Thayne McCulloh passed out a booklet to the Committee entitled “Can a University Change the World,” “2014: A Blueprint for Excellence” which was created by Seattle Pacific University aimed toward benefactors and alumni. He thought this booklet could give the Committee an idea as to how others publicize their strategic plan as more of a development piece. Using a tool like this could possibly open opportunities to lay the groundwork for a new campaign or use as communication. The Committee was directed to look at pages 40 and 41 of the booklet at the general topic areas they’ve named, that are likely to be in ours as well, categorically.

Thayne then handed out copies of the Matrix outlining the SWOT groups. The Committee was informed that the meetings that are X’d out on the form are completed group sessions. He stated the he and Margot would be handling the Trustees and a lot of that will be done by phone by the two of them. The April Board of Regents meeting will be used in part for a SWOT discussion with that group. Thayne said that even though the Board doesn’t meet until April, we would still be able to integrate their feedback in with the rest of the feedback. Facilitators were encouraged to get their SWOT notes emailed to Teri as soon as possible.

Jason Swain commented that he had done a SWOT discussion with the Diversity Students and that date was not reflected on the Matrix. It will be added.

Sue Weitz stated that she has learned a lot by doing these sessions. She, Jason and Nick said that there are a lot of common themes that are coming up within the various groups, especially in the Strengths and Weakness areas. Most of the groups appear to be having difficulty with the external components of the SWOT analysis. Thayne indicated that the Mission group had a lot of feedback on the external components.

The question was asked about how the data will be gathered, assimilated and integrated. A lengthy discussion followed about how to go about studying the raw data and who should have that task. The following points were brought up and discussed:
• Raw data – should it be brought to the entire Committee for review? Or, if any refining is done before the data is given to the Committee – who and how?
  1. It was originally thought that the raw data would not be distributed to the entire Committee because of time constraints.
  2. After discussion, it was decided that maybe it would be best if it was provided to the Committee and they could through it all if they choose.
  3. How can we find the recurring themes if we don’t go through it all?
  4. We wouldn’t want to lose what specific groups had to say.
  5. Some groups provided all data discussed while others prioritized and voted on the data to be provided.
  6. Thayne said he had made the assumption that he would go through the data and provide all raw data to the Committee.
  7. Maybe it be helpful to have a sub-committee, including the facilitators, to go through the raw data.

• What would be most helpful for the Committee to have?
  1. Should we proceed with specific groups – like students?
  2. Is there a group that should take priority over others? Or start with A and go to Z?
  3. This shouldn’t and can’t be a “who gets the most votes” thing.
  4. Remember this is done with “fishing methodology” – we’ve hooked in a large amount of data and some will be thrown back.
  5. It should all be put together to find the common themes with the ability to go back to check the individual group data.
  6. Keep the constituencies listed on the back of the SWOT Discussion Framework sheet in mind.
  7. Focus on the good of the University “as a whole” and not individual groups.
  8. Keep in mind the core Mission, not prioritizing but understanding how the voices are heard.

• Before the half-day meeting of the Committee on March 31, what needs to be accomplished?
  1. Break down key things that came out of the groups – common themes.
  2. Put the groups into categories from the 44 groups down to a few.
  3. The Committee needs to resist the creation of a hierarchy in breaking down the groups.
  4. The Committee should search for the community’s perspective of critical issues across all groups.
  5. Use the facilitators as a cross-check, endorsing some of the themes the Committee identifies. The facilitators can add some extra validation as well as insight of emotions displayed and any other information gathered from the group participants.

After further discussion on the points above, the Committee felt the raw data could be put into the following categories:

Students
Faculty
Jesuits
Staff
Board (Trustees and Regents)
Alumni
Parents (Freshman and Sophomore)
The Committee decided that it was the roll of the Committee to study the common themes and add perspective and ideas of what needs to be in an institutional strategic plan for higher education. The Committee will come up with the critical strategic goals. Thayne said that conversations he and Margot will have with the Board will generate where the buy-in will be. Critical conversation with the President will be important and Thayne felt it best to have the entire Committee meet with Fr. Spitzer, rather than one person.

Thayne said that there is a great deal of suspicion on the part of the community of how all of this data will be handled. Not every point brought up will be used, but with all of the discussion the Committee has had, it can be stressed that the Committee has really thought through the process and that everybody can have access to the data collected. The Committee felt it was important to get the feedback of each group, back to that group, letting them know that their information will be added to the other groups and advising them of what will happen to the data.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.