

**Strategic Planning Council  
Chairs of Workgroups Meeting  
November 4, 2008**

PRESENT: Allaire, Daniel, Fenner, Gonzalez, Jaffee, Jaffee, Robinson, Serwatka, Shuman, Workman

Mark Workman opened the meeting at 10:05am. He said the action statements presented at the October 24 full SPC meeting that were written at a high level of abstraction and scope best fit the mission of the workgroups. He asked the chairs of the workgroups to report on their progress in developing action statements for their assigned goals.

**Group 1: Learning Environment Goal (David Jaffee)**

David Jaffee distributed his group's current action statements and explained the rationale behind their phrasing and meaning. He said they had a chronological order for student succession within broad action statements about student learning. Jaffee said the group discussed the need to connect benchmarks with measures, or intervening means, which would describe specifically how the actions statements would be carried out. He said the group is working in a dynamic spreadsheet to input ideas for what types of programming would need to be in place as part of the action statements.

**Clarification of Intervening Means and Outcomes**

Shari Shuman asked for clarification about the meanings of actions and goals, and whether intervening means were meant to serve as building blocks toward the broader goals, or as actions that fall under the action statements. Shuman asked how intervening means would fit within the University's strategic planning software. Mark Workman responded that action statements should describe actual actions, using verbs such as develop, create, provide and prepare. David Jaffee said he understood the purpose of intervening means as informing units about suggestions for achieving goals. Other working group chairs said their groups had had similar discussions to those of David Jaffee's group, in which they gave steps of execution for each proposed action statement.

Shari Shuman said the question of assigning individuals to actions and the authority of those individuals to carry out their assigned action statements would need to be addressed within the current strategic planning software. Mark Workman said he believed the individuals with primary responsibility would be fairly high-ranking individuals or units, who may serve to facilitate tasks that would require individuals from other units. David Jaffee said he thought the action statements should inform units below the level of Academic Affairs, who would then take responsibility for indicating the means by which their units would contribute toward carrying out the action statements. Shari Shuman asked if this was the expectation, and there was consensus that it was.

Mark Workman reminded the group that what motivates the strategic planning process is an ambition to become an institution of national quality. He said the benchmarks that are set for the University should be somewhat lofty to be in agreement with this goal.

**Group 2: Diversity Goal (David Fenner)**

David Fenner reported that his group recently met to work on improving their initial action statements. Some rewording changes were discussed. Fenner asked whether a definition should be created to explain what is meant by diversity, or whether the group felt it should be left as broad as possible. Mark Workman said guidance would be needed from the benchmarks group to determine this, but that he felt the definition would be implicit in the benchmarks that are set. Tom Serwatka agreed.

**Group 3: Research Goal (Larry Daniel)**

Larry Daniel distributed minutes from his workgroup's meetings. He explained that they had brainstormed ideas about what they'd like to see in the University relative to research & creative endeavors. He said the workgroup started with a long list of ideas and narrowed it down to five key actions, while also discussing steps toward accomplishing the action statements.

**Group 4: Civic Engagement and Community-Based Learning Goal (Mauricio Gonzalez)**

Mauricio Gonzalez gave a synopsis of his group's work to date. He said they had developed four actions that they felt were strong enough and broad enough to propel the University's goals forward. He explained that the Carnegie classification action was more direct, while others were derived from Carnegie foundation materials detailing what is expected of the kind of university that would achieve this sort of classification. The QEP is paramount in terms of achieving Carnegie classification. He explained other factors that influenced the creation of his group's action statements. Others offered input to help bring the action statements in better alignment with the others in terms of span and abstraction.

**Planning**

The group discussed the progress that had been made and determined that the best next steps to take would be to share progress to date and articulate action statements with the larger group at an upcoming meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 11:05am.

Minutes submitted by Melody Taylor