Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Summary: October 17, 2012 Meeting

AB5 -309

2pm-3pm

Present: Snyder, Duff, Genson, Jaeger, Gischel, Felke, Pelliccioni, Magiera, McDonald, Caltafamo, Rogers

Absent: Harrison, Henry, Kakkuri

1. Co-Chair’s Report

Paul noted that a meeting was held last week of the co-chairs of the SFC, ERMC, and the Budget committees and the Provost for which he was also present. Ron asked the 3 committees to collaborate on the following: What is our physical capacity if average section size were to rise slightly in fall 2013? How would this impact room utilization in terms of capacity? What would this look like at an average section size of somewhat greater? How many existing classes could increase their capacity based upon room capacity? What would it look like with a MWF schedule at 55 minutes per class? How can our classrooms and schedule be maximized. What is our capacity if we include Saturday classes?

If we move to these higher average section sizes how could the resulting benefits be best allocated (e.g., raises, software acquisition, chiller plant, South road, etc.)? Steve provided additional context and how the Budget committee was approaching this task. The ERMC was asked how do we optimize student enrollment to ensure the greatest likelihood of student success?

2. Policy Review

Paul asked if there were additional comments from the group. He noted that Doug had shared the draft with the Senate’s PRT for its input. That input would be forthcoming by the end of the month. The Committee would review that input and then make revisions as it deems appropriate before moving the consolidated proposal forward to the PBC for its review.
3. **University Committee Study**

Paul turned to the working group of Tom, Carolynne, and Sal to review progress on the development of a template for collecting information on this topic. He added that he had received a list of all university-wide committees from Brice that had SG representation, which he distributed to the group by email before the meeting. Carolynne provided a draft of the content of the instrument for group discussion. Questions concerning purpose, scope of review, and how to proceed were raised and discussed at length. Paul explained in his mind the purpose was to determine where there was duplication of effort and where representation might need to be adjusted. Carolynne added communication among committees also as important.

4. **Next steps**

Paul asked the committee to be prepared for further discussion of the policy draft at our next meeting when input from the PRT should be received. He also said that he would take the work of the subgroup and turn it into a template for further review discussion at our next meeting scheduled for October 31 about how to proceed and to whom the instrument should be sent.