

University Planning Group

Thursday, November 3, 2011

LSC Conference Room

Minutes

Present: J. Day, M. Bestul, L. Bowen, J. Carfagno, S. Crahen, A.R. Day, J. Krukones, K. Lis Dean, K. Manning, M. Marsilli, B. Martin, R. Mausser, M. McCarthy, P.V. Murphy (HS), P. Murphy (MML), R. Rochford, N. Santilli, J. Smith, M. Valencia, B. Williams

Dr. Day called the meeting to order at 8:37 am and welcomed the group. The October minutes were approved.

J. Day asked the group to review the Strategic Goals and Objectives (SG&O) document dated October 21, 2011. He distributed a handout and discussed a roll out plan with the goal that it be completed before spring break. They would like to have a community meeting on January 20, 2012.

N. Santilli would like to break the UPG members into a diverse mixture of cross functional triads to discuss the SG&O and compose a UPG document that would be open to feedback. To achieve this aim the number of UPG meetings may be increased in the spring semester. Since the Board of Directors will not meet in plenary session in March, the goal is to present the document to the BOD in May 2012.

M. McCarthy suggested STAD have an input in the planning document.

The FSA and student senators will be invited to the January 20, 2012 meeting. Many members of campus will have the opportunity to participate in at least two meetings, the kick-off event and a targeted group meeting. J. Day noted the UPG membership's suggestions and the process for our next phase of discussions and implementation of the SG&O document would be set in motion.

N. Santilli presented a power point presentation of the *Comparator Institutions Phase Two*, a summary of past discussions.

Using CIC criteria as a guide, N. Santilli reviewed our process for discerning our list of peer institutions and the basis for developing an aspirant set of institutions. N. Santilli facilitated a discussion focused on the criteria the UPG would like to use to form an aspirant group of institutions.

University Planning Group

A lively discussion surfaced a number of dimensions for further consideration:

How to define the criteria and the parameters must be decided by the group, ex: student/faculty ratio. The group suggestions are:

- Institutional performance in the last X years – fiscal health
- Student quality
- Increased diversity – global curriculum
- Division III athletics
- Endowment
- National recognition/rankings

J. Day thanked the group and said the discussion will continue at the next meeting. He adjourned the meeting at 10:04.