

Fitchburg State University
Thursday, November 20, 2014
Strategic Planning Committee meeting

In attendance: Paul, Jane, Arnie, Jannette, Cathy Canney, Jamie, Beth, Hank, Chris Hendry, Meg, Kisha, Sean, Jay

1. Forum update

-Roughly 50 people attended. There was a lot of good feedback.

-Jane noted the white papers said "draft" on them (on the web), but she'll have Carla take that off.

-Jamie said how people who weren't necessarily active in the planning were there voicing their opinions at this time.

-Paul said it was overall good feedback, nothing negative. Two recommendations were given that weren't in any white papers: 1. A commitment to sustainability and 2. High impact writing intensive courses.

-Meg asked about web feedback. Paul said there were a couple comments underscoring the points in the white papers. One trustee complimented the community groups' plan. Paul also said he and Jane will have another open forum like this in mid-December for opportunity for feedback from the community again.

-Arnie noted that the draft plan cannot include every item in the white papers. Operational v. strategic items need to be worked out, but points will not be lost as documents will be retained.

-Meg brought up sustainability and how it's not just a case of reducing our carbon footprint. We need to look at the short-term supply of students and consider how we approach doing business.

-Paul said he, Jane, and Petri already got together to compile the papers and looked at repetitive items and values or ideas v. goals. Items need to be specific and measurable, yet not too much to tie the hands of our new President.

2. Discussion Item

Discussion Item from the Boston Globe this week

<http://www.bostonglobe.com/magazine/2014/11/16/massachusetts-college-graduates-will-short-supply-report-says/6JUU9hk66IJ209CtfUPnJM/story.html?event=event25>

and the underlying report:

<http://cew.georgetown.edu/recovery2020>

-The articles were posted on the large screen for all to see. Arnie asked if the university speaks of supporting its labor force. Paul said that was more of a community college effort. Sean said it was more of a situation where the governor has more influence with the community colleges.

-Meg said workforce alignment discussion is in some of the working groups' papers.

-Sean brought up the Chronicle article

<http://chronicle.com/article/The-Plight-of-the-Public/150127/> and the cost-containment issues. Regarding work force alignment, we need to have a broader discussion of what it means in regards to guiding people towards careers. Cathy said the strategic planning processes have helped (with understanding of work force alignment). Jannette said the discussion needs to come from here (bottom up v. top down). Sean agreed that since it's out of Freeland's mouth, people may think it's the Board of Higher Education pushing their agenda. It's important to have a conversation of what it means and a healthy way to approach it.

-Arnie mentioned new programs and the possibility of exploring healthcare and STEM programs.

-Jamie asked if we are marketing – do we say we are preparing students for the workforce?

-Sean regarding the forum, Ben Lieberman brought up competency-based courses and the need to speak from evidence. Meg said we already have some competency-based offerings such as advanced placement exams. Paul also made note of the self-pace math courses we currently run. Cathy also noted the LPN to BSN bridge program. Jane noted that competency-based classes do take a financial investment. Jay – based in financial model – what programs are generating revenue? As well as the need to get creative. Jane suggested a pilot program in one area. Meg agreed we need to consider this. Paul mentioned that faculty have lots of good ideas regarding competency-based learning, but it will take adapting, flexibility, and refocusing on a broader LA&S program. Jane said this would be a cultural shift.

-Arnie on what Jay said, we will need to fight hard to keep the pie the same (reallocation of resources). Jannette mentioned cognitive dissonance with regards to planning and values (something added = something taken away). People often shutdown and we need to figure out how to get past that.

-Arnie said dissonance won't go away. Sean agreed we need to make the tough decisions and explain the reason(s) behind it/them. Being open from the get-to helps. Beth agreed that knowing why something is being done helps.

-Jane noted that faculty will likely work harder to promote their program.

3. Timeline

- 11/20 - Outline of key points to SPC. Overview to EPC. 12/4 - White Paper to SPC
- 12/5 - SPC final meeting-Miller Oval (12:30-1:45, lunch provided)
-AUC and Graduate Council will get the plan in Mark prior to the Board of Trustees.

4. Reminders

- Meeting schedule – hold open weekly meeting time just in case
- Items from the floor
– Larry said to continue working on disclosure to the group and that there will still be a process to integrate items after the first draft.
- -AUC and Graduate Council will get the plan in March prior to the Board of Trustees.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 10 AM. Minutes by Karen Valeri