

Opening Plenary: Excellence is Never an Accident
University Retreat
Aug. 23, 2017

Individual Responses from Discussion of Draft Dashboard

Q: How clearly does the dashboard show connection between strategic plan priorities, action steps, resources, and outcomes?
The dashboard is very comprehensive and easy to read. There is clarity concerning where we are and where we are heading. The progress status is especially appealing, as it gives the viewer an idea of how far we are into the process.
Clearer delineation needed between topics and text
seems pretty clear to me - feels accessible and clear
Clear once the form can be deciphered
Very clear. As Phillip mentioned " the plan is rooted in our culture" - what has been and is important to the culture is contained therein
The dashboard is clear in its connection as to the focus and direction.
can't tell, I need to study and review. It would be more helpful to have some info on how we got to this point. I think most of this has happened with a small distinct group- not inclusive and transparent.
Nicely done...but could more clearly connect the \$ to the specific bullets
very clear, but I am still a bit confused about where resources are listed
The dashboard could use a visual to link and introduce.
Reasonably Well
Clear
It is not clear on the outcomes.
specific outcomes not clearly identified;
I found it hard to read; it is very wordy; resources and outcomes are not distinguished; resources are not integrated
It is very clear, I have no problem seeing the connection.
We have questions and feel these increase over the 15 minutes we have available to look at this
Its good. Just missing the resources needed to accomplish the goals.
Dollar amounts do not clearly link back to objectives.
I think the dashboard does a decent job of showing the connections between the priorities of the strategic plan, its action steps, and its resources. I think it is fairly early in the process to see outcomes very clearly, but under several of the areas they are noted, especially with regard to the 'first step' areas. I.e. Principal Lecturer was a goal, and now it has passed the Faculty Senate, and one imagines is in some committee somewhere. I liked very much how the dashboard connects the various threads between the elements of the strategic plan.
seems OK

it would be more helpful to be interactive. it is a high level overview but still a lot.i would love to be able to search it in a way that would allow me to see if my dept. goals correlate with university goals.

good connection between goals and steps toward those goals

If the investments are directly related to focus priority tables, we can see the connection between priorities and resources more clearly. \

Sort of - the threads are not clear as to where they came from; no linkage with objectives and budget items at the end; does not link to actual offices or programs and the actions we are taking (who's leading it, how can you provide feedback/ask questions)

dashboard colors are confusing- use dashboard software available-needs to be interactive

Not clear how investments and objectives directly relate.

Yes, well done. Would like to see more specificity on outcomes

It is not unclear but sometimes outcomes are noted and sometimes they are not. The colors showing the progress are nice but there could be some links to more information.

The dashboard shows connections between priorities and action steps, but not resources and outcomes. All this should be in the same table.

Moderately clearly. I sense that you are trying to accomplish a lot in a single document. Some terms used are unclear. It appears that double/triple counting of funding allocations occur in the funding allocations (and only clarified as a footnote later.) Hard to read and flip between goals and funding allocation. We recognize the challenge of getting all of this information in a single document.

Not enough time to explore it

The design is aesthetically easy to read and follow. Would like to see more clarity in regards to resources and outcomes. How are we measuring this? Assessment in place. Would like more detailed steps to explain exact plan/steps in implementation.

It depends on who is looking at it, and what they are trying to understand. At our table we talked through a few scenarios of how people would use this information and identified situations where we thought it would work, and some where it wouldn't.

For example, how would I use this to figure out if my department might get more faculty hires? How could I use this to understand major changes / efforts on campus overall.

I found the Investment Priorities lacking information. Do they cross?

I believe the "First Steps" block is well articulated. However the "Next Steps" could use a more specific explanation of HOW the plan will be implemented. Provide more insight about who and how is in charge of the critical elements.

Priorities are clear, but the threads are not linked. Need to connect investments to objectives.

The dashboard is displayed nicely and is easy to read and follow. The color code and key makes it easy to understand the immediate and long term goals. However, more details would be could. Some examples of first steps taken so far would be helpful to know what progress could has been taken.

The dashboard shows those connections well but is fuzzy on outcomes in the sense that it lacks data and metrics

Generally clear

Plan priorities and action steps clear. Connection of those with resources and outcomes not clear.

The next steps and priorities connection is clear. The connection between resources and outcomes is difficult to see; I can't find headings or identify that connection on first glance. I really like the shading of the steps and the integrating threads(which I figure are the connecting resources).

