management & Accounting
18. Dr. Gladys Shelton, Interim Dean, School of Agriculture and Natural Sciences
19. Ms. Shelia Bailey, Interim Dean, Library Services
20. Dr. Sarah Acquah, Director, Center for International Education
21. Mr. Philip Taylor, Director, Information Technology
22. Dr. Frances McKinney, Director, Title III Program
23. Mr. Warner Sumpter, Director, Public Safety UMES
24. Mr. Daniel Kuennen, Director, Rural Development Center
25. Dr. Kathy Webster, Associate Dean, School of Pharmacy & Health Professions
26. Dr. Karen Verbeke, Chairperson and Professor, Department of Education
27. Mr. Marvin Jones, Director, Residence Life
28. Mr. Austin Cox, CEO, Cox Heating and Air Conditioning, Member, UMES Board of Visitors
29. Dr. Julius Zant, Peninsula Neurosurgical Associates, Member, UMES Board of Visitors
30. Dr. James White, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
31. Dr. Bernita Sims-Tucker, Interim Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
32. Dr. Jacqueline Brice-Finch, Interim Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
33. Dr. William Talley, Department of Rehabilitation
Appendix 2: An evaluation of participant perceptions

Introduction

This evaluation report is for a workshop on Collaborative Strategic Planning (CSP) that was funded by the Title III Activity – Preparation for Progress Initiatives (PPI) in the Office of the President at UMES. The two-day workshop (i.e., 9-10 September 2010), facilitated by Dr. Patrick Sanaghan, President, The Sanaghan Group, Doylestown, Pennsylvania was a professional development opportunity for members of the Strategic Plan Steering Committee. Dr. Sanaghan is a recognized expert in Collaborative Strategic Planning. His book on “Collaborative Strategic Planning in Higher Education” is widely used by evaluators and leaders of other organizations. The purpose of this workshop was to prepare steering committee members and taskforce Chairs for their roles in the development of the UMES 2011-2016 Strategic Plan.

To make the workshop productive, the Office of the President at UMES and The Sanaghan Group started developing the agenda of the workshop in advance. Few meetings were even organized over the phone to discuss and streamline the agenda before it was finalized. This workshop was organized to energize the participants about the concept and methodological process regarding the development of the next strategic planning.

Thirty-three out of thirty-five participants (94%) including Chair and Co-Chairs, Vice Presidents, Deans, Professors, Directors, Members of the Board of Visitors, the President of the Student Government Association, and staff attended the workshop. Sixty-five percent completed a brief one-page evaluation instrument, designed to solicit their perceptions of planning and organization of the workshop; facilitator’s preparation of the contents, delivery, handling questions and comments, learning styles; pace of the workshop and participants’ perceptions of the impact of the workshop on their responsibilities; and their take-a-ways from it. The instrument used was a five-point Likert Type scale (i.e., 1-5 where 1=Strongly Disagree; 3=No Opinion; and 5=Strongly Agree).

Analysis

Based on respondents’ responses, 100% of them either “strongly agree” (85%) or “agree somewhat” (15%) that the workshop reflected careful planning and organization. Similarly, overall, the workshop was a great success as confirmed by 100% of the respondents either “strongly agree” (70%) or “agree somewhat” (30%). Simultaneously, overwhelming numbers of respondents have rated that the facilitator was well prepared about the contents of the workshop. Accordingly, 90% and above of the total participants have rated “strongly agree” or “agree somewhat” for the use of Hermann Brain Dominance Instrument, Four key elements of designing meetings, Creating guiding principles for Collaborative Strategic Planning, Looking at our recent past - the accomplishment design, Looking at current reality, Maintaining open discussion, Developing Communication Plan, Large group affinity design, and Conducting a planning audit. Respondents’ all these high ratings have confirmed that the contents designed for the workshop were very useful and the facilitator articulated them very well. In addition, of the 100% participants, 75% of them either “strongly agree” or 25% “agree somewhat” that the facilitator utilized the comments appropriately. Also, 90% and above of the total participants have
acclaimed that facilitator provided variety of learning styles in relation to CSP and conducted the sessions at an appropriate pace. Similarly, 100% of the participants either “strongly agree” or “agree somewhat” that they increased their knowledge of CSP and also learnt tools that they will use in the taskforces they are assigned.

Table 1: Workshop Participants’ Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement/Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Participant Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The workshop reflected careful planning and organization</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Facilitator was well prepared for the presentations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Collaborative Strategic Planning Workshop</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 18 (90%) Agree Somewhat 2 (10%) No Opinion 0 (0%) Disagree Somewhat 0 (0%) Strongly Disagree 0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of the Hermann Brain Dominance Instrument</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 15 (75%) Agree Somewhat 3 (15%) No Opinion 0 (0%) Disagree Somewhat 2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the 4 key elements of meeting design</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 16 (80%) Agree Somewhat 4 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating guiding principles for Collaborative Strategic Planning</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 14 (70%) Agree Somewhat 4 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at our recent past - the accomplishment design</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 12 (60%) Agree Somewhat 7 (35%) No Opinion 1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at current reality</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 13 (65%) Agree Somewhat 6 (30%) No Opinion 1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking toward the future</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 14 (70%) Agree Somewhat 3 (15%) No Opinion 3 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating talent bank</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 10 (50%) Agree Somewhat 4 (20%) No Opinion 5 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open discussion on day 1 discussions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 17 (85%) Agree Somewhat 2 (10%) No Opinion 1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Communication Plan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 10 (50%) Agree Somewhat 8 (40%) No Opinion 2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large group affinity design</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 16 (80%) Agree Somewhat 2 (10%) No Opinion 1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review some meeting design</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 18 (90%) Agree Somewhat 2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a planning audit</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 16 (80%) Agree Somewhat 3 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitator provided for a variety of learning styles</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 16 (80%) Agree Somewhat 4 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sessions were conducted at an appropriate pace</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 14 (70%) Agree Somewhat 5 (25%) No Opinion 1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The comments of participants were utilized appropriately for learning in the presentations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 15 (75%) Agree Somewhat 5 (25%) No Opinion 1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions and concerns were handled appropriately</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 17 (85%) Agree Somewhat 3 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I increased my knowledge of Collaborative Strategic Planning concepts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 17 (85%) Agree Somewhat 3 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content of this workshop provided me tools I will use in the Taskforces to which I have been assigned for UMES'2011-2016 Strategic Plan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 13 (65%) Agree Somewhat 7 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meals were very good</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 13 (65%) Agree Somewhat 6 (30%) No Opinion 1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The room for the workshop was pleasant</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 15 (75%) Agree Somewhat 4 (20%) No Opinion 1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the Workshop was a great success</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Strongly Agree 14 (70%) Agree Somewhat 6 (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anecdotal comments confirmed very positive impact presented in the analysis of closed-ended statements (see Table 1). Examples of their great satisfaction with the facilitator in the open-ended statements include: The presenter was excellent, he has outstanding experience, he should come back, he kept the attention of the audience, and this was one of the better workshops I have attended. Conversely, one of the anecdotal comments confirms that the activities on the second day seemed more rushed particularly after lunch, which was contrary to the moderate pace on the first day.

Respondents were also solicited to provide their responses about meals and workshop venue. Ninety-five percent of them responded either “strongly agree” (65%) or “agree somewhat” (30%) that the meals provided
during the workshop were very good. Correspondingly, 95% declared that the room for the workshop was pleasant: “strongly agree” (75%) and “agree somewhat” (20%).

Comments and Conclusion

This workshop on Collaborative Strategic Planning facilitated by Dr. Patrick Sanaghan was a resounding success. The analyzed data (see Table 1) revealed that almost all respondents have increased their knowledge and received variety of learning styles about CSP. They seemed committed to apply the tools of the workshop in the respective taskforces they have been assigned to while developing the next Strategic Plan. Simultaneously, it bears note that this accomplishment would not have been possible without the strong support of the President of UMES and Title III program. Continuous improvement of the institutional effectiveness and student learning depends very much on professional development of the faculty and staff and use of their enhanced knowledge and skills for UMES worthy cause.