

Student Affairs Strategic Planning Committee
3:00 – 4:00 p.m., October 24, 2016
International Room

Meeting Notes

Members: Steve Allton, Meagan Collins, ~~Vanessa Delgado~~, Joe Gillespie, Leticia Gradington, Kevin Joseph, Lisa Kring, Michael Maestas, ~~Megan Smith~~, Lindsay Orion, Kari Stone-Sewalish, Jill Urkoski, Aramis Watson

1. Welcome/Introductions

- Kevin welcomed committee members and thanked them for accepting their appointment to the committee.
- Each committee member introduced themselves and their department.
- Kevin then shared the overall purpose of the committee—to facilitate the development of a division-level strategic plan that encompasses 3 – 5 strategic goals for 2017 – 2020.

2. 2016 – 2017 Strategic Planning Process

- Explanation of Six Phase Planning Process
 - Reviewed Planning Process Handout—which included an explanation of each phase in the process, phase overview, involved groups, key phase activities, deliverables, and timeframe.
- Committee Responsibilities
 - Committee/committee member responsibilities were included in discussion of the planning process document.
- Timeline/Key Dates
 - Reviewed Planning Process Key Dates Handout—which included an explanation of key dates in the planning process.
 - Kevin mentioned a November committee meeting would be tentative—due to the all-staff survey still being active. If this is the case, the larger committee more than likely would not reconvene until early in the spring semester.
- Website Update
 - Kevin mentioned wanting to work with Lindsay Orion to update the Strategic Plan tab on the Student Affairs website. The revised website would outline the process, provide status updates, contain the final plan, etc. The goal is to provide a resource on the process for all Student Affairs staff.

3. Discussion

- Student Involvement in Planning Process
 - Opinions were sought regarding ways to include students in the strategic planning process.

- Some of the ideas shared included: adding a graduate student to the committee, administering a survey to student leaders/student org presidents, administering a survey to student advisory boards, and conducting focus groups with students.
- Committee members also thought it would be beneficial to identify ways to gain feedback from less engaged students.
- Early discussion on wanting to understand how students perceive Student Affairs.
- Discussion eventually shifted to not being concerned with perception of Student Affairs, but rather gaining insight into their overall KU experience and ways in which it could be improved. From there, the committee could distinguish the relationship between student responses and Student Affairs.
- Kevin agreed to share committee thoughts/discussion with Dr. Tammara Durham to determine the best way to include students and report back to the committee.
- Staff Survey
 - A draft version of the all-staff survey was shared with the committee.
 - It was suggested to split questions containing “students and/or staff” into two separate questions.
 - It was also recommended to include a “Prefer not to respond” answer option for demographic questions—in an effort to protect the identities of those wishing to remain anonymous.
 - It was suggested to replace “Graduate Assistantship” with “Graduate Assistant”
 - Due to similarity, Kevin asked if questions 5 and 6 both needed to remain on the survey. The committee agreed to keep both questions.
 - It was briefly mentioned that survey could also be shared with students. However, the committee eventually agreed that if a student survey was administered, it should look different and be somewhat shorter.
 - Due to time limitations and in an effort to protect the identities of staff respondents, it was also determined that the question regarding focus groups be removed from the survey.
 - Kevin mentioned he would make all changes/revisions and send out to committee. He asked for any feedback by Friday, Oct. 28th.
- Phase One Survey Results—Mission, Vision, Values
 - Kevin shared the results from the Phase One Survey and asked for feedback/discussion on the results.
 - Discussion primarily revolved around the current mission statement. Committee members were not fond of “enhance quality of life”—indicating that the statement was unclear and not realistic.
 - Committee members suggested incorporating phrases such as “encourage further critical thinking,” “enrich student experiences,” and “empower students” into the mission statement.
 - Committee members were fine with the current vision statement—which mirrors the overall survey results.
 - Kevin presented the thematic categories for proposed values statements. Categories were generated from the 83 individual responses captured from the survey.
 - Committee members felt “Access & Inclusion” and “Innovation & Excellence” should either be split or clearer in what they are intended to convey.

- Committee members also suggested that we not consider “Personal & Professional Development” as a specific value because it relates directly to staff.
- It was also recommended that we consider using the Jayhawk Values as our values statement—because they are already in existence and overlap with the thematic categories.
- Kevin shared that he would also seek feedback on the survey results from the Student Affairs Leadership Team and report back to the committee.
- Working Group Assignments
 - Committee agreed to Kevin randomly assigning each committee member to their specific working group.
 - Kevin also mentioned he would also work through all survey data.
- November Meeting?
 - Kevin again mentioned a November meeting is tentative.

4. Additional Comments/Questions