

Planning Sub-Meet and Confer Notes
Thursday, February 13, 2014
3:00-4:00 P.M. in CSU 238

Meeting Note Taker:
Welcome (M. Wells)

Discussion Items:

Debrief Strategic Priority Funding Process (15 min.)

Give explicit instructions to presenter and limit the time: do an overview, then focus on the priority of the meet and confer. Then allow a fixed amount of time for questions. In the past we've only recommended they allow time for questions.

Parts and whole disconnect? Can you add a column asking the person to rank the proposals? Is there a way, in addition to the criteria, a way for people to give an overall impression of the proposal without taking it to the ranking level? The all-around? How can we reflect a composite that is more than the sum of the parts? Maybe the criteria are not weighted appropriately. We may not have articulated some criteria that are important to us. Are we ranking these on our 10 most important criteria?

Perhaps people could submit a written question that was not asked if time ran out, and the written response could be considered.

Regarding the question, "how would this be sustainable?" Maybe there should be more specificity here. Should they work with someone in the grants office from day one to get this message across?

Is it possible to videotape all the presentations so they could be viewed by anyone? We would need consent from presenters. Should we send them a model presentation? Or a model proposal?

Do we want to put a limit on the number of proposals funded for any one person or group or amount that people can receive?

Do we want to provide the applicants with suggestions of where else they might get funding if they were not accepted?

□ Academic Mapping (K. Greer – 10 min.)

78 people participated in the same workshop, momentum established. They are building a map template. Modules of the workshop day will be available on d2i for those not able to participate. Patty Hoffman in CETL has volunteered space there for people to work on the template. Names of participants will be shared with dept. chairs and directors for networking purposes. The map is a useful tool. The aim is to have 100% of programs have a map by the end of the calendar year. Not supposed to change your curriculum, but to record it on a map. The maps will be the underbelly

of agile grad, which is a planning tool for students. The drop template will be taken to the meet and confers next week.

- Integrated Academic Planning (M. Wells and L. Akey – 15 min.)

Trifold handout on Academic Planning distributed. Documents have been presented to 12 different bodies around campus. Website on back of brochure. Plan to have several meetings across campus to determine common academic values for one thing. Some will have an external facilitator.

- University Centers and Institutes (3:40 p.m. - D. Friend – 10 min.)

Info provided to us, the Cabinet and other meetings. Inventory to start next week of all existing centers. Quick turn around time of 2 weeks so it is finished by spring break. See handout of definitions. After this, we need to identify an approval process for new centers. Existing ones will likely be grandfathered in. Need to be clear that centers are not academic departments. There are implications for voting through stipulations in the contract. Need to include who benefits from the center—who are the clients of the center? Who benefits from your services? If there is duplication, can there be collaboration?

Update Items:

- University Contracts (S. Smith – 5 min.)

Meeting scheduled to begin discussing the RFP for the exclusive beverage pouring rights.

- Meeting Schedule (5 min.)

Planning Sub-Meet Future Meetings

Next: March 20 9-10am CSU 238. 4/24 3-4pm CSU 238