

Strategic Planning: Academic Planning Working Group Meeting
July 8, 2014, 10:3am – 12noon
Hammond 314

Members in attendance: Michael Turk, Lisa Gim, Chris Picone, Sam Tobin, Jeannette McMenamy, Jeff Godin, Linda LeBlanc, Randall Grometstein (chair)

Guests in attendance: Eric Budd, Brian Bercier, Chris Cratsley, Jane Fiske, Michael Leamy

C. Canney agreed to take minutes.

Chair reviewed the agenda and minutes from previous meeting. Motion made and seconded to approve minutes with all in favor.

Report on Strategic Planning Committee meeting of June 26th

Linda L. reviewed the meeting and made the following points (also included member comments to same):

- Seemed that most working groups were in similar places with some focused on organization.
- Consultant reviewed that the main focus of the summer work should be the big picture focus, with research and reading.
- Learned through working group reports that most wanted to conduct surveys so agreed that there should be some collaboration.
- Consultant indicated that working groups should have 3 or 4 declaration statements and not get bogged down with too much data. “Directional” statements was also used to describe our charge.
- Enrollment discussion with Jay B. pointing out that 100 students equates to 1 million dollars. Enrollment is down in fall by about 250 for undergraduate. Point being made about the need to look at alternatives.
- Jane F. informed members that a report was being circulated from the DHE regarding potential centralization of online learning with the public universities – posted to Blackboard.
- Mike T. noted the different approaches of the various working groups and how that might come together. Suggested that we use value terms (i.e. ought to, should,..) in our directional statements.
- Consultant suggested we be looking at how we see ourselves in the future. Linda indicated that example given was teaching or research university. Discussion clarified this point to agree that the group was not considering this specific question.
- Recommended priority reading from the original list is CheckList for Change by Zemsky and Lean Higher Education by Balzer.
- Consultant reviewed definitions of strategic planning.

Refining the mission of our Working Group

Chair read Options A – E as group considered approaches to the charge of the group. C. Picone suggested grouping in 3 meta questions that would still encompass all parts. Questions noted below would have additional specifics under the larger questions.

1. How do we strategically plan so our students are armed for future? What are the skills our students need and employers want?
2. How do we improve admission, retention, and completion?
3. What processes and standards are used to decide if programs should expand or contract?

M. Turk raised the possibility of adding a 4th question to address who we are and what we do in particular in light of the change from college to university. This is the first strategic plan developed since that change.

Lots of rich discussion on this topic with consensus in addressing this question as an overarching or framing question that is considered when discussing and answering all 3 questions.

Discussion regarding the role of faculty research and importance of considering this within our thinking and deliberations as we address the questions.

Discussion surrounding resources in relation to program development and the need to be realistic about resources needed for programs.

Option F: (This option will be used by the group as an approach to address its charge)

Overarching question: Consistent with our university's mission as a comprehensive university, how do we define ourselves as a learning institution (as we've moved from a college to a university, and given the changes coming in the future)?

1. How do we strategically plan so our students are armed for the future? (What skills do they need for grad schools, employers, technology, literacy etc.? We can address LAS here.)
2. How do we improve admission, retention, and completion? (Curricula, Online learning, scheduling, competency-based assessments, demographics? Learning methods (incorporating students and faculty)? Delivery methods?
3. What process or standards would be appropriate for assessing and planning academic programs for the future?

Next meeting date: Tuesday, August 19th, 10:30am, Hammond 314.

Next meeting will focus on question #1. C. Cratsley will provide data in advance to include skills employers seek from several organizations including LEAP as well as the Lumina degree qualifications profile.