Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (SPIEC) Meeting

March 12, 2010 9am -10:am Holmes Hall 109

Summary

Present: Snyder, Duff, Pegnetter, McBride, Baurer
Absent: Belcher, Henry, Shepard, Johnson, St. Hill, Lindsey, Genson, McClelland, Wright-Isak
Guest: Alexander

Update of the Strategic Planning Process

Paul reviewed the progress of the strategic planning process since the last meeting of SPIEC in February 2010. He noted that about 40% of units responded to the original deadline for action plans of March 1. He added that the deadline had been extended through March 12. Paul also stated that work on the committee reports was coming along, that he had provided feedback on a couple of drafts and that he expected all to be submitted by the April 1 deadline. Paul also recapped the review of SPIEC’s report on an Assessment and IE plan, which the committee had reviewed in February. He said the report had been revised based on the discussion at that meeting and was now ready to go forward to the PBC for its review before being cast as a policy. Paul then introduced George Alexander to explain how he had organized all the action plans that had been submitted in response to the seven goals proposed for the 2010-2015. George described the content of the binder and how the action plans were organized by strategic plan goal and unit such that each action plan included in the matrix had been numbered according to the sequence in which it appeared in each unit’s submission. Paul noted that there were about 85 discrete action plans and about 105 duplicated (i.e., the same action plan under more than one goal).

Review of Action Plans

Paul referred the committee to the binder and noted that what we were looking for was about 10-20 action plans per goal. He noted that the action plans should be reviewed with a sense of match to the goal, the inclusion of an indicator, and a benchmark that could be assessed preferably by quantitative means but qualitative if that wasn’t possible. Dick noted that there didn’t seem to be any specific goal for university-private partnerships to promote economic development, especially curricular responses. Paul suggested that this might be something we include under strategies under any of 3 goals: community engagement, environmental sustainability, or discovery and application of knowledge. He also suggested that Dick raise this at the Council of Deans.

Dick asked if there was time to revise action plans. Paul responded that there probably was since we would take the next two meetings to review the actions plans. Paul also noted that we should focus on identifying action plans that will require minimal or no additional resources to implement since next year will probably be another tight budget for us. Paul also asked the group to think of a hierarchy with the goal at the highest level, followed by strategies, and then action plans below. So while committee members reviewed the action plans under each goal they should look for 3-4 possible themes among groups of action plans much as the current strategic plan document is structured.
Finally, Paul also noted that we need to view the action plans in the context of the BOG work plans so that they are properly aligned. Cathy asked for a copy of the BOG work plan outline and Paul said he would share that with the group. He also noted that he hoped to embed the President’s annual goals within the strategic plan as well.

Next steps

Paul mentioned that PIP would update Dr. Alexander’s matrix again at the end of next week to capture any additions or edits and also forward a pdf with updated action plans. At the next meeting of the committee to occur on March 23, we will continue the review of the action plans and consider strategy statements to create sub-groupings of the action plans under each of the seven goals. The committee thanked Dr. Alexander for the way he organized and presented the action plans.