The dashboard is a document of steps and goals with a rather abstract conceptualization of progress. I feel it would be more useful to visualize the connections and progress in less static way.

Use technology to allow users to pull down tabs for more detail.examples could include input measures, future actions, etc.

I'm unclear on the use of the word dashboard which implies something interactive - this is a PDF of tables.

The links are clear. But the presentation could be done more effectively

the resources part does not connect well--we'd like to see some way to connect resource allocation more specifically to our priorities

This seems to be more detailed than a dashboard. A simply info graphic on top would be useful.

For those who have been heavily involved it's ok. For everyone else it's very hard to approach. We wanted to see what areas were working on each pieces

It just shows priorities and action steps but it does not show outcomes. It is not very clear.

The dashboard is designed well and easy to follow.

Its a bit clumsy in its printed format.

Need more clarity around the intergrating thread and how they came to be. Should they be included on the dashboard?

I had difficulty in seeing outcomes listed in the dashboard. The other items were clearly stated.

Clearly

Not enough....I just don't see the roles of faculty, students, and esp. staff spelled out enough.

Was unclear on action steps, resources, and outcomes.

Somewhat clear but could be improved.

It's clear but really lengthy. It would be great to have an abbreviated version of it in order to have a clearer grasp.

Excellent color scheme - easy to follow.

Use of depth of color is helpful

Useful layout

It is easy to follow, but the simplicity is also a challenge because many details/additional information are missing from the dashboard.

Layout is good. Too wordy. Nice to see the threads. Too early to show outcomes. How will outcomes be assessed and shown?

Trying to put head around the tangible, hand-held version and what the actual dashboard will look like. Seems to be a disconnect about how the resources connect.

Generally I think it does although it would be helpful to have a more direct link, perhaps by numbering the strategic goals of the strategic plan on the dashboard.

Dashboard is not the correct word. Hard to measure and also connect funding with each activity. Integrating threads are not easily connected to strategic plan. Hard to know who is the lead person on each area. But the progress in each category was good.

Lots of good information, however not easy to determine actual progress. Can the progress be put into more graphical summary form,,
This could be much clearer. It seems very vague and self congratulatory. To take, for example, the Focus Priority to increase significantly faulty diversity,
Need more time to study the to have a better assessment. Difficult to hear people at my table... very noisy.
I think that the intended connection is very clear between the priorities, action steps, resources, and outcomes
It only becomes clear after reviewing the document for a while.
Good start but needed to have this (and the questions) sent out in advance of the retreat in order to have a meaningful discussion
If resources is meant to be the foundation, than it is there but I would expect there to be some reference somehow which/how existing resources are being leveraged to address strategic plan priorities. While progress is well demonstrated, the outcomes are not obvious. However, for a dashboard to be effective it needs to be easy to read and not overwhelmed with information. I would be reluctant to add too much more.
Fairly
A more specific planning timeline might be useful. Not as clear how the 3-year budget timeline relates to the planning priorities. The number of faculty hire funds seem to be duplicated. As such, can the totals for faculty hires be accurate? Could use more clarity. There was a LOT of discussion about the 231 increase in funding for new faculty hires.
There is variable clarity of the entries on the dashboard- also few are quantitative, e.g. how many FTE of psychologists were added to counseling and how many psychologists do they have relative to benchmarks of peers. for example X psy / X students
Our table wondered whether the published dashboard would be an uploaded PDF, or an interactive site where we could drill down to metrics on such things as the current degree completion rate that we are trying to improve.
Not very clear
The increased shading is very helpful in showing the level of progress and completion. The description of next steps provides a level of details that can be easily followed. The individual first focus priorities in the Dashboard do not directly correlate with the strategic goals in the booklet, which leads to some confusion.
Color coding good, a digital copy that is more direct, multi-page confusing. Tying to the "integrating threads" are helpful, video good illustration of threads
There is a clear link between the various parts although the language is technical and hard to understand outside of the campus community. The steps are clearly outlined though.
Initially it is quite cumbersome to navigate the various sections; however, upon multiple reviews it becomes easier to understand
Most of the information is relatively clear. However in many cases specifics are not given. For example, "Numerous faculty diversity initiatives continue and are linked to 5-year faculty hiring plan." does not specify what these initiatives are.
The dashboard is very well structured and easy to understand, particularly the first focus priorities section

