Present: Patricia Arredondo, Michael Fendrich, Marylou Gelfer, Chris Gluesing, Mark Krueger, Sally Lundeen, Laura Pedrick.

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 by M. Gelfer.

1. The minutes of 3/3/08 and the agenda for 3/14/08 were approved by consensus.

2. M. Gelfer presented documents detailing instructions to committee members for completing summaries of their assigned departments’ and centers’ Academic Planning Questionnaire responses. Procedures for assigning departments/centers were also discussed. Samples of summaries for Electrical Engineering and Mathematical Sciences were distributed.

3. Questions arose regarding additional stages of the summarization process and a later evaluation phase.

   a. Given the fact that deans will be commenting on submissions from their schools or colleges, it was suggested that perhaps before committee members did summaries for their assigned departments, it would be best to wait until after the deans had completed their commentaries before beginning analysis of the departmental submissions. (Deans’ responses have been asked for by March 24, which is a little under two weeks prior to the April 11 due date set for the Subcommittee reports.) Given this time frame, it was decided that the deans’ commentary would be incorporated into the academic planning process as part of the next phase of analysis.

   b. The evaluation phase of the academic planning process was also discussed, especially in light of the planned growth in faculty size that several departments had indicated in their response to the Academic Planning Questionnaire. M. Gelfer reminded committee members that the committee has no funds or positions to distribute or withhold. Resources to support new faculty would come from the DIN, cluster hires, grants and contracts awarded to departments by external agencies, and possibly from revenues generated by increased
enrollment. Departments/schools indicating large increases in faculty size could be asked by committee members in the “reality check” phase of the academic planning process about anticipated support for these positions. Deans could also be asked to give more realistic estimates of the resources available to departments for faculty/staff growth. It was suggested that estimates for growth could be made at the aggregate level (school, college, or unit within L&S, for example) rather than at the department level, to reduce over-estimation.

4. M. Gelfer distributed the (nearly) final list of departments/schools and centers to be summarized by committee members. It was noted that School of Continuing Education and the Center for Urban Initiatives and Research were left off the list. M. Gelfer was charged with finalizing the list, making assignments, and distributing materials to committee members. Summaries are due to M. Gelfer prior to the next meeting of April 3rd. Eventually, all summaries will be accessible to all subcommittee members via a Pantherfile.

5. Committee members were reminded of the following dates:
   Thursday, April 3rd, 9:00 – 10:30 – subcommittee meeting, Union 250.
   Friday, April 4th, morning: campus-wide launch event for the Master Planning process. Time and location to be announced.
   Monday, April 14th, 9:00 – 10:30 – subcommittee meeting, Union 250.
   Week of April 28 – May 2: focus group sessions by the planning consultants. Times and locations to be announced.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Marylou Pausewang Gelfer