STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
November 15, 2012


Meeting Minutes – November 1, 2012
Approved with no additions/corrections

Announcements and additional agenda items
NONE

HLC Quality Initiative Update - draft
Section 1 – no changes

Section 2
   - Is it too far reaching to add, Chancellors language, system language, alignment?
   - If we add things then we have to assess them and demonstrate that we have complied with the measurement.

Section 3 – no changes

Section 4 – no changes

Section 5
   - Outcome 1
     - Are we saying that we promise to conduct an evaluation of how well we can list the areas of the outcomes?
       - We could engage the campus in a survey and ask this question.
     - Assessment of this outcome could identify if we have more work to do in improving our understanding of the initiative outcomes.
     - At the macro level it is important that everyone knows what these outcomes are.
     - Implementation is where staff will be better integrated into the outcomes.
     - Connection to a larger unifying principle is something that needs to added.
     - The relationship between anything that we can formulate at the macro level that is meaningful across all levels becomes more irrelevant at an individual level.
Design the process so that the Means by which we develop the process is by listening to people in the classroom and what they do.

Concerned that characterization is an isolated moment that does not connect back to the campus community.

Difficult to know what the measurement will be because we don’t yet know what the outcomes are so it makes it difficult to know whether or not we will have a good understanding of our outcomes.

There is no expectation of communicating or repeating verbatim what the outcomes will be.

The intent is identify outcomes that come out of the work that is already being done in the classroom.

Eliminate the know and be able to list and just stay with the other two bullets “know and describe the alignment…”

- Outcome 2 – no changes
- Outcome 3 – no changes
- Outcome 4 – no changes

Section 6

- Add: As well as units, departments and divisions to make it broader than just university committees

Section 7 -

- Add a qualifier to the count of students
  - Biggest challenge will be around buy-in and engagement.

Section 8

- No changes

Section 9

- Suggested the possibility of tri-chairs rather than co-chairs- (faculty, administrator, student life representative)
- Purpose of assessment includes student integration so the co-curricular part is represented appropriately.
- Adding going through the regular processes would help.
- Expand the last bullet to include technical experts and content experts.
- What if we ask for one from each of the committees and then we purposefully make decisions about the representation (network of committee representatives)?