Members Present: Lisa Foss, Judy Kilborn, David Sikes, Sara Grachek, Sarah Larson, Diana Burlison, Joe Melcher, Mike Sharp, Tom Hergert, Jennifer Quinlan, Mark Petzold, Linda Williams, Karen Lindgren, Orn Bodvarsson, Michele Mumm, John Eggers, Tracy Ore, Michael Ernst, Dan Gregory, Lalita Subrahmanyan, Dan Pedersen, Stephen Hornstein, Kristian Twombly, Mark Jaede, Debra Gold, Diana Lawson, David DeGroote, Margaret Villaneuva, Plamen Milténoff

Guest: Kim Oren

Survey

- 2,077 students completed the survey – 365 completed the survey before the link was fixed.
- Nothing surprising or conclusive was revealed.
- A summary of the response rate and the survey instrument itself were requested.

Next Steps:
- We can divide up the open-ended comments and go through them, read them carefully, note interesting trends and report back.
- A copy of the survey instrument will be emailed to the SPC.

Summary of SPC Listening Session

- In addition to presenting the Listening Session comments, a statement from the SPC about the need for clarity around definition of terms needs to be put together before any type of structure is formed. There may be more than one thing.
- Numbers will be updated on the document and provided before the final presentation.
- There are specific pieces that need to be handled via the various bargaining unit agreements but are important for the campus as a whole to understand. Note in the document that these items are being discussed via the meet and confer process.
- We need to request definitions for school, college, program, department.
- We should pass along the concerns and don’t try to define what the concern means.
- It is important to represent whether it was individual or departmental feedback.
- We should note there are documents on the SharePoint site that go along with the comments in the summary document.
We should include the individual comments in a section called Comments by Individuals without identifying who they are from.

Move to take the recommendations (edits in the texts and new individual section) of the SPC and have Judy Kilborn make adjustments to the document and send it back to the committee for review and comments before it is brought back for final approval.

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

Should the SPC make Recommendations?

The SPC should highlight and emphasize the items that keep coming up and ask the Provost to take a closer look at the suggestions and reconsider his decision related to those decisions.

There is concern around clarification in the areas of staffing and resourcing.

Move that the Strategic Planning Committee recommends that Provost Malhotra takes a closer look at the lack of definition that is causing a lot of uncertainty around resource allocations, especially staffing, for administrative/academic units and the fear that those might fall through the cracks between the Academic Reorganization and ASAOPSA processes.

Motion: Lalita Subrahmanya  Second: Linda Williams  No objections.  Motion Passes.

Adjourn