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4/10/17 Chancellor’s Mini-Retreat Debrief
- Setting was a comfortable space for discussion and conversation was good overall.
- It was good to hear what other constituents are thinking.
- We heard constructive comments about SIF process, from Deans in particular. They signed-off on budgets but wanted more time to think about whether ideas could be pursued using internal temporary funds budgets or through cross-unit collaboration. There was general feedback from Deans that they felt unaware of what is happening with plan implementation and didn’t see the open door to engage with SPCC. There is definitely an invitation for us to hear what the Deans and Directors are doing.
- Communicating to Deans and Directors through Chancellor and EVC is not sufficient. SPCC will take up issue of engaging academic leadership in future meeting.
- Infrastructure needs were identified as well as communication barriers.

Spring 2017 SIF Proposal Review
Members shared holistic observations from reviewing the proposals:
- 27 proposals felt like a success! Also, a collaborative spirit was evident. We have a meaningful pool to discuss.
- Recognition that participating in SIFs will take TIME from partners and honored that in proposers’ budgets/designs.
- There is an ongoing need for connection, awareness of what is happening on other parts of campus and in the community. Our connecting in the pre-proposal stage was a good start, but campus still has a lot of “siloing.”
- SPCC members wondered whether other internal resources could be found to fund some of the smaller ideas – including some that may be less transformative/innovative.
- We’ll need to consider how we handle proposals that seem to be geared to on-going operations (sustaining or incrementally growing the work of a functional area) vs. innovation?
- SPCC members were asking themselves how many people (students!) is this impacting – and how many GENERATIONS of people (i.e. is this a long-term impact and systemic change)? They also considered how narrow vs. how broad the impact would be.
• Defining systemic change was challenging
• Proposals fell into different “categories” – conferences & workshops; grants-based; technology; space; curriculum link/supplementation
• Students told us over and over we need parking & spaces for students. The proposals don’t reflect any movement on these issues.
• How do we handle proposals where author did not follow directions?
• We need to address proposals that included elements that were cause for exclusion in the idea phase (e.g. we were clear we would not consider curriculum development).
• Several proposals commented on flexibility of how funds can be spent.
• How do we balance progress on multiple goals?

Next Steps
☐ Each SPCC member will use an anonymous catalyst survey to put every proposal into one of three categories: (1) fund more or less as is; (2) need to discuss; (3) don’t think this should be considered at this time. Categories and comments will help us plan discussion for meeting on 4/17.
☐ Co-champions are encouraged to identify the top 5 – 10 proposals that would have the most impact on the impact goal they represent.
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