

Salem State University  
Strategic Planning Council  
2010-2011

Meeting of 10/18/10  
3:00-4:30  
Salem Room, Alumni House

Attending: Lee Brossoit, Drew Darien, Amie Goodwin (co-chair), Arlene Greenstein (co-chair), Karen Sayles, Chris Sullivan, Eileen O'Brien, Marty Krugman, Zach Newell, Stephenie Young, Keja Valens, Guorong Zhu

1. The co-chairs reviewed the materials that had been sent to the committee members:
  - a. Agenda
  - b. Membership List and contact information
  - c. Strategic Plan, 2009-2014
  - d. Strategic Planning Progress Report for each of the five goals (February, 2010)
  - e. Proposed SPC Progress Report workgroups
  
2. The co-chairs reviewed the President's charge to the 2010-2011 SPC
  - a. Educate the SSU community re: the plan's Mission, Vision, Values
    - i. The SPC co-chairs have spoken with the NEASC Steering Committee Co-Chairs about combining efforts in this regard.
    - ii. "Marketing" of the Mission, Vision, Values is also a priority in preparation for the April 2011 NEASC site visit
    - iii. Communications Department students are developing a marketing plan to assist us in building awareness within the SSU community.
  - b. Look at the accomplishments
  - c. Look at the plan with "fresh eyes"
    - i. The planning process began in Fall 2007 and the plan was approved by the Board of Trustees in September, 2008.
    - ii. This is year two of the 5 year plan
    - iii. This is the time to take a hard look at what has been accomplished
  - d. Be open to a revamping of the plan consistent with changes in the external environment
  
3. The committee discussed ways in which multiple planning processes across the University appear to lack connection one to the other.
  - a. The NEASC self-study outcomes should be used to inform strategic planning
    - i. This topic has been proposed for discussion at the President's October Cabinet "advance"
  - b. Fiscal implications of planning have never formally been considered and need to be
  - c. Academic planning is under way and will also inform strategic planning and resource allocation decisions
  - d. The timing of planning and budgeting needs to be reviewed and retooled.
  - e. A relationship must be established between planning and budgeting
    - i. This was an issue raised in our last decennial NEASC accreditation visit
    - ii. At its opening meeting with the President, the SPC suggested that it work in partnership with the University Budget Committee.

4. The committee discussed:
  - a. Feasibility of posting the Progress Report document on Navigator, in an effort to increase transparency
  - b. The lack of a process for deciding “what to cut” when funding is reduced.
    - i. The trend has been to apply “across-the-board” reductions; such an approach is not strategic.
  - c. There is a perception among some faculty that the academic planning process is being pursued in a spirit of scaling back and cost-cutting.
    - i. This is the first time that an Academic Vice President at SSU has asked for faculty for such direct input into academic planning decisions.
    - ii. For many reasons, including fear of losing resources, some departments are hesitant to make recommendations for streamlining.
    - iii. The academic planning process provides an opportunity to look at departmental collaboration and interdisciplinary course development
5. The Council formed five groups, one for each goal, to assess the progress made in the past two years by addressing the following questions:
  - a. What progress has been made toward achievement of the plan’s objectives (based on information in front of you)?
  - b. What is the status of this objective?
  - c. Should this objective be updated?
  - d. Should this objective be re-written so that results can be measured?
6. The assigned groups are:
  - a. Goal One: M. Breitborde, A. Goodwin (convener), M. Krugman, K. Valens
  - b. Goal Two: Y. Ruiz, K. Sayles (convener), C. Sullivan, S. Young
  - c. Goal Three: S. Cirillo, E. O’Brien, G. Zhu (convener)
  - d. Goal Four: A. Darien (convener), B. Doran, J. Stoll
  - e. Goal Five: L. Brossoit, A. Greenstein, Z. Newell (convener)
7. Groups are to convene in whatever manner they wish (virtual or face-to-face meeting) and begin reviewing the accomplishments within their assigned Goal.
  - a. Council will meet in November to consider the work that has been done to that point
8. If as a result of the President’s Cabinet “advance”, the SPC is asked to formally incorporate the draft findings within the 2011 NEASC self-study, the co-chairs will revise the assignment as needed.