**To:** Committee on Planning and Priorities

**From:**  Steering Committee

**Re:** Planning domain

**Date:** December 2010

Background

The Steering Committee’s review of governance has brought to light a need for a system of institutional planning which benefits from community participation in the same way that the current governance process benefits. To accommodate this, Steering is planning on releasing a draft of revisions of the governance document that brings the work of institutional planning into shared governance. However, it is evident that the existing processes that have been used for making recommendations to the administration on issues concerning policy, program and procedure will not transfer exactly to institutional planning. Moreover, from the testimony gathered as part of this review, it is evident that Planning Councils, those governance bodies that have been formed in an attempt to institutionalize planning, have had an uneven record of utility and effectiveness.

Additionally, we recognize that the Committee on Planning and Priorities has been working, almost since the inception of the new governance structure, on defining appropriate roles for itself in setting institutional priorities and participating in institutional planning at the highest level. We feel that, in terms of the former, CPP has come a long way, while in the latter, more clarity is still needed.

Lastly, we recognize that the new draft of the governance document embraces three roles for shared governance:

1. Making recommendations about policy, program and procedure to the administration;
2. Interpreting the mission of the college and setting institutional priorities; and,
3. Developing and bringing community participation into institutional planning.

Historically, the second and third of these have been the purview of CPP. While these three roles are intimately entwined, they are different in terms of process and output. Because of this, the governance bodies that have evolved to do the first well are less well-equipped to perform the others.

Steering has been working on fine tuning the part of shared governance that makes recommendations. The remaining work is to develop a structure of institutional planning and a process that ensures intimate connections among the bodies doing these three jobs. Steering hopes that CPP will do the former and work with Steering to do the latter.

Below is excerpted material from the draft of the revision of the governance document:

From section 1 of the draft of the governance revision.

The governance structure is made up of two domains: policy/procedure/program and planning. The policy/procedure/program domain consists of three components: 1) the Steering Committee; 2) Standing Committees; 3) Program Councils and Faculty Committees. The planning domain will be steered by the Committee on Planning and Priorities (CPP) which will be charged to design the structure of a planning process that is inclusive, transparent and effective. In each of these domains and components, the three campus constituencies -- faculty, students, and staff/administration--are represented, except in the “Faculty Committees” (see below). The two domains are linked so that policies resulting from the shared governance process inform planning, and policy needs that result from planning decisions are considered within the governance system.

[Description of Policy/procedure/program domain omitted]

*Planning Domain:*

Planning is an on-going process that is distinct from the consideration of the policy/procedure/program issues in governance, but benefits from similar shared participation of all members of the campus community. Concurrent to the current review of governance, CPP will lead the design of the structure of the planning domain.

*Linkage between the two Domains:*

Communication is required between the Steering Committee and CPP, in the form of a joint meeting each semester and regular communication between their chairs. This will ensure that policy/procedure/program issues being considered in governance that may also have implications for short or long term planning are considered by CPP and the planning process. In turn, this communication also will ensure that planning decisions originating in the Planning Domain that generate issues of policy/program/procedure are directed by Steering to the appropriate Standing Committee or Program Council.

Concurrrent to the 2010 review of governance, CPP was charged to lead the design of the planning domain. This design will be subject to the usual governance process, so it is expected that it will not be completed before the completion of the governance review. The final form of the planning domain will eventually be described in in section 7 of the 2010 governance document replacing the current section 7 which is the charge to CPP.

Charge to CPP:

CPP is asked to develop a structure and processes through which TCNJ engages in planning at an institutional level. This includes determining a body, which may be CPP, that will provide oversight to the Planning domain in much the same way that Steering steers and provides oversight to governance in the Policy/Procedure/Program domain. CPP should consider the importance of efficacy, community engagement, communication, transparency, flexibility and assessment while developing this structure. CPP should define institutional planning and describe an output of planning processes that can regularly be reviewed.

In its deliberations, CPP should consider the effectiveness of the current planning councils. It is not essential that the final planning structure should maintain these planning councils as they are currently constituted and charged. However, there should be mechanisms by which cabinet officers receive and respond to feedback as planning is done.

In addition, CPP is asked to revisit their own charge and membership. It is expected that CPP will maintain responsibility for evaluating strategic needs and priorities of the College’s Mission and Core Beliefs and continue to support the President’s development and periodic review of the College’s institutional strategic plan.