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| Strategic Planning Committee Meeting |
| NOTES | march 19, 2012 | 4PM | Mod Hall Conference CeNter |
|  |
| NOTEKEEPER |  |
| Attendees | **□**Gabe Aquino **□**Marijoan Bull **□**Joseph Camilleri **□**Junior Delgado **□**Vanessa Diana **□**Tian-jia Dong (spring) **□**Kelly Galanis **□**Linda Hogan Shea **□**Mark Horwitz (fall) **□**Brian Hubbard **□**Christine Irujo **□**Brad Knipes **□**Brenda Lucas **□**Ryan Meersman **□**Emily Tobin**□**Carol Persson **□**Carlton Pickron **□**Laurie Simpson |
|  |
| Agenda topics |
|  | Mission Statement |  |
| Discussion | C. Pickron asked about the process moving forward, so the group reviewed the plans to get feedback. L. Simpson noted she had checked and due to NEASC schedule there was not time at the next Dept Head meeting for a conversation to get feedback. It was agreed that instead a hard copy would be mailed to the Dept heads for feedback and they would be encouraged to ask members of their departments for comments, too. C. Pickron suggested adding the Board of Trustees to the list of those receiving the draft version. The results of those that sent preferences to M. Bull among the four circulated mission statement versions were presented: 1 vote for version1; 3 for version 2; 5 for version 3; and 3 for version 4. Since version three had the most votes the group turned to reviewing that version. M. Bull reported one member had expressed an inability to support 3 with the closing statement, “We serve the greater community as a resource for economic, social and cultural advancement.” The last sentence was reworded to read “We contribute to the economic, social and cultural vitality of the region.” Also “provides a multidisciplinary education that” was struck from the first sentence. With these edits a vote was taken with 7 in support, 1 opposed (L. Simpson) and 1 abstention (B. Hubbard) (B. Knipes arrived after the vote). |
| The group then moved to the third goal and objective 3.1 This was reworded as “Increase the Financial Yield of University fundraising activities.” 3.2 “Pursue Creative Delivery of Dervices” was dropped although L. Simpson spoke on behalf of keeping it as another way to have students develop leadership and team skills, while also serving the University. 3.3 and 3.4 had minor edits, and after seeing all of goal three it was decided the plan needed to also address increasing the level of state financial assistance. After discussion, this was addressed by adding a phrase to 3.1. Under goal 4, some minor editing was done of 4.1 and 4.2. There was a discussion of the precise meaning of 4.4 “Bridge Physical Distances.” After discussion, this was reworded as “Address Physical Fragmentation of Campus,” and the general understanding was the challenge of maintaining connections, shuttles, and a cohesive community as functions moved downtown and the basic Horace Mann disconnect some feel. Under goal 5, minor edits were made to the goal statement, 5.1 and 5.2.. 5.3 was a focus of attention with a discussion on whether or not it is the role of the University, the idea that we are already directly involved in this activity, and the idea of how much the University should in fact do in this regard. After discussion it was left. Changes were made to 5.4 to make it more reflective of the revised mission statement version. The Committee then had a discussion of the LEAP/Vision project and if and how that should be addressed in the Strategic Plan. V. Diana reported on the ACC discussion and letter to the DHE Commissioner Freeland. The discussion raised points that assessment was a valid activity Academic Depts already engaged in, but the fear would be these initiatives would remove campus control of the assessment process and lead to an inappropriate one size fits all approach. It was agreed to revisit this concern at a future meeting. A second action the Committee is working on is a recommended process for Strategic Planning. The subcommittee appointed to this task, B. Hubbard and B. Knipes, reported that B. Hubbard had drafted some ideas but B. Knipes has not yet reviewed them. The subcommittee will report back at the next meeting.It was decided M. Bull would make the changes worked through on this day, and the full committee would meet to go through the entire document as one piece. In addition M. Bull would prepare a short narrative to describe the process and address some of the concerns the committee has expressed during the planning process. C. Pickron recommended the meeting be set for one week, as everyone there indicated they could attend a meeting on Monday March 26, and time is of the essence.  |
| Action items | Person responsible | Deadline |
| Make edits and revisions; draft process and transmittal narrative, and distribute to all members for review prior to next meeting. | M. Bull |  |
| n0tes BY |  |  |
| M. Bull |  |  |
|  |