

# Meeting Notes

## Integrated Planning Committee Meeting

November 20, 2017

3:30 – 4:30pm

A-2029

### Attendance:

**Dr. Noreen Golfman**, Provost & VP (Academic) (Chair)  
**Dr. Donna Cox-Hardy**, Social Work  
**Dr. Ian Sutherland**, Music  
**Dr. James Feehan**, Humanities & Social Science  
**Dr. Donald McKay**, Medicine  
**Dr. Laura Robinson**, Arts & Social Science, Grenfell  
**Jillian Kavanagh**, Marine Institute  
**Younis Abdalla**, GSU  
**Keith Matthews**, Associate Director, Academic Budgets  
**Paul Chancey**, CIAP  
**Réanne Kinsella**, CIAP

### Unable to attend:

**Dr. Aimée Surprenant**, Graduate Studies  
**Renata Lang**, MUNSU  
**Lori Pike**, Budget Office

## 1. Review of meeting notes from October 30, 2017

The meeting notes from October 30, 2017 were reviewed and accepted by the committee.

## 2. Consultation Process Discussion

A draft outline was circulated for discussion regarding the consultation process for the IPC Budget Report.

The consultation process is proposed to begin in December, beginning with meetings with Deans and Directors. A presentation and consultation questions will be piloted at this time. Based on the outcome, subsequent questions may focus on more specific areas or issues.

The month of January will be largely dedicated to consultations with the remainder of the groups proposed – Students, Academic Councils, Grenfell Campus, MI Campus, PBC/Senate and general Town Halls (on each campus). The process will be institution wide and consult with the university community as a whole, including groups such as Facilities Management, Office of Finance, etc. In the interest of time, some of the smaller units may be bundled.

Consultation sessions will be approximately 1 hour in duration and begin with a brief presentation covering the scope and magnitude of recent cuts and the extent to which the university has been impacted; the current budget gap; and approaches currently being explored by the committee. A brief list of proposed questions was presented for review by the committee.

A discussion followed, during which the following points were raised:

- It was suggested that consultations may present a good opportunity to gauge interest regarding some of the priorities identified by the committee in the spring.
- The committee felt that the proposed questions presented an overall negative tone. It was suggested that questions explore both positive and negative areas associated with the budget. CIAP will work on the development of questions.
- There was concern regarding the length of time allotted for consultation sessions. With 15 minutes required for a brief presentation, only 45 minutes would remain for discussion. It was suggested that a short video could be developed which could be circulated and posted beforehand. This would ensure that a consistent message is being communicated.
- It was felt that financial information should be communicated by the Provost and the Finance Office; however, it was suggested that an individual not involved in budget process should facilitate the discussion portion. All were in agreement that this individual should be an experienced facilitator and ideally be someone currently working at Memorial or a retired faculty member who would be willing to dedicate time to this process.
- It was suggested that students be asked to contribute to the sessions so that everyone is working together towards a common goal.
- It was suggested that some sessions should have a particular focus on students. A suggestion was made to hold a session in the student residences.
- It was suggested that Dr. Robinson approach members of the administration at Grenfell and that Dr. Golfman would approach members of the administration at MI in order to introduce the idea of the proposed consultation process.
- Overall, the committee emphasized the need for the consultation process to be positive and constructive as it is such an important undertaking.

An open link survey is also proposed in order to gather additional information from faculty, staff and students. The questionnaire would be very brief, asking respondents to rank the top five areas in which they would prioritize resources as well as an open ended question for any further comments. It was suggested that priorities be developed based on the consultation sessions. Some concern was expressed with the open nature of the survey. It was suggested that IT Services could be consulted to identify possible solutions (such as analyzing IP addresses) if such concerns arise.

### 3. Development of Report Outline – Key Areas

*In the interest of time this topic was not discussed*

### 4. Other Business

Dr. Golfman asked for feedback regarding the November Special Meeting of Senate regarding enrolment and budget information. Members felt that the session was successful. It put forward simple and clear messages and attendees appeared to recognize and accept the need to revise the enrolment plan in order to better reflect the reality of the situation.

No other business was raised. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.