

## 1) LRPC recommendation for planning SOE Fall Retreat 2006

The members of the LRPC discussed the agenda committee's request that we identify a process for planning the Fall Retreat, and understand that the reason why the agenda committee made this request is so that, in the future, there will be follow-up to the retreat and it will be monitored by a standing committee throughout the academic year.

The LRPC agrees with the agenda committee that this is a good idea and appropriate responsibility of the LRPC. Given the short notice of this request prior to the end of the academic year, the LRPC decided that the best strategy would be to do some initial planning for the retreat and pass this along to a task force that can work in the summer to finalize the planning for the retreat (as has been the approach used in previous years). This year, an LRPC member (Anne Stright) will be on the task force, and will help to make sure there is a transition between the retreat activities and LRPC follow-up on the retreat. Beginning next year (2006-2007 academic year), the LRPC will expect to take on the responsibility for planning the retreat and will do that work during the academic year.

THE PROCESS FOR 2006-2007 SOE RETREAT PLANNING recommended by the LRPC is as follows:

### RETREAT THEME: Revisiting the Long Range Plan

The committee members noted that it has been about 5 years since the faculty as a whole have reviewed the Long Range Plan, and that there have been a number of changes at the school, university, state and national levels during this time that make it appropriate to revisit the plan and to consider whether the strategic directions in the plan continue to be the important priorities for the school.

### PROCESS:

1) The Agenda Committee should constitute a task force to plan a retreat around the theme identified above. See the list below of faculty we recommend be invited to be on the task force. *This task should be completed before end of school year.*

2) Task force is responsible for three activities:

1 - Plan the retreat - *to be completed by end of summer*

2 - Lead the retreat - *to be completed date of retreat*

\*3 - Prepare a final report that documents the action items that result from the retreat - *to be completed two weeks after retreat*

\*Item #3 is a new step in the process of retreat planning, and an important one. This report will be submitted by the task force to the Long Range Planning Committee, and this report will serve as the document that guides the LRPC's work during the academic year to follow-up on the retreat and monitor the ongoing impact of the retreat.

3) Long Range Planning Committee is responsible for:

1 - Implementation of follow-up activities that result from retreat - *to be completed during academic year 06-07*

2 - Monitoring follow-up activities that result from retreat - *to be completed during academic year 06-07*

3 - Providing report about retreat follow-up activities to Policy Council - *to be completed at last PC meeting Spring 07*

4 - Determine Retreat Theme and complete retreat planning for 2007-2008 - *to be completed during Spring 07*

RECOMMENDATIONS for 2006-07 RETREAT PLANNING TASK FORCE MEMBERS:

(A number of faculty and staff were identified who have vested interest in the goals that are part of the current long range plan. We recommend that the Agenda Committee invite about 5 of the persons listed below to serve on the task force.)

Anne Stright - LRPC member

Bill Black - Ed Leadership, IUPUI

Charlie Reigeluth - chair of last LRPC that revised long range plan

Tom Brush - CTE

Jack Cummings - Secondary

Jeff Anderson - P-12 partners

Keith Moran

Luise McCarty

Ghangis Carter

Dick Lesh

Peter Cowan

Deb Winikates

**2) Response to question about faculty service load in SOE**

The members of the LRPC discussed the email sent by Heidi Ross requesting responses to the question about faculty service load in the SOE. Together, we decided that we want to share the following points with the Agenda Committee:

1) Yes, we clearly agree with the view of Brad Levinson and others that faculty service load in the SOE is entirely too heavy for some and much too light for others.

2) We want to pull "our fair share" of the load, but don't know what that is because there is no clear standard for what a normal load is or what is expected. We would like to see a statement like that from the leaders of the school.

3) When determining what a "fair share" looks like, there should be consideration and explanation of the integration of that load between department, school, university, profession, state, national and international activities.

4) We especially think it is important to determine what a "fair share" is for pre-tenured faculty, while recognizing this is important to know for post-tenured faculty as well because too much service leads to burn-out.

5) There should be a re-consideration of the current committee structure in the SOE to determine if all the existing committees are needed.

6) When new committees are formed, there should be some consideration and acknowledgment of the economics of forming the committee, such as how many person-hours will be used for the work of the committee and the dollar cost of those hours to the school, in order to determine if the committee is worth the return on investment.

7) There should be consideration of differing expectations regarding service by different departments. For example, faculty in counseling psych have a greater service load due to advising than faculty in other departments.

Respectfully submitted by

Barbara Bichelmeyer

for the Long Range Planning Committee