SLU Landscape
*collects, galvanizes and animates university
resources in the landscape architecture field*

STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN – ACCEPTED

2021-06-18

Strategic Action Plan

Introduction

The Strategic Action plan builds on workshop materials from the bi-annual Strategic meeting that was held 2020-11-18. During the workshop the participants were divided in two different groups. They received a matrix, with a horizontal axis for Now/Later and vertical axis with Easy/Difficult, to place and prioritize different actions. The actions were compiled into a common matrix, and actions which needs to be reframed were pointed out. Those actions that should be achieved within two years were also defined. This material has been further interpreted to establish a priority order.

The result of the interpretation of the action priority order was discussed during the Strategic meeting that was held 2021-04-15. Before the meeting the result of the interpretation was sent to the steering group, and all were asked to reflect on "what do you want to contribute with, and what do you think would contribute to achieve these actions?". During the Strategic meeting (2021-04-15), requests were made for reactions on the priority order, and decisions on responsibility division for actions - that should be achieved within two years.

Below you´ll find the updated result of the interpretation. The updates are based on the discussions and decisions from the Strategic steering group meeting 2021-04-15.

RESULT

The result of the action prioritization is presented in table 1.

Reading instructions table 1:

Action priority order is the column which describes in what order the different actions should be started. There are five different shades of blue in the column, the lighter the blue shade is, the sooner the work propounds to start. All of these should be achieved within two years. Yellow colour in the column implies that actions will be handled later. **Action which needs to be reformulated/reframed, is written in bold-type in this column.**

The column *Target area* describes which category the different actions belong to.

The column *Difficulty* reports if the action is assessed as difficult to work with. If the action is measured as difficult the shade in the column is pink, and if the action is measured as very difficult it is red.

The column *Who* stands for responsible and participating. Each actions will have one steering group member as responsible.

The column *Start* contains suggestions of when the actions are planned to start.

The column *Milestone 1 /Follow up*, represent the next step to work with after decision on *Who* and *Start*.

Table 1.

Action priority order	Target area	Difficulty	Who	Start	Milestone 1 /Follow up
0.1 Gemensam röst t.ex. i remissvar			Responsible: CD	(2021)	
1.1 Generate statistic Generate statistics regarding allocation of resources to SLU Landscape in relation to other parts of SLU. How, for example, do allocations for research in relation to the teaching volume within SLU Landscape compare to other subjects/ environments?	1. Scale up the economy		Responsible: KL	(Spring 2021)	
7.1 Extend LTV Faculty level funding Extend LTV Faculty level funding of 250k for another 3-year cycle (2021–2023)	7. Finance		Responsible: KL	(Spring 2021)	Confirmed!
7.2 Budget to compensate WG Allocate budget to compensate WG members undertaking facilitation tasks.	7. Finance	Difficult	ISH + LJ	(Spring 2021)	
6.2 Annual SLU Landscape goals Define concrete and achievable annual SLU Landscape goals and regularly review progress and follow through on communication and action plans	6. Support SLU staff		SG (chair]	(2021)	
6.4 Facilitator Assign a facilitator as a strategic process and project facilitator to coordinate SLU:L actions and activities.	6. Support SLU staff		Responsible: SG + UF	(2021)	Completed for 2021.
2.4 Support other platforms and networks within SLU Continue strengthening the "living lab" model of collaborative-culture-building with forward-looking, institutionbuilding work at LTV.	2. Broader base		Responsible: SG (chair)	(2021)	
2.3 Cross Faculty Linkage Explore new opportunities for Faculty linkages; NJ (Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences) and LTV, through SOL, and expand involvement of less engaged people/groups in the landscape field.	2. Broader base		Responsible: NV/UF in collaboration with SG	(2021)	
4.2 Online Web news Regularly post on line web-news about staff publications, funding awards, international collaborations, Call for Ideas projects, Teaching and PhD's forum activities	4. Clearly communicate		Responsible: Bruno S, Participating: Maria Wisselgren Alva Lindvall,	(2021)	

