STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
October 21, 2010

Members Present: Lisa Foss, Judy Kilborn, David Sikes, Michael Ernst, Dan Gregory, Michele Mumm, John Burgeson, Joe Melcher, Linda Williams, Tracy Ore, Mark Petzold, Orn Bodvarsson, John Burgeson, Sara Grachek, Mike Sharp, Debra Gold, Sarah Larson, Jen Furan, Stephen Hornstein, John Eggers, Mahmoud Saffari, Kristian Twombly, David DeGroote, Tony Akubue, John Palmer, Mark Jaede, Plamen Miltenoff, Kay Worner, Debra Leigh, Jarrod Wiggins, Brady Haggstrom, Margaret Villaneuva

Meeting Minutes from October 7, 2010
Approved with no changes. No objections

Additional Agenda Items
None

Discussion of draft recommendation document – both rationale and models

Forums will be hosted after the Provost’s recommendation comes out.

It was suggested that we add a statement to the documents reminding programs/departments that where they are placed in a particular model may not be where they end up. There is opportunity for feedback and changes.

Motion to have Lisa Foss take over as convener of the meeting.

Motion: Judy Kilborn Second: Sara Grachek No objections Motion Passes

• Concern was expressed around Social Work and Gerontology being placed in the College of Education.
• The small department sizes usually meant that either we did not receive any type of feedback or it was not clear where they wanted to be placed.
• It as suggested that we pull Economics out into its own department.
• There were several comments on how large the engineering and computing group is.
• It was suggested that we bring back the idea/concept of Schools into all the models.
• As a result of a document received by the department chairs, the College of Business was basically left the way it is currently with only one combination of departments.
• Environmental Studies and Technology Studies seems to be missing from the document.
• Kinesiology does not appear in document – this idea was represented by some individuals and groups of individuals but not all – there is currently no staffing or curriculum.
• Economics – desires to be own governing unit – views themselves as large enough department or program area. This is not as important as autonomy – interested in a School – consider the concept of a department with multiple program areas.
• Request to focus on departments was very clear in the feedback received.
• Geography department is asking for clarification on whether Social Studies Education was intended to remain with Geography. Steering group recommended that they remain.
• The SPC is not in a position to formally endorse any specifics about what a School is or how it would be governed or subdivided. These remain open for discussion and cost and analysis.
• There seem to be inconsistencies in units that are combined with other units to form large groups and those that are not combined and left as smaller than minimum in the three models.
• We need to keep the professional development needs of the students in the forefront.
• We need to be mindful of addressing the major/minors so that when we combine departments, we do not disadvantage the students when they are choosing their programs.
• It was suggested that Special Education/Teacher Development be combined.
• Area Studies is not listed anywhere – it should follow Global Studies.
• Chemistry and Physics do not seem compatible.
• Some faculty are not included in the organizational model numbers because they are part of the University College, including those in LRTS and Counseling.
• Remove the Math Skills Center – mentioned because it was talked about in the Math department document but it is not agreed upon by all.
• Business Law is not listed because it is integrated into the various departments that make sense.
• Even though EdAd and HiEd did not make sense where it was located, they were not necessarily looking to have a smaller unit.
• When we look at departments working together, we need to consider discipline and size factors.

Motion to move forward with the draft document revisions (with track changes on) after the SPC has had a chance to review the document including the comments, concerns, and questions of today’s discussion.

Motion:  John Eggers. Second: Linda Williams  One objection  Motion Passes
Motion: that the draft document goes out to the campus community, including a statement that provides opportunity for feedback/comments to the Provost/OIE and also that the document be posted by OIE to the SharePoint site.

Motion: Judy Kilborn Second: Linda Williams. No objections. Motion Passes.

Motion: to strike the costing section from the document due to concern that the SPC has made no recommendations on staffing levels in the models.

Motion: Dan Gregory Second: Tracy Ore No objections Motion passes.