Overall layout and presentation with coding helps to understand status of various initiatives
Mostly clear
Colors good, good organization, like including resources, like first focus areas acknowledging can; No outcomes shown. Should show progress - none, in progress, complete - setting benchmarks.
It shows connections but is missing some detail on who the stakeholder/steering groups are that are involved in the steps. Perhaps the funding page is tied directly to the steps so better understanding of where the allocation is going. For ex. base funding going to OUE generally doesn't tell how the various programs within OUE will be targeted to support the steps.
does not seem to be a dashboard - good info but it is not quickly understood, like an info graph (visuals). Dashboards are key indicators visually and do not require work to understand. Needs instructions on how to read it. Takes a lot of time to understand. The integrating threads box is somewhat confusing.
Depends on the audience. Some of the vocabulary is specific to pedagogy and administrative procedures.
The dashboard does not clearly show the mapping from the plan to the responsible parties within the institution. It also doesn't clearly show the participating groups in each step and allocation of resources to the steps.
The plan shows which threads are being addressed and what the action plans are, however there should be more information into how these next action items will be accomplished. There should also be more information on the metrics and how close these actions will take us to reaching our goals.
The document is a good start. It doesn't really show outcomes yet if you think of them as performance metrics not resource inputs. We should think whether we want to really use integrative threads -- right now they are more confusing than helpful.
May be good to tie together using same numbering scheme. A little cumbersome to look at but generally connected. Missing some outcomes.
The presentation of the plan is bit difficult to follow--I feel that priority is not effectively emphasized via use of light and dark colors. Action steps leave a bit to be desired in certain areas as well (i.e., 'build on existing activities'). A more interactive format would be effective for the understanding of all viewers--in fact, the video shown during the retreat spelled everything out in a concise manner. Finally, there is a better way to show the numerical investments and additions in the back of the pamphlet. There is too much white space to make sense of cumulative totals.
It would have been extremely helpful to get the information ahead of time. The time provided is too short to fully give input.
Color coding is helpful - continue to use; Dashboard is fairly clear
Reasonably so. There is a lot of information to distill, and inevitably much is lost in the distillation.
The dashboard should expand upon desired outcomes that can be measured. Ex. Graduation rate improves from X% to Y%.
The dashboard does a good job showing the priorities and the actions step. One criticism is the clarity of resources beyond financial resources. The dashboard provides monetarily qualified investment and I assume that some of that investment is Human Resources and other from the description, but a breakdown of non financial investment would strengthen the presentation.
The connections are clear, easy to read and understand.
Generally the dashboard shows connections outlined in the plan. It would help if there was more specificity about how this process will work. It also would have helped to provide feedback if we had seen this earlier.
The information is presented clearly. the next steps are sometimes too vague.
It clearly shows the plan priorities. The resources required for the initiatives aren't necessarily clear as to who will be working on these efforts.

The draft dashboard has all the information but is somewhat confusing in how everything is connected, and lacks specifics in terms of outcome measures.
This dashboard does not have the detail necessary to illustrate progress towards a goal. It needs benchmarks or milestones, and progress towards them
Extra columns on budget to tie numbers to strategies, more interactivity for a true dashboard
Connections are very clear.
More detail is needed. For example, we will add two associate Dean's for Research. What will they do specifically to increase the reserch effort. Will they reengage faculty who stopped doing research and therefore are not fulfilling their duties as faculty.
Certain supporting objectives from the plan are missing from the dashboard.
The dashboard is still somewhat confusing based on the layout of how all of the focus areas connect and work in unison.
could be clearer, not sure of the comparisons, what has happened in the past
Very good for the most part. Some small suggestions are to explain the integrating threads and to find a way to include the supporting objectives.
The next steps column is largely vague: broad steps, rather than particular measurable items.
I think it does a fairly good job; however it really doesn't show resources and outcomes very well
Wording of strategic goals has been changed. Why not keep same wording in both strategic goals and first focus priority?
Feels "busy" - maybe delete the integrating threads column as this doesn't add much
It is clear once an overview is provided how information is related and the colors are helpful, except not sure where the outcomes are included?
The dashboard is able to display the steps that are taking place are were taken to impact the focus areas of the Strategic Plan and the possible impacts that are taking place. The outcomes, however, are unclear and the resources that are being used and followed to meet the priority.
Very well.
On p. 7, resources are described as being focused on "what matters most." What "matters most?" Is that to be inferred from the rest of the plan/document, or from somewhere/something else?
Takes some time to understand, then clear
The Dashboard does show initial priority steps. However, it does not at all clearly explain how the resource investment priorities at the end are related to various focus priorities outlined on the first part of the dashboard.
There is a clear link to the broad strategic goals but it is less clear which supporting objectives are being met by the activities. Overall provides a nice summary.
The dashboard really doesn't show the connections well at all. For example, how are the budget numbers related to the priorities? There is no listing of the "who." Who is responsible for making the decisions or engaging the community on the various initiatives? On the budget numbers, the dashboard indicates that the moneys are not one-time, so I assume that they are recurring; however, it is not clear that, when there are blanks with no dollars, that the previous money carries over. As far as outcomes, I don't see any indication of concrete outcomes, only some very general concepts.
I find the document is a starting point for a dashboard but is not a dashboard as I understand it to be. I do not find action steps and identified outcomes included and the means to which progress will be

