Introduction

In his inaugural address, incoming Saint Louis University President Fred Pestello identified three critical issues for the University—1) planning for the future, 2) making a SLU education affordable, and 3) engaging more fully with the St. Louis community. Success in the first of these—strategic planning—was seen as essential to meeting the challenges of the other two. He called for a planning process that would be “inclusive and transparent…. grounded in meaningful dialogue across all sectors of our community.” This paper reviews the process that was used to develop a new strategic plan for the University, identifies strengths and concerns with that process, and provides guidance for future strategic planning efforts at the institution.

Context

The strategic planning effort launched as one of the President’s priorities was not the first such undertaking at Saint Louis University (SLU). The institution had developed such plans at several points beginning in the early 1990s, and a strategic plan document was developed in 2012 for the period 2013-2017. However, rapid changes in both SLU’s internal and external environments were such that a static plan document rapidly became outdated and inadequate to the current state of affairs. Those changes created the context in which the new strategic planning effort was launched.

The external challenges are those that affect higher education in general. They include the issues of cost vs. value; the impact of rapid technological change; increasing diversity in society and higher education; a decline in society’s investment in research; and an increasing emphasis on achieving measurable outcomes. These factors are detailed in the plan section titled “Our Challenges.” (Appendix 1)

Internally, SLU had recently passed through a difficult period of conflict dominated by concerns about shared governance, lack of communication and dialogue, and centralized decision-making. Morale was low across the institution, and faculty, staff and students alike voiced their discontent through protests and expressions of “lack of confidence” in University leadership, most notably about the former president and chief academic officer.

Taken together, these external and internal factors called for change in the institution. One of the important vehicles for that change was the strategic planning process.

Initiating Planning

President Pestello launched the effort to develop a new strategy responsive to the institutional context with an invitational retreat on August 13, 2014. Participants were representative of all segments of the SLU community, selected from the faculty, staff and student body as well as the University’s administration. After an introduction by the President, the group participated in facilitated discussions that led to two reports—a list of priority areas for consideration in planning (Appendix 2) and a set of principles to guide the development and implementation of the planning effort (Appendix 3). The Principles document set expectations concerning the planning process and reflected the President’s commitment to open and participative planning as well as the group’s desire that those characteristics be institutionalized in the process to follow.

Strengths:

- Group was broadly representative of the SLU community.
- Represented a departure from previous strategic planning efforts.
- Participation in discussion was strong.
- Group was engaged and produced useful output (priority areas, Principles)

---

1 Prepared by James R. Kimmey, M.D., Strategic Planning Coordinator for the University Archives
Areas for Improvement: none identified

Establishing a Structure

There were a number of factors considered in establishing a structure for developing the SLU strategic plan. They included the tight time frame proposed by the President (his goal was to have a plan by April, 2015); the desired focus on broad-based and open planning, and securing the time commitments that the process would require. A Strategic Planning Coordinator was named (James Kimmey) and he proceeded with developing a structure that was responsive to those factors. The structure that was proposed and accepted provided opportunities for inclusion for the SLU community at each stage of the process. The structure is described in Appendix 4. Following acceptance of the proposed structure, members of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC) were appointed by the President as were Co-Chairs of the committee (Kent Porterfield and Joseph Weixlmann).

Strengths:

- Structure was inclusive of SLU community in each of the groups created to develop the plan.
- Structure provided a clear hierarchy of groups linking the SLU community with final decisions concerning the plan.
- The SPSC members selected were representative, motivated and productive.
- The Co-Chairs gave the task priority and provided effective and engaged leadership.
- The original group from the August retreat was maintained as the Strategic Planning Assembly (SPA)

Areas for Improvement:

- Although the concept of the Topical Reference Group was worked out in the description of structure, the TRGs were not really involved in practice and may well have been a redundant element.
- The SPA met infrequently and was not as fully involved as suggested in the model. This should be considered in future planning and a schedule established and followed for SPA meetings. The aggressive timeline for the planning process was likely a contributing factor.

Information Gathering

The SPSC determined that, following the Principles, the first task was to create a mechanism for securing broad input from across the SLU community concerning the future direction of the institution. The approach selected was a series of listening sessions conducted in the fall of 2014. There were two types of sessions—group-specific and organization-wide—conducted. Twenty group-specific listening sessions were held between September 29 and November 13, 2014. In the same period, five Town Hall or open meetings were held on the north and south campuses, as well as one with the Madrid campus via teleconference. (Appendix 5) More than 1000 members of the SLU community participated, and more than 300 specific ideas concerning potential plan elements were generated.

Strengths:

- An open and participative process.
- High quality input from across the SLU community.
- Presence of SPSC Co-Chairs and members at each session demonstrated serious commitment to hearing the community.
- Systematic capturing of input from each session.

Areas for Improvement: none identified
The Imperatives and Visions

The SPSC was faced with the challenge of organizing the input from the information gathering meetings in order to design the next phase of the planning process. The goal was to identify critical issues raised by the SLU community as well as any cross-cutting concerns that needed to be addressed. The committee first identified four Imperatives to be explicitly considered by all participants and at every step in developing strategies to advance SLU toward the future. The SPSC then considered the range of specific recommendations emerging from the information gathering activities, and grouped them as eight Visions of that future. (Appendix 6). The Imperatives and Visions became the charge to the Topical Work Groups (TWGs) responsible for the next phase of planning.

Strengths:
- Captured the broad concepts expressed in the listening sessions.
- Provided an organizing framework for the plan development phase.

Areas for Improvement:
- TWG attention to the Imperatives might have better promoted and more closely monitored.

Topical Workgroups

In proceeding from identification of major strategic areas for development to crafting a plan for each area, a key role was assigned to the Topical Work Groups (TWGs). Each TWG was responsible for developing detailed plan elements in an assigned topic area. Plan elements included strategy, goals, and objectives that, when implemented, would advance the University mission and vision. TWGs varied in size depending on the task(s) assigned and the number of individuals interested in the topic area. In addition to a core membership, the TWGs had corresponding members who provided additional input to the core group throughout the process. (Appendix 7) Each TWG had two Co-Conveners responsible for guiding the group in determining and carrying out the work and for reporting periodically to the SPC. (Appendix 8) The TWGs’ final reports were detailed and documented, and were the principal source of Magis’ Goals and Objectives. It is anticipated that these reports will also significantly impact the development of the action items for each Objective.

Strengths:
- Broad representation of faculty and staff in the core and corresponding membership.
- Good attendance and participation by core members.
- Strong leadership from TWG Co-Chairs.
- Overall quality of recommendations and supporting materials.

Areas for Improvement:
- Better orientation for TWG members concerning strategic and operational matters.
- Student participation in TWGs was less than optimum.
- Involvement of corresponding members was variable across TWGs.
- Although members of senior management had opportunity to provide input to TWGs, few took advantage.

Initial Plan Development (from inception to “Becoming...”)

The SPSC had the task of analyzing more than 300 recommendations provided by the TWGs and drafting a plan document for further consideration. Although the TWGs had defined areas of responsibility for developing recommendations, it was quickly apparent that there were overlaps and duplications in their output. The SPSC members had the experience of the listening sessions, which assisted them in regrouping and clarifying the recommendations. Through review and discussion, SPSC developed a set of six initiatives under which the source materials were organized as Goal and Objectives. (Appendix 9) An overall
theme—Becoming...—was developed and appropriate front matter developed. This initial draft was presented to the SLU community, and additional Town Hall meetings were held to secure input. This version of the plan was presented to the Board of Trustees as a concept and was reviewed in detail with SLU Senior Management.

Strengths:

- The initial effort to craft a plan incorporated a substantial portion of the specific ideas and language provided by the TWGs.

Areas for Improvement:

- Several Objectives included in the Becoming... draft had duplicative elements or were less strategic than is desirable in a strategic plan.
- Use of minimally-edited input from the TWG process resulted in some overly long Objectives.

Plan Evolution (from “Becoming...” to “Magis VI”)

The meetings with the Executive Staff (4/23/15) and the Board of Trustees (5/2/15) were the first direct opportunities for either to comment on the Becoming... draft document, although both groups had received earlier briefings concerning the process and the general direction the planning was taking. Comments received in April and May were extensive, and focused in three areas—theme, length and content.

Concerning the theme, both groups were uncomfortable with the Becoming... idea. There was a concern it would project an idea that the institution was not already a strong vibrant Jesuit education and health care entity, rather that the strategic thrust was to “become” one. The SPSC was encouraged to rethink the theme, and come up with one that was more appropriate signify strengthening an already strong position.

Regarding the plan’s length, comments focused on two aspects—the extensive narratives describing some Objectives and the number of Initiatives. In the former case, it was suggested that the language spoke better to an academic audience than to audience broader set of SLU stakeholders and should be simplified and “punched up” to the extent possible. In the latter case, the consensus in the Executive Staff was that there should be no more than five Initiatives, and that much of the material included in the current draft could be combined and restated without losing the sense of the community.

Finally, comments concerning content related both to things that should be removed, largely because they were considered to be under way or completed, and things that should be added to fill in perceived gaps in the plan (athletics, entrepreneurship, technology, for example) or to strengthen areas of particular importance (such as research, institutional distinctiveness).

Based on these inputs, the Co-Chairs launched a review and revision effort that resulted in several new drafts as additional comments were received, considered and incorporated. Regarding theme, a new theme Magis: The Saint Louis University Strategy for the Future was proposed by Co-Chair Weixlmann and found acceptance. The number of Initiatives was reduced from six to four by merging some of the Initiatives and developing new descriptive language, and a new Initiative was added that focused on innovation and entrepreneurship. (Appendix 10) Objective statements were edited, and several recast as potential Action Items and removed from the Magis document. The Magis document went through several iterations before a final draft was ready for review by the Board of Trustees on September 24, 2015, at which time it was approved and become the SLU’s strategy for the future.

