JOSEPH M. MCSHANE, SJ: … This convocation begins our new approach to strategic planning for the institution. And so I want to go to the next slide.

What we’re trying to do here is: In times past, what Fordham did was like most institutions did. We produced a strategic plan. And that strategic plan was to guide us for five, seven, or 10 years. It became an object of veneration. It was placed on the bookshelf. But it did direct us. And it was pretty good.

But let’s be honest. The role of higher education is changing at a rate which is extraordinary these days. And so it seemed to me that what we had to do is move away from an exercise which would create a document that we were supposed to live with for five, seven, or 10 years, and move toward a process of continuous strategic planning, which would enable us to be far more agile in reacting or responding to what was going on, and then plotting a course that would differentiate ourselves from others. And that, by the way, is a large part of what strategic planning is about. It’s differentiation. And part of the differentiation that we seek is the differentiation which is marked by agility and anticipation of new trends and new developments in higher education.
So that’s where the idea for continuous strategic planning came from. The goal that we have in mind is we want to change entirely Fordham’s approach to the task of planning by creating a planning process that is inclusive, mixed—both local and central—and ongoing. It’s going to be continuous.

And if we go forward, the guiding vision in all of this—and this, my friends, is what I am buying and what I’m selling. The guiding vision that I place before you, as I’ve placed before CUSP and placed before the deans and the vice presidents is this: What we want to do is achieve greatness for Fordham on Fordham’s own terms. (pause) Achieve greatness on our own terms—which means making Fordham the model—the model urban Jesuit university for the 21st century. There are five terms there. Model. Urban. Jesuit. True university. And 21st century.

Now the reason I’m pushing this is it seems to me that the terms there are inviting and inclusive, and they invite interpretation locally. For instance, what does it mean to be a Jesuit graduate school of education? Or a graduate social service? What does it mean to be a Jesuit undergraduate college of liberal arts? What does it mean to be in New York rather than in Sioux City? What does it mean to be in New York rather than in Boston? What does it mean to be the model urban Jesuit university in the 21st century? A time when there is going on among us as great a change in literacy, as was brought about by Gutenberg. Our students are literate in a completely different way. So, enough room to maneuver, great conversations, but that’s the rubric.
The mantra that I am using, and I’ve already used it a number of times with the Senate is this: Because we want it to be inclusive and mixed, what I am saying is our mantra is, “Participation is key because participation leads to ownership; ownership leads to commitment; commitment leads to implementation; implementation is followed by annual review; and that leads to assessment and adjustment because we’re in an ongoing process.”

And as we go forward, the timeline is this: In the first year, we are not going to produce what you expect in the way of a strategic plan as you would in any other planning cycle or process. The real deliverable of our first year in the planning process is the creation of a process which is inclusive.

This is a process I believe that’s going to be three years before we get it down—because it is new. It’s pretty—if not completely unique—it’s nearly unique in American higher education. And we’re going in this direction because we want to steal a march on the rest. We want to get out in front of change. We want to get out in front of the different trends that are developing.

So I believe that the second and third years are the years in which we will affect a change in the culture of the university. We will not be a university that depends on one plan for five years, but rather we’ll be an attentive and agile university as we go forward.

Our challenge is, it seems to me as we go forward, are is the following. In order to have a process which is dialogic between local and central, we have to figure out the planning committees for the schools, divisions, departments in the university. And this is a key thing.
You know, some of the deans and some of the faculty on the Senate wonder, “Should we create planning committees for the schools? Or should we adopt the councils—the school councils—as the main planning bodies?” My sense is, from talking with leadership members—members of the Leadership Team in the Senate—is that they would prefer to go with the councils.

The second challenge is we have to really come up with a clear articulation of the relationship—the dialogic relationship—between the local planners and the central planning operation, which is going to be CUSP. The group that we’re going to introduce you to right now.

Next challenge is the commitment to the continuous nature of the process. In taking up this approach—or adopting this approach—we really have to, as a university family, completely commit to this. Why? Because one of the things that we have to do is we have to make sure that what we do is refreshed every year, which means we’re going to be doing SWOT analysis and environmental scanning on an annual basis. Let me give you one example of why this is necessary. And I say it with Matt in the room.

Twelve years ago—ten years ago—no one could have imagined or predicted what happened to legal education after 2008. So, what we have to do is each year review, through SWOT analysis and environmental scanning, what’s going on so we are not caught off guard as we go forward. So the continuous nature of this is very important. (pause) And we also have to figure out the annual feedback loop.
The CUSP membership is interesting—Continuous University Strategic Planning. If you look up at the front of the room, you’ll see a troika, which is a very talented troika. And it’s important. Notice, it is composed of a faculty member who was chosen by the faculty senate; faculty member chosen by senate, by a dean, and by a vice president.

