

Strategic Planning Community Working Group  
Meeting Friday, May 30, 2014 2 pm in Academic Affairs Conference Room

Committee Attendees: Beth Walsh, Chair, Chris Hendry, Jannette McMenamy, Rob Carr, Josh Spero, Dan LaFond. Absent: Megan Pierce, Rene Scapperone

Guests: Mike Leamy, Marilyn Gaganon, Lisa Moison, Julie Primeau, Jessica Augat, Matt Bruun, Paul Weizer, Jane Fiske, Bill Cummings

Logistics: A Blackboard site can be set up for each group; members can include committee members and interested ad hoc participants.

Meetings will be scheduled for Mondays at 10:30 am, every other week, beginning June 9, 2014.

Themes Discussed:

The charge is large, with numerous questions proposed by the consultants. The resulting discussion was broad. Several themes emerged, including the following:

- We should analyze the status quo and what we currently do well. The status quo is reflected in many of the questions proposed by the consultants. However, we should also look forward to develop a larger strategic vision regarding university and community partnerships.
- We should identify key community stakeholders and invite them to attend certain meetings to ensure that a broad range of voices is heard. We do not want to make claims about community perceptions, relationships, and partnerships in a unidirectional manner. We should also recognize that relationships are transactional, and that both the University and the community benefit from successful partnerships.
- Several successful examples of partnerships were discussed such as ALFA, FAVE, and the recent work with the Cleghorn Neighborhood Center. There are more such examples, and we should pull together information about all of them.
- It is important that we thoughtfully consider the definition of “community” and to think about the definition in relation to the University’s mission. Our ideas about community, and its range, will have a profound impact upon our planning and upon future partnerships/activities.
- It is important that we evaluate results of our planning efforts not only in terms of physical structures (e.g., new buildings in the community), but also in terms of broader outcomes such as successful activities, changed perceptions, etc.
- The perception of the University differs based upon target populations. For example, students’ perceptions may differ significantly from those of residents of the city. Both positive and negative perceptions exist. We are the largest employer in the city (positive). The University’s physical footprint has grown larger (could be positive or negative). We should find ways to get an honest assessment of different perceptions.

At the end, plans for future meetings were discussed. It was suggested that participants generate a list of key community stakeholders; we plan to invite some to future meetings. It was also suggested that participants generate a list of recent successful community partnerships. We should also look at the list of the questions generated by the consultants to see if we can categorize them and create a smaller number of topics to discuss.