measured with the appropriate metric. I do not find that the dashboard necessarily needs to show a connection between the strategic plan priorities but suggest a separate vehicle be used to display this.

Dashboard is easy to follow - makes sense

IT IS FAIRLY CLEAR, HOWEVER, THE FIRST STEPS AND NEXT STEPS SHOULD BE LINKED BACK TO THE OBJECTIVES THEY ARE ADDRESSING RELATED TO THAT GOAL/PRIORITY.

The section for Community & Extended Connections has limited information. The dashboard shows that some areas of the strategic plan have been more fully fleshed out than others.

Could use expanded details on how the budget connects to this.

You have to really work to see the connections. Our table seems to be focused on how the money connects to each area, rather than how the priorities are connected.

The connection of resources to is not clear and transparent

Looks great! The team has really done a great of honing in on presenting the strategic plan to the campus community in the last few years. Overall the material is very easy to digest but I would prefer to understand the connection between the first focus priorities and the investment in university priorities FY16-18

I find the document is a starting point for a dashboard but is not a dashboard as I understand it to be. I do not find action steps and identified outcomes included and the means to which progress will be measured with the appropriate metric. I do not find that the dashboard necessarily needs to show a connection between the strategic plan priorities but suggest a separate vehicle be used to display this.

it is comprehensive. I would add a column on outcomes for substantial completion

it seems to be self-congratulatory in that it emphasizes what we already said we were going to do. It is uneven in its specify of steps. It is also not nuanced enough in terms of how the columns show the information.

It is generally clear

The layout of the dashboard is phenomenal. Easy to follow and clear color coordination. The progress status shading is helpful but the use of the word "low" is a bit discouraging. Maybe "in progress" would be a better choice of words because it would encourage others to reach out and become involved in these initiatives. On the subject of becoming involved, it would be helpful to have more information about the resources. The investment graph is helpful but if there were more information about specific departments involved in these initiatives it would allow others to reach out and provide their feedback on this programs to better the process.

Is outcomes something that will be added in the future?

Resources not clearly stated. Who do I speak to if I want to know more or want to be involved.

Fairly clearly

Goals and outcomes are clearly displayed while providing each steps connection to a broader idea. It isn't clear the degree of importance for each step and which goals the university has considered the most pressing.

4 verticals are wise plotted and they seems closely interwoven with each other and makes good connections.

More detail about first steps.

It seems to show them clearly. I have been working with and viewing the strategic plan for a few years now, so it seems to make sense and be cohesive. Not sure if users who have not been involved would feel the same way.

First Focus goal clarification is very helpful in focusing our own efforts and decision-making; Dashboard is clear and easy to interpret.

Looks great! The team has really done a great of honing in on presenting the strategic plan to the campus community in the last few years. Overall the material is very easy to digest but I would prefer to understand the connection between the first focus priorities and the investment in university priorities FY16-18

Seems well laid out, good at documenting areas of activity and focus.

Some connections are vague, specific goals would be helpful

Connections between priorities and action steps are clear but the ones between priorities and resources are not so clear.

Next steps are vague and not measurable for many of the items. For example, faculty hiring plans speak only of "progress" for 2018.

Could be clearer. Right now there is a too much complexity. Consider changing words to "First Focus Priorities". - rather than Priority. It's more than one.

We do not see what priority the numbers are specifically addressing. There seems to be double counting? Could there be in the future a last column for outcomes and assessment on progress of the funding?

The hard copy dashboard is very clear overall. It shows the connections in a very "broad strokes" manner. The plan lists the priorities, action steps and resources fairly well. The outcomes aren't clear however.

