Members Present: Lucas Golliet, Mark Petzold, Steve Hornstein, Laura Finch, Lisa Foss, Judy Kilborn, Dick Andzenge, Tracy Ore, John Eggers, Kristian Twombly, Geoffrey Tabakin, Alex Polacco, Lalita Subrahmanyan, Mike Sharp, Debra Carlson, Mike Reedy, Steve Hornstein.

Minutes – November 21, 2013
Tabled until the next meeting.

Announcements and additional agenda items:
None

HLC Quality Initiative Timeline Update
The ending date of the timeline was altered slightly by the update. Work on the timeline is to hopefully begin next semester. Kristian presented a narrative of the different phases of the plan for the group. There were some questions regarding beginning the assessment plan prior to completing the learning outcomes portion of the plan and whether there should be language in the document to reflect that. It was also noted that there is no commitment to AAC&U with this proposal. The final report will be submitted May 2016.

Move to accept the proposed changes to the timeline with additional language clarifying that any assessment work that will begin prior to the approval of the Institutional Outcomes will be preparatory.

Motion: Lalita Subrahmanyan   Second: Mike Sharp   No Objections   Motion Passes

Institutes and Centers Discussion w/Provost Malhotra
This discussion evolved with the request of SOPA for a name change for their Research Office. Some of the committee members questioned how we used institutes and centers and how they were used by other institutions as well as how the use was interpreted.

The Provost stated that he was there to engage in discussion with the group about needing some shared understanding about when and where the terms would be used. We need to have a shared understanding. There is no unique answer to any of the questions posed at the last meeting.
We need to have clarity in the process of creating new institutes/centers. Developers need to be explicit about their proposed unit and the purpose. It was suggested that maybe we could use Learning Outcomes in this process? He stated that SPC should develop a process for proposing new centers and institutes and also a process where existing units could be renamed. He also said that “Good ideas should not automatically translate into an institute or center”. There should be “minimum” thresholds in place for institutes and centers before they are developed.

Workload involved also needs to be addressed for Institutes/Centers. The Provost suggested doing this at the same time as the proposal is developed. He also stated that we need to determine how to measure a unit of time for Institutes and Centers.

The Provost questioned - What happens to their existence if they have been created due to a grant and the funds are used up? This needs to be addressed in the proposal as well.

Other members questioned the benefits of name changes, the cost involved and resources used to do so as well as whether we really needed to be having this discussion about institutes/centers at all or whether we were “overreacting”.

It was asked if we had a list of current Institutes/Centers on campus.

Provost Malhotra also raised the question of whether we needed to have ongoing review of Institutes and Centers at SCSU just like we do for Program Review. He stated that we need to figure out a way to support interdisciplinary work on campus and that Institutes and Centers might be one way to support interdisciplinary work.

Meeting adjourned at noon.