Members Present: Lisa Foss, Kristian Twombly, David Sikes, Lalita Subrahmanyan, Sara Grachek, Casey Gordon, Jennifer Quinlan, Diana Burlison, John Burgeson, Kerry Marrer, Mike Sharp, Rich Shearer, Joe Melcher, Michael Ernst, Sue Pope, Debra Leigh, Mark Petzold, Judy Kilborn, Juliet Ogembo, John Eggers, Mike Reedy, Brady Haggstrom, David DeGroote, Plamen Milttenoff, John Palmer, Dan Gregory, Tony Akubue

Guests: President Potter, Provost Malhotra

Minutes – October 20, 2011:

Approved - No changes

Additional Agenda Items:

NONE

SPC Sub-group Update

- Met on Thursday, October 27, 2011
- Membership was adjusted for administrative positions that no longer exist or are vacant –
  - Director of Institutional Research
  - AVP for Enrollment Management
- Student representation moved from two representatives to three
- IFO representation moved from 12 to 10
- There was discussion around potential substitutions for members who are absent.
- There seemed to be a desire to keep the current model of faculty co-chair / administrative co-chair.
- Next meeting on Thursday, November 10, 2011.

President Potter and Provost Malhotra (10:30am time specific)

Goals for the year:

President Potter

- Implementing the reorganization decisions. We will have to change the way we work. We will have to not do some things. It is a difficult process to go through.
- It is important that we all remain in a learning mode. Every decision may not be right the first time. We need to remain open to making appropriate corrections.
• It is part of our job as a committee to help people understand the decisions that have been made, being part of the leadership team that helps people understand that this is what hard change feels like – it is the nature of large scale change.
• We will continue to be in the process of rethinking and redoing for quite some time. We need to do it as a community and do it with some compassion and support for each other and understand when others don’t understand. Listen graciously.
• The Chancellor’s goals parallel ours that there is going to be a prolonged period of change.
• Recognize that we are doing good work together and it is recognized in the system and across the country that we are leaders in what we are doing at SCSU.
• SPC needs to lead the campus through the change. This is the primary task of the SPC committee. We need to help others understand the work in a systemic thoughtful way.

Provost Malhotra:
• Logistical issues that schools and colleges are working on
  ○ Missions/Vision/Value Statements
  ○ Faculty workload, functionalities of the three new positions
  ○ Article, 20,22,25  IFO Contract
• We need to rethink how all this relates to the effectiveness of how we serve our students.
• Issues of changing roles and expectations will need to be addressed.
• The core of our reorganization is being driven by wanting to support interdisciplinary work.
• We will need to be addressing space configuration relatively quickly. We will also need to address the changing approaches to delivery of classes.

Discussion:
• It would be helpful if a report on space utilization were sent to the full committee.
• CIO – Timeline?
  ○ Search to begin in January
  ○ Some changes can take place prior to the arrival of the CIO and some things should wait
  ○ SPC conversations with the campus will help shape the answers to these questions
• What is impact of new Chancellor’s strategic framework on how we do our work?
  ○ The Chancellor’s agenda is bold but it is a high level view.
  ○ Focus on increasing our work on collaboration
  ○ We need to begin conversations on faculty roles and how we teach.
  ○ Develop strategies to reduce duplication of work.
  ○ Maintaining sustainable access.
  ○ Increase the breadth of what we do around being the community partner of choice.
  ○ Recognize that the quality of the work we are doing is excellent.

Technology consultant assessment report

President Potter has communicated that he would like the SPC to play a role in managing the campus conversations around this report much like we did for Strategic Program Appraisal and Reorganization.

• This is the final report from the consulting firm. The opportunity does exist to ask clarifying questions and request additional information from the consultant.
- Consultant acknowledged the need for technology in working with CETL.
- Much is still unknown and challenges were acknowledged but no solutions offered.
- Seems to be appropriate to figure out the identity and the plan and then find the leader (CIO) that matches that plan.
- We need to be careful not to cut out the people that know the issues best by creating a process before the leader is hired.

Table this item to allow everyone to read the document... think about two things

- Do you have any reactions or questions that need to be clarified?
- Develop a process for vetting – what is a reasonable, fair, transparent process to gather feedback and provide recommendations for next steps?

Move that the SPC gather feedback on the Technology Report by sponsoring multiple campus wide open forums and strategically planned focused forums with technology and library faculty/staff keeping in mind the need to accommodate a variety of schedules.

Motion: Judy Kilborn         Second: Jennifer Quinlan   No objections.    Motion passes.