Strengths:

- The Magis drafts eliminated redundancies and “action” language from the Objectives.
- These drafts reflected a level of input from University leadership that was not present in earlier drafts.
- Innovation and entrepreneurship became an area of emphasis and were made more visible.
Areas for Improvement:

- Secure input and participation from University administrators earlier in the planning and drafting process.
- Screen out non-strategic items earlier in the drafting process.

Summary

The paper and its appendices provide an overview of the strategic plan development phase of SLU’s 2015 process. It is intended to provide some guidance to those who are responsible for developing the future strategic planning processes and documentation. In addition to the strengths and areas for improvement relating to each part of this planning process, there are general observations offered that may be useful:

1. **Start the planning process a minimum of two years before the new plan is to become effective.** For a variety of good reasons, the time frame for the 2015 plan was compressed. The major contributing factor was the rapidly-approaching 2018 Bicentennial of the University and the comprehensive campaign which is integral to that occasion. In order to plan such an effort, a clear vision of the University’s future direction and the strategies for moving forward is essential. However, given the lead time for organizing such a campaign, the strategic plan needed to be developed on a faster schedule than is usually the case.

2. **University administrators should be involved earlier and more significantly in the plan development process.** By bringing senior administrators fully into the process relatively late (as was the case with the 2015 effort), their input and recommendations, grounded in their responsibility to implement the plan, could be viewed negatively by the community, and particularly by those community members who participated actively in TWGs. This observation needs some context. The 2014-15 planning process was under way during a period of crisis stemming from racially-charged incidents in the St. Louis community that impacted the University and required senior administrators’ focused attention. Thus, there was less time for them to devote to the concurrent planning activities described in this report.

3. **Improve methods to actively engage students in the process.** Although the SPSC received solid input from students in the information-gathering phase, they were not as engaged in the TWG activities.

The most important observation on the experience in developing *Magis*, however, is the involvement of the SLU community in the process. Scores of individuals gave willingly of their time and talent to make *Magis* a true reflection of their commitment to the values of the institution and to its future. The participants at each stage of the process are listed in Appendix 11.
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Our Challenges

The decline in the number of students graduating from high school, combined with the enrollment decline in Catholic primary and secondary schools, has significant implications for the traditional pipeline to Catholic universities.

Rising tuition costs pose a growing barrier to those seeking access to the advantages of a higher education, and indebtedness is a growing burden to graduates. The primary response of higher education—lowering the tuition charged on a case-by-case basis—means less revenue to support the people and activities of the University.

Technology impacts all areas of the University, accelerating expectations and challenging traditional ways of operating while also providing unparalleled opportunities for innovation in education, research, and service.

Students expect institutional investments in technology and other areas of support beyond anything previously experienced.

Seekers of higher education are increasingly heterogeneous, and this diversity requires a broader range of response than in past times.

Competition among universities for top students, top faculty, and top researchers is increasing.

The societal investment in research is declining at a time when the need for innovation and the capability of scientists and others to advance knowledge are rapidly expanding.

Competition for limited resources inside academe reinforces the need for unique and distinctive solutions.

Decision-making within academic culture is typically slow and deliberative, whereas the realities of the economic environment and societal expectations for higher-education institutions sometimes require a rapid response.

The focus on outcomes has grown stronger in recent decades, from health care to academic-accreditation standards to consumers. Donors, foundations, and government leaders are likely to intensify their focus on accountability in coming years.

A final challenge for a mission-driven, values-oriented, faith-based university is maintaining and nurturing those values and that faith tradition in an increasingly secular environment—a challenge Saint Louis University willingly confronts, and meets, every day.
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Planning Priorities from August 13 Meeting

People-Oriented Needs

- Resources to support our people
- Investment in our people
  - Staffing levels
  - Talent management
  - Rewarding performance
- Align Compensation with Appropriate criteria
- Promote vibrant professional education and clinical practices
- Faculty support in innovation, research/scholarships, extramural
- Compensation Start Ups
- Strategic succession planning in the development of human capital.
- Competitive and fair compensation for faculty and staff must be achieved.

Facilities and Services

- Building Spaces
- Residential Housing (quality and quantity)
- Facility and Infrastructure
- State of the residence halls
- Security of the campus
- Infrastructure to support international education
- Infrastructure to support move towards excellence
- Parking for students—cost/availability—commuters
- Housing
- Establish and invest in a competitive student housing master plan.
- Maintain aesthetics of campus grounds.
- Campus Facilities Master Plan
  - Housing
  - Parking

Information Technology

- Website Renovations
- Information Technology; how do we remain knowledge leaders of technology; integrating workforce; using new technologies for teaching/learning
- Making electronic information resources continually available in an environment of increasing costs.
- IT Infrastructure (2)

Academics—Instruction

- Exploring a university-wide core curriculum and resources to support the core
- Access & Affordability
  - What is our responsibility related to our Jesuit mission?
  - Increase minority representation
  - K-12 programs
- Interdisciplinary Collaboration
- Aligning Academic Program with Market Reality
- Recommit to a rigorous and fulfilling process of educating the whole person
- Academic excellence as essential to our mission
- Promoting research and educational excellence
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Academics—Research

- Resources for Research
  - Funding Generally
  - Research Services
  - Technology
  - Value of Intellectual Property
  - Endowed Chairs
- Form alliances with local research networks
- Opportunities for undergraduate research collaboration with faculty

Administrative/Managerial

- Financial Transparency
- Shared Governance
- Ability to deploy and redeploy assets strategically and flexibility
- Supporting marketing, enrollment, retention
- What do we want to be in so far as size of student body; quality of student profile; demographics of student body; and action dependent
- Enforce that high priority research informs Strategic Decision-Making
- Decision-Making Processes
- Consider different Business model/Finance model

Funding and Support

- Funding for Academic Programs
  - Serve the mission
  - Support the mission
  - Focused programming across the university
  - Recruit and retain qualified and diverse faculty, staff, and students
  - Compression
- Funding for Scholarships
- Improve fundraising
- Develop revenue stream beyond current sources
- Decrease tuition dependency
- Additional streams: Endowment, Extramural
- Identifying financial Resources
- Generating additional and different, renewable streams of revenue to support the plan
- What are we doing; how are we doing it; evaluation how and why we are doing it
  - Follows resource allocation or reallocation where resources, equal time, human resources, funding, capital
- Long term financial planning
  - Process

Definitions

- Define “excellence” in academia, research, healthcare
- Academic Excellence
- Define Academic Excellence
- Define Excellence:
  - In measurable terms for each of the corporate purposes (Teachers, Research, Service, Health Care)
- Review scope of institutional effort
  - Clearly define
- Define terms
  - Market, competition, profile, retention
  - Who are we here to serve?
Assessment & Measurement
- Assessment of academic and operational impact
  - Evaluate investment as a result
- Review scope and audience your corporate purposes

Corporate Culture
- Changing the climate of the university
  - Transparency
  - Collaboration
  - Trust
  - Faith
  - Safety/Risk Taking
- Identify Crisis- Are we a research institution or not?
  - Culture
- Risk adverse culture
- Support entrepreneurial attitude
- Time to implement the plan of change, the culture, and work collaboratively together in a compressed time frame
- Trust & Civility
- Walk the walk on social justice/mission across institution
  - Mission Focused

Health Care
- Future hospital partnerships
- We must adhere a long term sustainable hospital partner
- Future and the Medical Practice

Topical Plans & Programs
- Affordability plan for all admissible low income students
- Develop an institutional/diversity plan aligned with our mission.
- Enrollment—Communication Plan for the process and for the plan
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Planning Principles

The University strategic planning process will be guided by a set of principles developed by participants in a “Launch” meeting hosted by President Pestello on August 13, 2014. These principles will shape every aspect of the planning process in the months to come. They provide assurance to the community that the planning activities will be accessible and will reflect the views of the many stakeholders in SLU’s continued success.

In carrying out strategic planning, the University will assure that the process is:

- **Mission-driven**, faithful to, and congruent with, our Jesuit heritage and educational values.
- **Open** to participation of all who have a stake in SLU’s future, and that that participation will be actively sought at every step in development of the strategy for the future.
- **Transparent**, assuring that the community will have a clear understanding of the process and of how decisions are made and priorities set.
- **Inclusive**, offering individuals and organizations invested in SLU’s success multiple opportunities to suggest, promote and comment upon the strategies developed for the plan.
- **Aspirational**, accommodating new ideas and new ways of doing things unconstrained by traditional thinking and entrenched policies and procedures while respecting identified needs and the resources available.
- **Dynamic**, recognizing the strategy is constantly reviewed and renewed is the face of a rapidly-changing environment, both in academia and the larger society, and
- **Responsive**, balancing careful analysis with respectful consideration of the expressed needs and interests of stakeholders.

Adhering to these principles is a major step toward developing the level of trust required if the strategies developed over the coming months are to succeed is moving the institution forward as they are intended to do.
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Thoughts on Structure

The Context

Saint Louis University is launching a strategic planning effort at a very significant point in its history. Internally, the institution is emerging from a difficult period in which there was deep distrust of its administration, organized protests and low morale across its community. In spite of this, many of its programs were thriving and stakeholders long term commitment to the University’s mission and traditions remained strong. A new President has been appointed and begun leading the institution. And in just four years, the University will reach its 200th anniversary. Externally, SLU is subject to the same pressures as most academic institutions as society increasingly questions the costs and content of higher education in a world of technological imperatives. Taken together, these internal and external factors form the context for a through reconsideration of the University’s strategies as it seeks to achieve its mission. Strategic planning in the current SLU context has several ancillary purposes in addition to setting a course for the future—it is a tool for revitalizing the institution’s culture and reestablishing trust in the SLU community.

