

STRATEGIC PLANNING TASK FORCE 2012-17  
Meeting #13 October 20, 2011  
Student Center, Room 310  
8-9:30 a.m.

Members Present: H. Akin, C. Alexander, K. Bales, P. Gestwicki, M. Goldsby, M. Holtzman, T. King, W. Knight, T. Lauer, K. Lee, K. McGeary, B. McNely, R. Morris, J. Obrycki, T. Proudfoot, C. Rhine, J. Scheib, C. Sullivan, L. Siktberg, T. Taylor, G. Vasquez de Velasco,

Members absent: J. Bott, B. Hannon, R. Howard, E. Kelly, J. Palilonis, P. Repp, F. Sabatine

Provost Terry King convened the meeting at 8:00 a.m.

The Provost led the discussion on the three charts in which he wrote:

- 1) MIDDLE CHART: Strategy (1)  
Theme (3-6)  
Outcome (Goal) (multiple)  
Targets (multiple)
- 2) LEFT CHART: Strategy: Differentiation  
Themes:
- 3) RIGHT CHART: Themes (six listed below)

The goal to accomplish today was to get a general sense of the themes and work on outcomes, as well as how we can communicate effectively with the university – formal and informal.

The last strategic plan had four themes:

- 1) Higher quality students
- 2) High impact learning experiences
- 3) High quality academic programs and faculty
- 4) Vibrant campus community (physical and student life/cultural activities)

Two additional themes that came up from the current data gathering that appears to be important:

- 5) Engagement for economic development and quality of life (primarily off-campus)
- 6) Future viability (coming up all the times when dealing with the State)

- How do we define impact? How do people know about us?
  - ✓ High Quality Students – what would be a differentiator?
    - “May all schools go for scores as the element that measures how desirable students are for admission.”
      - What would happen if we added an additional layer that states you’re more than numbers for us?

“Understanding what we mean by quality and additional are we just interested bringing in high quality students or creating high quality students? (Diamond in the rough)

- Process question: Interested in understanding how we articulate the various steps we’ve taken to get to this point, especially how we’re articulating what we’ve done with our qualitative analyses to get us to here. How are we using information that we’ve gathered thus far to get to this point.
- The themes we have here resonate from the analyses. We have to remain constantly cognizant about the data, because there was some negative. Should we discuss synthesis?
- The piece that’s missing is the data that was gathered. There are unresolved issues. Is trust a problem? There’s a sense of “I want to know more because I don’t trust.”

“Elephants”

- ✓ Trust (or lack of)
    - State
    - Faculty
    - Administration
    - Staff
  - ✓ Morale
  - ✓ Relative emphasis (graduate v. undergraduate)
  - ✓ Faculty Governance – fears that a lot of what we’re doing
  - ✓ Not focused
  - ✓ Implementation
  - ✓ E-learning
  - ✓ Grading-departments, faculty, support units
  - ✓ Program elimination/consolidation/restructuring
  - ✓ History of institution is not our future (big tension – those hired 30 years ago we would not hire today and they feel uncomfortable)
  - ✓ Core curriculum
  - ✓ Appropriate metrics (quantitative/more quantitative)
  - ✓ Focus on negative rather than positive
  - ✓ Student Services not a concern to university
- 
- To the identified problems: How do you frame them so it’s always positive? How do you find the balance without making the problems look huge? Look at positive plans geared towards the discontented who like it.
  - Discussed mentioning items that was not gleaned from data. We must go from the data collected.
  - Next Step:

- “This is what we think you said,” and give them a Google document with opportunity to respond?
  - Needs to be parameters around it (where it came from) and invite them to respond again (in some other fashion). Then we can go back and refine or change.
- Holtzman, Lauer, McNely, Proudfoot, Rhine – come together to propose mechanism to get word out to people. Progress of task force hopefully targeted in next President’s Perspective.

For next week: Think about themes and outcomes (and how we’re going to accomplish)

Retreat format (half-day) when task force starts discussion about targets. Once themes are identified, break into small groups and work towards common target groups. Keep small groups as before and take two themes each.

Adjournment: 9:25a.m.

/mt