

Agenda

Strategic Planning Committee

Wed., Apr. 12, 2012, 1:00, Computer Science Department conference room

1. Call to order
@ 1:07 by **Sanders**. QEP revisions from today will be sent to Sanders and then on to the Senate. Friday the QEP subcommittee members should be at the Senate. Attending are Hannes Gerhardt, Debra MacComb, Jon Anderson, Will Lloyd, Nadya Popov, Betty Ishoy and Rob Sanders. Carol Goodson and Ebenezer Kolajo excused.
2. Approval of minutes.
Moved MacComb and seconded by Lloyd.
3. Sub-Committee reports are the agenda items.
4. QEP Draft-Jon, Debra
Anderson: We could present the QEP to the Senate as an information item or to be passed as an action item. Either would be fine to get the University to review it. The benefit of it being an information item would be some thought- out time before its official adoption.
Sanders: If sent as an action item, could be argued and then sent back to committee. Best to send as an information item to let the Senate think it over. **Lloyd**: Same. Send as an information item. **Popov**: Same, that it be sent as an information item due to timing in the semester, it could be perceived as rushed. We could use the time for the Committee to cobble it. **Lloyd**: Could bring forth the controversial items during the information time.
MacComb: Presented first two years element of the QEP to the general education committee. They were surprised at the changes in the core. Could take from E instead of D. **Lloyd**: Core changes will probably be the thing that will cause the most angst in the university. Has to be thought of in terms of impact to different departments. **Popov**: Could have DSW be core classes, and not have as much multiple choice tests. **Anderson**: By getting the QEP out there, while some of the college plans are pretty good, others will see that they need to step it up like other colleges. **MacComb**: Univ. of Wisconsin plans (6 points) are robust, fairly easy to do. Perhaps use some or all of it to improve the individual colleges. (Narrative on learning outcome 2 (p. 19).) Each college perhaps wrote theirs in a vacuum without consultation or knowing about others. **Anderson**: How to implement QEP needs to be discussed. Lloyd referred back to the WAC. We need an administrative structure to implement, but hesitant to have committees outside of the Senate structure. Perhaps we need a sub-committee on this. Perhaps add one rep. from each college to have representation from each. **MacComb**: Liked the library piece and how it fits in. **Anderson**: Could ask the Senate to take action on the next brief steps of returning to each college to look at p. 19 and this could be done over the summer. The Committee's final recommendation is to present it to the Senate as an information item with brief action step of returning it to each college to look over their submitted portion, reflect, revise and resubmit. We need to incorporate Kolajo's edits and then Anderson will resend to the

colleges and the University as a whole. After recompiled, then submit to the Senate in the fall for approval/acceptance of the QEP.

5. Revisions to current Strategic Plan-Will

All received scanned pdf without changes recommended from last time. This should go as an action item to the Senate. Sanders will send revised Strategic Plan to Teresa Ock. **Anderson:** Students we attract or admission rates won't really change. What will/can change is how we serve the students.

6. New business, announcements—None

Moved and seconded for adjournment @ 1:37.

Minutes submitted by Betty Ishoy.