Applicable Principles

The President is considering a set of principles that will guide the strategic thinking and planning for the school. Among those principles are four that directly impact the structure for strategic planning:

- **Open** to participation of all who have a stake in SLU’s future, and that that participation will be actively sought at every step in development of the strategy for the future.
- **Transparent**, assuring that the community will have a clear understanding of the process and of how decisions are made and priorities set.
- **Inclusive**, offering individuals and organizations invested in SLU’s success multiple opportunities to suggest, promote and comment upon the strategies developed for the plan.
- **Responsive**, balancing careful analysis with respectful consideration of the expressed needs and interests of stakeholders.

Taken together, these principles underline the need for a structure that creates many opportunities for participation and input for all SLU stakeholders and promotes “ownership” of the planning process.

A “Principled” Approach to Structure

Movement toward identifying a workable structure began with the “Launch” meeting on August 13, 2014 at which a broadly representative group of university administrators, academic leaders, staff and students gathered at the President’s invitation to begin thinking about a process for planning. The principles referred to above were a product of that meeting as was a list of items that need to be addressed, whether in the plan or in other ways. The meeting both provided attendees with a clear sense of leadership’s commitment to strategic thinking, and demonstrated a lively interest moving ahead. The group (subsequently dubbed the “Big Group”) was asked to meet again in October to review progress on the planning front.

In considering how to approach creation of a planning structure, the interest and breadth of the “Big Group” underlies the recommendation that follows, in which that group (renamed) becomes a key integrator in the structure and process for planning.

Creating an environment of “shared planning” requires opportunities for such sharing to take place. The suggested structure in this paper is tilted toward such participation at the cost of a degree of efficiency.
It requires a commitment of time and talent that goes beyond simply providing “opportunity” to participate—it is based on the expectation that people will participate and that that participation will be facilitated as needed by organizational policies during the planning period.

A diagram of a possible structure is shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1
A Possible Planning Structure

---
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Structural Elements

**Strategic Planning Committee (SPC)**

*Generally:* Directs and coordinated the entire planning process.

*Specifically:* The SPC conducts the initial discernment process (surveys, town halls) and, in conjunction with the Strategic Planning Assembly (SPA), identifies a limited number of strategic areas that will structure the planning process. It receives topical reports vetted by the SPA and is responsible for determining content and form of the final plan document. All hearings/communications concerning the final plan will be conducted by the SPC.

*Membership:* Up to 12 members selected by the President from among nominees of key constituencies, supplemented by individuals selected to provide specific expertise.

*Meetings:* Schedule will vary but SPC should hold a regular time for meetings semi-monthly.

*Staffing:* Coordinator

**Strategic Planning Assembly (SPA)**

*Generally:* Receives, reviews, amends and transmits proposed content to SPC.

*Specifically:* Using Topical Reference Groups selected from among its membership, the SPA will be responsible for assuring accuracy of data and consistency of strategies, goals and actions proposed by the Working group(s) in the topic area. The SPA will determine when proposals related to a topic are ready for SPC consideration and will make changes as required by the SPC.

*Membership:* The SPA membership is made up of the participants in the “Big Group” augmented as need to assure the SPA is broadly representative.

*Meetings:* The SPA meeting schedule will vary across the planning period, but probably bimonthly scheduled meetings will meet the needs of the full committee. Topical Reference Groups will need to meet more frequently while reviewing products and developing their input to the SPA and then “on call” for any changes requiring additional work.

*Staffing:* Coordinator

**Topical Working Groups (TWGs)**

*Generally:* Develops detailed plan elements in an assigned topic area.

*Specifically:* Is responsible for developing an entire plan element (strategy, goals, objectives, action steps) for an assigned area. Expected to seek broad input to the process through interviews, focus groups, hearings, etc.

*Membership:* Variable numbers, with representation determined by topic.

*Meetings:* The TWGs are the most labor intensive of the structural elements, meeting frequently (monthly or semimonthly) and also conducting information-gathering and structured input functions.

*Staffing:* To be determined
Summary

The time constraints on the planning process will require a substantial investment of time and effort on the part of members of each element of the SLU community. Factors that will determine the time required include the number of topic areas, the level of detail re. Indicators and baselines required in the plan and the amount of support provided the various elements.

Possible approaches to staffing the process will be covered in a separate document.
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**Strategic Planning 2015**  
**Listening Sessions / Town Halls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning University Wide Initial Retreat</td>
<td>August 13, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening Sessions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit Hall</td>
<td>September 29, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Association</td>
<td>October 08, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Government Association</td>
<td>October 08, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Advisory Committee</td>
<td>October 09, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>October 09, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>October 14, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Deans and Directors</td>
<td>October 15, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Student Development</td>
<td>October 21, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>October 22, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education and Public Service</td>
<td>October 24, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College for Public Health &amp; Social Justice</td>
<td>October 28, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Louis University Madrid Campus</td>
<td>October 29, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>October 30, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing / Doisy College of Health Sciences</td>
<td>November 03, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cook School of Business</td>
<td>November 04, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School for Professional Studies</td>
<td>November 05, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>November 05, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks College of Engineering, Aviation and Technology</td>
<td>November 06, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Sustainability</td>
<td>November 07, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>November 13, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town Halls</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Center Campus</td>
<td>November 10, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost Campus</td>
<td>November 11, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost Campus</td>
<td>November 12, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Center Campus</td>
<td>November 13, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Center Campus</td>
<td>April 13, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost Campus</td>
<td>April 13, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Louis University Madrid Campus</td>
<td>April 14, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Planning Imperatives and Visions

The Four Planning Imperatives

To be explicitly considered in developing strategies to advance SLU toward the eight Visions.

I. A Commitment to Reinforcing Mission & Identity
II. A Commitment to Enhancing Diversity & Inclusion
III. A Commitment to Deepening Interdisciplinary Collaboration
IV. A Commitment to Advancing Institutional Distinctiveness & Excellence

The Eight Visions for SLU’s Future

To guide development of strategies, goals and objectives for SLU’s future development.

I. SLU as a Source of Academic Excellence Rooted in Values-Based Learning
II. SLU as a Center of Research & Disseminator of New Knowledge
III. SLU as a Health Promoter & Provider
IV. SLU as a Leader in Student Access & Success
V. SLU as a Discerning Steward of Resources
VI. SLU as an Entrepreneur for Social Justice and Responsibility
VII. SLU as an Advocate for St. Louis
VIII. SLU as a Global Citizen

---

2 Developed by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC) based on listening sessions, Town Hall meetings and web input between September 29 and November 13, 2014.
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Topical Work Group Membership and Leadership

Introduction

Eight Topical Work Groups (TWGs) are central to the development of a strategic plan that will lead to realization of the eight Visions for SLU’s Future. These groups will be open to broad participation by self-nominated individuals. Given the wide interest within the institution in the planning process and the ultimate plan document, large numbers of individuals may self-nominate and seek to serve on a TWG. Such open participation is consistent with the Guiding Principles and has been stated repeatedly in various informational meetings hosted by the SPSC. Because this approach, if not carefully managed, has the potential to lead to TWGs of unwieldy size and to logistical problems with scheduling and producing products, this paper suggests approaches to structure and access to membership that mitigate some of the time and effort concerns while meeting the requirements of the Guiding Principles. In addition, the time constraints imposed by deadlines for project completion will require a fairly heavy time commitment from TWG members.

Categorizing Membership

In order to provide maximum potential for participation while being sensitive to individual members’ time constraints, there will be categories of membership on the eight TWGs. These are as follows:

- **Core Members** are a group of 9-11 individuals so designated from among the pool of interested individuals. Core members will meet frequently and will have principal responsibility for assuring that a TWG’s assignments are carried out effectively and that the required products are produced on time. Core members will be chosen in a way that provides representation from various stakeholder groups. They will be required to commit to spending at least four (4) hours a week from selection through completion of the TWG’s tasks in March, 2015.

- **Correspondent Members** can be of any number and are other individuals expressing interest in a TWG who are not designated as Core Members but who are willing to commit to participation in the TWG process for a minimum of four (4) hours a month. Although these members will be notified of all meetings and are welcome to attend, their principal means of participation will be via electronic media. They will receive, and have the opportunity for input on, all drafts being developed and considered by the Core Members, probably via Google.

Both categories are considered **Voting Members**, and will have the opportunity to vote on interim and final TWG products.

Creating the Pool

A pool of interested individuals will be recruited in each of the eight Vision areas. This pool will be developed in the following manner:

1. Once the Imperatives and Visions have been posted on the website (and announced in Newslink), a separate solicitation of interest in participating in one of the TWGs will be posted. Individuals may self-nominate or be nominated to become a member of the appropriate pool of interested individuals.

2. In order to be considered, individuals will complete an information survey and submit it electronically. On the form, they will be asked to indicate their interest and availability to serve as a Core Member or Correspondent Member.

3. All responses will be collated and reviewed by the SPSC and the designated Convener[s] for the topic. The SPSC will select the Core Members based on their interest, experience, and availabilit-
ity to participate fully. Selections will be made with attention to securing a core group that reflects the makeup of the SLU community. The SPSC may choose to interview proposed Core Member candidates.

4. All TWG members in both classes will be asked to sign a copy of the position description for their category acknowledging the time commitment.

Facilitating Participation
Support staff will establish and implement procedures for assuring the TWG functions effectively, with particular attention to communication among members of both membership groups. With eight groups, scheduling meetings and rooms, monitoring participation, managing Google postings and responses, and distributing information will be critical to accomplishing tasks on time.

