

Senate Recommendation to the President

Originating Body: Faculty Senate

Originator: Senator Anita Brown

Date Submitted: 3/4/2026

Requested Effective Date: immediate

Recommendation:

The Faculty Senate requests that President Lepre and the Strategic Plan Steering Committee co-chairs implement the recommendations from the attached motion. This recommendation is being sent separately to President Lepre and to co-chairs Weer and Hall.

Date Approved by the Faculty Senate: 3/3/2026

David Keifer

President, Faculty Senate

03/04/2026

Date

Action Taken by President

Date: _____

Recommendation Accepted

Recommendation Not Accepted*

Recommendation returned to the Originating Body for further review (see attached)

Disposition for Approved Recommendation:

President

VP Student Affairs

Faculty Senate President

VP Finance

Consortium Chair

School Deans

Webmaster

Graduate Council

Catalogue Editor

Provost Council

President

Date

SALISBURY UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MOTION

Submit this form to the Faculty Senate President

SUBJECT: Making the Draft Strategic Plan available to all faculty (and the campus community)

SENATOR PROPOSING MOTION: Anita Brown

SENATOR SECONDING MOTION: Sandy Pope

MOTION (this section alone will be recorded in the minutes):

The Faculty Senate requests that President Lepre and the Strategic Planning Steering Committee work with the Faculty Senate to revise the proposed 2026-2031 strategic plan so that the plan reflects what the Faculty Senate agrees would be appropriate Faculty input, guidance, and vision.

Thus, the Faculty Senate requests that President Lepre and the Strategic Planning Steering Committee agree to have the following occur before the current draft of the 2026-2031 strategic plan becomes accepted as SU's actual strategic plan.

- The current draft plan be distributed to all faculty as soon as possible, as far in advance of 11 March 2026 as possible.
- Feedback on the plan (including the vision/purpose and the goals and strategies) from all faculty is collected.
- The vision/purpose of SU be described in a manner that is clearly consistent with SU's stated mission and that is appropriate from the Faculty viewpoint.
- The concerns with the draft plan (available on the Faculty Senate website March 3, 2026 special meeting) already presented by the Long Range Academic Planning Committee, LRAP, and any significant concerns determined in the feedback from all faculty are addressed in a manner agreeable to the Faculty Senate.

The Faculty Senate also suggests that the proposed plan be released to the entire campus community and feedback be collected from the campus community with a mechanism to adjust the draft based upon any significant issues identified.

JUSTIFICATION:

The strategic plan guides the University for approximately five years. It often guides where resources and efforts will be deployed. As such, the plan impacts the entire campus community.

When the last strategic plan was drafted, after the formation of focus groups that reported to a steering committee, when the draft plan was provided, faculty complained that the process had not led to the faculty voice being heard effectively. In 2019, LRAP reported that, for a variety of reasons, there was concern that this process did not lead to a plan that seemed to appropriately include the faculty voice and vision.

In 2025, following a similar process, but perhaps working with a tighter timeline, working groups reported to the Strategic Plan Steering Committee, which drafted a proposed 2026-2031 Strategic Plan. The work of these groups was substantial and must be appreciated. In February 2025, a draft plan was

provided to LRAP and the FS, as well as other groups. It seems the FS and LRAP were asked to provide feedback but were asked not to share the draft. LRAP prepared a report indicating they had significant concerns about the process and some aspects of the proposed plan. Some senators have indicated concerns with the proposed plan and that they feel they cannot effectively represent the faculty if they cannot discuss the proposed plan or seek feedback from other faculty. It could be that the Faculty will not have significant concerns with the plan, or it could be that they have significant concerns. Unless all faculty can see the plan, we cannot be sure.

Although the current plan is identified by the Steering Committee chairs as focusing largely on top goals and not detailed implementation, thus permitting Units to devise much of their own implementation strategies to add within the framework in the proposed plan, the plan does identify SU's overall purpose as well as its major goals for the next five years related to that purpose, along with some strategies under those goals. SU's purpose, goals, and strategies presented in a strategic plan, should clearly reflect the Faculty's vision, and I believe the culture at SU has supported such. When the Faculty Senate was first established, I believe one of LRAP's roles was to draft the strategic plan. At SU, I believe a draft of the strategic plan has always been made available to the campus community with some opportunity for feedback prior to the plan being finalized.

Shared governance relies on effective communication and transparency. Delivering a plan that is to guide the entire campus but that has only been viewed by a handful of groups, does not seem consistent with transparency or with SU's culture.

Note: After a draft of this motion was distributed, but before it reached the floor of the Faculty Senate, the SU President and Strategic Planning Steering Committee informed the Faculty Senate that they were altering their timeline for the Strategic Plan to permit a draft of the plan to be distributed to the campus and to then receive feedback that could result in some adjustments to the plan. *The Faculty Senate greatly appreciates this change.* The motion was adjusted to still request that dissemination and collaboration with the Faculty Senate, especially for specified concerns.

Substantive concerns identified in the Feb 2026 LRAP Report on the Strategic Plan Draft:

- A perceived primacy given to SU's role as preparing students for employment rather than broad but crucial life skills, and a limited view of what experiences or skills relate to career preparation
- Inconsistent language regarding data-driven decisions, generally without identifying those data sources
- References to expansion without a clear sense of workload considerations
- A focus on current labor needs without sufficient attention to enduring needs and the resources needed for faculty to engage in experiential and community-based work
- A blurring of faculty ownership over curriculum and scholarship

Is this a recommendation to the Provost? Yes _____

No X

Is this a recommendation to someone else? No _____

Yes, to President, Strategic Planning

Committee

VOTE: Number of Senators Present:

Motion Passes or Fails: