Event/Date: Campus Saint-Jean Roundtable/23MAR16
Led by: David Turpin/Steven Dew/Anne Bailey/Amy Dambrowitz
Number of attendees: 39

Summary

| Big Picture | Positive response to the document
|             | Most comments related to implementation of the plan
| Specifics   | Obj 8—can we add “immersive” or “immersion” experience?
|            | Obj 7—can we add arts and culture to athletics?
|            | Obj 18—Could we add “preventative” into the objective to highlight the importance of being proactive?
|            | In Obj 16—could use one strategy to focus on the interaction between individuals, rather than groups/communities?
|            | Obj 15, Str iv—are we just “continuing” to build relationships with alumni and donors? Should we also have a point on re-evaluation to ensure what we’re doing is working?

Roundtable Notes:

- Obj 8—can we add “immersive” or “immersion” experience?
- Obj 7—agree with everything that is here—love athletics—but don’t see any specific mention of arts and culture and how these experiences add to student life.

- Are there plans to create a centre for the preservation of First Nations languages? CSJ has received a major philanthropic gift in this area.
  DHT response: We are hearing about a desire for this from Ottawa and we’ve taken the message back to key stakeholders on campus to see what’s possible here.

- Congratulations on the great work—to listen to so much material and to integrate it into a coherent document is great. Is there a timeframe for the document?
  DHT response: 10 year horizon but a in 5 years would go through a process of review and reflection. What is your advice, should we put dates on the plan?

- It’s good to have deadlines—but because society is changing so fast a 10 year horizon is too long.

- Obj 18—glad to see health and wellness being prioritized for students, staff, and faculty. Could we add “preventative” into the objective to highlight the importance of being proactive?
Clear here that our goals is to inspire collaboration, not only with external stakeholders but also within the university community.

In Obj 16—could use one strategy to focus on the interaction between individuals, rather than groups/communities?

One thing to see in the implementation phase is to tackle the barriers that prevent us from working across the institutions—e.g. cross-faculty PhD degrees.

Open doors for graduate students to take courses from multiple depts and faculties.

Thank you for consulting to widely. The buzz around campus is very positive.

Like the title—signals an important shift from the last plan.

Important that curriculum reviews (including ones currently underway) engage and align with the ISP.

Obj 1—what does “regions of strategic importance” mean?

DHT response: This has come up several times. We’ve set up a couple of committees.

SKD explanation: The first committee (led by the president) will look at what the institution wants to accomplish on the international strategy as a whole. The second will involve faculties, UAI, etc and will see where we can align priorities at that level. We recognize that international work is based on relationships and we don’t want to get in the way of that but we still need institutional priorities. We don’t want to name regions in the plan. We want to look at the situation and react nimbly. That is a role for the second committee.

Obj 15, Str iv—are we just “continuing” to build relationships with alumni and donors? Should we also have a point on re-evaluation to ensure what we’re doing is working?

DHT: I can assure you that the VP Advancement continually evaluates processes. Taking a very serious look at the transition between student and alum.

Add to the accolades already expressed. Like how the document manages the tension between local to provincial to international.

Benchmarking? How will we know if we’ve succeeded? Will there be a follow-up document?

DHT response: We will be adding a short, high level section at the end which will outline immediate next steps. We are already looking at what metrics we will use but recognize that there is a tension between what can be measured vs what really matters (sometimes what matters can’t be measured and sometimes what we can measure doesn’t really matter). First stage is to get the plan in place and then to determine metrics and immediate priorities.

I would like to acknowledge that you had the entire plan translated into French. Thank you!
- Obj 8, Str ii—will the French language services mentioned here be a shared responsibility or the responsibility of CSJ?

- DHT response: The desire is to start moving forward on this strategy in areas of greatest impact on student experience. The fact that we had the plan translated should be an indication that we see this as a shared responsibility.