You have Dr. Patrick Hornbeck, Chair of Theology and a member of the 1-leadership 1-team in the senate; you have Dr. Debra McPhee, the Dean of the Graduate School of Social Service; and Dr. Peter Stace, who is our Vice President for Enrollment Services or Enrollment. It’s important. There’s a partnership which we are, I think, entering into and almost canonizing by the leadership we have up there.

The membership of the whole committee, which is 22 members, is going to be rotated on some basis, but we have to figure that out as we go forward. And we have brought in an outside consulting group, AKA, that has broad experience in academic and university planning. Most recently, they went through the strategic planning process for and with the State University of New York, which has 64 campuses throughout the state of New York. So they know what they’re doing.

And as we go forward, the guiding vision—and this is where I’m going to end. The guiding vision is the only thing that I’m putting out there—that I’m selling—and I’m selling it, and I want you to buy it. (pause) Fordham has to seek greatness on its own terms. To my mind that means Fordham seeks greatness by becoming the model urban Jesuit university for the 21st century. Model urban Jesuit university for the 21st century.
Next—the mantra I am coming back to all the time in my own thinking. I woke up in the middle of the night last night saying, “Participation leads to ownership. Ownership leads to commitment. Commitment leads to implementation. Implementation gives rise to an annual review with assessment and adjustment as we go forward.”

Those are the only two things that I’m really pushing—the guiding vision and the mantra. Participation has to be inclusive, has to be dialogic—because if we don’t do that, there’ll be no buy-in. And no buy-in means no plan.

So at this point, I’d like to turn the platform over, and the conch, as well—none of you have read *Lord of the Flies*, I see—alright—

AUDIENCE: (laughs)

JOSEPH M. MCSHANE, SJ: —to Dr. Patrick Hornbeck for the second part of our presentation. Thanks, Patrick.

DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: Thanks so much. Thanks (inaudible at 00:32:38).

AUDIENCE: (applause)
DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: Excellent. Thank you so very much, Father McShane. It’s so great for Peter and Debra and I to be here and to have the next 15-20 minutes to talk with you about what it is that we’re hoping to do this year with the CUSP—Continuous University Strategic Planning process.

I want to just start off by introducing myself briefly since I work most of the time up at Rose Hill. My name is Patrick Hornbeck. I’m Chair of the Theology Department, and as Father McShane said, Secretary of the Faculty Senate. And one of the things that I’m bringing to this role—I’m delighted to have the opportunity to be in this role—is a commitment to listen as broadly as we possibly can to every member of the university community.

One of the things that Debra, Peter, and I want to emphasize today is how important it is for every person who wants to give input to feel heard in this process. Father McShane just talked about how important it is for community buy-in. We want to create a planning process that structures that buy-in from the very beginning.

And to that end, we hope that as you came in everyone got a little index card. So we want to start the conversation—the dialogue with folks—just here. So if—as I’m speaking or Debra is speaking or Peter is speaking—you have any question at all about the process, write it down on the card. There’ll come a minute—about 10, 15 minutes from now—where we’ll invite the cards to be passed to the center. And we’ll collect them and answer them at the end of the presentation. We want to use the cards so that we make sure to hear from everybody, and so we can group related questions together. So, please, if you have any questions at all, write them down and put
them on the card. If we can’t get to them today, we will find a way to get those answers to you because it is just so important that this planning process be as inclusive as it possibly can be.

I don’t want to repeat too much of what Father McShane said, but let me just reflect briefly on the planning document that we’ve been working with thus far. Many of you know it—Toward 2016. Well, now it’s Toward 2016. And so now would be the time in general where the institution should think about, “What is the next stage in the history of Fordham?” But as Father just said, one of the problems with the traditional strategic planning approach like Toward 2016, regardless of how good it was for its time, is that models or plans that are for five years or seven years or ten years can end up sort of limiting our ability as a community to adjust to challenges as they come up.

In 2005, when Toward 2016 was being put together, we didn’t know about the financial crisis of 2008-2009. We didn’t know what would happen to legal education. We didn’t know that demand for graduate education in the arts and sciences was about to go down. But yet, we had built a document that said, “Here is our strategy for the next 10 years.” And so that’s limited us, and it made us less agile and less nimble.

So what we want to do instead is to engage in a process of what we’re calling “Continuous University Strategic Planning.” which, thank goodness, has an acronym like CUSP because otherwise is would be a really big mouthful.
What I want to do briefly is to talk about what each of those terms mean. So first of all, we’re involved in strategic planning, which I want to distinguish from operational planning. Throughout this process over the next few years, our schools, our departments, our divisions, are going to continue to need to do their day-to-day work. In my department, we need to decide which courses we’re offering and which faculty members are offering them and which graduate seminars and so on and so forth. Those are operational decisions. Several levels above where I work as a department Chair, the provost has to decide which faculty positions to authorize. And those are operational decisions.