It shows well the connection to strategic plan priorities and the steps being taken. It is less clear the resources being used/allocated and the outcomes achieved.

More metrics should be listed, or possibly a new field that shows performance measures. There is a lot of information to digest. Action steps could have more transparent time fields or notable goals.

See below; would like to see at lower unit levels; linking money with the action steps.

So-so. Hard to see as living doc. Fact that two columns are across time and the third static is confusing. Try color coding for column 3?

I don't see a column for actual achieved outcomes other than monetary investments

So so. Hard to see as living doc. Fact that two columns are across time and the third static is confusing. Try color coding for column 3?

Fairly clearly; color variation helps. Unclear how often during each year it is to be updated.

It shows the connection well.

It's a good start but definitely could be better. Thank you for the effort in compiling this information and presenting it in an accessible format.

Not clearly.

The dashboard is very clear and shows an accurate and informative connection between priorities, actions and outcomes tied to resources.

Love the format, would suggest: instead of calling everything "first focus priority" (how can everything be "first"?), instead, identify each "first focus priority" referencing its place in the Plan (I.e., strategic goal #1, Objective 2.1. One concern is who is doing the updating, how to keep it consistent in its language? Concrete outcomes / metrics were vague--it would be nice to have a column for that for each first steps.

Unclear

Somewhat clearly.

After much analysis, the connections emerge. However, the group who designs this needs to abandon the commitment to rows and columns.

I think it is a good start, but it would be helpful to see who (or what units) are taking the lead on the different priorities. This will also provide contacts for individual faculty/staff to connect their particular work to the larger efforts on campus. Furthermore, the reason for the pulsed changes in base funding (high in 2016, low in 2017, and high in 2018) is not clear. Was this pulsed activity planned, or is it an artifact of the funding sources? The connection between action steps and outcomes is not clear. Are the outcomes the "first focus priorities"? A closer connection to outcomes would be useful.

Not very; I don't see any text regarding initiatives that have received substantial investment to date

It is confusing - first and next steps should relate to numbers of supporting objectives and unseen listed action items

All of those areas are clearly present, but some short blurb at the top/beginning, explaining what is contained in the dashboard would be helpful for those of us who are not as familiar with the strategic plan as are those who were more involved in its creation.

Pretty clear for first steps- less clear for next steps

More clarity could be provided. For example, why are the first year priorities being marked as priorities and some of the priorities are "strategic goals", while others are "supporting objectives". I think it would be helpful to align each of the priorities to how they fit within the strategic goals and/or supporting objectives. Further, I also think it would be useful to provide some data on status of each of the actions - where is "baseline" or what is the target goal? I think this would better map how to evaluate if the outcome has been met.

Some first steps are concrete, but some are not. Then some of the first steps that are not concrete also don't have concrete next steps. We see things like "continue to involve alumni in campus mission and vision..." on items marked as significant progress and where the first step is pretty fluffy, ie strengthen connections between alumni and the on-campus community. What's missing is the "how" and the proof. How did connections get strengthened and what's is your metric to illustrate that? Also some are in present and some are in future tense - not sure what that means, if they are complete or are not.

Good format. Maybe connect resource allocation to specific first steps. How do you allocate new faculty hires by category?

It is clear to me how it all connects. There are seemingly random positions inserted in discussions where it does not make sense (e.g., Student Experience: "Add psychologist to Counseling Center". How does this specific objective tie to the broader items?)

not well. the word priorities is not used in the plan. the dashboard should use the same language as goals and objectives - instead of priorities. there is no measurement of outcomes or steps made or baseline position on any of the goals/objectives/actions. the integrative threads need to be pulled out and explained or left out because it is unclear of their importance.

Clear connection between plan priorities and action steps by no outcomes listed (I.e student satisfaction with advising, number and dollar value of grant awards won by faculty)

The dashboard is aesthetically appealing and easy to follow. The plan priorities and action steps are clearly connected but the related resources and outcomes are less clear.

Resources could be enhanced by including column to show by dollar signs what the budget commitment is per item

Some things in first steps are confusingly vague compared to the next steps columns. The next steps appear to be very very specific.

Unclear when objective is complete or measure of success

Good use of color to connect focus areas with strategic plan focus areas

In some cases the description of First Focus Priority matches a strategic goal, but other places it does not

Use of depth of color is helpful

Useful layout

