

**THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**COMMITTEE ON GOVERNANCE AND LONG-RANGE PLANNING
MINUTES OF MEETING
VOLUME GLRP 17**

January 4, 2016

A meeting of the Committee on Governance and Long-Range Planning of the Board of Trustees was held telephonically on Monday, January 4, 2016.

The following members, constituting a quorum, were present: Rick Dandrea, Barbara Doran, Keith Eckel, David Han, Chris Hoffman, Betsy Huber, Anthony Lubrano, Keith Masser and Daniel Mead. Trustee Emeritus Carl Shaffer was also present.

Representatives Jessie Blank and Gul Kremer were in attendance, as well as the following staff members: Eric Barron, Steve Dunham, Frank Guadagnino and Nicholas Jones.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Eckel at 4:00 p.m.

Chair Eckel, laying the context for the Committee action, stated that for over a year Provost Jones has been briefing various committees as well as the full Board on the status and progress of the strategic planning process. The Strategic Planning Council has been working diligently to identify and articulate Penn State's priorities and goals for 2016 through 2020. Once these high-level strategies are unveiled, the University will then begin working on articulation of specific steps, responsibilities and matrices for implementation and progress measurement. The plan document is now at the point of Committee approval, which is under the Committee's jurisdiction as outlined in the Board's *Bylaws*. While it is not technically required, the Committee intends that the plan, as approved, will be submitted to the full Board for its concurrence in February.

Chair Eckel then called for a motion for the Committee to approve the strategic plan and recommend that the full Board provide its concurrence in February. The motion was put forward by Trustee Mead and seconded by Trustee Han.

Chair Eckel called for discussion, and Trustee Lubrano asked that his statement be read into the record. [see Appendix I]

After further discussion with dialogue from all members, and a request for a roll call vote, Chair Eckel proceeded. Voting proceeded, and 7 members voted in favor of the motion (Trustees Dandrea, Eckel, Han, Hoffman, Huber, Masser, and Mead), and 2 members voted against the motion (Trustees Doran and Lubrano).

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m. The audio of the meeting is available in its entirety at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SubcTslPcPY>.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J. Penkala
Associate Director, Board of Trustees

Governance Committee Teleconference

January 4, 2016

Statement provided by Trustee Anthony P. Lubrano

Chairman Eckel and fellow Trustees, I must confess to my surprise that we are being asked to approve "The Pennsylvania State University's Strategic Plan for 2016 to 2020" in its current form. I have concerns about the process by which this plan was developed as well as the product itself.

Let me explain.

First, my concerns about the process:

- The American Council of Trustees and Alumni, commonly known as ACTA, addresses the need for a Strategic Plan to have input from three co-fiduciary groups: administration, faculty, and board. The plan we are asked to approve today was made primarily by the administration, with very little meaningful input from the faculty or board.

- Our Provost informs us that Strategic Planning Council was the body responsible for the plan. But I ask, how does a 33-member group work together effectively on a complex project?

<http://www.opia.psu.edu/plans/uspc/member-roster>

Parenthetically, we have experienced firsthand the difficulty of 36 Trustees working together.

- The Faculty Senate saw the draft Strategic Plan in its final stages, and had very little input. The faculty on the Council were primarily administrators. What is the justification for making

long-range plans for academic programming without full involvement from faculty?

- The primary Board committee that should have involvement in strategic planning is Academic Affairs and Student Living, better known as AASL. In our bylaws, AASL “shall consider and report or recommend to the Board of Trustees on matters pertaining to: (1) the educational policies and programs of the University, including the long-range educational development of the University.” Best practices dictate ongoing and meaningful involvement of a university board’s standing committee on academics when creating a Strategic Plan, yet our AASL had no involvement in planning (and received only periodic updates saying the Council was working on the plan).
- Arguably, other Board committees should have had involvement in the planning process, particularly Finance. It is inconceivable that a strategic plan would not include some financial projections to support the academic planning. Was this done without input from the Finance Committee? And how about the need for capital projects? Is this considered somewhere within the Strategic Plan?

Now my Concerns about the product:

- The Strategic Plan, as presented, is a statement of broad, visionary goals. Although individual units (colleges, etc.) are creating their own plans to align with these visionary goals, where are the overarching goals and strategies for the university as a whole? The document as presented to GLRP for approval is without meaningful content. In my opinion, nothing within the

document offers direction for Board-level decision-making. No metrics or objective outcomes associated with concrete goals and strategies that can be monitored to determine whether progress is being made are referenced. If these are to be added later, as the Provost has said, then GLRP should wait then review, and if appropriate, approve that document. This is not a Strategic Plan until concrete and specific goals, with associated strategies and measurable outcomes are included.

- To what extent were rapidly-developing changes in the higher education landscape (and their expected impacts on PSU) considered when developing this plan? Are there reports on these changes available for Trustees to review?
- Were demographic trends in Pennsylvania, the U.S., and abroad reviewed for enrollment planning? Again, are reports available for review by Trustees? If so, then how were they used to develop the plan?
- Does each of the commonwealth campuses have its own plan? Is there a plan for the campus system as a whole? What studies were done to support this planning?

In short, because of these concerns, I will be voting against this Strategic Plan. In my opinion, “Our Commitment to Impact: The Pennsylvania State University's Strategic Plan for 2016 to 2020” is neither a plan nor is it strategic.