

Institutional Strategic Planning Committee

Monday, December 19, 2005

2:30-5:00p.m.

Denison Conference Room (HP 2220)

Present: Thomas Storch (co chair), Catherine Riordan (co chair), Bill Dailey, Gary Dunbar, Nancy French, Carol Haas, Angela Haddad, Jim Hageman, Judy Lannen, Marvis Lary, Roger Rehm, George Ross and Marcy Taylor

Absent: Christine Alwood, Monica Holmes, Mike Leto and Steve Poe

I. Committee Reports

A. Teaching & Learning – Marcy Taylor

- First year initiative update was handed out. Riordan gave a presentation on NSSE results.
- Math initiative update? Math submitted a proposal for a Math center. T& L committee sent it back and recommended they submit for year 2 funding. Will mention possible year one funds to prepare for Math center.
- Capstone courses update? Webster presented some information, but will be getting more results and will present a full update.

B. Diversity & Global Perspectives – Bill Dailey

- Data on percentage of students in each racial group was handed out. Priority committee made a goal to double these percentages.
- IEC will be sending out a survey to build a database on international resources.
- MDEC will be sending out a survey to find diversity in courses.
- One question that may need to be answered is whether funding should go outside of the infrastructure or if it should go to areas already established. There is nothing wrong with funding areas that have already been established, but there should also be some outcomes that are expected.
- Dailey will check on possible data on why students did not choose CMU, or did not stay at CMU. (FIPSE program is something that worked in the past)

C. Research & Creative Activity – Jim Hageman/Gary Dunbar

- Update report on this committee was handed out.
- President's Task Force on Research & Creative Activity has met twice. Task force agreed to read Scholarship Reconsidered and Scholarship Assessed. Will a plan be in place to take proposals in the spring? Yes, but clear criteria need to be established and it is expected these will be ready.
- Workgroup four has looked at benchmark data and has found CMU to be consistently below average.

D. Public Service – Nancy French

- An updated report was handed out.
- The group is redoing their KPIs and would like to focus their RFPs to areas that would be most successful in gaining national prominence: The Volunteer Center, The Carls Center, Faculty and Staff service (Bringing Life to Scholarship program in HP), Cultural Events for the Public (lectures, events and facility), The Sexual Aggression Peer Advocates program.
- Committee will also be looking at Charter Schools and Public Broadcasting when they get more information that wasn't available at the time they met.

- What events would we gain with this development? Possibly the type of events out at the casino? Committee agreed that events wouldn't necessarily be popular artists or events, but more cultural events.
- Would there be a study done on the amount of money put into an events center and the amount of return on that investment? Yes, there would need to be and this possibility is not very likely. Each college does have money for speakers/events and there may need to be more of an effort made to make sure there is no duplication going on.
- Calendar project is going on now and the group is looking at using a calendar similar to the one that RSOs use on campus.

E. Culture of Integrity – Roger Rehm

- Inventory on integrity policies is taking place and the committee is finding duplications. The group will be looking at possible ways (using technology) to resolve this duplication issue.
- Committee will need a future ISPC agenda item to discuss possible ways to assess the progress of CMU 2010.
- Policy on policies will need to be enforced.
- Has infrastructure and resources been discussed during a priority committee meeting?
No, not yet.

II. Funding Recommendations – Year One Initiatives

A. Teaching & Learning Priority – Marcy Taylor (Handouts)

1. *Strategy 3, Initiative 2 (ENG 201 Implementation)*

- The proposal was to have a week long workshop during the summer for ENG 201 faculty to help with the implementation of new ENG 201 requirements.
- What are the new requirements? One example of the new requirements is that ENG 201 will now be multidisciplinary instead of disciplinary specific.
- Why won't this workshop be required? Don't know how to make that possible, could do it during the semester.
- ProfEd has a syllabus tool that may be useful with these new competency requirements. Teleconferencing for this workshop may be a useful tool for ProfEd instructors.
- VOTE: 11 Yes 0 No