Record-Keeping
Attendance and participation records will be kept for all TWGs. Data will include attendance at called meetings (either in person or electronic), responses to requests for document review and comment, and voting. The Topic Coordinator will monitor participation and keep the Convener(s) apprised of any issues with participation.

Position Details

TWG Convener(s)

*Generally,* the TWG Convener is responsible for providing leadership to the efforts of a TWG in developing strategies, goals, and objectives that support the TWG’s assigned Vision.

*Specifically,* the Convener will:

- Chair all meetings of a TWG as it develops plan elements.
- Develop and implement a work plan for the TWG.
- Assign tasks related to development of strategies, goals, and objectives to individual TWG members or subcommittees.
- Provide for liaison between the TWG and the Topical Review Group (TRG) assigned the same area of activity.
- Supervise the Topic Coordinator and staff assigned to the TWG.
- Assure the activities of the TWG are consistent with SLU’s Guiding Principles for strategic planning.
- Report to the SPSC as requested concerning progress and problems encountered.
- Sign off on the TWG’s final report to the SPA.

*Time Commitment:* Estimated at 4 hours/week through March, 2015.

**Topic Coordinator**

*Generally,* the Topic Coordinator, under the direction of the SP Coordinator, provides support to the developmental activities of a TWG.

Specifically, the Topic Coordinator will:

- Coordinate scheduling of all meetings of the TWG and attend same, maintaining a record of the decisions and directions.
- Prepare the agenda for each meeting, assemble supporting material, and assure distribution to members.
- Prepare notices, drafts, and other TWG web postings and coordinate such postings with the Strategic Planning Administrative Assistant (SP-AA).
- Secure information and data requested by the TWG in the course of its deliberations.
- Manage logistics for TWG-sponsored public meetings, focus groups, and other methods used to secure SLU community input to TWG activities.
• Prepare draft versions of TWG reports concerning strategies, goals, and objectives, and after review and approval by the TWG prepare final versions.
• Direct any assigned student workers in activities supporting the TWG.

**Time Commitment:** Estimated at 8 hours per week through March, 2015.

**TWG Member (Core)**

*Generally,* a TWG Core Member actively participates in person in the development of strategies, goals, and objectives that support one of the eight Visions for SLU’s future.

**Specifically,** a Core Member:

• Regularly attends and participates in called meetings of a TWG.
• Receives, interprets, and summarizes input on the focal topic from a variety of sources.
• Participates as requested in TWG information-gathering activities such as focus groups and fora.
• As assigned by Convener, undertakes specific activities designed to inform TWG process and products.
• Serves as required on TWG sub-committees.
• Votes when required on TWG reports and products.

**Time Commitment:** Estimated at 4 hours per week through March, 2015.

**TWG Member (Correspondent)**

*Generally,* a TWG Correspondent Member actively participates via electronic means in the development of strategies, goals, and objectives that support one of the eight Visions for SLU’s future.

**Specifically,** a Correspondent Member:

• Regularly receives all TWG meeting notices, materials, and working documents electronically.
• Responds electronically as requested to TWG inquiries, drafts, and surveys.
• Participates as requested in TWG information gathering activities such as focus groups and fora.
• Serves as required on TWG sub-committees.
• Votes when required on TWG reports and products.

**Time Commitment:** Estimated at a minimum of 4 hours per month through March, 2015.
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Planning Principles

The University strategic planning process will be guided by a set of principles developed by participants in a “Launch” meeting hosted by President Pestello on August 13, 2014. These principles will shape every aspect of the planning process in the months to come. They provide assurance to the community that the planning activities will be accessible and will reflect the views of the many stakeholders in SLU’s continued success.

In carrying out strategic planning, the University will assure that the process is:

- **Mission-driven**, faithful to, and congruent with, our Jesuit heritage and educational values.
- **Open** to participation of all who have a stake in SLU’s future, and that that participation will be actively sought at every step in development of the strategy for the future.
- **Transparent**, assuring that the community will have a clear understanding of the process and of how decisions are made and priorities set.
- **Inclusive**, offering individuals and organizations invested in SLU’s success multiple opportunities to suggest, promote and comment upon the strategies developed for the plan.
- **Aspirational**, accommodating new ideas and new ways of doing things unconstrained by traditional thinking and entrenched policies and procedures while respecting identified needs and the resources available.
- **Dynamic**, recognizing the strategy is constantly reviewed and renewed is the face of a rapidly-changing environment, both in academia and the larger society, and
- **Responsive**, balancing careful analysis with respectful consideration of the expressed needs and interests of stakeholders.

Adhering to these principles is a major step toward developing the level of trust required if the strategies developed over the coming months are to succeed is moving the institution forward as they are intended to do.
Preface

Welcome to your role as a Topical Work Group (TWG) co-Convener in Phase II of the SLU strategic plan development process. With your colleague and the members of the TWG, you will be developing key elements of the University’s strategic plan. You will have the opportunity to shape plan content and indicate direction for the future in the assigned topic area. Each TWG will be provided background information in its topic area that was developed in Phase I, the information-gathering phase. TWGs also have the opportunity to gather additional information through various means, including the Strategic Planning website, dedicated Google sites, web-based surveys and public meetings.

This manual describes the strategic planning process, defines the role of TWGs in that process and contains various guidance materials that can be helpful in organizing the work of the TWG and moving to a conclusion within the time frame allowed for this Phase of the process.
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Introduction

The task of preparing a comprehensive plan for the University involves many stakeholder groups that need to be represented in the planning process, both to secure their input and to create understanding and acceptance of the final plan. This section discusses a structure and process that are grounded in inclusion, broad-based input and transparency.

The Stakeholders

When all potential stakeholder groups are listed (Figure 1), the list is substantial. Not all of those suggested have equal involvement or interest in the University, but all need to be considered and ways of assuring their understanding of the University strategy developed and implemented in the structure and processes for planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current students</td>
<td>Potential students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current faculty</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current staff</td>
<td>Established donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school/college administrators</td>
<td>Potential donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>Grant-making agencies and organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Trustees</td>
<td>Accreditors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community organizations and NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government agencies (LSF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faith-based organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elements

Saint Louis University is launching a strategic planning effort at a very significant point in its history. Internally, the institution is emerging from a difficult period in which there was deep distrust of its administration, organized protests and low morale across its community. In spite of this, many of its programs were thriving and stakeholders long term commitment to the University’s mission and traditions remained strong. A new President was appointed and began leading the institution. And in just four years, the University will reach its 200th anniversary. Externally, SLU is subject to the same pressures as most academic institutions as society increasingly questions the costs and content of higher education in a world of technological imperatives. Taken together, these internal and external factors form the context for a thorough reconsideration of the University’s strategies as it seeks to achieve its mission. Strategic planning in the current SLU context has several ancillary purposes in addition to setting a course for the future—it is a tool for revitalizing the institution’s culture and reestablishing trust within the SLU community.
Applicable Principles

The President has endorsed a set of principles that guide the strategic thinking and planning for the institution. Among those principles are four that directly impact the structure for strategic planning:

- **Open** to participation of all who have a stake in SLU’s future, and that that participation will be actively sought at every step in development of the strategy for the future.
- **Transparent**, assuring that the community will have a clear understanding of the process and of how decisions are made and priorities set.
- **Inclusive**, offering individuals and organizations invested in SLU’s success multiple opportunities to suggest, promote and comment upon the strategies developed for the plan.
- **Responsive**, balancing careful analysis with respectful consideration of the expressed needs and interests of stakeholders.

Taken together, these principles require a structure that creates many opportunities for participation and input for all SLU stakeholders and promotes “ownership” of the planning process.

A “Principled” Approach to Structure

Movement toward identifying a workable structure began with the “Launch” meeting on August 13, 2014, at which a broadly representative group of university administrators, academic leaders, staff and students gathered at the President’s invitation to begin thinking about a process for planning. The Principles referred to above were a product of that meeting as was a list of items that need to be addressed, whether in the plan or in other ways. The meeting both provided attendees with a clear sense of leadership’s commitment to strategic thinking, and demonstrated a lively interest moving ahead. The group subsequently dubbed the Strategic Planning Assembly (SPA) was asked to meet again in October to review progress on the planning front. The SPA role is that of key integrator in the structure and process for planning.

Creating an environment of “shared planning” requires opportunities for actual sharing to take place. The structure developed is tilted toward such participation at the cost of a degree of efficiency. It requires a commitment of time and talent that goes beyond simply providing “opportunity” to participate—it is based on the expectation that people will participate and that that participation will be facilitated as needed by organizational policies during the planning period.

A diagram of the planning structure is shown in Figure 1.
Structural Elements

**Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC)**

*Generally:* Directs and coordinated the entire planning process.

*Specifically:* The SPCS conducts the initial discernment process (surveys, town halls) and, in conjunction with the Strategic Planning Assembly (SPA), identifies a limited number of strategic areas that will structure the planning process. It receives topical reports vetted by the SPA and is responsible for determining content and form of the final plan document. All hearings/communications concerning the final plan will be conducted by the SPCS.

*Membership:* Eleven (11) members selected by the President from among nominees of key constituencies, supplemented by individuals selected to provide specific expertise.

*Meetings:* Schedule will vary but SPSC generally meets semi-monthly.

*Staffing:* Coordinator and Administrative Assistant
**Strategic Planning Assembly (SPA)**

**Generally:** Receives, reviews, amends and transmits proposed content to SPSC.

**Specifically:** Using Topical Reference Groups (TRGs) selected from among its membership, the SPA will be responsible for assuring accuracy of data and consistency of strategies, goals and actions proposed by the Working group(s) in the topic area. The SPA will determine when proposals related to a topic are ready for SPCS consideration and will make changes as required by the SPCS.

