

**Institutional Strategic Planning Committee**  
**Thursday, January 18, 2007**  
**Lary Conference Room**

**Present:** Bill Dailey, Linda Dielman, Nancy French, Carol Haas, Marvis Lary, Dan Nowiski, Wayne Osborn, Orlando Perez, Roger Rehm, Carole Richardson, George Ross, Catherine Riordan, Gary Shapiro, Brad Swartz and Denise Webster (representing Marcy Taylor).

**Absent:** Maxine Kent, Mike Leto, Kate Rosier, Marcy Taylor

**I. New Members**

- Gary Shapiro – interim provost
- Maxine Kent – replacement for Amy McGinnis on maternity leave

**II. FY08 Submissions & Review Process**

- 22 proposals have been submitted with the majority of proposals falling under Priority I or II.
- One major research proposal has been submitted, but other proposals may come in.
- Proposals are posted on the secure planning website.
- More pros and cons given by committee members would be helpful during the evaluation of proposals.

**Update on revision of rubric**

- Overall quality added to the Link & Impact section.
- Qualifications of personnel added to the Outcomes Anticipated section.

**III. Discussion of timeline for FY09**

- The committee discussed different timeline possibilities presented by Richardson for the FY09 RFP process.
- Members agreed that the ISPC should not consider the major research proposals separate from the other proposals.
- The committee preferred a fall deadline for FY09, but acknowledged that the review of proposals should not take place at the end of the semester.
- Richardson will alter the timeline to make the deadline for proposals in mid-October, then shifting the timeline earlier in the semester by 2 months. She will resend the altered timeline to members electronically.
- Members discussed the possibility of committees identifying their stipulations as soon as possible so that the RFP can go out during the Spring semester.

**IV. Strategic Planning DVD**

- Members watched a DVD of Roberta Katz speaking about Change Management and Strategic Planning.

The following items were mentioned during the committee's discussion:

- Members noted President Rao sometimes states things in ways that the Vision Plan doesn't make as clear.
- Members acknowledged that keeping the vision statement, priorities, strategies and stipulations straight can be difficult for the university community.

- Members agreed that a strategic planning day with the president and vice presidents would be very helpful. The goal(s) could then be clarified and defined from the top first and then let the priority committees could go from there.
- Priority Committees are seeing proposals from all different areas across campus. Since CMU 2010 has been in existence for a couple of years, the group should be able to identify one thing/project/area to focus on for Teaching & Learning, Diversity & Global Perspectives, etc.
- One recurring flaw in the proposal review process is that committees are reviewing proposal quality rather than looking for proposals that will move the institution forward.
- If effort is expended, any proposal can be linked to a priority, which is another reason why one specific thing/project/area should be identified from each priority.

**VI. Discussion of Year 1 Initiatives**

- Several of these initiatives remain unfinished even though they were established as low hanging fruit.
- The priority committees could be consulted to determine whether these really are the things that will move us forward.

Respectfully submitted, Kara Beery, recorder