Strategic decisions are separate from those. Strategic questions are the ones that ask us to step back and take a sort of 30,000-foot view of the institution. What is Fordham and why are we here? Where do we see ourselves in the marketplace of American higher education?

Father McShane just spoke about, “What is it that makes Fordham distinctive so that we can be excellent on our own terms?” So the question becomes, “Well, what are those terms?” And those are strategic questions.

Now as we begin this process, we’re all going to be figuring out how the relationship between strategic planning and operational planning takes place. And we’ll have more to say about that in just a second.
This is also university level planning. And as the process goes on, we’re going to be talking about the relationship between what CUSP is doing for the whole university, and what school, or division, or departmental groups will be doing in their own spaces later on down the line.

It’s also continuous planning. And this is where we have a new framework—a new mode of reference—a new mode of being. One of the mantras that I have, which is shorter than the one that Father McShane has, is, “This is not business as usual.” I think very often here at Fordham, we’re used to thinking or acting or proceeding in certain terms. We’ve gotten used to the way that we do our business. And part of this planning is disrupting that and figuring out how we can be ourselves in a better way—in a more effective way.

So the outcome of this process is going to be two-fold. First of all, we need to articulate as an institution—as a university community—what our long-term goals and aspirations are. What will characterize the most excellent Fordham of 2025, for instance?

But second, we have to interrogate really closely the question of what is our manner or our way of proceeding? What are the things that we are so used to doing here that sometimes we get in our own way?

One of the things that we hear a lot about—what Debra will speak more about later on—is the phenomenon of siloing. Where faculty members or students or staff can work really well within their own particular community—within their own schools, for instance—but have a lot of
difficulty collaborating with just the school one floor up or one floor down in

(inaudible) Lowenstein.

So, the continuous part of the this process is going to involve matching those long-term goals and aspirations with new ways of doing business that’ll make ourselves more effective, more nimble, and more inclusive as we go on. And all of that is to say that we’re going to be creating a culture of planning here at Fordham. That what we want to do is to build planning and planning-related thinking into the work that we do on an ongoing basis—continuous and strategic.

So that gives you a bit of a brief overview of what it is that we’re hoping to accomplish throughout this process. There is absolutely no way that we can make it work without significant buy-in from all members of the university community. So the commitment that the three of us are making to you—it’s the same commitment that we made to the members of the CUSP committee a few weeks ago—is that we want to leave literally no stone unturned and no person un-talked to when it comes to soliciting feedback, ideas, complaints, concerns. If we aren’t open with each other—if we aren’t able to have this sort of conversation—then the planning that we want to do will be hampered or hindered from the very get-go.

So we’re excited to hear what everyone has to say. Please, as we keep talking, remember the index cards. Write your questions down. We will engage them in just a little bit. But at this moment, I’m delighted to hand the microphone over to my colleague, Dr. Peter Stace.

AUDIENCE: (applause)
DR. PETER STACE: Thanks very much, Patrick. I want to underscore a couple of things from Patrick’s commentary and what Father has said. We keep talking about “we.” I want to talk a little bit about who “we” is and how we get there. And underscore that by looking at the words here.

This CUSP process—it’s going to be evolving; it’s going to be collaborative; and it’s iterative. So, unlike a traditional strategic plan, often we can’t put out before everybody a set of timelines, and this is what’s going to happen when and this is what it’s going to look like. We’re discovering that as we go along and things emerge and the community participates.

Starting long before our meeting today and before the CUSP meeting, in fall of 2013, the trustees met at a retreat—planning retreat—identified a series of issues that really reflect the conversation in higher education today—the main threads of those dynamics—and charged the administration with beginning a planning process that involved the whole university. And they wanted to be sure they we did address those threads—the cost structure of higher education, technology, the balance of liberal arts and professional education, graduate and undergraduate, the nature of Jesuit education and how that informs what we do. And at that level of generality, charged us to deal with the issues and appointed a board strategy committee to insure that that process proceeded.

And it proceeded rather quickly—Father McShane and conversationally. Father McShane began having conversations with the senate, with the vice presidents, with the deans—sharing his
vision for the model Jesuit university in the 21st century and talking about a collaborative planning process that had both local planning dimensions and strategic issues addressed. (pause)

In the course of those conversations, the structure that we have today evolved, and it led to the appointment of the CUSP committee. And I want to describe who’s briefly alluded to and we’ll show you who’s on that committee, talk about the way they came to be appointed, and what the work is that we will do and how we will proceed to engage the community and act on what we hear.