**Membership:** The SPA membership is made up of the participants in the “Big Group” augmented as need to assure the SPA is broadly representative.

**Meetings:** The SPA meeting schedule will vary across the planning period, but probably monthly scheduled meetings will meet the needs of the full committee. Topical Reference Groups may need to meet more frequently while reviewing products and developing their input to the SPA and then “on call” for any changes requiring additional work.

**Staffing:** Coordinator

**Topical Reference Groups (TRGs)**

**Generally:** Coordinates development of plans in a specific content area.

**Specifically:** Each TRG will be the point of contact for the working group(s) in the assigned area, reviewing and commenting on reports and proposals and proposing complete products to the SPA for further action.

**Membership:** Each topic selected for development in the planning process will be assigned a TRG appointed by the Co-chairs of the SPSC from among the members of the SPA. TRGs should be small (no more than 5 members) and made up of persons with an interest/involvement in the topic assigned.

**Meetings:** The TRGs schedule will vary depending on their topic and the schedule for the affiliated working group(s).

**Staffing:** SP Coordinator and staff

**Topical Working Groups (TWGs)**

**Generally:** Develops detailed plan elements in an assigned topic area.

**Specifically:** Responsible for developing an entire plan element (strategy, goals, objectives, action steps) for an assigned area. Expected to seek broad input to the process through interviews, focus groups, hearings, etc.

**Membership:** Variable numbers, with representation determined by topic. TWG membership is open to all, based on interest in the topic as articulated in a brief survey completed by interested individuals. There are two types of membership (see Section 2 of this document). Members are assigned to a group by the SPSC co-Chairs.

**Meetings:** The TWGs are the most labor intensive of the structural elements, meeting frequently (weekly or semimonthly) and also conducting information-gathering and structured input functions.

**Staffing:** TWG Coordinator and staff
Process Considerations

As noted earlier, a successful strategic planning effort in the current environment in the University needs to be grounded in inclusion, broad-based input and transparency. The structure described provides the opportunity for meeting those needs, but the process is the critical element for success.

Earlier, 17 categories of SLU stakeholders were identified. Most of these categories could be further subdivided, making the point that SLU’s strategies affect, and can be affected by, many individuals and organizations beyond the institution. In addition, the centrality of the organizational change to a stakeholder’s interests varies. For example, faculty has a greater stake than a foundation that occasionally funds in the higher education arena. These variations are important in structuring planning but less so in establishing process. It is important to have the high stakes groups fully participating in the formal structure, but it is equally important that all stakeholder groups are involved in the process. The degree of involvement will vary—ranging from providing information through review of products to active participation in planning structure. The critical factor is to provide opportunity for input and, hopefully, a sense of ownership of the final plans across as broad a spectrum as practicable.

In the first section on structure, the various elements were defined and their responsibilities outlined. An important responsibility of each structural element is to assure that the planning process adheres to the Principles and provides ample opportunities for stakeholder input. Early decisions are needed concerning the pathways for input and responsibility for each.

Tools for facilitating inclusiveness include:

1. **Town Hall meetings**: Open meetings, widely publicized can be a good initial tool for introducing the planning process to stakeholder groups and gathering initial feedback for consideration. Such meetings should be chaired by SPC member(s), facilitated and recorded. Town halls may also be useful near the end of the process when documents are available for stakeholder comment.

2. **Focused surveys (web based)**: TWGs or the SPSC may want to use small focused surveys to get information on a topic or to solicit opinion on an issue from a sample of stakeholders. Tools are available through the University for designing, administering and analyzing results of such surveys.

3. **Web-based discussions**: A website has been established for strategic planning. The website is interactive, allowing the SPSC and/or TWGs to post interim products, questions, etc. and get feedback from interested parties that could be considered in the planning process. An additional advantage of the dedicated web site is the ability to give regular updates to the SLU community concerning planning progress and products.

4. **Social media**: Creative use of social media to secure input, comments and suggestions as the planning process goes forward is an essential if the student stakeholder group is to be fully engaged.

5. **Delphi exercise(s)**: An initial opinion and idea gathering exercise such as a two round Delphi (or similar method) would demonstrate that the process was open and seeking input from the many stakeholders in the outcome. This could be a single process across stakeholders or segmented for a subset.

6. **Specific information requests**: The SPSC and/or TWGs may have specific questions that can be directed to one or another individual or organization with specialized knowledge or experience related to the question.

7. **Interim product distributions (selective)**: Certain interim products or working papers and ideas can be distributed to a specific audience or group of individuals for comment. Such distributions would be issue and recipient-specific as determined by the SPSC or TWG.

8. **Solicited opinions**: Finally, the University would benefit from specifically soliciting the opinions of selected stakeholder groups on the final plan as distributed.
All of the above steps are designed to be an open and transparent approach to the planning task. To the extent they are followed and are successful, they will result in a better plan and wider buy-in from key constituencies.

**Summary**

The time constraints on the planning process will require a substantial investment of time and effort on the part of members of each element of the SLU community. Factors that will determine the time required include the number of topic areas, the level of detail regarding indicators and baselines required in the plan and the amount of support provided the various elements.

Approaches to staffing the process will be covered in a separate section.
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Introduction

Eight Topical Work Groups (TWGs) are central to the development of a strategic plan that will lead to realization of the eight Visions for SLU’s Future. These groups will be open to broad participation by self-nominated individuals. Given the wide interest within the institution in the planning process and the ultimate plan document, large numbers of individuals may self-nominate and seek want to serve on a TWG. Such open participation is consistent with the Guiding Principles and has been stated repeatedly in various informational meetings hosted by the SPSC. Because this approach, if not carefully managed, has the potential-to lead to TWGs of unwieldy size and to logistical problems with scheduling and producing products, this paper suggests approaches to structure and access to membership that - mitigate some of the time and effort concerns; while meeting the requirements of the Guiding Principles. In addition, the time constraints imposed by deadlines for project completion will require a fairly heavy time commitment from TWG members.

Categorizing Membership

In order to provide maximum potential for participation while being sensitive to individual members’ time constraints, there will be “classes” of membership on the eight TWGs. These are as follows:

- **Core Members** are a group of 9-11 individuals so designated from among the pool of interested individuals. Core members will meet frequently and will have principal responsibility for assuring that a TWG’s assignments are carried out effectively and that the required products are produced on time. Core members will be chosen in a way that provides representation from various stakeholder groups. They will be required to commit to spending at least four (4) hours a week from selection through completion of the TWG’s tasks in March, 2015.
- **Correspondent Members** can be of any number and are other individuals expressing interest in a TWG who are not designated as Core Members but who are willing to commit to participation in the TWG process for a minimum of four (4) hours a month. Although these members will be notified of all meetings and are welcome to attend, their principal means of participation will be via electronic media. They will receive, and have the opportunity for input on, all drafts being developed and considered by the Core Members, probably via Google.

Both classes of members are considered Voting Members, and will have the opportunity to vote on interim and final TWG products.

Creating the Pool

A pool of interested individuals will be recruited in each of the eight Vision areas. This pool will be developed in the following manner:

- **5.** Once the Imperatives and Visions have been posted on the website (and announced in Newslink), a separate solicitation of interest in participating in one of the TWGs will be posted. Individuals may self-nominate or be nominated to become a member of the appropriate pool of interested individuals.
- **6.** In order to be considered, individuals will complete an information survey and submit it electronically. On the form, they will be asked to indicate their interest and availability to serve as a Core Member or Correspondent Member.
- **7.** All responses will be collated and reviewed by the SPSC and the designated Conveners for the topic. The SPSC will select the Core Members based on their interest, experience, and availability to participate fully. Selections will be made with attention to securing a core group that reflects the makeup of the SLU community. The SPSC may choose to interview proposed Core Member candidates.
Facilitating Participation
Support staff will establish and implement procedures for assuring the TWG functions effectively, with particular attention to communication among members of both membership groups. With eight groups, scheduling meetings and rooms, monitoring participation, managing Google postings and responses, and distributing information will be critical to accomplishing tasks on time.

Record-Keeping
Attendance and participation records will be kept for all TWGs. Data will include attendance at called meetings (either in person or electronically), responses to requests for document review and comment, and voting. The Topic Coordinator will monitor participation and keep the Convener[s] apprised of any issues with participation.
One of the problems in strategic planning is the variation in use of terms across planners and institutions. While on the one hand this may seem a trivial matter, communication is critical to planning, both the process and the results, and lack of clarity on terminology inhibits or confuses communication. Accordingly, it is important for participants in strategic planning to have an agreed-upon set of terms that describe the elements of a plan. The following definitions are typical and are being used in the SLU process.3

“Mission Statement: A brief expression of the organization’s purpose. It should answer the questions “Why do we exist?” and “What, at the most basic level, do we do?”

“Vision Statement: A description of the organization’s desired future state. An organizational vision statement is internally focused: It projects the future in terms of the program, budget or staff size, answering the question “Where do we want to be?” Some organizations also adopt societal vision statements, articulating the desired influence of their work on their target community or constituency. This type of vision statement answers the question “What is the impact of our work?”

“Values Statement: The principles on which an organization is built, and that guide its planning, operations and programs. It answers the question “What do we believe in?”

“Goals or Objectives: These express desired outcomes and may be focused on discrete parts of the organization’s programming or internal operations. Progress toward achieving goals and objectives should be measurable. While the terms are often used interchangeably, goals are generally more comprehensive or far-reaching than objectives. Framed clearly, they answer the question “What do we want to accomplish?”

“Strategies and Tactics: These consist of approaches or sets of activities needed to achieve the goals and objectives. They answer the question “How will we actually accomplish our work?”

“Implementation Plan”: This is an organizational “user’s guide” to the strategic plan. It spells out the cost, duration, priority order and accountability for each strategy and tactic. The implementation plan answers the questions “What are our specific priorities?” and “How can we pursue our plan in a logical fashion?”

---

Mission Statement

The current SLU Mission Statement is:

“The Mission of Saint Louis University is the pursuit of truth for the greater glory of God and for the service of humanity. The University seeks excellence in the fulfillment of its corporate purposes of teaching, research, health care and service to the community. It is dedicated to leadership in the continuing quest for understanding of God’s creation and for the discovery, dissemination and integration of the values, knowledge and skills required to transform society in the spirit of the Gospels. As a Catholic, Jesuit University, this pursuit is motivated by the inspiration and values of the Judeo-Christian tradition and is guided by the spiritual and intellectual ideals of the Society of Jesus.”

After consideration by the Strategic Planning Assembly (SPA) and the Strategic Planning Committee (SPSC), it was decided not to recommend changes in the Mission Statement at the beginning of the plan development process. To do so would have potentially delayed the process, and, given the fixed deadline of May, 2015, for a plan, a delay would have been a problem. In discussions with the SPA and SPC, there were many suggestions for tightening up the language, but the basic concepts were generally supported. Editorial changes to streamline the statement will be reconsidered by the SPA and SPC prior to publication of the Strategic Plan in May.

Planning Imperatives

Four overarching Imperatives emerged clearly during virtually all of the twenty-six listening sessions that the Strategic Planning Steering Committee held during the first phase of this year’s strategic planning initiative as well as in the information received from those using the input form on the strategic planning website. Indeed, these Imperatives were identified as mission-critical components of the planning as this initiative moves forward, for the Imperatives lie at the core of what SLU stands for and aspires to build upon as it prepares to enter its third century as a seat of learning. For this reason, the specific strategies, goals, and objectives that Topical Working Groups (TWGs) will develop in order to move SLU toward achieving the eight Vision elements enumerated in the second section of this document must explicitly incorporate the four crosscutting Imperatives below as the groups work to flesh out SLU’s Visions for the Future.

I. A Commitment to Reinforcing Mission & Identity

SLU’s Mission and its identity as a Catholic, Jesuit institution have been central to its teaching, research, and service activities throughout its nearly two centuries of existence. Fulfillment of the Mission underlies the University’s achievements and constitutes the core of its identity, both in the community and among peer institutions. The importance of the University’s adherence to and advancement of its Mission is a consistent theme among faculty, staff, and students, and the SLU Mission is a source of distinctiveness and excellence across all University functions. Each strategy developed for achieving a Vision for SLU’s Future will identify ways that the strategy will support, and be supported by, SLU’s Mission and identity.

II. A Commitment to Enhancing Diversity & Inclusion

By its nature, the quest for social justice that lies at the heart of SLU’s Mission has a particular focus on populations with the greatest needs and fewest resources—the unserved and underserved. These populations exhibit great disparities in socioeconomic status, health status and access, societal influence, and educational attainment, among many other factors. Both to better address these disparities, and because diverse perspectives are necessary to in-depth pursuit of truth in teaching and research, it is essential that University programs, in both their internal and external activities, attend to the diversity within society. SLU must be an exemplar among academic organizations in its attention to differences among people and communities, whether
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based on race, ethnicity, culture, religion, gender, sexual orientation, ability, or socioeconomic status, and to accommodating these differences in every aspect of its operations. An imperative therefore exists to increase the diversity in the University’s faculty, staff, and student body and, in that way, to enhance both SLU’s educational programs and its goal of creating men and women for and with others. Achieving a diverse SLU community must also be accompanied by policies and programs that assure all members of the community are included in the variety of activities that constitute the SLU experience. Every strategy developed to support SLU’s Visions for the Future must explicitly demonstrate how diversity and inclusion will actively be advanced by the pursuit and achievement of the strategy.

III. A Commitment to Deepening Interdisciplinary Collaboration
SLU is a complex institution that encompasses virtually every field of knowledge within its academic units—a fact which should open up rich interdisciplinary possibilities. However, while a number of formal and informal collaborations currently exist within and among SLU’s Schools and Colleges, and across university lines, and although these collaborations make significant contributions to the discovery and transmission of knowledge, many more opportunities for interdisciplinary achievement are possible. Because the amelioration of major social and scientific issues increasingly demands the efforts of people working across disciplines, new partnerships and connections of all sorts need to occur in order to benefit both society and the University. Expanded collaboration can also be powerful as a path to expanded resources and an enhanced reputation for the institution. This potential must be explored as strategies are developed that advance the SLU mission and support achievement of its Visions for the Future.

IV. A Commitment to Advancing Institutional Distinctiveness & Excellence
Although SLU’s commitment to Ignatian principles of education and the Jesuit values of its founders comprise the core of its distinctiveness, there are other ways in which the institution achieves recognition from the public and among its peers—for example, those of the University’s programs that are nationally recognized for their academic excellence and those that are unique among America’s Jesuit universities, high levels of student academic and athletic success, accomplishments of prominent alumni, and University leadership in the community. Achieving recognition for leadership in these and other areas is a critical element in strengthening the University’s reputation, which in turn is crucial in attracting top faculty and students, as well as financial resources. TWGs must plan with the goal of identifying and enhancing SLU’s sources of distinctiveness and excellence in each Vision area, supporting their growth, and better communicating institutional achievements both within the University and to SLU’s local, regional, national, and international publics.

Vision Statement(s)

Although most organizations have a single vision, the SPSC’s conclusion after the listening sessions was that eight “Visions” for SLU’s future better captured the input received from the SLU community. These are based on themes that were sounded repeatedly during the listening sessions and by those using the input form on the strategic planning website. These eight were described in the document The Context for Planning which was widely circulated for comments within the University. The eight statements will guide the planning activities of a similar number of Topical Work Groups (TWGs). The visions are:

I. SLU as a Leader in Student Access & Success
II. SLU as a Source of Values-Based Learning
III. SLU as an Entrepreneur for Social Justice
IV. SLU as a Developer & Disseminator of New Knowledge
V. SLU as an Advocate for St. Louis
VI. SLU as a Health Promoter & Provider
VII. SLU as a Global Citizen
VIII. SLU as a Discerning Steward of Resources

Each of these is more fully developed in the Context document referred to above.
The Constraints

There are several constraints that need to be kept in mind as the Co-Conveners lead the TWGs in carrying out their planning responsibilities. These are:

1. **Plan Presentation Date:** The President expects to present a complete set of strategies for the future to the Board of Trustees at their meeting in early May, 2015. This constraint must drive every aspect of the process over the next few weeks.

2. **TWG Member Availability:** Between the Core and Correspondent members, the TWGs are very large groups, all of whom have other responsibilities. This will present scheduling problems for TWG meetings, problems which will need to be met by full use of electronic communications available to each TWG. Co-Conveners should consider a simple majority rule for core participation when scheduling any meeting.

3. **Requirement for Open & Transparent Process:** This is a critical element of the planning model, but also has an element of inefficiency. Again, creative use of electronic media available to each TWG will be critical in meeting this need and mitigating the constraint.

Process Considerations

Each TWG will be provided with a set of relevant materials at the beginning of its work. These will include ideas generated in the initial planning retreat as well as the listening sessions in the fall. These materials will provide the TWG with a sense of the SLU community’s expectations related to the Vision area assigned. Although not intended to limit the scope of the TWG’s consideration of ways to achieve the Vision, they should be carefully considered in that process.

A general description of the TWG process is:

1. Review the background materials provided and discuss broad themes that the TWG identifies that will support achievement of the Vision assigned.

2. Identify any additional information/data required, if any, to develop goals and supporting objectives and assign responsibility for securing same.

3. The TWGs may restate the assigned Vision as one or more “Initiatives”—broadly defined areas of activity/achievement critical to SLU’s future.

4. Each such Initiative proposed will be supported by one or more Goals to be pursued in support of the Initiative.

5. Based on the preceding, develop one or more goals to be pursued to support progress toward the Vision. **Goals may be either transformative or sustaining:**
   a. **Transformative Goals** — *those goals that build on strengths, but align and support those strengths in new ways that advance the institution consistent with the assigned Vision.*

   b. **Sustaining Goals** — *those goals that make incremental but significant changes across the institution and support realization* of the assigned Vision.

6. The TWG will prioritize both the transformational and sustaining Goals.

7. Each Goal will be supported by one or more measurable Objectives.

8. Indicators to be tracked will be identified for each Objective.

9. The TWGs will *not* attempt to define actions and strategies at this time.
Format and Documentation

1. In the model being used, a goal should be stated as:

   “The University will [action]”

   Examples:

   “The University will develop interdisciplinary Centers of Excellence that focus its resources on advancing both the acquisition and application of knowledge to improve human wellbeing.”

   The University will establish new partnerships within the St. Louis community that actively seek ways to apply the University’s knowledge to needs identified by, and jointly approached with, community members.

   The University will develop a coordinated effort to expand its global reach, with particular emphasis on expanded cooperation with Jesuit service and academic organizations in other countries.

2. For each goal developed, the TWG will identify one or more objectives that support achievement of, or progress towards achievement of, the goal within the planning period. Objectives should be time-specific and, if feasible, measurable, and in the format:

   “By [year] SLU will [state what will be done] as measured by [state metric]”

   Examples:

   “By the end of AY 2017, SLU will increase the annual percentage of minority students matriculating by 20% above the baseline level.”

   “By the end of AY 2018, SLU will establish an Institute for [topic].”

