STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE  
January 21, 2010

Members Present: Judy Kilborn, Mahmoud Saffari, John Palmer, Debra Leigh, Mitch Rubinstein, Lalita Subrahmanyan, Diana Lawson, Amos Olanguju, Ravi Kali, Jim Sheroahman, Karen Lindgren, Diana Burlison, David Sikes, Sara Grachek, Stephen Hornstein, Margaret Villanueva


Announcements: Defer Online and Institutional Measures groups until next agenda

SPC Involvement in the SPA Process

We would like to let programs know on Monday what the process is so they can fit the work into their schedules.

SPC has been tasked with making recommendations to the President in regards to university-wide decisions by Feb. 18th. These recommendations will be informed by several sources, including the Provosts’ recommendations, the university-wide open meetings, and the reports by the colleges (Jan 25th).

The deans corresponded or will be corresponding with all faculty in their colleges with a preliminary recommendation asking for feedback on the college report.

It was suggested that the SPC should have a draft copy of the dean’s reports to the Provost before any changes are made to the document that goes to the Provost on Jan. 25th based on feedback from the faculty.

The SPC’s charge is to review the University-wide recommendations and look for alignment with the SCSU Strategic Action Plan.

There should not be that many changes to the deans' reports following the feedback from the faculty.

It was indicated that the reports have already been emailed to all of the faculty so getting a draft of the deans' reports for the SPC should not be an issue. The open campus meetings may bring up some of the issues that are addressed in the drafts from the deans.
It would like to see the changes that occur between now and the time that the deans' reports go to the Provost.

**MOTION:** The Strategic Planning Committee would like to have additional information and therefore would like to see the deans' reports in the original draft format.

*MOTION by Stephen Hornstein / Second by Ravi Kali / No Objections*

Concern was expressed regarding access to the commentary feedback from faculty about the deans' reports. The feedback will come in a variety of ways, and there is a concern about people’s privacy.

Concern was expressed about data overload for the committee. If people start coming to the committee saying the process was not followed, it then becomes our responsibility to report that.

**Do normal rules apply?**

There are standing rules that have gone through the Meet and Confer process, which is consensus with a limited number of objections (3) allowed to keep moving forward.

Everyone needs to be comfortable with the process moving forward.

**Process/Mechanism**

**MOTION:** A subgroup of the SPC would prepare a draft document that the entire committee would then review and respond to with additions and/or corrections.

*MOTION by: John Palmer / Second by Stephen Hornstein / No objections*

The draft will be available by Feb. 16th to meet the Feb 18th deadline of having a recommendation ready for President Potter, who will most likely then take it to President’s Council for discussion.

Lisa Foss and Judy Kilborn (co-chairs) will put together a request to all faculty and administrators asking for volunteers to be a part of the subgroup to put together the draft recommendations that will come forward to SPC as the basis for discussion and revision. The revised version of these recommendations that is agreed upon in SPC on February 18th will go forward from the SPC to the President.
What model will we use for open meetings?

Suggestions and discussion:

- Individuals cannot speak on behalf of a program or department unless it has been agreed upon that the person can speak on their behalf.
- We need to be time specific.
- Everything must be in writing, and there should not be open testimony.
- Programs and departments could get together and present their information at the open meeting as a group with a designated spokesperson.
- Will there be time allowed for minority voices to be heard?
- Should there be a rule that we only hear those who speak for the program?
- Individuals should disclaim up front that they speak for themselves and not for the program.
- If we require written documents, we do not have to allow oral commentary; however, the author should have the opportunity to clarify any confusion about how the written document is interpreted.
- Who will moderate the meeting? If someone from SPC moderates, they cannot listen.
- Give the programs an opportunity to thoughtfully put together a response by requiring them to respond in writing.
- Do we require writing, or do we allow oral?
- What form does the forum take, and do we allow questions and presentations?

Motion: Programs will submit a written document (500 words or less), which will be available at the open meetings to the SPC and audience participants followed by specific time set aside for questions and clarification.

Motion: Lalita Subrahmanyan / Second: Stephen Hornstein

Objection: Diana Lawson thinks this process is too complicated and does not follow the spirit of having an open forum by requiring them to have it in writing.

Individuals will be asked to respond to the SPC, understanding that its charge is to make recommendations to the President in response to the Provost’s recommendations and that a small number of individual voices will be heard. The SPC agreed that Lisa Foss and Judy Kilborn should make decisions about scheduling the open meetings and the subgroup meeting times.