Middle States Subcommittee 2: Institutional Resources  
Notes from meeting held on Friday, December 5, 2008

Present: Yu-Hui Chen  Anna Z. Radkowski-Lee  
Lisa Donohue  Carole Sweeton  
Timothy Gage (chair)

Matching of questions to answers
Questions 1, 2, 3, 6 and 9  Kim Bessette  
Questions 7, 8  Wilcox  
Question 4  John Giarusso  
Question 5  unmatched

LD – How shall we proceed with Kim on December 19th?  
TG – Ask general questions first. Then interview her again on specifics.  
LD – Shall we prepare the questions now?  
TG – Start with what do we need to know? How does it work?  
LD – (Looking at her printed out graphs from the wiki), who decides what the University gets?  
CS – Clarify the bars and graphs in the imbedded documents.  
TG – Is there anything missing from our list of questions? I thought of ICR. They are not listed in the documents. I will send an e-mail to the committee to ask is anyone has any additional questions and to bring attention to the Compact Planning documents.  
CS – Some documents, but not all, are available through the wiki hot links. When will the rest be available?  
YC – For departments which received Compact Planning awards, who assessed the results?  
TG – Does the Compact Planning “contract” still exist? I do not think so. At some point in time, we’ll want to divide questions into smaller groups. All should be present for the first meeting with Kim Bessette. I will ask for volunteers via e-mail.  
YC – (Reads section from Compact Planning process regarding confidentiality) How did the then-Provost decide who should be awarded Compact Planning money?  
TG – I can tell you. Our division considered our abilities and needs. Our requests went to the Dean. The Dean negotiated with all departments and the prioritized plans. The Deans met with other Deans and the Provost.  
LD – What happened to the plan and the money put towards it?  
TG – I will obtain the official status of the Compact Plan.  
CS – It happened for a very short time.  
TG – Middle States might be more interested in learning what happened after the Compact Plan’s mentor left.  
CS – What are we doing instead of it?  
CS – Since we don’t have a leader, I think that the GFP shows that the University is still planning.
TG – I don’t know what the procedures are in the GFP.
CS – It’s kind of an interesting process. Sue Phillips invited people to sessions. Information was gathered during the sessions. This gathered information will yield an action plan.
TG – So this is done on a volunteer basis?
CS – Yes. There is an element of a grass roots effort.
YC – The action plan has not been published yet.
TG – (Looking at Carole Sweeten) Why were you selected?
CS – I attended a workshop on the process earlier in the year. Perhaps that is why I was invited to the smaller committees. As it turns out, people are thinking along similar line.
TG – Then that’s another area we should explore.
CS – I don’t know what’ll happen…how resources will be allocated in response to the current budget crisis.
TG – Has anyone served on UPC? This is the committee that gets to see the budget. I expect that the GF committee is advisory to Sue Phillips.
CS – Someone has to write a report but Sue Phillips wants to see the information in the raw about. She want to see what the University is about.
YC – They talked about communication and transparency.
TG – Maybe we have two issues: 1) questions we might want to add and 2) do we get to interview VP Lowery?
CS - There are no documents before and after Compact Planning. The compact planning process seems to have been at differed levels. It approached an operational level.
TG – CP was negotiated and there was more give and take.
LS – How will no funding and no hiring be understood by Middle States?
TG – Middle States will know that levels vary. They are more interested in procedures and transparency.

Next meeting will be held on Friday, December 19, 2:30 pm – 4:00, place to be confirmed.

Submitted by A. Z. Radkowski-Lee on 12/9/2008