   ‘By the end of AY 2017, SLU extramural funding for medical research programs will increase by 75% above the baseline level.’

3. Decisions will be reached by development of a general consensus, not by voting per se.

4. Each proposed objective developed by a TWG will be documented on a Plan Objective Development Worksheet which will be shared with the appropriate Topical Referenced Group (TRG) of the Strategic Planning Assembly and with the SPSC. [Attachment 1]

5. Once the TWG has identified its goals and objectives, these will be prioritized and summarized on a TWG Worksheet which will be the basis for SPA actions and for the SPSC in developing the final plan document. [Attachment 2]
### Plan Objective Development Worksheet Instructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Insert name of TWG that developed this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Insert name of individual preparing this worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Insert the Vision Statement to which the goal and objective apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Insert the goal statement that supports the Vision and which is in turn supported by the objective described in this worksheet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5    | State the proposed objective in the following format:  

By [year] SLU will [state what will be done] as measured by [state metric].  
Some goals do not lend themselves to a specific metric and the “measure” may be completion of the action in the time frame stated. |
<p>| 6    | Insert a brief statement of how the proposed Objective was developed and chosen for inclusion as a means of accomplishing the goal. |
| 7    | Insert a brief explanation of the metric(s) chosen or the reason there is no applicable metric. |
| 8    | Indicate which if any of the Imperatives the TWG feels are addressed by this objective. |
| 9    | Indicate the methods used by the TWG to secure required input from the SLU community in identifying and preparing this objective. |
| 10   | Include any comments from the TRG concerning this objective. |
| 11   | Indicate approvals as noted. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TWG Name</th>
<th>Prepared by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Applicable Vision Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Proposed Objective Supporting Achievement of this Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Briefly Explain How Objective Was Chosen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What Metric(s) are Proposed for Tracking this Objective?

8. Which of the Following Imperatives Does this Objective Support (if any? (check all applicable)

   - [ ] I. Commitment to Reinforcing Mission & Identity
   - [ ] II. Commitment to Enhancing Diversity & Inclusion
   - [ ] III. Commitment to Deepening Interdisciplinary Collaboration
   - [ ] IV. Commitment to Achieving Institutional Distinctiveness & Excellence
   - [ ] None (Briefly explain)

9. What Methods Were Used to Secure Input on Development of this Objective (check all applicable)

   - [ ] Web posting with response
   - [ ] Google site
   - [ ] Public meeting
   - [ ] Survey
   - [ ] Consultation with relevant SLU committees

10. TRG Comments if any

11. Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TWG Co-Convener</th>
<th>SPSC Co-Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision/Strategy:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective (s)</td>
<td>Indicator(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective (s)</td>
<td>Indicator(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective (s)</td>
<td>Indicator(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 4:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective (s)</td>
<td>Indicator(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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_Becoming...:_ Elements of Draft 1 of the SLU Strategic Plan

**Initiative One: Becoming a model for education that not only**

Goal 1: _We will redouble our commitment to academic excellence in undergraduate, graduate, and professional education as we build upon our Jesuit academic heritage by expanding and creating new opportunities in the classroom and in the world that will assist students to develop into leaders and agents of change._

Goal 2: We will strengthen the support services that enhance the experiences and support the success of SLU’s undergraduate, graduate, and professional students, facilitating transitions into their programs of study and strengthening retention and graduation rates.

Goal 3: We will increase the opportunities for those who encounter educational and financial barriers when attempting to access the transformative power of a SLU education.

**Initiative Two: Becoming a leader in focused, mission-related research and dissemination**

Goal 1: _We will continue to embrace excellence in research as a cornerstone of our mission and will focus support on efforts to expand the amount of externally funded research activity across the University._

Goal 2: We will support the University’s research enterprise by providing a more facilitative research infrastructure.

**Initiative Three: Becoming the market leader in linking health promotion with high-quality medical care**

Goal 1: _We will undertake a holistic approach to integrating health professions education, biomedical and broader health-related research, and the provision of health and medical services to the St. Louis community._

Goal 2: We will build on our established strengths in the clinical health sciences, with an emphasis on strategically providing expanded access for both the SLU community and the larger community.

**Initiative Four: Becoming a catalyst for change in our St. Louis community**

Goal 1: _We will pursue a more active and participative relationship with the community and its residents, focused on its needs and the opportunities for partnerships that will assist in meeting them._

Goal 2: We will, in conjunction with the community, develop and implement new approaches to bring University resources into the community setting.

Goal 3: We will create a new structure in the University that provides a clear focus for research and service activities related to communities and their residents.

Goal 4: We will develop a structure and process for guiding the University’s physical development activities that integrate these initiatives with the communities which surround the St. Louis campus.

**Initiative Five: Becoming a pacesetter in the new global environment**

Goal 1: _We will create the administrative infrastructure necessary to coordinate international initiatives in an effort to foster, support, and expand SLU’s international instructional, research, and service activities._

Goal 2: We will develop programs and activities that facilitate and enhance international involvement on the part of SLU faculty, staff, and students.

Goal 3: We will strengthen both administrative and programmatic relationships between SLU’s Madrid and St. Louis campuses.

**Initiative Six: Becoming the University community our mission calls us to be**

Goal 1: _We will continuously assess the degree to which our employment policies and procedures are structured and administered in a manner consistent with our mission and values._

Goal 2: We will ensure that all faculty and staff have access to, and take advantage of, structured opportunities both to increase their understanding of the principles of Jesuit education and Ignatian pedagogy and to apply these principles in their daily work.

Goal 3: We will develop and implement an innovative leadership program for faculty and staff that is grounded in Jesuit, Catholic principles as they apply to the complex task of leadership in an academic setting.
Goal 4: We will create and support a more diverse SLU community—faculty, staff, and students—consistent with our Jesuit heritage, urban location, and global reach.

Goal 5: We will establish and maintain financial and management systems across the University characterized by transparency, efficiency, and responsiveness in revenue generation, allocation, and accountability.

Goal 6: We will make sustainability a major consideration in all decisions concerning our facilities, our grounds, and our use of resources.
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The Magis Outline

Initiative One: Being a National Exemplar of Transformative Educational and Research Excellence

Goal 1: We will intensify our commitment to excellence in undergraduate, graduate, and professional education as we build upon our Jesuit academic heritage by creating new opportunities to facilitate students’ development as leaders and agents of change.

Goal 2: We will continue to embrace excellence in research and scholarship by investing in our faculty and research infrastructure, expanding the level of externally funded research, and promoting the application of scholarly achievements to societal challenges and opportunities.

Goal 3: We will enhance the array of support services that facilitate students’ transitions into their programs of study and strengthen their rates of retention, graduation, and job placement.

Goal 4: We will increase access for those seeking the transformative power of a SLU education.

Initiative Two: Being a Market Leader in Health Promotion and the Highest Quality Medical Care

Goal 1: We will model a holistic approach to integrating health professions education, biomedical and broader health-related research, and the provision of health and medical services to the St. Louis community.

Goal 2: We will expand access to clinical services for both the SLU community and the larger community by building on our established strengths in the clinical health sciences.

Initiative Three: Being a Leading Catalyst for Groundbreaking Change in the Region, the Nation, and the World

Goal 1: We will engage more vigorously with the Greater St. Louis community and its residents, pursuing an active, mutually rewarding relationship focused on the community’s needs and the opportunities for partnerships that will assist in meeting them.

Goal 2: We will demonstrate our commitment to the community by working with it to develop and implement new approaches to bring community-responsive research and scholarly activities into the community setting.

Goal 3: We will develop a process for guiding the University’s physical development activities in the context of the communities which surround the St. Louis campus.

Goal 4: We will foster, support, and expand SLU’s global instructional, research, and service activities by creating the organizational infrastructure necessary to coordinate best practices in this growing field.

Goal 5: We will develop opportunities for SLU faculty, staff, and students that facilitate and enhance their international engagement.

Goal 6: We will strengthen the bonds between SLU’s Madrid and St. Louis campuses.

Initiative Four: Being an Innovator and Entrepreneur in All That We Do

Goal 1: We will provide our students, and those who teach them, with a powerful learning-technology environment both to facilitate learning and to prepare them for employment in an increasingly technological workplace.

Goal 2: We will adopt and promote new models of educational design, program delivery, and market development, especially insofar as these paradigms address current challenges to the traditional higher-education business model, which are largely driven by affordability and access concerns.

Goal 3: We will create new opportunities for members of the SLU community to foster their socially responsible entrepreneurial interests.

Goal 4: We will utilize SLU’s athletics programs as a strategic asset in increasing the visibility of the SLU brand and the prestige of the University nationally and regionally.

Initiative Five: Fostering a Culture of Excellence, Effectiveness, and Efficiency Deeply Rooted in Our Institutional Mission and Catholic, Jesuit Values

Goal 1: We will ensure an employment environment that is consistent with our values and which supports our efforts to sustain a mission-aligned faculty and staff of the highest quality.

Goal 2: We will provide structured opportunities for all faculty and staff to increase their understanding of Jesuit educational principles and values in order to apply them in their daily work.
Goal 3: We will become a more diverse and inclusive community.

Goal 4: We will sustain our ability to carry out our academic mission by establishing and maintaining financial and management systems across the University characterized by subsidiarity, transparency, effectiveness, efficiency, and responsiveness in revenue generation, allocation, cost containment, and accountability.

Goal 5: We will apply the Jesuit concept of care for creation to our stewardship of the environment on our campus and in our community.

Goal 6: We will strengthen our internal and external communications capabilities and effectiveness.
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The Magis Participants

Strategic Planning Staff

James R. Kimmey M.D., Strategic Planning Coordinator
Mary Ann Bindbeutel, Administrative Assistant
Mary Flick (1/15-4/15)

The Launch (August 13, 2014)

Participants in initial meeting, these individuals subsequently comprised the Strategic Planning Assembly.

