STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
September 19, 2013

Members Present: Lisa Foss, Kristian Twombly, David Sikes, Alex Polacco, Debra Carlson, Diana Lawson, Michele Mumm, Lucas Golliet, Kerry Marrer, Susan Hubbs, Bob Lessinger, Geoffrey Tabakin, John Eggers, Stephen Hornstein, Judy Kilborn, Casey Gordon, Mark Petzold, Lalita Subrahmanyan, Mike Sharp, Mark Springer, Dan Gregory, Dick Andzenge,

Special Guests: President Potter, Provost Malhotra, Orn Bodvarsson

Minutes – September 5, 2013

Approve at next meeting.

Announcements and additional agenda items:

NONE

MnSCU Report – Charting the Future

- Do a better job and a more cost effective job through collaboration. Work together to create solutions.
- Strategic directions
- Centralization – concern
- Growth of online - underserved populations would be counterproductive
- Certifying competencies
  - Two year schools are more comfortable with this, pressed to provide certificates
  - Four year – language needs to be addressed, national call to produce accountability for
- Tenor of board conversation on line – too narrow, broader to accommodate high bred strategies - e
- Push to create capacity to offer students a choice – e
- Contract – design of the strategy that they will be addressed. Bargaining table that seems to be a restriction in the contract. Not one right now that says it will drive us to that point -e
- Credit for prior learning – delivery system management issues that we need to work together on for a solution.
- Did not see a clear distinction – speaking to the uniqueness of the four year universities of what the faculty are expected to do at the four year compared to the two year. Professional development is very different for the two groups.
  - There in code but not completely clear. Characteristics identified between the two and four year institutions with an emphasis on collaborations. Understanding of the issue Upon implementation this issue is a big part –e
- Concern about the plan as a whole – skepticism.
• Reality is we need to figure out how to get this right so that we learn from our mistakes.
• Better statewide vision for technology and facility management. Academic plan needs to drive our facilities plan. We need to manage our facilities in the same manner that we our monies. –e
• Approach to academic planning has to drive our facilities planning. Take the things that our supposed to be understood and make them public for everyone to understand. e
• Making assumptions that may not be there –
• For profit institutions encroaching on our market share – how will this plan interface with that concern – what extent do we compete or not compete.
  o Board policy 3.6 - mission of the system. Broader responsibility to the people of MN to provide an affordable education for its residents.-e
  o Do we have a responsibility to offer students an alternative to private education?
  o Strong element of obligation as a public -e
  o Challenge is you don’t compete by offering a certain class at a certain time but rather by understanding what the private is offering and how do you offer something similar at a lower cost. -e
  o Questions of service, competitive products at a lower cost
• Skepticism is it is just another plan. Strategic framework how do they intersect? What does implementation look like?
  o Not different from framework - it is the next step in more detail
  o What is next? Cost and quality challenges addressed by the six points.
  o Directions
  o Implementations – system wide- address redundancies- shared services is making a difference – cost savings-
• Who are the workgroups?
  o In the document
• Degree to which the report reflected the consensus
  o Reports to varying degrees addressed the questions that were asked – for those that were not addressed the fundamentals were taken and were summarized.
• Feedback needs to be fully reflective of what you are thinking? –e
• Change is difficult and self-interest and fear of change comes into play – motivation of change
• Successful place for me in this vision than I will not be motivated to support it. –e
• Thank you for the work that is being done
- Models of thinking about those involved – overload and on load- offload- private contracts with too many students – not been screened through the curriculum process
- Should we address new initiatives or use our current processes to address these issues
- Financing concern – pricing for online courses did not seem to reflect all the rest of the investment that has to go into that – online is significantly more work than face to face and how do we compensate for that? Appropriate differential
- Need upfront investment in an infrastructure that would be expected to be profitable
- We don’t pay faculty a premium for online delivery but rather a per student basis.
- Who are we serving
- Rather than a starting point is it something additional and extra? Imagine what it might look like differently
- Bringing about a cultural change will take a significant amount of time – move to online being on load.