

University Strategic Planning Group

M. Johnson, J. Krukones, C. Brennan, T. Bruce, J. Burke,
B. D'Ambrosia, R. Day, C. Dietz, J. Dillon, E. Eickhoff, M. Farrar, D. Hareza, R. Hessinger,
D. Kilbride, A. Kugler, G. Lacueva, S. Levenson, T. Lewandowski, K. Malone, M. McCarthy,
A. Miciak, M. Millet, M. Morgan, M. Moroney, M. O'Connor, E. Peck, J. Rick, D. Riley,
J. Schupp (19), B. Saxton, W. Simmons, J. Sully, D. Vitatoe

University Strategic Planning Group

Thursday, November 29, 2018

LSC Conference Room

Minutes

In attendance: J. Krukones, T. Bruce, J. Burke, B. D'Ambrosia, R. Day, C. Dietz, E. Eickhoff, D. Kilbride, A. Kugler, K. Malone, M. McCarthy, A. Miciak, M. Morgan, M. Moroney, M. O'Connor, E. Peck, J. Rick, B. Saxton, J. Sully.

B. Saxton made a motion to accept the minutes from the November 15 meeting. E. Eickhoff asked for an explanation as to why, at the previous meeting, the change was made to tactic 3.5, wherein "equal" representation was changed to "appropriate" representation on University-wide committees. He noted the importance of having staff representation on committees and the present imbalance on some committees that is not appropriate. B. D'Ambrosia explained that the rationale behind the change was due to the fact that different committees have different charges, and some may need a higher number of faculty than staff. E. Peck noted it was also to avoid committee fatigue and to be more deliberate about membership, and to not fill seats just for the sake of filling seats. Finally, B. D'Ambrosia also pointed out that the committee did not define "appropriate," purposely leaving that to be determined as circumstances warranted. The minutes from the November 15 meeting were then unanimously accepted.

T. Bruce moved to the presentation of the prioritized tactics, thanking the committee for responding to the survey. The tactics were arranged according to Most Critical, Must Do, Nice to Do, and Lowest Priority. No tactics had been assigned to Needs More Development or Don't Prioritize. T. Bruce asked the committee if they agreed with the proposed prioritization, and also noted that a few tactics that landed on the borderline between assigned categories needed to be placed into a specific category. He reminded the committee members that the recommended prioritized tactics would then be sent the Senior Leadership Team for their final decisions: they could disagree, make changes, or consolidate some items. This work is being done now so that any costs might be incorporated into next year's budget.

There was discussion on the difficulty of prioritizing tactics without knowing budget needs. It was noted that it is important to take a look at what we need to be doing outside of the funding process. It is important to determine which of these tactics we strongly believe are important to do. Some may require reallocation of strategic funds. Funding should follow what we determine is important.

Discussion ensued on the importance of the Student Engagement Tracking tactic (1.4, 1.5, 3.4) and its relation to academic success. In the end, the tactic was marked **Most Critical**.

Attention turned to the tactic to Develop and Resource a Diversity Office (2.4.) E. Peck explained that we need some type of office structure, and need to determine what that will look

like in order to know the budget amount involved. It is designated a priority to send a strong message as to its importance. This tactic was marked **Most Critical**.

E. Peck also explained the need for the Online Diversity and Inclusion training tactic (2.4), as we have had a massive push for training for every member of the University community, and modules for ongoing training can be developed regardless of the structure of the Diversity Office. This tactic was marked **Nice to Do**.

Discussion recently began on the recommended new advising office/structure, and costs for this tactic will be in staffing and support. When final decisions are made in a few months, we will not want to wait a full year to implement them. This tactic (1.5) was marked **Most Critical**.

The tactic for Funding CAS and/or JCU Professional Development (1.2) was moved to **Most Critical**. It was noted that there is relatively low cost involved, and, as it is already off to a good start, this will help move it toward completion.

M. McCarthy noted there is a high need for counseling and having a full-time counselor who is on campus and knows our students. It is a one-time investment and a long-term need. As a result, the tactic for Increasing Counseling Center FTE (1.5) was marked **Must Do**.

The tactics for the SIEM System for Proactive Cyber Security (3.4) and Academic Planning and Degree Audit Enhancements (3.4) were moved to the **Must Do** category.

It was noted that, some tactics currently ranked as a relatively lower priority often support tactics in a higher category. It was also pointed out that, even though some tactics may be marked Lowest Priority, we have approved them and want to move them forward.

Members approved the final prioritization of the tactics. T. Bruce said that he would email the final version of the prioritized tactics to all USPG members.

With the help of a PowerPoint, T. Bruce then shared information on the external market for higher education that had been presented at an Educational Advisory Board summit. The data included information on higher education's three most pressing problems: financial sustainability and current business models, the needs of the "student of the future," and the public's lack of confidence in higher education. T. Bruce said he would post this information for the committee.

T. Bruce noted that President Michael Johnson will attend the next USPG meeting on December 13 to talk about his vision for the 2020-25 Strategic Plan.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Lovequist