

Institutional Strategic Planning Committee
Thursday, October 12, 2006

Present: Bill Dailey, Linda Dielman, Nancy French, Carol Haas, Marvis Lary, Amy McGinnis, Dan Nowiski, Wayne Osborn, Orlando Perez, Steve Poe, Carole Richardson, Catherine Riordan (co-chair), Katherine Rosier, George Ross, Tom Storch (co-chair), Brad Swartz and Marcy Taylor

Absent: Mike Leto, Maria Marron and Roger Rehm

I. Update on CMU 2010 Progress

- Riordan informed the committee that the CMU 2010 funding has had positive impacts in projects around campus including the First-Year Experience program.
- Perez and Taylor gave an excellent presentation to the Board of Trustees in September.
- A future presentation to the UBAC may be needed in the near future to request additional funds.
- The group will likely have another discussion about Collins' hedgehog concept.
- A CMU 2010 presentation to the Academic Senate will hopefully take place in the next two weeks. Input on the presentation details and presenters will be sought through email.

II. Priority Committee Reports

Priority I – Marcy Taylor

- Taylor noted that the committee has met twice and may have some input on KPIs.
- The committee has also reviewed the proposals for the FY07 second call.
- Taylor noted that the committee is looking for buy-in/commitment from the ISPC on their stipulations for FY08.
- For FY08, the committee is especially interested in proposals from strategies 1 & 2:
 - Strategy 1 – The committee would like to see proposals that impact multiple disciplines and promote a culture that values learning.
 - Strategy 2 – The committee would like to see proposals that affect a large number of students, increase the national prominence of the program, impact student learning in the program/field, and show a relationship between the synthesizing experience and program-level assessment.

Priority II – Orlando Perez

- Perez noted that the committee has met once and has reviewed their charge and has added a student, Tashana Taylor, to their committee.
- The committee has not yet discussed FY08 stipulations yet.
- The committee may want to conduct a survey through Mary Senter that would require CMU 2010 funding, but the project cost would be minimal, so it would not be a proposal.

Priority III – Kate Rosier

- The Priority III committee will meet next week to review the FY07 second call proposals and the committee should have the FY08 stipulations figured out by early November. The committee will also review its membership after reviewing the proposals.
- The committee found that the rubric did not address all categories and so will include the overall quality of the proposal under the link & impact category and will include the qualifications of personnel under the outcomes anticipated category.

Priority IV – Linda Dielman

- The Priority IV committee has not yet discussed FY08 stipulations, but should decide on them by the end of October.

Priority V – Carole Richardson

- The Priority V committee has discussed FY08 stipulations and Richardson will send those to Riordan.
- The committee did not receive any proposals for the FY07 second call so they have been discussing the KPIs.
- Osborn noted that one possible proposal under Priority V would be to hold a series of workshops on integrity.

The full list of stipulations will not be available until November, but stipulations will be shared as soon as they come in with the ISPC and in draft form in the proposal workshops and web.

*The committee FY08 proposal workshop scheduled for 10/19 will be held even though not all stipulations will be available.

III. KPIs

- Richardson explained the upper level and detailed KPIs and explained that green/yellow/red light labels:
 - Green – Data is currently being collected.
 - Yellow – Data is not currently being collected, but could be with minimal resources.
 - Red – Data is not currently being collected and significant resources would be needed to do so.
- The Com Com may come forward with a funding proposal to obtain the data that is not currently being collected.
- Members questioned what the KPIs should be used for other than to help write a better CMU 2010 proposal. The KPIs should be used as the basis for goals and performance reviews. This would need to be implemented from the top down.
- The priority committees will need to review and approve at least the top level KPIs by mid November.
- Members noted that ProfEd is not included, but should be. That data will be listed separately so not to give an inaccurate picture of the campus as a whole.
- Internal benchmarks should be tracked to monitor progress and priority committees will need to establish targets.

IV. Proposal Review Process

- ISPC members will use the rubric to rate each proposal and rubric scores should be sent in advance of the Oct 27th meeting.
- Members noted that the grading from the deans may be inflated.
- Any project leader and/or senior officer involved in a proposal should not vote on the proposal and should leave the room during discussion of the proposal.
- The rubric should be used during evaluation, but final recommendations will not simply be a summary of the initial ratings, but also include the balance of recommendations across priorities and the conjoint impact of the proposals on the campus.

Respectfully submitted,
Kara Beery