Of the three co-chairs, as Father mentioned, Patrick was appointed by the Senate. Two of the faculty members on the CUSP committee were also chosen by the Senate. AKA advisors had done previous work with us and have done outstanding work at other major institutions across the country including the recent SUNY Strategic Plan process that has been again in the news.

There are 22 members in CUSP. It’s a balance of—one of whom should be first on this and is missing from the slide—Eva Badowska. I don’t know how that happened.

AUDIENCE: (laughs)

MALE: She’s cancelled.

AUDIENCE: (laughs)
DR. PETER STACE: (laughs) Absolutely. But the members of CUSP—they were nominated by the president’s advisory committee, which is itself a new structure that developed in the course of these conversations about planning. And it’s composed of the deans, the vice presidents, and the representative of the faculty senate, to advance and support the planning process. Two of the members of the CUSP committee were chosen directly by the senate. The others were chosen, not to represent particular departments or areas of interest, but for their multiple involvements across the university and in communities of intellectual pursuit and administrative activity beyond the university. So, their charge isn’t to represent their respective direct areas of association but to bring to the conversation a broad perspective that we share with each other as we review and examine and solicit input from the university community.

And that’s the first job for CUSP to do. It’s to solicit input from the community through interviews, focus groups, town halls, surveys. The “Tell Us” link that’s already up on the website and to which we received more than about 50 responses—suggestions of important issues that those individuals think the university should address.

So bottom line, if there’s a group that we haven’t thought to reach out to, there’s an opportunity for everyone to provide input on an anonymous link. So if there’s something you think we should be thinking about and you don’t raise it as a question or a suggestion today, please use the “Tell Us” link on the website.
We’ll be reaching out to students, to alumni, faculty, staff, parents, employers, (pause) and perhaps interest groups, digital learning community, areas of intellectual pursuit of approaches to instruction, other themes and dimensions that will come up in the process of our conversations. And those will come up, and we will pursue them. What’lls CUSP do with all of this?

The objective is to identify things that are important in the community, to frame those, and feed them back to the community and say “Did we get it right?” And in an iterative process, kind of winnow and assemble the suggestions that are coming forward to constitute principles, themes that will become one of the major deliverables for the CUSP process, which will lead to a document that’s shared with the board for a vote in September 2016—but prior to that, will be shared with the university community, with the senate, with the other bodies that I’ve mentioned.

So, the penultimate draft will be seen by everybody. And in the course of conversations prior to that, emerging things will be known and become part of conversation. And that’s already begun to happen. We have the responses on the “Tell Us” link. And there have been conversations with Arts and Sciences chairs and in other forums across the institution. So that this planning process isn’t something that’s being dropped from the sky and kind of imposed on folks, it’s a conversation. And as that goes forward, I think we’ll find that as ideas are shared, change begins to take place, and it doesn’t wait for a starting gun to be fired. People’s thinking changing changes and evolves with time and conversation. And that’s a very important part of the process that we’ll pursue.
Deliverables from this process? First and foremost and right out of the chute, is university engagement of the university community. Everybody’s part of the conversation. If they haven’t been asked directly, there’s the opportunity to reach out and say, “Here I am and this is what I think.” And they don’t—you don’t need to wait to be asked.

A framework for strategic thinking. There will be a document produced. It won’t be nearly the volume or the specificity of what Toward 2016 provided for us. It will be a set of principles that will apply to the whole university community to guide the way we make local decisions.

And then finally, a process for continuous planning. As we look at that process—there’s a presumption. All of this is very collaborative. Are the structures that exist in the university today supportive of that collaborative approach to decision-making? Do we have the opportunities across departments, across schools, across divisions in the university, to have conversations that are necessary to bring the best thinking to bear on the directions we choose and the things we do?

So we need a process to look at what our structures are, to talk about how they might change to serve our purposes better, and then to put in place a monitoring approach that allows us to say, “Okay, if this is the direction we’ve all agreed we want to go, how do we know we’re getting there? And what are our expectations for indicators going forward?” Those will be the deliverables from this CUSP process. So there’s both a set of principles and then a process to keep it moving.
And as I say this, I stand here thinking, “This sounds like a life sentence.” (laughs) It is ongoing. It is a continuous process. But it’s invigorating and enabling, and there will be turnover. (laughs)

But I thank you for taking this seriously and really using the opportunity to reach out. The CUSP, as I said, is already underway. The first meeting of CUSP was September 8th. The website was launched and people are already using it. President’s Advisory Council met 10th and 11th to share ideas about—to develop a kind of common understanding of some of the major themes, and hear from each other—deans, vice presidents, and faculty—what we’re thinking about those kind of issues that I’ve mentioned.

Fall convocation today.

And so, the call has gone out. The community is responding. And we hope it becomes a ground swell, and you keep us attuned to your interests as you see Fordham going forward.

And now I’d like to turn it over to Debra, who will share with us some of the things we’ve really already begun to hear from the community.

