STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
December 2, 2010

Members Present: Lisa Foss, Judy Kilborn, David Sikes, John Palmer, Kay Worner, Mark Petzold, Orn Bodvarsson, Tom Hergert, Kristian Twombly, Lalita Subrahmanyan, Sara Grachek, Tracy Ore, Jennifer Quinlan, Michael Ernst, Diana Lawson, Kerry Marrer, Michele Mumm, Mike Sharp, Sarah Larson, Diana Burlison, Linda Williams, Plamen Miltenoff, John Burgeson, Joe Melcher, Dan Pedersen, John Eggers, Mark Jaede, Brady Haggstrom, Tony Akubue, Casey Gordon, Jarrod Wiggins, Debra Gold, Debra Leigh

Minutes

November 4th Approved with no changes
November 10th Approved with no changes
November 18th Approved with no changes
November 24th Approved with no changes

Additional Agenda Items:

None

Announcements

Academic Reorganization Steering Group minutes – handout for your information

President Potter will make his final decision on December 10, 2010.

ASAOPSA report next week:
   The report will be shared with campus on Friday, Dec.3, 2010.
   It will be brought forward to the SPC for feedback on Thursday, December 9, 2010.

Spring semester meetings

We will keep meeting weekly but will leave open the option of moving back to bi-weekly meetings.
Listening Session document discussion

Motion to approve the listening session document as amended.

Motion: John Palmer  Second: Tom Hergert  No objections  Motion passes

Motion to limit the discussion on survey analysis to time specific of 11 a.m.

Motion: John Palmer  Second: Tom Hergert  No objections  Motion passes

Quantitative analysis from survey discussion

Motion to create a document that includes a survey overview, names of the people who worked on the survey, the methodology and simple tables with the responses to each item. A draft will be distributed to the planning committee for edits.

Motion: Tracy Ore  Second: Tom Hergert  No objections  Motion passes

Qualitative analysis from survey discussion

Motion to accept the document with the addition of collapsing the categories between personnel and students and the addition of information on campus-wide numbers. Also include a statement that includes that this is a self-selected sample and not representative of the entire campus.

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

Specific recommendations to go forward to President Potter

Motion that the programs in the current Earth and Atmospheric Sciences be placed with other natural science disciplines in the final model.

Rationale:

The faculty from the EAS department and other knowledgeable individuals see the proposed placement of these programs within a predominantly engineering and computer science unit as problematic because there are fewer natural connections for EAS there than with a natural science discipline such as physics.

Placement with natural sciences will enhance synergies among the programs whereas placement in an engineering based unit could serve to isolate the EAS programs and faculty.

Motion: Tom Hergert  Second: Judy Kilborn  3+ objections  Motion Fails
Motion that for in each case where the administration intends to use the contractual formula for chair reassigned time in administrative units, those units be called departments to match more precisely the language of the MnSCU/IFO Master Agreement.

Rationale:

While the contract does use the terms “department,” “program,” and “administrative unit” in various places, the fact that there are distinctions by virtue of their uses in different contexts therein points to the need for a distinction in the SCSU use of the terms.

If program and department are exact synonyms as the administration seems to assert, then every program, no matter where they are located in the new structure, will be entitled to a chair and governance rights that are the same as departments now have, especially as regards chair reassigned time and the promotion and tenure process. This would seem to reduce savings from reorganization of programs.

In the most recent model, there seem to be three different definitions in use for the term “program.”

1. There are programs within departments that seem to be close to the current idea of academic programs that are “units in which a major and/or minor area of curricular study is normally available.” (Article 5, Section P) That concept has been extended to include certificates as well as majors and minors.
2. There are programs within schools where the intention seems to be to have different resource plans than for departments or other programs. Sometimes these programs seem to include more than one academic program as defined above.
3. There are programs designated as college-level programs that seem to include multiple academic programs and also seem to function in almost every way as do our current departments.

The contractual definitions of department and program do not address resource allocation beyond chair reassigned time. This administration could choose to define, by policy, the resource allocation parameters for departments or programs that would address their desire to have departmental resources allocated somewhat differently than is done now.

Motion: Tom Hergert    Second: Mark Jaede    3+ objections    Motion Fails

Move that all the counseling programs now in the College of Education be co-located in the new School of Health.

Motion: Tom Hergert    Second: Judy Kilborn    3+objections    Motion Fails
Motion to create a School (rather than a College) of Education consisting of Special Education, Teacher Development, Child and Family Studies, Physical Education, Human Relations, EDAD and HEID, CIM, and Traffic Safety. (Specific Units TBD)

Motion: Judy Kilborn    Second: Tom Hergert    3+objections    Motion Fails

Motion to ask President Potter and Provost Malhotra to develop the concept of University College sooner rather than later due to the strong impact that it has on the students.

Motion: Diana Lawson    Second: Judy Kilborn    3+ objections    Motion Fails

Adjourn