Strategic Planning Committee Meeting
February 20, 2014
Meeting Minutes

Members Present: Kristian Twombly, David Sikes, Laura Finch, Alex Polacco, Jennifer Quinlan, Mark Petzold, John Eggers, Judy Kilborn, Dick Andzenge, Bob Lessinger, Casey Gordon, Kathy Johnson, Lalita Subrahmanyan, Kerry Marrer, Sara Grachek, Mike Sharp, Debra Carlson, Geoffrey Tabakin

Minutes – January 16, 2014

Approved as amended – add Alex Polacco to sub group members for review of action grant process.

Announcements and additional agenda items

None.

Provosts Action Grants - Review

- Recommendations go on to the Provost for final determination.
- Way to identify the great things that are happening around campus.
- There did not seem to be a category for goals and limited assessments – it was all or nothing.
- Concern around creating a message about it not being an assessment culture – if it ends up eliminating proposals.
- Important to provide feedback to the applicants – why they were not funded.
- Communication to everyone on how they can request an application.
- It is helpful on both micro level to individuals and broader sense.
- Concern around proposals that had curricular items attached still need to go through the process. A successful grant does not mean they would bypass the curriculum process. People do the work all the time on curriculum related projects that do not go through.
- Acknowledge in the proposal that there is one more step in order for them to be completely successful.
- Recommend to the Provost that any projects funded with curricular implications must follow the process in place related to curriculum changes.
- Make it more apparent in the proposal regarding curricular implications.
- Surprised that some of the projects are not funded already.
- Budgets were thoughtfully done and others were thrown together without much thought.
- Plan for tracking, presentations and assessment plans.
• Scoring – how consistent reviewers were in regards to interdisciplinary. Where there was disagreement I went with the majority.
• Identify the department and program on the application form for next time.
• Rubrics – explanation of what it means and a few examples of what we are looking for.
• Auto populate the rubric based on the fill in the blanks.
• Extension did not necessarily bring more quality proposals.
• If done in the future make the edited comments available to the full committee.
• Spreadsheet will not be public information.

Move to send the document sorted by total score including the meeting discussion and major themes and SPC comments forward to the Provost for his recommendation.

Motion: Mike Sharp Second: Mark Petzold No objections. Motion Passes

Move to send reviewer comments forward to the Provost anonymously for his consideration in the decision making process.

Motion: Mike Sharp Second: Laura Finch 1 Objection Motion Passes

Meeting adjourned.