AUDIENCE: (applause)

DR. DEBRA MCPHEE: Thank you. Good afternoon! I first want to start by thanking my great co-chairs, Peter and Patrick, for being such great partners as we move to this place, and for Father for giving us all the opportunity—and also to the great members of—thank you to the
wonderful members of CUSP. We’ve only had one meeting so far, but we’re very excited about going forward and working together.

I was at a conference last week and was reminded of a great quote that went something like, uh, “Most people don’t like the status quo, but they’re not too crazy about change either.” (laughs) Which is sort of where we are, I think, as we launch into what really is a very big, different way of proceeding—particularly around strategic planning and how we’re thinking about what we do every day.

As we did that, we know that change generates both anxieties and great hopes for possibilities in the future. But we want to be able to try and capture some of those as we start the process—as we will when we go along.

So, we’ve done that in a couple of ways. As Peter mentioned, we have a website and “Tell Us,” which I’ll show you as we go through. (pause) Aghh, I really don’t know how to use this thing apparently?

AUDIENCE: (sparse laughs)

DR. DEBRA MCPHEE: As we go through, I’ll let you guys do that. But one of the things we did, we gave homework to our CUSP memberships—members. And it was a great way to capture both their concerns and their hopes, but also some specific ideas for themes and things
that they thought Fordham should be paying attention and we should be paying attention to in the strategic planning process.

We also had AKA, who did a number of focus groups and research and will continue to do that, and have done that in and outside of Fordham. We captured some of that information.

And we’ve had some response to the “Tell Us”—uh, “Tell Us” link. So one of the things that we thought we would do today is share with you some of the anonymous themes. They’re in no particular order. But I think it’s helpful to hear what people are saying.

In terms of what people hope for in the CUSP and strategic planning was pretty loud and clear people hoped that it isn’t collaborative. And we’ve heard folks here today say we’re committed to doing that and finding ways of making sure we make that happen. That it’s transparent—that people know what we’re doing and why we’re doing it and when we’re doing it. That it’s mission-driven. And that it’s focused on students.

These were pretty loud and clear hopes that these are things that we’re going to stay focused on as we go forward. That it includes all schools and divisions; that there isn’t a priority or ranking of who gets heard and who gets included; that we provide clear structures and outcomes—as both in terms of how we set ourselves up and going forward; that it’s creative and innovative in the things that we’re considering and the things that we’re doing; that we’re efficient; that we’re agile; that we’re realistic; and that we align with fiscal realities. So, lot of hopes. (laughs) So, a lot of things to pay attention to.
At the same time that people are hopeful, they’re a little concerned. They’re concerned that the institution may be resistant to change and to innovation; that we’re a little too insular and that we may fail to recognize the complexity of the challenges that are facing us in higher ed and across different professions, etc. The department and self-interest will trump the best interest of the whole—the idea that silos and people will defend their turf and their sacred projects. So, we heard that loud and clear; that maybe Fordham’s already committed to some strategic commitments that can’t be undone; decisions that have been made that maybe will need—some people feel need to be reconsidered and that will be hard to do; that the outcome maybe is already—or outcomes are already predetermined; that the real work and decisions are going to get behind closed doors and the idea of collaboration and transparency isn’t legitimate; and that we’ll engage in a very long and intense process but that in the end, very little will change.

Those are some of the concerns and hopes. And I think they sit side-by-side and we’re very cognizant of that. And we felt it really important to put that on the table as we started with the CUSP members and it began to generate additional concerns (chuckles) as the process goes forward.

Some of the specific things that people felt Fordham should be paying attention to—and that the CUSP process should be paying attention to—is, of course, Fordham’s mission and values; that we should—that’s going to be primary in thinking or what Fordham needs in the future; that we need to balance liberal arts and—with chasing the market-driven trends—or the market-approach trends in the professions in the workplace; that we need to understand and incorporate learning
styles of 21st century students. Lots of us came up through a very different era and system, (chuckles) and a lot of students process and deal with information and how they use it in very different ways, and that we need to understand that diversity. We heard that very loud and clear—diversity among our students, among our faculty, among our leadership.

That digital literacy and citizenship across the university was a real concern—that needed to be a priority. And a lot of these are interconnected—right?—with students and with a lot of the top themes we’re they’re connected with one another. That increasing tuition—that we needed to pay attention to increasing costs of college education, increasing tuition, and what our value proposition is in that reality.

That how do we balance prioritizing undergraduate, graduate, and professional commitments and priorities to those areas of education.

Globalization—we need to balance local and global in all of the initiatives that we have.