2. *Strategy 5, Initiative 2 (Honors Program)*

- The proposal was to have three consultants from the NCHC come and evaluate the Honors Program.
- Is the funding amount that they have down accurate, is it enough? Yes
- Why are three consultants needed? They would each handle a different aspect and have experience within other Honors Programs/Colleges.
- What is the expected outcome? To have information on how to run the Honors Program more efficiently/effectively.
- Shouldn't there be follow-up funding so that they can move on with the consultants recommendations? Not necessarily, if more funding is needed then another funding request may be submitted.
- Were these proposals solicited? Yes, members of the committee went to their areas to get proposals because there were specific year one initiatives.
- VOTE: 9 Yes 2 No

3. *Strategy 4, Initiative 1 (First-Year Experience)*

- The proposal was to take seven members of the ARLSA committee to a conference in Atlanta in February.
- Is this a conference that they typically go to anyway? No, this is a new committee and Jack Logomarsino would probably attend the conference anyway, but other members would not.
- Is there funding specifically for staff to attend conferences? No, a department would have to use funding from their operational budget.
- VOTE: 8 Yes 3 No

4. *Strategy 3, Initiative 3 (Writing Center)*

- The proposal was to fund release time for a faculty member “to better support both student and faculty services for writing across the university”.
- Is funding for one person enough? Yes, she has two staff members already and the department plans on asking for additional funding in the future.
- What is the outcome? There is no tangible report mentioned in the proposal, but if funding is approved the committee could require an outcome report to be submitted. Year 2 will be more structured but it is necessary to make sure year 1 funding is accomplishing something.
- A discussion may be needed to discuss whether funding is necessary for a consultant rather than funding to have staff/faculty do the work themselves.
- VOTE: 10 Yes 1 No

5. *Strategy 1, Initiative 1 (Raising Academic Standards)*

- The proposal was to fund a consultant, Dr. Laurie Richlin, to “present and discuss the variety of methods open to faculty for evaluating teaching.”
- Outcome? The consultant will have findings which will hopefully result into recommendations for changes.
- Again, dissemination of findings is necessary as well as a report of findings submitted.
- Possible year 2 funding is to have a department in each college implement changes that are recommended.
- VOTE: 11 Yes 0 No

B. Diversity & Global Perspectives Priority – Bill Dailey

1. *Strategy 2, Initiative 1/Strategy 3, Initiative 2 (Syllabus Survey for Diversity Curriculum)*

- This proposal was to have students go through the master course syllabi and identify how often diversity appears in the courses.
- VOTE: 11 Yes 0 No

2. *(Pilot Study for diversity and Global Perspectives)*

- Committee will wait until the next meeting to discuss this proposal.

III. Budget Update – Tom Storch

- Funding requests will be accepted twice each year. Will there be a certain amount of funding allotted each time? No, it may all be given out the first time each year, but if the process is being successful then the BOT would be willing to look at the possibility of finding funding for more than the allotted amount.
- Year 2, 3, etc initiatives need to be established in advance. A lot of year one initiatives will carryover to year two and priority committees could come forward with new initiatives. When do these initiatives need to be set?

- Move “Vision fund approved in budget” up to July
- There needs to be a university-wide call for proposals. Have the Senate announce the deadlines and identify the chairs of the subcommittees.

IV. RFP Draft – Year Two Initiative Process – Catherine Riordan

- Use the same RFP for each priority committee? Yes, but maybe have a main form and alter it based on priority committee.
- Can an area/department apply for funding in multiple places? Yes, but perhaps have them note where else they have requested these funds from. Encourage them to ask for funds in multiple places.
- Selection criteria #6 may not be possible for certain areas. This does not apply to base funding requests. A space is needed where they can note whether it is base funding or one-time funding that they are asking for.
- The committee agreed to finalize the form in January.
- Adjust wording in selection criteria #5

V. Communication Plan Implementation – Carole Richardson

Send link to committee prior to sending to supervisors

VI. Next Semester Meetings

No resolution at this time