



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 18-0015 **Version:** 1 **Name:**
Type: Discussion Items **Status:** General Agenda
File created: 1/10/2018 **In control:** Town Commission
On agenda: 1/16/2018 **Final action:**
Title: Strategic Planning Discusison
Sponsors: JP Murphy
Indexes:
Code sections:
Attachments: 1. StratPlanPyramid.pdf

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
------	------	-----------	--------	--------

Summary

To: Mayor Gary H. Katica & Commissioners
From: JP Murphy, Town Manager
Date: 1/12/2018

Subject:

Discussion of Strategic Planning Process

Summary:

Commissioner Kurey asked that the Commission have a discussion regarding a strategic planning process. I believe going through a strategic planning process would be incredibly valuable for the town, and will provide concrete direction when considering priorities. Over the past few years staff has conducted several pre-strategic planning activities which include: increasing engagement, identifying stakeholders and neighborhoods, creating goal defined programing, creating core, aspirational and behavioral values as part of our leadership playbook, and moving towards programmatic budgeting and performance measurement. An approved vision, mission and values is absent. Management of the town centers on generally accepted directions but there are no clear mandates aside from a focus on infrastructure improvement.

My belief is that strategic planning starts with and must constantly include our stakeholders. The Commission should heavily weigh their input in the creation of the shared vision and strategic vision for the community. Once the overarching strategic vision and strategic goals are created all other plans and priorities should nest clearly underneath them. This includes annual goals, objectives and budgetary priorities. We should utilize logic to tie objectives to strategic goals and data to analyze if our logic is correct. Budgeted resources should reflect the intensity in which goals and objectives are to be achieved. This cascading of decision making should run from a position in which the stakeholders have a strong presence in the setting of the strategic direction.

As to how the process begins and is facilitated is a matter of preference for the commission, weighing best practices and resources. A couple of questions to consider might be:

- What do we hope to achieve?
- Who will facilitate the process?

- Are we willing to commit to the effort?
- How do we want to engage our stakeholders? (or defer to facilitator)
 - Survey or In Person
 - Large Session v. Small Sessions
 - Electronic Engagement v. Neighborhood discussions.
- Can we miniaturize the processes?
- When would we like to see the plan adopted by?

I'd recommend a professional facilitator to avoid any internal party from "steering" the process one way or another. This minimizes "politics" staff pressures and benefits from prior experience in conducting strategic planning processes. I will provide more discussion at the meeting based on the preferences of the Commission.

Previous Commission Action: The Commission previously started to generate a mission but it was never formally adopted, and only used input from senior staff and the commission. There was no citizen involvement.

Background/Problem Discussion: N/A

Expenditure Challenges Variable, too early to provide estimates

Financial Implications: N/A

Recommendation: N/A

Proposed Motion N/A discussion only.