So those were some of the top themes. And those are some of the concerns that we had. We are not all finished generating that input, and as we begin, we have started with a couple of things that have already been mentioned. The website—if you’ve not been there, please go and have a look. On that website, you’ll see the “Tell Us” link, which is anonymous feedback, comments, for questions, etc. And we also have an e-mail that you’re welcome to use.
This is one of the kinds of forms we’ll use going forward to talk with folks and get your feedback and, of course we want to reach alumni and students, and the outside the community, as well. So, the whole committee will generate ideas for how we’ll best do that.

We would like to spend the rest of our time giving you an opportunity to ask questions and voice your concerns and maybe attach your concerns to the top themes today. So that’s why we gave you those cards. If I could ask you to pass those sort of to the end so we could grab any questions that you have? (long pause)

We’ll do our best to try and deal with as many as we can today. But like I said, please feel free to go and if we miss your question, put it on the “Tell Us” link. And we are going to continue to create a document that has a running tab, if you will, of concerns and questions.

DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: Great. So thank you very, very much for these and thank you very much to Father McShane for helping us to collect them.

AUDIENCE: (applause)

DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: Thank you, Debra. What we’d like to do in the about 20-ish minutes that that we have left here is to work our way through as many of these as we can. As Debra said, “If we miss any, we will make sure to get the answers to them out to the community as best we can.” We’d also like to avoid that phenomenon where we end up looking like the
three talking heads who all say the same thing. So, the mechanism we’d like to use is I’ll read the questions. I may answer some. Debra and Peter may answer others. Diane, thank you so much.

The first one is just a comment. And someone writes, “Please know how empowering it is for us women and men at Fordham to have women now so integrally incorporated into our leadership and vision. Thank you to the staff committee.

AUDIENCE: (applause) (whistles)

MODERATOR: I think that’s a great place to start.

DR. DEBRA MCPHEE: Me too. Yes, sir.

AUDIENCE: (chuckles)

DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: Second question—or first question: “Have the 25 focus groups decided already?” And the person may be asking, “Have the groups then decided upon already who’s going to be involved in them?” The answer to that question is absolutely not. We are waiting for the next time that the full CUSP committee will convene to talk with them about what’s the best way to gather input from as many members of the community as possible. There are some absolute no-brainers as to groups that we should go to and work with as focus groups including, especially, the faculty senate—although, as the senate appointee, of course I would say that—
DR. DEBRA MCPHEE: Students.

DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: Students, as well, faculty, researchers, and so on and so forth. If there’s a particular constituency that you want to make sure gets represented or gets asked, please tell us that on the website, or please e-mail us at cuspl@fordham.edu.

DR. PETER STACE: Patrick, I just might add to that— (overlapping talking)

DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: (overlapping talking) Please.

DR. PETER STACE: —that the meeting with the faculty senate is, in fact, already scheduled and thank them for that.

DR. DEBRA MCPHEE: I would add to that, too. (laughs) Not to be the talking head sort, but I would say that—it’s the trickiest part—the trickiest group perhaps or one of the most difficult groups to get to is students. And I would argue is probably a primary, most-important group to get to. And because students are at different locations and their stages of their education, different schools—so we’re going to put that on the agenda as a priority for how to really reach as many student voices as possible.
DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: Absolutely. In fact, one person just asked, “Will there be an opportunity to include student input in an ongoing way on more than a feedback level—perhaps on the committee level?” So that’s a very, very helpful point.

One thing that we are going to be absolutely sure to do is to work with not only the undergraduate student governments on both campuses, but also the different graduate student associations that are there among the graduate schools and the professional schools.

DR. DEBRA MCPHEE: Father.

DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: Yes, Father.

JOSEPH M. MCSHANE, SJ: This is a question looking for information. “Do the school councils have student representatives on them? And if so, can they not be kind of delegated to do important work with fellow students who also need it.” I don’t know the answer to that. Are students (inaudible) college?

DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: Certainly in arts and sciences they attend. In social service I—

DR. DEBRA MCPHEE: Social service—we have a strategic group that they are involved in, as well. And I think most schools have student councils. This is part of what we’re trying to organize. Right? How do we—if you have one—much like the committee, one person doesn’t represent—you couldn’t possibly have representation for every area, as you couldn’t with every
student group. We will find ways using AKA—using the committee—to get to both the representative groups within schools and other students, but also the larger groups of students themselves. And that’s really what we’re struggling with is that town halls—is that, you know, electronics—digital formats, as well as, using the kinds of things like orientation and graduations and all of those kinds of normal—or those ongoing activities—to try and reach them, so—parents’ weekend, homecoming (laughs)—those are the kinds of things we’re trying to think about.

DR. PETER STACE: In essence, so much of the other work they were that we’re doing trying to plug into existing structures they’d that already have a community of interest— (overlapping talking)

DR. DEBRA MCPHEE: (overlapping talking) Right.

DR. PETER STACE: —and people who come together to talk about the issues that we’re addressing.

DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: Absolutely. There are two comments here that are related to each other. One person notes, “There is a hunger fast going on at St. Louis University to support adjuncts in salary and other recognition. What might Fordham do?” And other person asks simply, “Adjunct clinical faculty,” and I can’t read this one word, “Will they be involved in the process?” So, questions about contingent faculty, non-tenure eligible faculty. Would one of you like to respond to that?
DR. DEBRA MCPHEE: Yeah, I will in the sense that I think, as I said, top priority for us is for the committee to—we have a dual purpose, obviously. One is structure for communication and input and participation—that collaborative piece. We need structures and mechanisms for doing that as well as the process issues and the themes and the concerns. So I think top priority for when we come together next time is to really focus on, “How do we access some of these groups?” We’re very clear that it’s faculty in all of its forms, students in all of their—the configurations—alumni, which of course is a very large and widespread group, as well as the fact that we’re in New York City. We’re in the Bronx; we’re in New York; we’re at Westchester. We have to be able to reach those community people to have their input so that we’re not so insular that we’re making up our own conversations without outside input. So, these are the challenges. So, the short answer is, “Yes.” How we’re going to do that, we’ll have to stay tuned.

DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: But I think there’s also a bigger issue with regard to contingent faculty members. And here I want to single out my colleague, Anne Fernald, who’s the President of the Faculty Senate this year, and who has decided that one of the key initiatives within the Faculty Senate is going to be to look at the very important moral, ethical, and justice questions that come up around the use of contingent faculty members—especially adjuncts.

For me—can we applaud Anne for that?

AUDIENCE: (applause)
DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: For me, what I would say is that, going back to Father McShane’s denotation for Fordham—the model urban Jesuit university for the 21st century. One of the things that we’ve discovered already in this process is that not everyone means exactly the same thing by each of those terms. So what I understand Fordham, as a Jesuit university, to be might be different than what someone else understands. Or what Fordham, as an urban university is, looks different if you’re in Social Service and if you’re in Theology. But certainly, going back for at least the past four decades, there’s been an incredible emphasis within the Jesuit order on both the service of faith and with the promotion of justice. And if the questions about adjunct and contingent faculty don’t fall under the promotion of justice, I’m not entirely sure where they do fall.

So, I think that in working out those large-scale aspirations for who we are and who we hope to be, I think that’s a place for that piece of the conversation.

There’s a few questions that are about process. So, one of them that comes up is, “Should units—meaning departments, schools, or divisions—as opposed to individuals—be submitting contributions via ‘Tell Us?’ If not, how and when will units participate? Or should units wait for the framework?” (pause) Peter?

DR. PETER STACE: First, I wouldn’t view it as an either/or. I think the outreach is broad. It’s all-inclusive. And any individual should feel free and actively encouraged to share viewpoints and thoughts. For departments, for schools—there are existing bodies that generate conversation or generate ideas. They will also be included in the CUSP process. But there’s a I’m hearing in
some of the—in a number of the questions—kind of a sense that CUSP might somehow displace or override some of these existing organization bodies—and, that’s not at all the case. There’s a level of granularity in choice where the prerogatives reside elsewhere. I think the power of CUSP is in articulating the will of the community and setting the direction—a set of principles—that guides those who are responsible and those bodies that are responsible for making particular, more local decisions—and that they would be guided by the principles that emerge from the CUSP process as the direction the university wishes to travel to achieve the goal of being the model Jesuit urban university in the 21st century.

DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: Yeah. Thank you. There’s a couple of questions that have to do with the issue of social justice. One person asks, “What steps will Fordham take to develop fully its goals of cultural, racial, and economic diversity on its campuses? Where are the mandatory annual workshops on racism, sexism, etc.? Talking at students in their freshman year is not enough. And faculty/administrators need refreshers, too. As part of our social justice mission,” this person continues, “will we include a process for dealing with climate change? This includes relooking at where our investment dollars go.”

And related to that, a different person writes: “Many of my students asked if there could be a mandatory class or orientation that focused on how to be sensitive, respectful, inclusive, and respectful to others from a different culture, sexual orientation, socio-economic, or ethnic background than ourselves. Words are powerful and my students were concerned about how to communicate issues and grievances without offending.”
DR. PETER STACE: Debra, can you talk about how that relates to CUSP?

DR. DEBRA MCPHEE: Yeah, I think (chuckles) in response to—as Patrick said before—there’s no one way. It’s not an either/or. And it’s not an easy response to formulate quickly. I think what we heard very loud and clear in the feedback we’ve gotten so far is diversity at all of its levels, and diversity connected to justice issues is very, very important. And how that will manifest itself—in other words, how that gets put in place either at student—in curriculum, outside of curriculum, explicit/implicit curriculum—that has been a long battle. You know, do you have one course and one workshop or do you integrate it throughout in everything that you are and how you function?

