**Integrated Planning Council Notes of February 1, 2019**

**Present:** Z. Toro, L. Bigelow, C. Casamento, C. Galligan, D. Dauwalder, P. Troiano, S. Cintorino, M. Jackson, K. Fruin, M. Jasek, K. Kollar

**Introductions**

Z. Toro introduced the group to Michael Jasek, the new VP for Student Affairs.

**Submissions Under Review**

There were no new submissions for review; however Z. Toro noted that there are a few proposals pending in the portal that would not be considered until after the budget was complete. Z. Toro then asked if this delay would be an issue. D. Dauwalder replied that the BS in Electrical Engineering will not be complete this Spring, and the two graduate engineering programs are currently with the Curriculum Committee. In fact, none of the programs are set to launch until Spring 2020 or Fall 2020; however the IPC may have to review the proposals again pending any significant changes.

D. Dauwalder also noted that the DNAP accreditation report was recently submitted, and the program will undergo accreditation this Spring.

**Strategic Planning Process – Progress Report**

C. Casamento provided the Council with a brief update on the recent work of the SPSC, which was scheduled to meet that same day to discuss final planning details of the first Strategic Planning Open Forum. Three Open Forum sessions are scheduled for February 6th, where participants will break into small groups and have open-ended discussions led by a facilitator. Group sessions will be followed by a summary and wrap up session. Z. Toro announced that there is a lot of excitement surrounding the first Open Forum, and responses from the external community have been very good. She added that a few elected officials and BOR members have also expressed interest in becoming part of the strategic planning process, and Matt Ceppi will schedule some phone calls to speak with these individuals.

L. Bigelow noted that the room was silent at the last Senate meeting when the strategic planning process and Open Forum format were discussed, and she asked M. Jackson if there had been any negative feedback from faculty. M. Jackson replied that he viewed the silence in the room as a positive response, and that it seemed faculty were pleased with the format of the Open Forum and the transparency of the strategic planning process thus far.

**Space Requests**

Council members had a brief discussion regarding space requests from various student groups on campus. As previously discussed, groups such as International Students, the GSA, transfer students and others expressed interested in having their own designated space on campus where they can gather, study and socialize. Considering the amount of student groups on campus, the Council considered creating common spaces across campus that various student groups could share. After taking an inventory of possible spaces that could be utilized, S. Cintorino reported that only one space in Memorial Hall was identified as a possible common meeting space. This particular space is 1,800 square feet and is currently completely unoccupied.

After a brief conversation, members agreed that it is important for student groups to feel they have an identity and a connection to the CCSU campus. However, due to space restraints, it is important that guidelines be developed for the allocation of space to student groups.

Some factors to consider are:

1. The current allocation of student/faculty/administrative space on campus. Are all spaces being properly utilized, and if not, how can spaces be reallocated? (Keeping in mind that if a meeting space has already been provided, it will be very difficult to take it away.)
2. Best practices of similar institutions. Are there some examples that can be taken from other schools who thought of innovative ways to solve this space issue?
3. Encouraging interaction, rather than creating segregation among the student body. While it is important that each student group maintain its distinct identity, would providing separate spaces be the best option? A university should be a place where different groups of students come together and share experiences.
4. Ensuring appropriate accommodations are available. For example, if a meeting space is provided for commuter students, is the location open and accessible during the times that commuter students will need to use it? Can food services be provided during the timeframes convenient for the student group?

Upon consideration of the above factors, the Council agreed that more research needs to be done before reaching a resolution on this issue.

**Budget Update**

C. Casamento reported that CCSU recently submitted a balanced budget in its mid-year report. She further explained that the budget was only balanced as a result of the current number of vacant campus positions, and that there are several factors that could negatively affect the budget next year (i.e.: the Governor’s budget, historically high fringe benefits and salary increases beginning July 1, 2019). She added that considerations must be made in an effort to prepare for possible budget restraints, especially if there is no tuition increase.

**Next Meeting: March 6, 2019**