

Work Team One of the Strategic Planning Team  
Meeting Minutes  
March 28, 1:00-3:00p, Swenson Room 209

Attendees: Lisa Buono, Donna Brown (note taker), Melissa Maxwell-Doherty, Veronica Guerrero, Juanita Hall, Kapp Johnson, Sally Lorentson (conference call), Susan Lundeen-Smuck, Bruce Stevenson, Gretchen Serrano

Absentee: Julius Bianchi

Handouts: Student Focus Group Survey, Work Team One Outcomes\_Questions (updated) (blue paper), CLU Culture and Diversity Values Analysis Powerpoint presentation

**Action Items for Next Meeting, April 11**

- *Talk to Sally about being the coordinator of SubTeam Question One--Lisa*
- *Work with Sally to upload the thread for discussion related to an electronic survey to adjunct faculty--Donna*
- *Develop the electronic survey to students-Lisa, Bruce, and Sally*
- *Disaggregate commuter and residential students in the "How are you doing" survey related to how connected students of color and international students feel to the campus community—Juanita*
- *SubTeam coordinators work with Melinda Wright to find time to meet as a small group; invite other campus resource people into the conversation—Sally, Juanita, Kapp*
- *Edit Student Focus Group Survey, post on Blackboard, send to Work Team One—Donna*
- *Upload Information about TO perception of CLU – Donna*
- *Update on Faculty Survey – Bruce*
- *Obtain Noel-Levitz data for ADEP and grad students – Juanita*
- *Look at NESSE/Noel-Levitz data for undergrads before lead focus groups - Juanita*
- *Give minutes of ADEP student focus group meeting to Donna – Gretchen*
- *Report from the adjunct faculty survey to April 11 meeting—Julius*
- 

**OLD BUSINESS**

**CLU Culture and Diversity Values Analysis Powerpoint Presentation – Bruce Gillies**

- Analysis looked at what values are embedded in the CLU culture currently as well as what is needed in future. It is important to reward behaviors that enhance our culture.
- Most characteristic values are responsible idealism, collaborative work
- CLU seems to reward passive, "sit back and wait until told what to do" attitude

**Student Focus Group Survey - Melissa**

- Updated demographic information. Will print demographic info at top of front page, services/departments on campus at bottom of front page, and questions on back page

**Report on first Student Focus Groups**

- ADEP - Gretchen
  - surveys completed individually then discussed
  - surveys turned into work team (yellow sheets)
  - many negative comments during discussion regarding limitations of services and food
  - Gretchen will give minutes of the group meeting to Sub team One
- SOM - Veronica
  - Small group, good population sample
  - Students filled out demographic info
  - Facilitator read questions and students discussed answers, no forms filled out

### **Update on Faculty Survey – Bruce**

We will soon know the target date for the faculty survey. Do we need faculty focus groups or is Dru's faculty survey enough?

### **Electronic Survey for Adjuncts – Sally**

Sally not able to begin discussion board on BlackBoard; she will send notes to Donna. Need to follow up with Julius to get his input from last survey done.

### **Budget to disaggregate information from Noel-Levitz and NESSE – Melissa**

Budget is approved for this through the Provost's office

### **Obtain Noel-Levitz data for ADEP and grad students – Juanita**

No report.

### **Look at NESSE/Noel-Levitz data for undergrads before do focus group - Juanita**

No report.

### **Information about TO perception of CLU – Sally**

Sally has not heard back yet from here sources on this.

### **Development of electronic student survey – Bruce, Sally, Lisa**

They will proceed when Sally returns from conference.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Dividing into SubTeams to work on each the three overarching questions**

Each team is responsible to:

1. Explore data from relevant surveys (see March 8 meeting minutes for list)
2. Collect more data if needed to answer the questions
3. Invite campus resource people to enter into the conversation
4. Develop a set of questions that can be used in the electronic survey of students
5. Lead a focus group of students in April regarding their topic.

Each team coordinator can work with Melinda Wright to determine a good time to meet to begin this work.

