

Strategic Planning Steering Committee

Meeting February 8, 2016

4:30 – 6:00pm, Mudd 456

Meeting summary

Present:

Diane Yu*

Marvin Krislov

Kathryn Stuart

Julie Min

Board Members

Chris Canavan*

Meg Coward*

Motoko Deane*

Lillie Edwards*

Robert Lemle*

Chesley Maddox-

Dorsey*

Alan Wurtzel*

Alumni

Andrea Hargrave*

Chuck Spitulnik*

A&S Faculty

Ron Cheung

Bob Geitz

Chris Howell

Eric Inglis

Maureen Peters

Sandy Zagarell

Conservatory Faculty

Brian Alegant

David Breitman

James Howsman

Lorraine Manz

Senior Staff

Tim Elgren

Mike Frandsen

Andrea Kalyn

A&PS

Deborah Campana

Andria Derstine

David Kamitsuka

Students

Jasmine Anderson

Hayden Arp

Machmud Makhmudov

Avalon McKee

Sarah Minion

Umazi Mvurya

Guests

Joyce Babyak

Debra Chermonte

Ben Jones

Ross Peacock

Ferd Protzman

*participated remotely

Introduction by Marvin Krislov

- Welcome and thanks to the Steering Committee

Approval of December 3, 2015 Meeting Summary

- Marvin called for approval of the December 3 meeting summary. Brian moved to approve. Summary was approved.

Discussion of contents of Strategic Plan, February 5th version

Marvin and Diane reviewed the changes in the February 5 version of the document, pausing at each section to ask for further comments.

- Changes to Introduction and Executive Summary:
 - Introduction considerably shortened.
 - Executive summary also condensed. Feedback was that it felt repetitive, so it too has been shortened to the 3 goals of the process and the 3 Directions for the future.
 - List of all recommendations has been removed to Appendix.
- Comments from committee:
 - A sentence about this being an open process will be reinstated in the text.

- Changes to preamble sections:
 - Prologue to the Mission Statement and Core Values has been removed; now simply stated.
 - Text of 2005 Plan reduced, and bullet points clarified to be a selection of highlights, and not all or the only results.
 - Record of accomplishment section has been shortened and tone is more measured, less “self congratulatory” than before.
 - The case for Oberlin was included in response to calls for calling out Oberlin-specific attributes, including the Allen Art Museum; now shortened by a few paragraphs from its original length.
 - Challenges before us now includes more specific language about what we mean by compositional diversity.
 - Diversity; Equity; and Inclusive environment, terms that appear throughout the document, are now explicitly defined here at the beginning.
- Comments from committee:
 - In Missions Statement, replace “reflecting” with “encouraging” and remove comma after “ideas.”
 - p2. Explanation re task forces should be more clear (see further discussion below).
 - p4. Under stewardship, add “trustees”
 - p4. Re core value of diversity: remove the 2nd sentence (“such a community....”).
 - p8. Re Case for Oberlin: strengthen social justice aspect of Oberlin identity.
- Changes to Direction 1:
 - Retention now included as part of the goals (not just admission or hiring)
 - Inclusion of staff in recommendations made more explicit
 - Clarity about what we mean by increasing diversity, in terms of the statistics; language now is careful not to exclude other people of color and to define what “historically underrepresented in STEM fields” means
 - Changes in profile of international students
 - Examples of efforts in both divisions to further support all students and especially those from underrepresented groups
- Comments from committee:
 - Re course clusters, add “challenges *and opportunities*”
- Changes to Direction 2
 - Discussion of importance of residential experience as a means to enhance connected learning—curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular
 - Advantages of Oberlin’s spaces to engage students in active learning
 - Interactions with individuals important to liberal learning in general and for understanding how to interact effectively across line of difference
 - Further develop systems of support for all students, with special attention to students from historically underrepresented communities
 - Advantages of Oberlin’s location
 - Importance of civic engagement

- Comments from committee:
 - First time we've seen Oberlin's location in positive terms.
 - Eric Estes and Meredith Raimondo helped get more substance in this area.
- Changes to Direction 3
 - Topics the same but governance now given more emphasis
- Comments from committee:
 - Re strategic recommendation 3.10: add "Educational *programs and offerings*"
- Changes to Looking to Tomorrow
 - Three areas identified as initial focus: connected learning, with special emphasis on advising and Oberlin 4+4, a diverse and inclusive community of students, faculty, and staff, that ensures equitable paths to success, and financial and environmental sustainability
 - Next steps clarified.
- Comments from committee:
 - Rename this section Next Steps
 - Add table of contents to the document
 - Correct Steering Committee roster and remove distinction between two student groups
 - Implementation steps including leadership role and formation of task forces should be more clearly laid out.
 - Process will be similarly inclusive and collaborative to how steering committee was formed, consulting with all constituencies, though individual task force composition may depend on specific issues being addressed
 - Students would like to see a way to become involved immediately
 - NB: revised text follows:

Once the Strategic Plan is approved by the General Faculty and the Board of Trustees, it will be implemented by the administration, led by the president, in collaboration with the General Faculty Council (acting in its planning capacity), the Board, and Oberlin's faculty, staff, students, and alumni. Task force structure, mandates, and calendars will be determined by the administration working with those stakeholders, and will be finalized with the Board's approval by the end of the Spring 2016 semester. Implementation groups will be established through existing governance structures. In particular, the Board, advised by the administration, will set broad financial parameters for the president and senior staff's consideration. The Board will also determine a set of indicators or means of measuring the overall health of the College and Conservatory, and request an annual assessment of progress in achieving the Strategic Plan's objectives.

- The new Plan should be accompanied by a document that summarizes changes since the October draft, to demonstrate that the feedback was considered and incorporated.
- Those who submitted comments should be thanked in the document, even if not individually.
- Final version of document will include graphic design by Communications.

Discussion of next steps

- Upcoming important dates:
 - February 10: Strategic Plan posted for General Faculty on Blackboard and on Strategic Planning website for general review
 - February 17: General Faculty discussion/approval of Strategic Plan
 - February 24: Additional General Faculty meeting for discussion/approval of Strategic Plan if needed; this will be announced at first meeting.
 - Immediately following GF approval, Strategic Plan will be finalized for distribution to the Board
 - March 3, 4:30-6:00pm: Steering Committee meeting to discuss presentation of Strategic Plan to Board
 - March 4, 9:00-11:30am: Steering Committee with Board of Trustees plenary for approval of Strategic Plan.
 - Monday, March 7: please hold for a Steering Committee thank you
- A presentation on the Strategic Plan will also be made to the Alumni Leadership Council, which will also be meeting that same weekend.

Meeting adjourned at 5:45.