STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
November 18, 2010

Members Present: Judy Kilborn, David Sikes, Kay Worner, John Burgeson, Jennifer Quinlan, Linda Williams, Karen Lindgren, Kerry Marrer, David DeGroote, Mark Petzold, Michael Ernst, Orn Bodvarsson, Tracy Ore, Dan Pedersen, Plamen Miltenoff, Sarah Larson, Tom Hergert, John Palmer, Diana Lawson, John Eggers, Kristian Twombly, Lalita Subrahmanyan, Mike Sharp, Tony Akubue, Debra Leigh, Margaret Villanueva, Brady Haggstrom

Meeting Minutes

Will be covered in a later meeting.

Additional Agenda Items:

Survey update
Definition of "program" at the committee level

Reorganization Survey:

The survey went out on Wednesday, November 17, 2010.

Students did not have access to the Provost’s document at first, but that problem is being fixed, and an email will be sent to the impacted students, letting them know that they now have access to all the information.

What would we like to see from the results?
- Listing of the open ended statements posted on the SharePoint
- Disclaimer (both on announcement and survey results itself) of what the survey is and what it is not (self selecting sample): it is an attempt to gather data, and it is not the voice of the entire campus. Explain why we did not include demographics.
- Graphs and Charts are good (simple).
- Sort responses by type of employee (IFO, Staff, Admin).
- Verify how much analysis would be available by Tuesday end of the day.
- Make it clear that the survey was decided by SPC as a means of providing feedback to the Provost. It was not a suggestion of the Provost.
Move to hold a special meeting on Wednesday, November 24th from 8-9:50 a.m. with the purpose of finishing the processing of the Listening Session feedback, survey results, and be able to come up with an overall summary to be sent forward to the President and Provost.

Motion: Mike Sharp  Second: Linda Williams  No objections  Motion Passes

Debriefing on Listening Session

Computer Science
   CNA was left out.
   Include computer science in the name.
   Concerned about the addition of layers to the model.
   Concern about the proliferation of Deans/Associate Deans.
   Concern around the reporting structure.
   Concern that the staffing level and college was too large.
   Even thought the names are placeholders, there was real concern around naming becoming permanent and the program becoming invisible. There is a process in place for changing the name of a program.

EAS
   Clearly did not want to be grouped with Engineering.

Nursing
   Critical (required for accreditation purposes) that the point person be a nurse.

CDIS
   Reflect that they were worried and that they responded positively to their placement in the Provost's new model.

Ethnic Studies
   Concern around representation on committees/structures of merged programs.

Move to finish putting together our summary before we go on to any type of recommendations.

Motion: Linda Williams  Second: Mark Jaede  No objections  Motion Passes

Discussion:
- It was pointed out that it is important to clarify whether a comment is administrative or related to disciplinary concerns.
- We will also want to clarify whether a speaker was talking on behalf of an entire department/program or as an individual.
- It is important to include in the summary the comments about staff and how staffing will impact not only the departments, but the entire university.
- It was suggested that we group overarching themes together.
- We should organize and look at each area within the themes.
We should create two sections: one overall concerns thematically and the second specific department/program concerns (like my discipline does not match with that discipline).

Process Suggestion:
- Lisa and Judy will summarize the session notes using themes and other suggestions, overall/general concerns, and give to SPC for feedback.

Process for Recommendations:
- Review the documents and Survey Results
- Clarification on the definition of programs/departments
- Key Themes for which we have recommendations

Adjourn