

Strategic Planning Committee  
Boardroom/Rm. 502, 600 S. Michigan Ave.  
Monday, October 19, 2009

## Minutes

**In Attendance:** Pan Papacosta (chair), Ben Sutherland, Sandra Allen, Oscar Valdez (alternate attending for Roland Hanson), Erin McCarthy, Carly Flagg and Non-voting staff. Anne Foley

**Absent:** Neil Pagano, Alicia Berg, Eric May, Heather Cramond, Annette Barbier (alternate), André Foisy (non-voting)

The meeting began at 10:00am. The agenda was distributed and the minutes of the September 28<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved. Members reviewed and confirmed the dates for future meetings, which André Foisy had emailed after the September 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. These are

Monday October 19<sup>th</sup>, November 9<sup>th</sup>, December 7<sup>th</sup>, February 8<sup>th</sup>, March 8<sup>th</sup>,  
April 19<sup>th</sup> and May 10<sup>th</sup>.

Pan stated the primary purpose of this meeting was to discuss our choices for an agenda item for the 2009-10 year. He gave an update on his meeting with Bob Thall, Strategic Planning Committee chair for 2007-08 and 2008-09. He reported last year's agenda item as "growth." He then stated that he'd also met with Anne Foley, V.P. of Planning and Compliance, Research, Evaluation and Planning, and he and Ms. Foley briefly summarized their meeting.

Pan then distributed the document *"Objectives-Composition-Proposed discussion items"*, which he compiled for the meeting. Members reviewed and discussed the viability of each of the proposed discussion items.

In support of item 1 (examine our Self study report and the comments of the NCA team) on the list of proposed discussion items, Pan distributed the abridged "Criteria" from the 2009 Self Study Report (which Mr. Foisy had emailed to Members after the first meeting), and the "Advancement Section", a summary of the comments of the NCA team visit. "Report of a Comprehensive Evaluation Visit".

In response to item 3 on the list of proposed discussion items (Retention and Graduation), Anne Foley reported that there is already a presidential task force assigned to the issue of retention and graduation. There is no need for us to duplicate their efforts.

There were several responses to item 4 (Education for the non-traditional students. Ann clarified the issue, stating that in light of the nationwide decline in the 18-24 demographic entering college programs, there is a shift in emphasis toward accommodating "older", "other", "non-traditional" students who are entering or returning to college. She described several motivating factors for these "other" students' enrollment, including returning to finish degrees, extending/ deepening/ broadening expertise in an ongoing career, and changing careers due to changing job markets, unemployment, etc. She clarified that this population is typically looking for accreditation, rather than "continuing education" in the sense of taking courses "on the side," as a hobby or secondary interest.

Ms. Foley stated that several Chicago institutions have already been targeting this demographic, and that Columbia is lagging and needs to catch up.

Carly Flagg, chairperson of ASL-English Interpretation, referred to a proposal she'd worked on to create an accelerated degree program in ASL, and she highlighted the bureaucratic and technological barriers to implementation that she'd

encountered. Some of the other points raised with regard to item 4: This issue intersects with item 3 in the sense that our efforts to improve retention and graduation will reduce the number of new “other students” who have partial coursework but return to college to finish degrees.

Papacosta added that we might consider programs that are already in place at Columbia that can be retooled or repurposed for this audience. (Ex. Minors)

Pan emphasized the usefulness of consulting the Research, Evaluation, and Planning page listed on the handout (Provost’s Office site, “Institutional Evaluation” link), which includes several illuminating survey reports. (Such as Employer Survey & Graduating student reports)

Ms. Foley drew attention to two potential issues for the committee to consider:

The first is the question of how well we are adapting our programs to the changes in the industry and career landscape. She referred both to interdisciplinary adaptation (i.e. the growing dissolution of exclusive, specialized departments) and to technological adaptation. The second is the issue of student-centered learning, and how well we are implementing it, where we can improve, etc.

Members briefly discussed the issue of task forces that already exist that address issues of possible interest for us. In addition to the Student Retention task force, Anne and Pan reported a task force to develop an Honors Program, which was then handed to LAS to develop a pilot program.

Pan asked if we should invite input from the Chairs Council and/or the Deans.

Ben Sutherland, Audio Arts & Acoustics, asked Sandra Allen, Marketing Communication, about the status of a possible suggestion from the Executive Committee of the College Council, which she’d mentioned at the last committee meeting. Ms. Allen clarified the issue she’d mentioned but said that the Executive Committee had been debating whether the issue was better suited for Budgeting or Strategic Planning.

Ms. Foley stated that based on past experience, a topic related to the academic and/or student experience might be best suited to our committee’s expertise, rather than a business-model, or more purely administrative topic.

In summary on the topic of choosing an agenda item for the year, Pan reminded members that there are only six remaining meetings, and stressed the importance of individually considering, reflecting upon, discussing, and consulting colleagues about the possible topics before November’s meeting, so that everyone is informed and prepared to decide on an agenda item.

He summarized the various resources members can review and consult:

- The 2009 Self Study, focusing on noted shortcomings or recommendations for improvement. See Mr. Foisy’s summary of the Criteria for a concise report on the areas of review.
- The HLC/NCACS Site-Visit Report: As with the Self Study, this document is lengthy, and the “Advancement Section”, distributed at this meeting, concisely identifies the findings and recommendations of the Evaluation Team.
- The Columbia 2010 plan, and in particular, the parts that were not completed or need to be extended (which may be identifiable in the yearly progress reports, once the webmaster has made them accessible).

- Members of the 2015/2016(?) Planning Committee, who may be able to provide 1-2 items from their study on which we can focus.
- What is going on at other institutions to address issues that we also face (e.g. curricular review and revision, improvements in the quality of education).
- The survey reports accessible on the Provost Office's "Institutional Evaluation" page.
- Colleagues from each member's own department.
- Members of the Chairs Council.

He further encouraged that we share these ideas with each other prior to the November's meeting so that everyone can see the pool of ideas.

Papacosta adjourned the meeting at 11:05AM.