#### **SubTeam Question One - Comprehensiveness**

Sally Lorentson, coordinator

Lisa Buono

Veronica Guerrero

Howie Wennes - Advancement

Rep from Facilities

George Petersen - SOE

Gerhard Apfelthaler - SOB

Eileen Leese - ISS

Joan Griffin – Dean

Susan Tolle - HR

Lorraine Purmort - Registrar

Tom Hoener - Enrollment

Rep from FADC

Dru Pagliassotti – Communication

Sharon Docter – Communication

Randy Foster – Regent

Darla Arcuri - ADEP

Cindy Lewis – Career services  
Ineke Dyer – Transfer admission  
Linda Boberg. – Multicultural

Subteam Question Two - Inclusivity

Juanita Hall, coordinator  
Gretchen Serrano  
Julius Bianchi  
Christine Paul – Residence life  
Andrea Huvad – Biology  
Erashel Vaiz- CAAR  
Colleen McCarthy - HR  
Alan Goodwin – counseling services  
Cindy Grether-Online  
Scott Maxwell-Doherty – campus ministry pastor  
Sergio Galvez – upward bound  
Anna Calderon – Student Support Services  
Diana Stephens - SOE  
Randall Lindsey – former Interim Dean SOE (researcher in area of cultural proficiency)  
Dane Rowley -Admissions  
Jose Marichal – Political science  
Melissa Maxwell-Doherty – Campus ministry  
Tom McCambridge – SOE

Subteam Question Three – Community of faith

Kapp Johnson, coordinator  
Bruce Stevenson  
Susan Lundeen Smuck  
Ashley Patterson – Int'l Student Services  
Carla Walter – SOB  
Wes Sullivan - Admission  
Colleen Windham-Hughes – Religion  
Arne Bergland – Church relations  
Debby Day - Athletics  
Frank Nausin - SOE  
Adina Nack – Sociology  
Kris Butcher – Chemistry  
Rahuldeep Gil – Religion  
Cynthia Jew - SOE  
Melissa Maxwell-Doherty  
Jamshid Damooei – SOB

**Review of “Toward a Stronger and More Inclusive Community”**

We reviewed the PowerPoint prepared by Juanita Hall titled “Toward a Stronger and More Inclusive Community” based on data from five different surveys. We discussed the first slide on what it means to be inclusive. Some of the attributes were based on a student’s perception of inclusion while others were based on direct evidence of an inclusive reality. A question for the Subteam Question Two group will be to decide whether we will focus perception or reality so that we are consistent.

A question was raised if the word “promote” would be a better term than “privilege” in “policies, program, and practices privilege shared ideals and values”.

Juanita will disaggregate the information from the “How are you doing” survey related to how connected students of color and international students feel to the campus community based on whether they are commuters or residential students.

A question was raised regarding the slides from the Multicultural Survey regarding students comfort levels in hanging out with diverse groups of people based on social status, cultural heritage, religion, or sexual orientation. What shall we do with the percentage of TUGs that do not value a community of inclusion? How much intolerance can we tolerate? These are good questions that the Subteam on a Community of Inclusion will want to delve into.

We noted that SubTeam Question One (comprehensive university) will need to delve into both surveys---CLU Culture and Diversity Values Analysis and Toward a Stronger and More Inclusive Community

### **Discussion of a Community of Faith**

We talked about how this question impacts students within the Graduate Programs and ADEP. While ADEP does have the general education requirement of Religion 100, a religious focus is not built in to the graduate curriculum. At Graduate Orientation sessions, potential students report that they are not looking for the religious connection of CLU but are looking at private vs. public education and are attracted by our small class size. Communication about our values, identity and mission will need to be nuanced to a graduate market. It was noted that our faculty do make accommodations for the diverse religious practices of graduate students. Also, our students report that they can have conversations in the classroom about religious values and perspectives that they could not have at other schools like UCLA.

We do not offer any training to our adjunct faculty in terms of the values of Lutheran higher education or CLU's mission which makes it difficult for them to transmit our values and vision. As our identity and mission is a differentiation for us in the market it is important to define what we mean by the Lutheran tradition of higher education to our students.

Subteam Question Three will need to define what we mean by a community of faith.

### **New Meeting Dates**

April 4	any team members who are free can meet with Work Team Three at 10 am in Alumni 115
April 11	time change moved to 2:00-3:00, Swenson 209
April 18	time change moved to 2:00-3:00, Library Room A

### **Added to Work Team One BlackBoard: Assessment Tools: Inclusivity and Culture:**

Toward a Stronger and More Inclusive Community.ppt  
CLU Familiarity  
Culture Climate Survey Feb 2011  
Symlog Org Culture Survey Feb 2011  
Work Team One Outcomes\_Questions Updated