

1-25-2018

Arts & Technologies Leadership Meeting Minutes, 01.25.2018

Plymouth State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.plymouth.edu/plymouthclusters>

Recommended Citation

Plymouth State University, "Arts & Technologies Leadership Meeting Minutes, 01.25.2018" (2018). *Clusters*. 469.
<https://digitalcommons.plymouth.edu/plymouthclusters/469>

This Text is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ Plymouth State. It has been accepted for inclusion in Clusters by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Plymouth State. For more information, please contact ajpearman@plymouth.edu, chwxson@plymouth.edu.

Leadership Meeting January 25, 2018

Phil, Matt, Linda, Trish, Maria, Ann (chair), Melissa, Lisa, Annette (scribe), John, Nick, Jason, ZhiZhang (Did I miss anyone? If so, Please add your name!)

Ann Facilitated

Decided to identify pros and cons of each model

Remember: This is a beginning structure that we will be voting on—We are also developing bylaws that will evolve depending upon the model we choose. This is a transitional model. Once we decide on model, collaborating on the bylaws and voting on them is our next discussion (as well as defining release time for our cluster).

Model 1 – Cluster Council – formalizes a place for the disciplinary leadership/Officers take on administrative responsibilities

Model 2 – Collaborative Team Model (regardless of discipline)

Model 3 – A Task-based/Officer based Model

PLEASE ADD YOUR INPUT OR CLARIFY ANYTHING THAT YOU THINK NEEDS CLARIFICATION

Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<p>Initial Conversation: Looks too much like status quo (Matt disagrees) Has it been decided that those are the disciplines for model 1 (Phil). Doesn't think art is represented as it is (Matt). Is there flexibility in how things get divided up. Nick says it is too late to change model. Continues with discussion/debate about how disciplines are defined and represented in this model. SOME ATTENDED FELT THAT: Pros: small disciplines have a voice at the table -project heavy participants have more voice at the table -most disciplinary collaborative model (for meetings together) -pseudo bicameral aspect – house of disciplines as a house of reps. With a board of</p>	<p>4-5 committees with at least 3 in committees SOME ATTENDED FELT THAT: Pros: -We can be more efficient. -forces communication among all disciplines. -looks most collaborative/entirely team based -allows clustering to happen organically -a bigger step toward giving the cluster an identity (opposed to being a cluster of these disciplines) -disaggregates power -if there is a cluster major, this model is better equipped to have a coordinator of it. Cons: -a lot of people -Workload</p>	<p>Officers by task – THIS IS THE SMALLEST MODEL by people/staffing SOME ATTENDED FELT THAT: Pros: -considers our timeline -we need people who will talk the talk and someone responsible for cluster, this is more realistic and concentrates authority in fewer people to make people work collaboratively. -COULD MAKE FOR A SMOOTHER TRANSITION Cons: -do the present chairs, doing their present duties, is it feasible to ask can you do this structure too....? (don't fall on default – start to make the transition)</p>

<p>directors element to the senate...elected by the body....it does allow for elected officers and committees (Matt)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -doesn't put everything on the backs of the discipline coordinators. - we have to make sure that who serves understands the other disciplines (Stewardship) <p>Cons: a lot of what we are already doing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -too many meetings -we have to make sure that who serves understands the other disciplines (Stewardship) -(some attendees felt that: reinforces what we already have....(Annette – not fully-disagreed and Melissa agreed and articulated....) -workload concerns with Model 1 -Could burden small programs (unless we address it) -depending upon how elections go, the number of disciplines count so that not all leaders come from one major – could exclude smaller disciplines. -doesn't feel collaborative enough -weights the representatives unequally (Phil) -some disciplines are more or less able to contribute to committee work -Messy if we develop cluster major. <p>Needs 4 elected, then min of 9+ others (or one of the four includes the nine)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Challenge to find this many people who are willing and able to do the work -need right people for right jobs (anybody for any job) -need 15 people to fill this model - some disciplines are more or less able to contribute to committee work -no system of checks and balances (Jason) (BUT WE HAVE A POLICY DRAFT THAT INCLUDES CHECKS AND BALANCES AND BEING ABLE TO REMOVE PEOPLE FROM OFFICE IF APPROPRIATE) – SO WE NEED TO REMEMBER AFTER WE DECIDE ON MODEL, WE WILL RETURN TO DEVELOPING OUR BYLAWS. This applies to all models. <p>Needs 15 people</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Is this concentrated power? - - Are there too few people involved. -is this too much work for just a couple of people? <p>Need 5-6 people</p>
---	---	--