

GPN Strategic Planning Meeting
Dec. 17-18, 2007
Kansas City, Mo

Day 1 2
Introductions..... 2

SWOT Analysis 2
 Carousel Design Exercise 2
 1) Strengths (what do we do well) 2
 2) Weaknesses (what must we improve) 3
 3) Opportunities (what we see that we should take advantage
 of, what excites you) 3
 4) Threats (what makes you nervous) 3

Future Timeline 5
 Most Important Points..... 6
 Strategic Audit related to Most Important Points 6

Hopes & Aspirations..... 8

DAY 2 9
The Planning Process – Moving Forward 9

Shared Picture of the Future 9

Beginning Thinking – Strategic Goals 12

Day 1

Introductions

Greg Monaco (Executive Director): explained handout material and thoughts

Pat Sanaghan, facilitator: introduction and clear points

rule of four

interactive, but not wacky

advocacy and inquiry

STRATEGIC PLANNING: external focus is important, creating a “shared” picture of the future in essential, leadership commitment

Parking lot: loose-end issues

SWOT Analysis

(Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats)

Carousel Design Exercise

Bold items had the most agreement; each asterisk indicates an additional participant agreed with the item.

1) Strengths (what do we do well)

Manage a network well*****

Handsome Exec Council**

Able to manage \$ acceptably for the numbers

Geography*

Sound financial structure/goings on

Good access to telecom hubs in KC*

Good geek acumen**

Good EPSCoR opportunities

Good history of cooperation*****

Kept a focus on research – most others are only about the network****

Consensual decision making*****

High-level of expertise across membership*****

Ready platform for extended network development among small regional players****

Credibility**

Researchers want to collaborate – excited*

Organization and leadership foresight (this conference)*

Commitment to network use by researchers

2) Weaknesses (what must we improve)

NSF/CI \$ opportunities**

Dependence on one Exec Director*

Identity-Role? ***

Limited \$\$ available*

Collaboration of researchers (within GPN)*****

Collaboration of with other regions

Athletics

Few tangible results other than networking**

Decreasing collaboration

Lack of time to contribute governance*

Minimal institutional awareness of GPN at the senior executive level*****

Unifying vision among participants**

Lack of visibility within host and potentially supportive entities*

Marketing and materials differentiators for educating member institutions**

Small staff***

3) Opportunities (what we see that we should take advantage of, what excites you)

NSF opportunities for cyber-enabled science*****

Regional Grant Collaborations*****

Information Exchange on various topics: i.e. networking, technical, research***

Serve as facilitators of institutional frameworks for cyber infrastructure development*****

Facilitate training in advanced cyber technologies**

As a larger group, influence national policy to help our region****

Pool resources regionally*****

Develop leadership understanding and commitment to regional networking (both institutional and political)*****

Create a regional cyber-infrastructure CENTER***

Leverage EPSCoR effectively*****

Facilitate more network infrastructure with GPN states

Further I2 use in K-12's*

4) Threats (what makes you nervous)

Losing site of the advantages of regional collaboration*****

Gigapops (RONS) become superfluous with regard to national networking futures*

East Coast/West Coast research (\$) swallow up everyone else*****

Regional uncertainty about the role and importance of networking in the lives of people**

Dilution of resources (lack of focus)*****

GPN Strategic Planning Meeting

Dec. 17-18, 2007

Kansas City, Mo

Lack of clear criteria for what constitutes GPN success*****

Some GPN people may be reaching retirement age – who will replace them?*****

Lack of visibility of GPN with our researchers*

I2/NLR/GENI dilution

Lack of public understanding of the value of I2 et al.

Dwindling institutional interest**

Big Topics – Headlines

- Improve reward systems for instructors/researchers, particularly young researchers
- Limited institutional awareness of GPN
- Using failures and successes to build collaboration
- GENI opportunities
- NSF/CI opportunities
- Relevance to people beyond the experts
- Refine relationship between networking and research
- Focus on 1 thing and go for it
- Cyberinfrastructure – GPN is poised to do powerful things
- GPN has powerful tools – searching for best use

Notions to Tease

- We have expertise relationship resource (and technical)
- Can we look at SURA (others) and learn from them?
- Other people doing similar things (Boreas, Quilt)
- KC is national networks' hub – unique strength

GPN Strategic Planning Meeting

Dec. 17-18, 2007

Kansas City, Mo

Future Timeline

(look at events, trends and issues that could influence (+/-) GPN in the next 3-5 years)