Philip Alderson, M.D.,
Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean of the School of Medicine

Theodosios Alexander, Sc.D.,
Dean of Parks College of Engineering, Aviation and Technology

Jennifer Baine,
Administrative Secretary for the Program in Physical Therapy

Kathy Barbeau,
Business Manager for the dean of Parks College of Engineering

Michael Barber, S.J.,
Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Anna Beasley,
Director of Consulting and Client Services

Clayton Berry,
Assistant Vice President for University Marketing and Communications

Jeffrey Bishop, M.D., Ph.D.,
Director of the Center for Health Care Ethics

Kathleen Brady,
Vice President for Facilities Services

Steven Buckner, Ph.D.,
Professor of Chemistry

Thomas Burroughs, Ph.D.,
Director of SLUCOR

Diana Carlin, Ph.D.,
Associate Vice President for Graduate Education

David Cassens,
Dean of University Libraries

Susanne Chawczczewski, Ph.D.,
Director of Campus Ministry

Meg Connolly,
Associate Vice President for Alumni Relations

Lisa Dorsey, Ph.D.,
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

Leanna Fenneberg, Ph.D.,
Assistant Vice President for Student Development

Bridget Fletcher,
Vice President and Chief of Staff

Jeffrey Fowler,
Vice President for University Advancement

Beth Freeburg, Ph.D.,
Dean of the School for Professional Studies

Jean Gilman,
Dean of Undergraduate Admission

Jay Goff,
Vice President for Enrollment and Retention Management

David Grabe,
Assistant Vice President and Controller

Patty Haberberger,
Interim Vice President for Human Resources

Keith Hacke,
Associate Vice President and Chief Technology Officer

David Hakanson,
Vice President and Chief Information Officer

Stacey Harrington, J.D.,
Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs

Ellen Harshman, Ph.D., J.D.,
Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs

John Hatton, D.M.D.,
Director of the Center for Advanced Dental Education

David Heimburger,
Vice President and Chief Financial Officer

Ramona Hicks, Ed.D.,
Assistant Vice President for Student Development and Dean of Students

Miriam Joseph, Ph.D.,
Reference Librarian and Professor

William Kauffman, J.D.,
Vice President and General Counsel

Elisabeth King,
Benefits Manager
Michael Lewis, Ph.D.,
Associate Vice President for Faculty Development

Michelle Lewis,
Director of the Office of Institute Equity and Diversity

Sheila Manion,
Associate Vice President for University Development

Gregory Marks, Ph.D.,
Associate Professor of Mathematics and Computer Science

Chris May,
Director of University Athletics

Marsha McBride,
Director of Payroll Services

Yvonne McCool-McLaughlin,
Grant Development Specialist

Kathleen Merlo,
Chief Operating Officer for University Medical Group (UMG)

Michael Mueller,
Associate Vice President for ITS Division Administration

Jaisel Patel,
Vice President of Finance for the Student Government Association and Senior Business Student

William Perkins,
Director of Pre-College and Access Programs

Theresa Perry,
Financial Coordinator

Kent Porterfield, Ed.D.,
Vice President for Student Development

Mary Christine Regan,
Associate Vice President for Service Operations

William Rehg, S.J., Ph.D.,
Dean of the College of Philosophy and Letters

Drew Roznowski,
Vice President of Internal Affairs for the Student Government Association and Senior Business Student

Ann Rule, Ph.D.,
Chair of the Department of Education

Douglas Rush, J.D., Ph.D.,
Associate Professor of Higher Education Administration

Scott Safranski, Ph.D.,
Interim Dean of the John Cook School of Business

Steven Sanchez, Ph.D.,
Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs

Chris Sebelski, DPT,
Associate Professor of Physical Therapy

Paul Stark, S.J.,
Vice President for Mission and Ministry

Maria Christine Stevens,
Director of Pastoral Care and Education

Rita Stites,
Manager in the Department of Pediatrics

Edwin Trevathan, MPH, M.D.,
Dean of the College for Public Health and Social Justice

Bridget Turner,
Program Manager for the Vice President of Research

Jane Turner, M.D., Ph.D.,
Associate Professor of Pathology

Dorien Villafranco,
Vice President of International Affairs for the Student Government Association and Senior Aerospace Engineering Student

Paul Vita, Ph.D.,
Director of Saint Louis University's Madrid Campus

Theodore Vitali, C.P.,
Ph.D., Chair of the Philosophy Department

Cari Wickliffe,
Assistant Vice President in Enrollment and Retention Management and Director of Student Financial Services

Douglas Williams, J.D.,
Professor of Law

Robert Wilmott, M.D.,
Chair of the Department of Pediatrics

Mardell Wilson, Ed.D.,
Dean of Doisy College of Health Sciences

Michael Wolff, J.D.,
Dean of the School of Law

John Woolschlager, Ph.D.,
Director of the Center for Sustainability
The Leadership

The process was led by a Strategic Planning Committee of individuals drawn from across the University.

Steering Committee Co-Chairs
Dr. Joe Weixlmann
Professor of English
College of Arts and Sciences

Dr. Kent Porterfield
Vice President for Student Development

Steering Committee Members
Brad D. Carlson
Associate Professor, Marketing
John Cook School of Business

David Cassens
Dean of the University Libraries

Christopher Collins
Assistant Professor, Theological Studies
College of Arts and Sciences

Heather Flabiano
Assistant Dean
College for Public Health and Social Justice

Ann Knezetic
President
Student Government Association

Debie Lohe
Director of the Reinert Center for Transformative Teaching and Learning

Will Perkins
Director of Pre-College and Access Programs, Enrollment and Retention Management

Chris Sebelski
Associate Professor, Physical Therapy
Doisy College of Health Sciences

Stuart Slavin
Associate Dean
School of Medicine
The Topical Workgroups

SLU as a Source of Academic Excellence Rooted in Values-Based Learning

Co-Conveners: Jennifer Popiel and Steve Sanchez
Jesuit Community: Fr. William O'Brien
At Large Core Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ellen Barnridge</th>
<th>Blythe Janowiak</th>
<th>Fr. David Meconi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Gohara</td>
<td>Timmy Pazderka</td>
<td>Jeanne Eichler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Carlson</td>
<td>Ruben Rosario-Rodriguez</td>
<td>Ken Parker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLU as a Center of Research & Disseminator of New Knowledge

Co-Conveners: Eleonore Stump and Joel Eissenberg
Jesuit Community: Fr. John Padberg
At Large Core Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anneke Bart</th>
<th>Robert Fleming</th>
<th>William Siler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrico DiCera</td>
<td>Daniel Hoft</td>
<td>Tim Achee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Felock</td>
<td>Silvana Siddali</td>
<td>Fred Niederman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLU as a Health Promoter & Provider

Co-Conveners: Ken Haller and Tricia Austin
Jesuit Community: Fr. Francis Ryan
At Large Core Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michael Anderson</th>
<th>Michael Lim</th>
<th>Shivani Singh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Bennett</td>
<td>Mary McLennan</td>
<td>Deborah Hwa-Froelich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris L'Ecuyer</td>
<td>David Pole</td>
<td>Arathi Srikanta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLU as a Leader in Student Access & Success

Co-Conveners: Leanna Fenneberg and Marla Berg-Weger
Jesuit Community: Fr. Jim Veltrie
At Large Core Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greg Beabout</th>
<th>Ivy Love</th>
<th>Cari Wickliffe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Israel</td>
<td>Janet Oberle</td>
<td>Tim Hercules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Kennell</td>
<td>George Theotokatos</td>
<td>Sabrina Tyuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLU as a Discerning Steward of Resources

Co-Conveners: Bonnie Wilson and Danielle Uy
Jesuit Community: Br. Bill Rehg
At Large Core Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patrick McCarthy</th>
<th>Andrew Sommer</th>
<th>John Wooslclager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angela Sharkey</td>
<td>Viki Villareal</td>
<td>Ellen Carnaghan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adekemi Sodamade</td>
<td>Doug Williams</td>
<td>Steve (Stacey) Harris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLU as an Entrepreneur for Social Justice and Responsibility

Co-Conveners: Jonathan Smith and Mona Hicks
At Large Core Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gretchen Arnold</th>
<th>Jerry Katz</th>
<th>Wynne Moskop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Coffin</td>
<td>Fred Rottnek</td>
<td>Olubukola Gbadgesin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Jenkins</td>
<td>Brandon Sampson</td>
<td>Leah Sweetman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SLU as an Advocate for St. Louis

Co-Conveners: Norm White and Bryan Sokol
Jesuit Community: Fr. Chris Collins
At Large Core Members:

- Bob Cropf
- Sheila Leander
- Yvette Liebesman
- Katherine Mathews
- Jonathan Pulphus
- Darcy Scharff
- Peg Weathers
- Stephen Belt

SLU as a Global Citizen

Co-Conveners: Peter Ruminski and Tom Finan
Jesuit Community: Fr. Don Highbeger
At Large Core Members:

- Abbie Amico
- Stephen Casmier
- Joseph Flaherty
- Cathleen Fleck
- Yuan Gao
- Seung Kim
- Fernando Serrano
- Bert Barry
- Richard Allington
The President’s Cabinet

Philip Alderson, M.D., Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean of the School of Medicine
Nancy Brickhouse, Ph.D., Provost
Jeff Fowler, Vice President for Marketing and Communications
David Heimburger, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer
William R. Kauffman, J.D., Vice President and General Counsel
Sheila Manion, Vice President for University Development
Fred Pestello, Ph.D., President
Kent Porterfield, Ed.D., Vice President for Student Development