

**Institutional Strategic Planning Committee**  
May 9, 2006 Retreat

Present: Becky Kraus (facilitator), Marcy Taylor, Carole Richardson (non-member), Carole Haas, Roger Rehm, Marvis Lary, Tom Storch, Dan Nowiski, Brad Swartz, Bill Dailey, Mike Leto, Monica Holmes, Jim Hageman, Catherine Riordan, Kara Beery (non-member) and Mary Meier (non-member)

Absent: Gary Dunbar, Steve Poe, George Ross and Judy Lannen

**I. Resource Engine**

- The House and the Senate have different formula funding. Contributing factors – financial aid allocation/budgeting, graduation rate
- Enrollment management & economic analysis is a factor in resources, need to find that balance.

**II. Brand**

- CMU takes average/typical students and helps mold them into good, effective students/citizens, especially for the state of MI.
- The state needs to provide excellent education and CMU is the place for that. CMU could double its size to accomplish this.
- Emphasize that this is the place for students who want to be involved in undergraduate research, a place where the faculty know their name and students have the opportunity to work one on one with faculty.
- CMU helps students realize their potential.
- Adequate academic advising for students has been a difficulty. How to solve? Faculty advisors – time issue & Gen Ed requirements are confusing – purchase advising system (already have it but not using it). Recruit “level 5” faculty who can advise students. Do a detailed study (maybe Jim Collins) on what students need as far as advising goes to be effective/successful.
- Also hire level 5 leaders in other areas of the university.

**III. Best At**

- CMU prepares students *from all walks of life* for their chosen futures better than any other institution of higher education in the nation. (wording needs to better reflect what was discussed)
- We need to figure out why we are good at this – internal study and then share with priority committees, colleges & departments. Could survey alumni.
- We are nationally prominent for all of this, but no one knows about it.

Are we really effective?/Why?/How do we find out?

- Alumni survey and/or focus groups (include international graduates)
- Student focus groups: Leadership, seniors
- Faculty focus groups
- Analyze all existing data: NSSE, capstone essays, assessment data
- International students of color

How do we measure it?

- Graduation rate according to ACT scores
- Outcomes – student careers after graduation
- Look at predictive modeling data – graduating more education majors vs taking longer to graduate
- Competitive analysis, benchmarking

How do we institutionalize this/apply it to everything else?

- Need statement from upper level executives defining national prominence\* in this way
- Buy-in is needed from all groups

How do we share it?

- Catherine & Carole will report to the ISPC about the data/measures available. Urgency is needed and data should be combined with KPIs. Timeline: look at what already exists over the summer (report date Sept 15), OIR help, hire a temp?
- Keep Academic Senate informed with yearly report, share enthusiasm.
- Key messages update through PR & Marketing (update to ISPC in June)
- President should update staff at the fall meeting.
- Cannot Over Communicate
- We should identify the rankings that we are going to acknowledge and follow.

*\*This is not a change to the strategic plan, it is a focus. This clarifies that the vision statement is to achieve national prominence primarily for what we are already doing, not for what we can add to our list of things we do. We should also strive to attain national prominence because of excellence in certain areas.*

#### **IV. KPIs**

- Above “epiphany” won’t necessarily have a drastic effect on current KPIs. Once the data has been collected and analyzed, KPIs could be tweaked from there.
- How were KPIs chosen, how were goals/numbers chosen?

#### **V. Critical Issues**

Succession Planning

- ISPC
  - Need representatives from staff (PA Council), students (SGA President), Faculty (COC Chair, Academic Senate Chair(s)), Priority Committee Chairs, VP’s, Dean(s), Provost & Vice Provost
  - Need strong faculty presence, knowledge of financial budgets
  - Balance of male/female, minority representatives, Dean of Students office
  - Agreement: no representative from PA Council, HR representative instead (Amy McGinnis)
  - 5-year term
  - Don’t replace Judy Lannen or George Ross
  - Replace Gary Dunbar with another faculty member
  - Steve Poe stay on ISPC for another semester? Yes
- Priority Chairs/Committees

- Priority II – Dailey will give recommendations to ISPC to replace members that are no longer interested, unable or did not attend regularly.
  - Priority I – Need more faculty, perhaps some that are not involved in programs directly related to T&L. Look at letter of invitation for 5-year invitation. Dismiss those who have missed several meetings.
  - Priority IV – Nancy French stepping down, Steve Poe stepping down after a semester, Brad Swartz too busy – ISPC will address. Adding Bob Ebner as a member.
  - Priority Committee chairs can recommend to the ISPC additional/replacement members.
  - Student representation needed on I, II, IV – Dan make recommendations?
  - Orientation for new ISPC & Priority Committee members - annually
- Engaging Colleges, Units & Deans-Provost (get others to plug in \$ to make this happen)
- *Not addressed at meeting*

#### RFP Process

- Clear Expectations
  - Base funding is not an option, but multi-year funding is an option.
  - Priority committees should have specific areas where they are looking for proposals to come from for FY08.
  - All FY07 proposals due Oct 2. (Carole will work out a timeline)
  - For FY08 – proposals due in January (look if feasible)
- Base funding is not really an option, but multi-year is an option.
- Rubric/Criteria
  - Needs to be redone, clarified. Rubric didn't show the differences between proposals and different sections of the rubric need to be clearer, more defined. Categories on the rubric weren't necessarily the reason(s) why proposals were recommended to the ISPC.
  - Criteria suggestions should be sent to Academic Affairs so that a new criteria/rubric can be discussed at early June ISPC meeting.
- Priority Allocations – Earmarking (minimum guaranteed)
  - *Not addressed at meeting*

#### Priority Committee level of empowerment

- *Not addressed at meeting*

#### Follow up on funded proposals

- *Not addressed at meeting*

## VI. Overall feeling from Retreat

### Taylor

- Work done on second day AM was good. Work done by Priority Committee on First day PM was very helpful, identified specific areas to focus on.

### Richardson

- Work done by committees very helpful

### Haas

- First day rather long, work done in the afternoon should have been done earlier in the day. Second day very effective, good direction for CMU 2010.

### Lary

- First day rather light & basic, we are past that stage. Second day good.

Storch

- First day not very effective. Second day AM very effective and just had to work through specifics in the afternoon. Priority Committees should be exposed to Collins book.

Nowiski

- Idea from second day AM is a good link for all areas of CMU 2010, need to get students to identify and focus on this. First day was good for different reasons.

Leto

- Second day AM was exciting, PM work perhaps could happen outside of the committee, got bogged down a bit.

Holmes

- Second day, good, disappointed that didn't get to KPIs. First day was not useful until the afternoon.

Hageman

- First day AM was very good/valuable, PM not useful except for last hour. Second day – good to great very helpful and a good framework to follow.

Riordan

- First day was helpful for priority committees – better idea of how things are functioning and where we are going, good to get to know the people that you are working with on a deeper level. Positive interactions on Second day couldn't have happened without the first day.