			Hanna Weiber Post, Caroline Hägerhäll		
4.4 SLU: L on dept. Info ETC Provide regular SLU Landscape inputs to departmental and faculty meetings and to representatives at SLU boards	4. Clearly communicate		Responsible: ISH/LJ	(2021)	
6.1 Roles and responsibilities Establish clear roles and responsibilities for driving SLU Landscape initiatives to encourage long-term traction and continued value from seed efforts	6. Support SLU staff		Responsible: SG (chair)		
0.2 Kapacitetsbyggnad inom forskning /research forum			Responsible: ISH with WG		Reframe 2021
4.3 SLU:L Tagline Encourage more landscape field staff to add the SLU Landscape webpage to their address, to increase identification as part of SLU landscape	4. Clearly communicate		Responsible: Bruno Santesson		
3.4 SLU Landscape webpage Maintain an updated SLU Landscape webpage to attract high quality staff and students by showcasing SLU's Landscape capacity to an outward audience.	3. Landscape Research School		Responsible: Bruno Sanetsson. Participating: Maria Wisselgren		
4.1 Collective body Identify opportunities for SLU Landscape network members to speak/act as a collective body, strengthening landscape visibility to grow external resources and attractiveness for partners in society and business	4. Clearly communicate	Difficult	Responsible: SG (chair), ISH	Ongoing with LARK anniversary as an event 2021.	
3.2 Expand Established Forums Expand established Teaching Synergy Forums, PhD's Forums, and Calls for Ideas to build more robust infrastructures for high-quality education and research	3. Landscape Research School		Responsible: SG (chair)		
5.2 Campus knowledge Provide trusted, knowledge-based leadership to steward SLU's sustainable physical campus planning and development strategy in Ultuna, Alnarp and Umeå, growing the university's reputation for cutting-edge "campus as-lab" learning and research.	5. Support SLU leadership	Very difficult	Responsible: KL		Reframe 2021
7.5 Funding and evaluation metrics Advocate for funding systems and evaluation metrics that reward cross-disciplinary projects and joint work processes.	7. Finance	Very difficult			Decided who and when

6.3 Evaluate the "living lab" annually Evaluate the "living lab" annually, reflect, extract and report on lessons learned.	6. Support SLU staff				Reframe 2021
5.1 Landscape knowledge Generate innovative sustainable urban landscape knowledge to support society and help SLU contribute to UN SDG Sustainable cities and communities.	5. Support SLU leadership	Very difficult			Decided who and when
3.3 Strengthen inter- and transdisciplinary Strengthen inter- and transdisciplinary links and encourage SLU to incentivize collaboration with trans- and interdisciplinary course offerings	3. Landscape Research School	Difficult			Decided who and when
3.1 Landscape Research school Seek SLU Urban Futures support for a Landscape Research School (post 2021) to build upon the existing Landscape and Society School (today based at NJ Faculty)	3. Landscape Research School	Difficult			Decided who and when
2.1 Three campus network. Use possible new landscape education at SLU Umeå to create a 3-campus network and expand educator involvement, coordinated course planning and schedules	2. Broader base				Decided who and when

Discussions and decisions from the Strategic Steering group meeting April 15th

<u>0.1 Gemensam röst t.ex. i remissvar</u> Responsible: CD
New action! A need to identify what referrals we need to make joint statements on. A discussion regarding if there should be a new system and how this can be coordinated. A need to differentiate between external and internal referrals. A continued discussion regarding this.

<u>1.1 Generate statistic</u> Responsible: KL
KL will start to coordinate this with the faculty economist and the education leader until next SG meeting.

7.1 Extend LTV Faculty level funding KL: confirmed
KL: Confirmed, continued funding from the faculty. It is possible to argue for increased funding.

7.2 Budget to compensate WG Responsible: ISH + LJ
Previous stated that it wasn't possible. ISH and LJ will discuss this in dialogue with Håkan.

6.2 Annual SLU Landscape goals Responsible SG chair
LJ: There must be several who are responsible. NV: We all work with this, and discuss this in SG.
The chair of the SG is responsible.

6.4 Facilitator Responsible: SG + UF
Assign a facilitator as a strategic process and project facilitator to coordinate SLU:L actions and activities.

2.4 SLU Horticulture Support other platforms and network within SLU
Previously a focus on SLU Horticulture but rather to be understood as a support to Continue strengthening the "living lab" model of collaborative-culture-building with forward-looking, institutionbuilding work at LTV

2.3 New Faculty Linkage update→ Cross Faculty Linkage Responsible: NV/UF
LJ: This action could be seen as two actions –as it is both externally and internally. NV: Can think of this in different levels – strategically. Can be worked with, within SLU Landscape Days. Plan and invite people who are not typical "Landscape", from other faculties – work strategically cross faculty. ISH: Maybe it´s "Cross Faculty Linkage" the action should be named. CH: A lot of focus is given to who, also important to discuss what (applies to all actions) through which activities will targets be met. Identify activities and create a form of checklist for the Landscape days – for example there is a need for several faculties. What happens between the landscape days? Use WG trough SG. NV: UF can stimulate this in collaboration with SG.