2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Change of national political administration (2008 forward)- More wireless uptake (2008 forward)- Out migration trend in GPN footprint will diminish financial resources in process and increase- Baby Boomers retiring (2008 forward)- Change in GPN leadership?- Identity having merit in the mix of numerous similar organizations- Communicate laterally and upward among universities to build strong consortia, political and expertise basis to secure research funding.- GPN wins a research grant which is large and has regional participation from all the member states- Flat finances for institutions and tough choices among priorities for technology expenditures- Aging local infrastructures and increasing demand for capacity and connectivity for years to come- CERN Linear Hadron Collider deployment- Trend in security issues: viruses, hacking, identity authentication, authorization, law enforcement rules- FCC Rural Healthcare Pilot Awards: "Funding of Network Capacity and Additions"
2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- EPSCoR funding usually has a focus. GPN states could pool efforts to increase the impact of funding (2009 forward)- Greater broadband capacity need (20??)- GPN is recognized nationally as a model of regional collaboration- Competitive/merger of I2 and NLR (have competition somewhat now – merger attempts have failed)- Increased government interest and oversight of IT-related issues. More need to provide clear cost-to-benefit picture.- Confused Intra-state networking picture where research and "public good" investments are concerned.
2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Possible financial collapse of I2 – would that fragment or solidify GPN?- General interest needs exceeding those of the researchers- NSF funding habits bringing focus to different/redefined regions- As GPN gets further away from network infrastructure issues, the more difficult it will be to reach consensus on collaboration opportunities- GENI development – tangible progress- Global warming, disease, energy issues- GPN is approached by NSF to manage a significant project like GENI- GPN has lost committed constituents which are a GPN voice in their states/regional

GPN Strategic Planning Meeting

Dec. 17-18, 2007

Kansas City, Mo

	networks - Advanced networking (I2/NLR?) becomes another flavor of commodity access. Then what? - Internet crisis – broad pressure on the resource due to demand could impact reliability - GPN leadership retirement – no time to mentor next generation leadership (mentor nor mentee time) (2010-2014) - Single investigator awards decrease dramatically
2011	- Building of new federal lab in GPN region – DUSEL - GPN will land a big one involving 10-15 institutions across multiple states - cyber-enabled learning trend: Holidech, distance learning, institutional focus on core excellence/de-emphasis on commodity - GENI deployment - The ‘haves’ will build the next private H.P. network to support <u>their</u> research (East/West coasts) - Telecom buildout reducing need for a physical GPN network (2011-2012)
2012	- End of the world (sayeth Nostradamus)
2013 +	- connectivity to future national I2 and G networks will be state-based – the natural political subdivision

Most Important Points

- People change = GPN leadership, state admin, federal level (policy and funding)
- Drive to create direct linkage between the work of institutions and GPN
- Funding shortfalls in higher ed
- No good process to identify needed resources to take advantage of specific opportunities
- do we need to aware of others but not dependent – we want to be able to use them, not reliant on one
- GPN’s role in networking? – growing beyond?
- Global warming – funding conflicts
 - cyberinfrastructure will not still be the hot topic in a few years

Strategic Audit related to Most Important Points

People Change

What we are doing now:

- involved in I2 and NLR committees

What we should do:

- GPN Leadership Mentoring Program: GPN pays 1/4 – 1/2 salary per state (1 state per year) to: 1) attend all GPN & national meetings, 2) visit other GPN members and promote collaboration, 3) engage substantively with Quilt, I2, NLR, etc.
 - ‘Real’ technical work groups with real projects that make an impact at the local level

GPN Local Accountability and Relevance

GPN Strategic Planning Meeting

Dec. 17-18, 2007

Kansas City, Mo

- Newsletter
 - increase mailing list
- Initiatives
- Research Advisory Group
- Representative Council
- Executive Council

Should do's:

- institutional provosts appoint Representative Council member
- develop message
- Institutional venues for increasing issue awareness
- Who should the players be?

Funding Shortfalls

- Limited funding for students to attend GPN meetings – we are doing some
- Expand/contract GPN activities depending on funding – using fund balance!

Need to do:

- Proactively seek funds for workshops, resolutions/proposals, etc. for GPN region
- Expand support of funding faculty and researchers to attend meetings
- Plan for continuing GPN support in fund balance
- Increase perceived value in order to increase rates (membership \$)

Processes and Protocols: to take an advantage of opportunities, collaborate with others

- Total reliance on Greg (limited resource)
- Would like to see representative council to create contacts, resources and process for:
 - identifying regional opportunities
 - review by-laws to provide guidance and authority for the process
 - protocol for creating grant applications and managing the competition
- Resources???

So, what must GPN do?

- Raise awareness
 - \$ does talk; come up with ways to gain attention while spending the least amount of \$
- Engaging high-level faculty of the institutions
- Develop a message: find one big project that provosts, etc. will pay attention to and work together

GPN Strategic Planning Meeting
Dec. 17-18, 2007
Kansas City, Mo

Hopes & Aspirations

Claude: "Anticipate the watershed activity that will give our constituents the clear feeling that they're glad they have GPN."

Scott: "Facilitate research growth."

Gordon: "GPN is a recognized, model environment (nationally) that supports research collaboration with minimal impediments imposed by institutional policies of the GPN member institutions - truly support Virtual Organizations."

Dave: "GPN recognized by Education and the State legislature as an essential and valued component of academic research, and economic development, beneficial multi-state constituents"

Bob: "Ambition: create a process that actively facilitates successful collaboration among GPN universities to enhance research funding."

