

## **Institutional Strategic Planning Committee**

Friday, March 3, 2006

2:30-5:00p.m.

Denison Conference Room (HP 2220)

**Present:** Tom Storch, Catherine Riordan, Gary Dunbar, Jim Hageman, Marvis Lary, Roger Rehm, George Ross, Marcy Taylor, Brad Swartz, Bob Newby (substitute for Bill Dailey) Nancy French, Monica Holmes.

**Absent:** Judy Lannen, Carol Haas.

Guest: Michael Rao, President, reporters.

### **I: Committee Reports**

The Committee Chairs were asked to talk about the general trends they were seeing in submitted RFP's to date.

#### ***Priority #1, Marcy Taylor***

The committee needs direction on KPI identification. The focus of RFP's being received appears to be general education. It appears that a Gen Ed Coordinator may be needed. Emphasis also continues with recruiting efforts - diverse students and faculty.

At the moment, the committee has received proposals that total \$570K in base. Marcy stated that the committee will have many difficult decisions ahead of them. Additionally, there are proposals for \$70,000 in one time funds, including FACit, inter-disciplinary infrastructure, student life and the first year experience. There is also a RFP for one time funds of \$50,000 for clickers for the classroom. The committee is concerned about the amount of available dollars to fund these initiatives.

#### ***Priority #2, Bob Newby (for Bill Dailey)***

Bob stated that the committee has reviewed a number of proposals to date. The proposals include several International Center proposals, Admissions recruitment of students and also one for a proposal for students who get Cofer to have their own college. Bob also mentioned that Robert Laird, undergrad admissions at Berkeley will be visiting the campus to speak early April.

#### ***Priority #3, Jim Hageman & Gary Dunbar***

The approved 2005 undergrad research initiatives are now funded for 20 undergrad students. This should result in a 25% increase in student publications. Materials have also been put together to enhance undergrad education at CMU. The committee is exploring ways to target the materials. They will look at comparative data from other institutes. The committee anticipates more proposals from FRCE and the Presidents Task Force.

#### ***Priority #4, Nancy French***

The Volunteer Center communication plan is complete. A senior student has been nominated for national recognition. The committee is busy recording data. The plan will

help do that. The committee is launching an Events subcommittee. The committee will have a University calendar in place by fall '06. A subcommittee is also meeting to look at faculty service and what to benchmark. The requests through RFP's currently received have been low, except for CARRS. The committee is also expecting to receive a RFP from events staff for \$60,000 for K-2 Outreach and the Volunteer Center.

***Priority #5, Roger Rehm***

The committee is working well with the Communication Committee. The Priority #5 committee is reviewing the administrative policy manual. They are developing a plan on how to move forward. Roger stated that the RFP's appear to be basic to their charge. An infrastructure to support their work is necessary. The proposals being submitted to Priority #4 and #5 will help put together a structure behind the committee's decision making. Conceivably, \$500,000 in proposals could be gathered from Priority #4-5 joint proposals.

The committees will need to do surveys to gather input to construct the KPI's. However, the committees do not want to inundate the campus with multiple surveys. Roger suggested that surveys be combined or staggered, etc.

(Further discussion resulted in the determination that the Communications committee will be the clearinghouse for survey development. George Ross indicated that he has several surveys currently underway including HR and Purchasing.)

**II. Remarks from President Rao**

The President spoke of his appreciation for the efforts of the ISPC and Priority committee membership in furthering CMU 2010. He also pledged his support in championing the plan in the days and months ahead.

**III. Additional Priority Committee Issues**

***Proposal Protocol Recommendations***

1. Approval of RFP Scoring Rubric

The Rubric format and scoring was unanimously approved by the ISPC. It was decided that the committees would have the individual discretion of assigning weights to different factors. Committees can add additional categories if they choose.

2. The Committee agreed that the Priority committees would submit an average overall rubric rating for each proposal they reviewed. This would then be given to the ISPC.

3. The Priority committees will come back to the ISPC with a summary Rubric for each RFP. A copy will also be provided to the applicant.

4. Proposals rejected at the committee level will be notified by the ISPC.

5. The ISPC will receive both rejects and acceptances RFP results.

### ***Funding***

1. There will be no predetermination of funding amounts to each Priority committee.

### ***Protocol for Review of Proposals***

1. If there are proposals that address multiple priorities, it will be received by the most applicable committee. Copies will be forwarded to the Chair of the other sub-priorities it also impacts.
2. Academic Affairs will send a response to the appropriate Sr. Officer and the proposer – when each proposal is received.
3. Note - It is very important that the campus understands the differences between one time dollars and base dollars.

### ***Committee Protocols to Ensure Integrity of Process***

1. Seeking Further Information As A Result Of Incomplete Or Sketchy RFP's  
The committees initially felt that they would need to use their best judgment about possibly going back and asking more questions. The group discussed the fact that this is possible if you only have a few proposals but becomes far more difficult if you have a large number of submissions. The policy decision was made that committees would not seek clarifying information. Each request and RFP will be judged on its own merits without further questioning.

### **IV. CommComm Report**

The question was asked: How can the CommComm best support the KPI work in each committee? Committee chairs in attendance recommended the group attend a priority committee meeting.

Nancy French presented the Communication plan. The plan will reach people 5 times a quarter, hopefully furthering the understanding of the plan. The plan consists of 4 elements; 1) a monthly update via CMUTODAY, web site, the first week of month. 2) A quarterly detailed update newsletter on the website as well as paper copy. CommComm is working with SGA to circulate these as well. It will include personal, success stories – human interest pieces. 3) An annual review – with media and an external audience to celebrate success. 4) A December-January annual preview of future directions. This could be sent to the media. The plan is primarily for internal use. One image piece has already been done – and sent out to other universities.

CommComm is also considering sponsoring a contest for the best ideas – with prizes – once a year. Nancy stated that the committee needs \$38,000 to implement the plan; \$28,000 for the newsletter and to fund 2 part-time students to find and write stories. The committee would need the funding by April.

The Provost agreed to fund the program for one year, with the stipulation that there be tangible outcomes that there has been an increased awareness for the plan, etc. George Ross stated that he will match those funds if we include a broader view of all the success

stories on campus. He also encouraged the ISPC to think of success stories and results in a broader vision than just those directly connected with current strategic initiatives.

#### **V. Bottom Line Request for FY'07 Budget**

1. The Committee discussed the amount of funding they expected to be requesting. After much discussion, George Ross recommended and the group appeared to support the position of asking for \$1mil, plus any the .7 mil roll-over from FY '06 funds, informing the UBAC that the ISPC would present a revised budget in October '06. This will allow the committee to provide a much clearer picture of funding.
2. The committee concurred that it is critical that funded proposals that do not meet their stated outcomes be eliminated.

#### **VI. Upcoming Meetings/May Retreat**

1. We need to determine a location for the April meeting.
2. Plans are underway for a May retreat. The Committee needs to approve dates, a meeting format and agenda. Feedback will be gathered through e-mail.