4.2 Online Web news Responsible: BS

NV: It concerns both maintenances, but also about content. Who has the right or liberty to produce content? BS: Maria and Bruno have had regular meetings with Catherine K, and also discussed the facebook page. Bruno is responsible together with a communications team. Participating: Maria Wisselgren, Alva Lindvall, Hanna Weiber Post, Caroline Hägerhäll. Ask CD regarding a name from Movium.

4.4 SLU: L on dept. Info ETC Responsible: ISH/LJ

Via everyone on each department/unit. At prefects meeting ISH and LJ.

6.1 Roles and responsibilities Responsible: SG (chair).

A discussion regarding that this action is marked as very difficult, which it should not be considered as. NV: Strategic action plan is a strategic asset in order to identify roles, responsibilities and new subjects (as in the discussion regarding cross faculty). The overview regarding all groups, that Caroline Dahl presented at the last SG meeting is also a part of this.
SG is responsible but the chairperson will make sure to put it at the agenda.

0.2 Kapacitetsbyggnad inom forskning/reserach forum Responsible: ISH

New action. Forum in a similar way as Teachers forum and PhD forum, in order to create more possibilities for interaction between research forums. Recommendation: bring up head of subject. Connect to faculty and invite Thomas Österman.

4.3 SLU:L Tagline Responsible: BS

BS: During the department meetings we have discussed to have it on every digital business card. Many has done this but not all, will be brought up to the department level.

3.4 SLU Landscape webpage Responsible: BS

ISH: Missing a direct link from SoLs webpage to SLU Landscape webpage BS: We are working with the webpage and will include it. Particpiants: Maria Wisselgren. Catherine Kihlström, Maria and MA have a meeting scheduled regarding this. MA sends the meeting invitation to BS.

<u>4.1 Collective body</u> Responsible: ISH

Several considered this action as difficult. ISH: Important to go together, for example working with debate articles. ISH referred to the discussion about referrals. ISH: We are representing one field. KL: A greater impact if we worked together and raise questions – both centrally and on a faculty level. ISH: By signing with all units, we can help sort what SLU Landscape is all about. KL: SLU Landscape should be more active in contributing to the board of education, for example why to keep the landscape educations. LJ: Important that we act against the board of education. ISH will process and return with a new formulation.

<u>3.2 Expand Established Forums</u> Responsible: SG (chair)

Both teaching forum and PhD forum has been active and taken steps forward. CFI has been harder to run during the pandemic – evaluate CFI?
It is the forum themselves that is responsible to invite/expand. SG is responsible to make sure they continue with that, check and discuss with the different forums and make sure that it will be a new group later (depends in how active/passive the forum is).

<u>5.2 Campus knowledge</u> Responsible: KL

KL: Interesting to see how the landscape competence comes into the process that is going on, but you can't take leadership here. One from Ultuna is involved in the Alnarp process - and vice versa. Emily Wade is involved in the Ultuna process. Discussion about whether there should be another from SLU Landskap and what role it has in relation to Emily and Petter. KL: Comments on the documents produced (planning principles, guiding principles) - would have been interesting to get input there. It may be a little late to plug it in now.

Next phase - Reports and dialogue

The working procedure entails follow up from the *Action priority order*. Responsible for prioritized actions from the steering group presents shortly the ongoing process and what has been done to contribute to the action, at every steering group meeting. The summaries are discussed to settle the future development and process for that action. The plan is continuously discussed at strategy meetings – for possible reconsiderations and reformulations.

Method

In the first step of obtaining the order of priority from the matrix, the axis that stands for now and later was divided into 12 parts. These 12 parts were assigned a value, *the first part value 1, the second part value 2, the third part value 3 ..etc.* Two values were then read from each action, since there were two different groups that placed each action, these two values were added together to then be divided by two – this to obtain an average value for each action. All actions were sorted by the values they received. To highlight actions that are closer to each other, the actions were divided into intervals of six and given the same shade in the column *Action priority order*, in Table 1.

The Easy/Difficult axis was divided into six parts; E3, E2, E1, D1, D2 and D3. Where E3 stands for very easy, E2 stands for easy, E1 stands for quite easy, D1 stands for quite difficult, D2 stands for difficult and D3 stands for very difficult. These six parts were assigned a value - *E3 was given value 1, E2 was given value 2, E1 was given value 3, D1 was given value 4, D2 was given value 5 and D3 was given value 6*. Two values were then read from each action, since there were two different groups that placed each action, these two values were added together to then be divided by two – this to obtain an average value for each action. This to nuance how easy/difficult these actions are considered to be to work with and to point out actions that need more support and resources.