

Meeting Notes

Integrated Planning Committee Meeting

September 24, 2018

3:30 – 4:30pm

A-2029

Attendance:

Dr. Noreen Golfman, Provost & VP (Academic) (Chair)
Dr. Donna Cox-Hardy, Social Work
Bailey Howard, MUNSU
Dr. Donald McKay, Medicine
Dr. Laura Robinson, Arts & Social Science, Grenfell
Dr. Ian Sutherland, Music
Dr. Sean Cadigan, Associate VP (Academic)
Dr. James Feehan, Humanities & Social Science
Roxanne Millan, Office of the Provost
Jennifer Batten, Office of the Provost
Keith Matthews, CIAP
Lori Pike, Budget Office
Réanne Kinsella, CIAP

Unable to attend:

Jillian Kavanagh, Marine Institute
Dr. Aimée Surprenant, Graduate Studies
Rizza Umali, GSU

1. Review of meeting notes from September 4, 2018

The meeting notes from September 4, 2018 were reviewed and accepted by the committee.

2. Discussion of Draft Detailed Timeline

Members of IPC reviewed and discussed a more detailed timeline for the budget report for the 2019-2020 fiscal year. The document was created by the working group to guide its work and ensure timely completion of critical tasks throughout the Fall. The working group, composed of Keith Matthews, Lori Pike, Jennifer Batten and Reanne Kinsella, will meet weekly and report to IPC on progress on critical activities identified in the timelines document.

A critical ongoing piece is the budget update report, which will provide an update on activities that are linked to the "What we Heard" report compiled last year.

3. Review of IPC Website

The committee reviewed the current design of the IPC website and acknowledged that it needs to be modified in light of the fact that there is an increasing amount of information to provide and it needs to be categorized by year. It may be useful to create sub-pages for major sections (e.g. consultations, about IPC, statistics, etc.). It was also suggested that the page could make more use of visuals, including graphs. It was suggested that a video be embedded in the site: a recording of the Provost welcoming people to the site and explaining the importance of the process. The website could include links to the dashboards hosted at websites of both the Provost and the Vice-President (Administration and Finance). A typo in the page ("2018-29") was identified.

The working group will work on updating the website and will provide further information to the Committee.

4. Preparation for Consultations

Based on the schedule of the Provost, the five consultations will need to take place either during the weeks of October 22nd or November 5th. Holding the consultations after November 12th is problematic for faculty and students as it would be too late in the semester. Maureen Volk (former Dean of the School of Music) and Sheila Singleton (former University Registrar) have been identified as potential facilitators for the sessions, but committee members are invited to suggest other individuals who have a connection to and understanding of the University but are not currently employed at the University.

Jennifer Batten has been investigating the possibility of Livestreaming the sessions over the secure MUN network. There should not be any issues.

It was suggested that one of the consultations could take place at the new Signal Hill campus.

The presentation from last year's consultations was distributed to the committee, including the questions posed to participants (including the questions posed at the student sessions). It was suggested that the presentation could include a follow-up on the "What we heard" recommendations to reassure the community that the feedback has been received and has informed managerial decision making. It might be useful to include the top risk themes identified by the University auditor. More information could be provided on total spending (up or down), staff complement, attrition, VRP numbers, etc.. It was suggested that the website could contain some of this information or provide links to other pages that contain the information.

There was substantial discussion regarding the questions posed during the consultations:

- It was suggested that the questions be more direct and specific and less "blue sky". (E.g. What specifically could be cut?).
- The first question is too broad and is less meaningful in the second year of the process.
- The second question does not need to state the specific campus. ("In what areas do you feel resources are most required?").
- It may be helpful to ask what new challenges have arisen since last year.
- The facilitator should give context before each question to acknowledge what we heard last year.
- When enquiring about resources it may be helpful to note financial, human, physical, etc.
- The questions should be provided in advance to participants.
- The questions should be the same for all sessions.

5. Other Business

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15pm.