STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
March 3, 2011

Members Present: Lisa Foss, Judy Kilborn, David Sikes, Jarrod Wiggins, Kay Worner, Mark Petzold, Jennifer Quinlan, Michael Ernst, Tracy Ore, Karen Lindgren, Michele Mumm, Kerry Marrer, Diana Lawson, Orn Bodvarsson, Mark Jaede, Sara Grachek, Linda Williams, Dan Gregory, Tony Akubue, Lalita Subrahmanyan, Diana Burlison

Minutes from February 17, 2011

Approved as amended. (see approved motion in box below)

Motion to amend the minutes with the following statement: The current Academic Steering Group was chartered for a specific purpose, and the SPC suggests that if a new steering group is formed from within the SPC, the composition should be different than the one for academic restructuring.

Motion: Mark Jaede  No second.  Motion Fails

Motion: to amend the minutes to read that the SPC needs to revisit and discuss the make up of the academic reorganization steering group.

Motion: Michael Ernst  Second: Mark Jaede  One objection.  Motion Passes

Additional Agenda Items:

None

International Vision and Plan

There was concern around the fact that the faculty members that worked on the document were not chosen consistently with the IFO contract.

Consistent with the motion made at the Feb. 17 Strategic Planning Committee meeting, consultations will be made with the appropriate groups before the draft document goes to the larger campus community.
Goal 4, page 4 - the document indicates that all programs should have an international component and have learning outcomes associated with it; however, it may not be possible for every course to have an international component.

Perhaps the process of the course and the environment, including students in the class of different cultures, needs to be considered as an international component, not just the curriculum elements.

Instructors are able to bring international context to a classroom even without a specific curriculum component requirement.

There is faculty concern that this vision and plan represents a particular perspective on internationalizing the curriculum and does not reflect other ways of doing it. It has certain processes and models in mind that would downplay the roles of some of our current programs. This thinking reflects the defect in how the faculty member representation was chosen to work on this plan.

There seems to be a bias in favor of study abroad students but lack of similar balance of the internationalization of students that are currently on our campus.

It is crucial to have structures of financial support for students participating in study abroad.

There needs to be better communication around visiting scholars on our campus.

There is a need for conversation with Foreign Languages around the language issues. Perhaps we could consider intensive language camps.

We need to gather the perspectives of our international students from other countries that are currently on our campus.

A student response will be written over spring break, outlining concerns and where student government sees the need for student input and where students may not need to be considered.

Our ability to communicate with international students on campus and students going to other countries is limited at times to the ability to speak the language. We need to consider the importance of allocating funding to support overcoming language barriers.

It was suggested that we may want to consider working with other universities to offer language courses for students that we may not be able to teach at SCSU.

A request was made to find out from Enrollment Management what the current international student enrollment is for fall and spring.

Future structure and charge of the Strategic Planning Committee

We need to look at the charge and structure of the SPC and make a recommendation to President Potter. It may work best if we put together a sub group to work on this.

Due to reorganization, the FA is in the process of reorganizing its representation on university committees. It will likely parallel the way members are appointed to FA committees. This will
require an amendment to the FA constitution. The SPC does not have a role in this other than if the number of faculty representatives on the SPC changes, then a balance for the other bargaining units may have to be considered. The timeline for recommending to Senate faculty representation is March 31st with a final deadline for elections by the end of spring semester.

It was recommended that we look at the charge first and then wait for FA to make recommendations around composition.

The makeup of the committee may change if we consider being linked to the Budget Advisory Group.

A suggestion was made to create some operational documents related to how SPC meetings will run.

Motion: to create a sub-committee of the SPC that will discuss the structure, charge, and operating procedures for the future of the SPC. This sub-committee will work on a majority rule voting system and contain a makeup proportionate to the current Academic Steering Group.

Motion: Jarrod Wiggins, Second: Lalita Subrahmanyan No objections. Motion Passes.

*The current make up of the Academic Steering Group is as follows: Co chairs of SPC, FA President, 3 IFO members, 2 Administrators, one from each bargaining unit and one student representative.*

**Transition Update**

Motion: Request that there be AFSCME representation from each work area added to the academic work groups.

Motion: Linda Williams Second: Mark Jaede. Three objections. Motion fails.

Conversation tabled until next meeting.