Present: Cynthia Brown, Michael Fendrich, Marylou Gelfer (chair), Laura Pedrick, Steve Percy, David Petering.

The meeting was called to order at 9:35 AM by M. Gelfer.

1. The minutes of 12/13/07 and the agenda for 3/3/08 were approved by consensus.

2. The website containing each department’s/center’s responses to the Academic Planning Questionnaire, and web reporting tool organizing the data were demonstrated. It was noted that department and centers requesting review by each subcommittee could be pulled out, as well as individual departments/centers or schools/colleges. The responses could also be reviewed according to question, or part of question (1.a., for example). It was also noted that not all departments/centers have responded at this date.

3. As currently planned, the departments'/centers’ responses to the Academic Planning Questionnaire will be summarized by members of the three subcommittees. The summary form developed by A. Horowitz and accepted by the Engineering and Basic Sciences subcommittee and the Liberal Arts and Professions subcommittee was reviewed.

4. It was suggested that the “Space and Resources” category be separated into two subcategories: “Human Resources” and “Other Resources.”

5. There was some discussion regarding the importance of summarizing the responses to the Academic Planning Questionnaire by subcommittee members. It was concluded that summarizing the data was a first step to identifying patterns of anticipated growth, new areas of emphasis, and areas of common interest between units.

6. The concept of a “reality check” was also discussed at some length. Subcommittee members were reminded that the academic planning process was not for the purpose of resource re-distribution, but should reflect the growth and development units believed they would make given trends in their respective fields and allocations from the DIN and cluster hires. Not all units
will grow to the degree proposed in their Academic Planning Questionnaires. In order for the results of the survey to accurately inform the Master Planning process, it is necessary to apply a “reality check” to the developments identified in the Academic Planning questionnaires. The process for doing this reality check is not yet completely clear. However, it was suggested that one role of the subcommittee would be to propose possibilities for the process as we move forward with our summarizations and become more familiar with the data.

7. Because many departments/centers indicated their wish to be reviewed by multiple or all subcommittees, it was proposed that the subcommittee chairs would review the list of departments/centers and decide which should get a primary review from which subcommittee. Departments/centers requesting review from multiple committees would then receive a secondary review from the other committees (i.e., their summaries would be reviewed and included in other subcommittees’ discussions). Using this method, not every subcommittee would need to summarize every department.

8. Members of the Health Disciplines subcommittee agreed with overall proposal for assigning departments to subcommittees, but noted that the following departments, at minimum, might receive their primary review from the Health Disciplines subcommittee: Health Sciences, Occupational Therapy, Human Movement Sciences, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Social Work, Psychology, Biosciences, Chemistry and Biochemistry; and the Schools of Nursing (non-departmentalized) and Public Health (no departments as of yet). Subcommittee chairs will send a proposed list of centers and any additional departments for primary review to the subcommittee for discussion and approval.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 AM. The next meeting will be March 14, 9:00 – 10:30 AM, Union 250.

Respectfully submitted,

Marylou Pausewang Gelfer