

**Institutional Strategic Planning Committee**  
**Wednesday, June 7, 2006**

**Present:** Catherine Riordan (co-chair), Tom Storch (co-chair), Bill Dailey, Nancy French, Carol Haas, Jim Hageman, Monica Holmes, Becki Kraus (consultant), Marvis Lary and Marcy Taylor

**I. Relationship between IUBAC and ISPC**

IUBAC stands for Interim University Budget Advisory Committee. This type of a committee was recommended by consultant Ed Whalen. The committee has 18 members, most of which are budget experts. College deans are also included and President Rao chairs this committee. The committee will no longer be 'interim'. UBAC is the center for all budget issues: assigning new funds, modifying current budgets, etc.

The relationship between the UBAC and the ISPC is one in which the ISPC will make recommendations to the UBAC for any additional CMU 2010 funding above and beyond the 1 million dollars each year. If the ISPC needed to make such a recommendation it would need to do so probably in the fall (Oct/Nov) and would need to submit a specific dollar amount. The UBAC's process takes a couple of months.

CMU 2010 is currently having little effect on the budgeting decisions coming out of the UBAC. Some who have submitted funding requests to the UBAC have emphasized the project's relationship/link with CMU 2010, but not many. The president made the final decision(s) and had CMU 2010 in mind when doing so. UBAC looks at many areas of the budget, not just new requests for money. UBAC has denied many funding requests and has made tentative decisions – looking into the possibility of projects going forward with only partial funding.

Some projects have sought funding from both the UBAC and CMU 2010. The two processes do need to be clarified but not merged. CMU 2010 is focused on one-time or 3-year monies and then the hope/expectation is that after funding under 2010. If those projects need new funding, they would need to be presented to the UBAC which would recommend ongoing funding. This however is a leap of faith. If there were successful, impactful projects initially funded by the ISPC that the UBAC ignored or did not believe were as valuable as the ISPC did—even when significant evidence is presented-- the progress on the vision would be undermined and create major morale and credibility problems for everyone involved. It was suggested the ISPC/UBAC relationship should be an agenda item for a joint meeting of the UBAC and ISPC. Riordan & French will look at interim messaging clarifying the relationship between UBAC and ISPC and Storch will look at long-term messaging.

In the future, the sustainability section of the rubric should be used to focus evaluation on the project leaders plan on continuing after 2010. Willingness to act on failure to achieve outcomes must be part of the ongoing CMU 2010 funding.

## **II. Annual Planning within divisions underway**

FAS and HR in particular is already actively engaged in aligning their planning with CMU 2010. HR is using software in this process that they will present at the June 27 ISPC meeting that the campus as a whole might be interested in using.

It continues to be important for the ISPC to communicate with campus on expectations for KPI tracking or other needs.

## **III. CMU 2010 Committees**

Overall Membership:

Membership of priority committees will be reaffirmed through a letter.

### **Recommendations to the president**

ISPC: (recommendations to the president)

Add Carole Richardson to the ISPC because of her integral role in the whole process. Linda Dielman should be added as the new chair of Priority IV.

Task Force:

The President's Task Force essentially completed its task of setting up guidelines and launching a selection process. They did a great job. Therefore, the task force should merge with the Priority III committee which will oversee all of Priority III strategies.

Priority III Research & Creative Activity:

Kathy Utecht is leaving

Priority IV Public Service:

Add Bob Ebner & Darcy Orlik, Linda Dielman will be chair

Priority V Culture of Integrity:

Add Hailey Gibbons (student) & Monica Holmes

## **IV. Progress on Year One Initiatives and FY 07 Projects**

Riordan met with those whose proposals were not funded during the FY07 first call on June 5<sup>th</sup> to answer any questions and to look toward the second call. Riordan and Richardson will meet with project leaders for FY 07 projects on June 21<sup>st</sup>. Reports for year one initiative projects are due by the end of 2006.

## **V. RFP Process**

Timeline:

Members reaffirmed its earlier decision that there will be one deadline date for all proposals (including major research proposals.) Distinguishing between the two kinds of proposals is getting easier, but may still be a challenge this next year.

Documents:

The guidelines and rubric have been updated. A footnote should be added to the guidelines explaining what FY 07 means. The members agreed to add an overall quality rating on the rubric and will submit input electronically on the weighting of each category. The categories should be listed in the order that they are weighted.

Remaining Funds:

If the ISPC continues to fund projects the way it has been and the task force funds a 250k project each year then the ISPC will not have much money to allocate in 2008 and 2009. More funds may be needed to continue progress on the vision and motivation to formulate plans in the form of proposals to CMU 2010.

**VI. Board of Trustees Report**

An electronic version of the report will be sent to members for their input. The group thought Gary Dunbar would be a good presenter. Another presenter would be needed. Becki Kraus is working on an evaluation of CMU 2010 progress. Preliminary data will be included in the BOT report.