Denise: "...that GPN becomes an empowering resource for BIG objectives among its members"

John: "For all GPN network participants to have/maximize their infrastructure interoperability."

Beth: "GPN to remain a significant force in Midwest computing using high-speed networks. To help members use IT to meet the research/outreach/education (instruction) as universities experience the great changes to come in the next 2-3 decades."

Myron: "GPN is known and respected in the same context as 'East' or 'West.'"

James: "Desire to see a wide regard and understanding of GPN's role and benefits within institutions and throughout governing bodies of the regions."

Bill: "Midwest H.E. institutions (GPN current and future members) 'own' GPN and view it strategically in the same way that SURA and CIC members view their respective organizations."

Greg: "Clarity of Purpose."

End of Day 1

DAY 2

The Planning Process – Moving Forward

- 1) Vision idea and handful of goals
- 2) Refined and chosen by the Executive Council
- 3) Report back to this group and other GPN groups
- 4) Begin breaking it down to specific objectives, responsibilities
- these steps should be accomplished within the next 60-90 days
- 5) Accomplish objectives

**Communication
and feedback
throughout
process**



Shared Picture of the Future

Imagine, that we are all gathered here, 5 years from now. We are here to celebrate all the successes GPN has experienced over the past 5 years. We have met many challenges, crossed many hurdles and experienced a great deal of success.

Focus Questions:

- 1) What kinds of important activities are involved with?
- 2) What changes in our organizational structure did we make?
- 3) What is one thing we had to change in order to be so successful?
- 4) How were we able to achieve the “penetration” (messaging) and real value of GPN? (What did we do?)
- 5) What is one accomplishment you feel especially proud about?

Group Answers:

Group 1:

- 1) - Driving several critical multi-state research projects
- Influence national policy R &E research
- Gained the attention and understanding by state governors
 - economic development(value to the state)
- SURA has applied to join GPN
- 2) - Presidents Council
- Redefined focus/direction of:
 - Representative Council
 - Research Council
 - Advisory Board
- Make appropriate changes to staff and specific roles
- 3) - Made GPN activities part of strategic plans for other organizations – resulted from successfully selling GPN necessity

GPN Strategic Planning Meeting

Dec. 17-18, 2007

Kansas City, Mo

- 4) - “Sold” significant successes/values (regional collaboration)
 - Focused the activities of several GPN groups on shared targets...
 - Defined, recurring analysis and communication of value of results – link to institutions...and others

- 5) - Job #1: Collaborative approaches to achieve high-value results for constituents
 - national/international projects
 - state leadership
 - institutional involvement
 - economic development
 - national policy involvement- Job #2: Provide technology to support Job #1
 - research support
 - well-managed economies of scale
 - advanced tools
 - networking capacity- “We are recognized as a model of regional collaboration and networking nationally (like SURA...)”

Group 2:

- 1) - Regional planning process
 - Become a lead partner in regional participation, global impact, involve business and industry, cooperation with other groups
 - String CI and research project collaboration with BOREAS and SURA
 - GENI – major player
 - Buy faculty time to fund research for national projects and develop and submit big regional and national grants
 - Create a vision that is compelling and relevant the 1st time

- 2) - Representation within the organization of member administrative leadership
 - with decision-making (or advisory ?) authority
 - Increase GPN staff to handle programs
 - GPN/BOREAS partner/merge
 - Organizational structure includes CI and research champions
 - work together effectively

- 3) - Expand organization to include higher administration and become a higher education compact through legislation in individual states (aka MHEC)

- 4) - Partner/join another network
 - Awarded major grant – demonstrates relevance
 - More F2F meetings

- 5) - Regional center for CI

GPN Strategic Planning Meeting

Dec. 17-18, 2007

Kansas City, Mo

- network connectivity/interoperability
- Achieve awareness and value at the institutional level
- Recognized in Midwest as source for networking expertise
- Services, collaboration and projects valued by all participants

Notes:

- Financial implications of new agenda
- Join SURA???
- being a small part of a larger group will not improve value/achieve our objectives
- need to be stronger, not bigger

GPN Strategic Planning Meeting

Dec. 17-18, 2007

Kansas City, Mo

Beginning Thinking – Strategic Goals

- 1) Come up with 2 strong recommendations that would begin to move us forward to our shared picture/vision:
- 2) Work with another group to come up with 2 most important recommendations

Group 1:

- 1) Pick a project, grant, etc., that includes multi-state/multi-institution involvement, and GO FOR IT.
 - Agree upon one project leader.
 - Time Frame: 6 months for decision
- 2) Restructure: redefine Representative Council and Research Advisory Council
 - Roles and who should be the designated representative...

Group 2:

- 1) Change current committee structure and replace it with one that facilitates and ensures GPN's goals and objectives
- 2) Win a major multi-state, multi-institution grant/award consistent with GPN objectives

Comments:

- Synergy with other groups important

- Help with DUSEL???