So I think departments and faculty often make those decisions themselves. If the question is about what can we as an institution do differently?—I think that is very much one of the primary themes that we’re going to deal with as we continue to hear feedback and generate priorities, and then how that gets manifested. Much like the Jesuit model, urban—how that gets manifested in all of the different local levels will look different depending on initiatives and projects and who’s involved in that. I think it’s the commitment to doing that that is primary. And I know that the CUSP has already heard that loud and clear. That’s going to be part of our agenda.

DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: And that’s precisely the distinction that we’re talking about between strategic and operational decisions. The strategic point is that we must be absolutely welcoming and inclusive of all these forms of diversity. The operational question is that in
Fordham College at Lincoln Center, that might get done in this particular way; whereas, in The Graduate School of Education, it might get done in this other particular way.

Speaking of The Graduate School of Education, someone asked, “Why is GSE not represented on the committee?”—which is an entirely fair question.

AUDIENCE: (faint laughs)

DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: So, Peter spoke briefly before about the process of constructing the 22-member committee for CUSP. I think there are a few points that need to be made here. One is that The Graduate School of Education is not the only school of the university not represented on the committee. We really wish that every school, every department, every division, every office, could have someone there. Obviously, that would be utterly unwieldy at the end of the day.

But I think the way that I want to answer this question is to reiterate that the purpose of the people on the committee is not to defend or to represent their particular territory. I am not going to CUSP as a theologian. I mean, I am because I’m a theologian. But my job is not to go there and to fight for the rights and prerogatives of the Department of Theology. I’ve been asked to serve on this because someone decided that whatever experience and perspective I have might help me think at a 30,000 foot level about the entire institution.
So the challenge that we gave to all the members at the very beginning of the process was not to speak for where you come from, but to speak out of your experience about what you see as the whole. And so as the—there are a total of 12 people with faculty appointments who are on the CUSP committee—12 out of 22. Three of those serve as full-time administrators, so we’re talking about nine out of 22 full-time faculty who don’t have administrative appointments. And they represent a whole range of expertise apart from just their discipline. Some are very involved in international programs. Some are very involved in online education. Some of them are very involved in interdisciplinary study. Others are involved in justice and the field work.

And so what we were trying to do was to capture a broad representation of skills—even if at the same time that meant that we weren’t able to represent every particular unit. Is that fair, Peter? Debra?

DR. PETER STACE: That’s well-said.

DR. DEBRA MCPHEE: Yeah, I would say that (chuckles) we’re very clear that the two pieces that—two primary missions that we have is one to help everyone think strategically, and generate strategic thinking at all levels of the institution. And the other is to gather the kinds of information that we need, and people are going to need to have a very broad perspective on any decisions and priorities that we set. So that means that 22 people or 50 people are not going to have the answers or have the broad environmental scan and perspective necessary. The people on the committee usually have several levels of expertise and—but we also understand that we have to go out and gather information from other groups and probably subcommittees of experts—
whether that’s around research or education or pedagogy or technology—that will be part of what we understand we have to do as a team.

DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: Absolutely. The last set of questions go together, as well, about the process. One person asked, “Will the strategic goals be updated every year?” And another person asked, “Will the process include a budget-planning initiative to fund new projects, organizational change, etc.” So they’re both questions about the scope of the enterprise.

DR. DEBRA MCPHEE: Peter?

DR. PETER STACE: Yeah, I think to produce—to go through a process and produce a document without a set of expectations and values without fiscal responsibility, without a sense of budget, without a sense of what this cost, and where the revenue will come from to fund those costs, would be only to do half the job.

DR. PATRICK HORNBECK: That’s it. Yeah. (whispered)

DR. PETER STACE: It’s not a wish list that we’re looking to produce, but a set of values and expectations that will guide us all in making some of those decisions about, “What can we do to generate revenue in a way that’s consistent with our values and our resources and our direction?” What needs to be pruned? What needs to be planted? What needs to be nurtured? And where does the money come from to do each of those? And what are the trade-offs that will best move us in the direction we want to go?
The fiscal responsibility is key to it. One of the folks who was mentioned as a new addition to our community made the observation that, “No money. No mission.”

AUDIENCE: (laughs)

MODERATOR: I guess this is as good a time as any. (laughs) I’d like to thank Father McShane and Dr. Hornbeck, Dr. McPhee, Dr. Stace—but most importantly, I want to thank all of you for taking the time to be with us today and to engage, not only in this conversation but in conversations that will take place throughout this year and the following years.

I’d like to invite you all to join us today in a reception that is going to take place in Constantino Room A, where we can continue with this conversation. Thank you, again, for being here.

AUDIENCE: (applause)

--END--