

# STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL 96/97

## MEETING MINUTES

**Second Meeting: January 28, 1997**  
*Meeting Time: 2:00-4:00*

### **In Attendance:**

Doug Ayers, Terry Bishop, Sue Braffet, Greg Carnes, Bill Chittenden, Michelle De Jean, Pat Delaney, John Engstrom, Rich Erickson, Angie Euhus, David Graf (SPC Facilitator), Debra Hopkins, Larry Jacobs, Peter Kaminski, Lynn Neeley, Rick Ridnour, Mona Salmon, Linda Schaller, Denise Schoenbachler, Carol Stolte, Bill Tallon, Beth Towell, Sally Wakefield, Jim Ward, Harry Wright, Dan Wunsch

### **Unable to Attend:**

Lori Marcellus, Mark Misic, Yves Mueller, Nancy Russo

### **Prepared January 30, 1997 by:**

Michelle De Jean, SPC Project Manager

Major issues addressed during the second meeting of the SPC follow:

**Draft SPC Bylaws.** Michelle De Jean prepared and distributed a first draft of the SPC bylaws. Michelle presented a brief overview of the draft document to SPC members:

- a) The structure of the draft SPC bylaws is modeled after the structure of the bylaws for the College's Board of Executive Advisors (BOEA). (Both the SPC and the BOEA serve in an advisory capacity.)
- b) The draft document contains the history of the SPC: describing its formation in 1994, its structure, its role within the college, the process it follows, and activities conducted since its inception.
- c) The draft document depicts the duties of SPC members as offered by Council members during the first SPC 96/97 meeting (held November 20, 1996).

Michelle asked all SPC members to carefully read the draft document, and explained that she will contact them for their reaction and additional contributions to the piece. Dr. Graf explained that this is to be considered a first reading of the draft bylaws.

**Value-Added Culture Report.** SPC members were given a copy of the merit plan report to read in advance of the meeting. John Engstrom, as a member of the Value-Added Culture Key Initiative team, presented the merit plan report,

summarizing its key components. SPC members discussed the report in detail and developed the following list of suggestions made in response to the report:

1. Keep the merit system simple, with an emphasis on motivation (attracting and retaining people)
2. Ensure uniformity in standards, definitions.
3. The merit system should recognize departmental objectives.
4. The merit system should provide for faculty feedback.
5. The merit system should address teacher effectiveness (required for the university, and for AACSB accreditation).
6. The merit system should include learner recruitment activities.
7. The merit system should match College of Business and University regulations.
8. The merit plan should be prefaced with verbiage that describes the purpose of the change in the merit system and what the change intends to achieve.

Motion was made and seconded to send the merit plan report to the College Council without endorsement and with the request that:

- the College Council proceed to develop a set of principles that each departmental merit system should follow in order to ensure that departmental merit plans are consistent with the College's strategic plan.

Motion amended and seconded to:

- send the merit report and the SPC's list of suggestions (as noted above) to College Council, and;
- request that College Council address the SPC's list of suggestions when College Council develops a set of principles for departmental merit plans.

Motion carried.