**Historical Context for Strategic Plan 2014/2015**

A number of major efforts have taken place in the last ten years that have helped define where the HSU stands today. These efforts include a Strategic Plan, Program Prioritization, the Cabinet for Institutional Change, reaffirmation of WASC accreditation, and the Enrollment Management Plan. These broadly inclusive projects combined with the realities of decreasing State resources have defined the priorities for the university: inclusive student success, initiatives that will generate additional revenue, and continued implementation of HSU’s vision. These priorities will serve as a platform for the new 2015 strategic plan. This plan will drive major decisions and resource allocations over the next several years.

**Strategic Plan Executive Summary 2004-2009**

In April 2003, HSU President Rollin Richmond announced the formation of a Strategic Planning Steering Committee. The purpose of the committee was to revise the 1997 Strategic Plan and oversee the process of developing a new plan.

The strategic plan amplified and expanded on the goals that President Richmond outlined when he took office in 2002:

* Be student centered
* Promote diversity of people and perspectives
* Practice social and environmental responsibility
* Be a role model for community involvement
* Promote responsible economic development

At that juncture, the vision For Humboldt State University that emerged was as follows:

Humboldt State University will be the campus of choice for individuals who seek above all else to improve the human condition and our environment. We will be the premier center for the interdisciplinary study of the environment and its natural resources. We will be a regional center for the arts. We will be renowned for social and environmental responsibility and action. We believe the key to our common future will be the individual citizen who acts in good conscience and engages in informed action. We will commit to increasing our diversity of people and perspectives. We will be exemplary partners with our communities, including tribal nations. We will be stewards of learning to make a positive difference.

**Academic Program Prioritization**

From October 2007 to December 2009 Academic Affairs underwent an intensive internal review of its academic offerings. Using criteria developed largely by the faculty, academic program prioritization identified programs that were candidates for augmentation, maintenance, reduction, restructuring or elimination. The process offered a way to review and rank academic programs for the purpose of guiding the allocation of resources. The process began when the campus anticipated increased resources and was concluded when the campus reduced its budget by roughly 10 percent. The Provost’s final recommendations in December 2009 reflected both the need to reduce the budget and the reality that program restructuring and elimination must be included in the strategies used to do so. That effort also directed tenure-track hiring for highly ranked programs.

Program prioritization processes, which were not only conducted in Academic Affairs, but in Student Affairs, Administrative Affairs, and in Advancement, greatly contributed toward clarifying and communicating institutional focus.

**WASC**

In June 2010, WASC reaffirmed HSU’s accreditation for seven years after a three-stage review, but requested an interim report after three years to ensure that HSU would sustain its progress and show concrete results in four key areas: assessing student learning, making excellence inclusive, embracing institutional change, making critical choices and realigning resources and institutional structures.

The Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) report, submitted in November 2007, reflected both our struggles with and our progress in these areas. The CPR Visitation Team, which came to campus in February 2008, provided additional focus and direction for our work as we entered the Educational Effectiveness Review phase of the process. Overall, the team pointed out that our institutional success would require fundamental changes to our culture and therefore recommended that the Educational Effectiveness Review be delayed by six months. Acknowledging our struggles to realize our institutional identity, they observed that Humboldt State University must unite around a common vision, develop processes and structures for making decisions about how to achieve that vision, and use data for planning and evaluating progress toward that vision.

The Visitation Team specifically recommended that HSU engage a third-party consultant to conduct a “comprehensive functional analysis (process re-engineering) of its budget development and management processes.” In response, HSU hired Maddox Management Consulting, a firm specializing in strategic planning and financial management for higher education and nonprofit organizations, to assist with these issues. HSU also retained Keeling & Associates, LLC to conduct an assessment of institutional culture in order to further elucidate findings of the WASC CPR Visitation Team report and help us address issues related to governance, decision making, policies, and organizational structure.

**Convening the Cabinet for Institutional Change**

The Cabinet for Institutional Change (CIC) was formed in early in the Spring 2009 semester, in response to issues raised during the current reaccreditation process and at the recommendation of Keeling & Associates. The Cabinet was charged with initiating comprehensive reforms at Humboldt State University, with the goal of making the institution more effective and responsive.

In February 2010, the Cabinet for Institutional Change defined five key areas of change on which to focus: University Vision, Campus Governance, Student Success, Culture of Evidence and creating a Collegial, Respectful and Responsive Community. The Cabinet made a number of recommendations in the final report under each of these five areas. To date most of the recommendations have been completed. The University community embraced the report and progress has been swift, resulting in new institutional investments in Institutional Research, the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, and assessment efforts.

The Cabinet not only worked toward the goal of addressing specific challenges, but along the way it also has sought to model some general processes that other campus groups could use for finding collaborative solutions to dilemmas that tend to divide us.

In the same vein, substantial improvements in the transparency of budget and business processes, along with an institutional commitment to providing broad access to common sets of data, are beginning to inform decision making and improve trust on campus. Quality Improvement and Excellence in Higher Education efforts, which have now expanded beyond Administrative Affairs, have resulted in the demonstrated enhancement of workflow and priority setting in several units.

**The Enrollment Management Plan**

An Enrollment Management Plan was produced for years 2009- 2016, representing the first coordinated effort at incorporating all of the aspects of enrollment management (student success, recruitment and retention) into a document that informs every part of the university about specific roles and responsibilities in these vital efforts.

**The University Senate**

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) review of our accreditation status in 2010 reaffirmed the urgent need for us to embrace institutional change. We are doing so. An excellent example is the restructuring of the Academic Senate into a University Senate that represents all constituencies within the university.

The new University Senate has now been in place for three years, and it is important that this new structure is used to develop practices that allow us to work more collaboratively across constituencies. Many of our administrative leaders are relatively new to the university. Communication, cooperation and collaboration are critical in achieving university goals. There is a good mixture of people with knowledge of the campus and its culture, as well as people with knowledge of how other campuses and systems get things done. Humboldt needs both in order to develop new processes for effective communication, cooperation and collaboration.

**HSU Priorities 2012-2016**

A priorities document was produced in 2012 to summarize campus priorities and are listed below.

Priority One: Student Success

The goals defining student success are increasing graduation rates, decreasing time to degree and closing the achievement gap. The overall goal is to improve graduation rates by 15 percent for under-represented students and 12 percent for the rest of the student population by 2015.

Priority Two: Enhancing Revenue

State and national trends clearly indicate that public revenue is going to continue to decrease while the pressure to reduce the cost of education will increase. Revenue generation has to complement our academic mission and our priorities. There are five initiatives that, when fully developed, can help the university compensate for dwindling general fund support while complementing our mission and goals. These are: grants and contracts, internationalizing the campus, philanthropy, self-support and distance education, and enterprise opportunities.

Priority Three: Enhancing HSU’s Vision

In its final report, the Cabinet for Institutional Change noted that “based upon our consultation, we conclude that at present they [the mission and vision statements] remain the clearest and best statement we have to guide campus decision-making.” The Cabinet also noted that HSU has not been effective in adopting clear plans to advance the mission and vision and to tie resource allocation to such plans. It recommended a number of short- and long-term strategies to tie campus planning to the mission and vision.