

**Institutional Strategic Planning Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**

Friday, October 27, 2006

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

**Absent:** Mike Leto, Maria Marron and Tom Storch (co-chair).

**I. KPI Collection**

Richardson informed the committee on the Com Com's progress on KPIs and their request for funding to track the KPIs. The committee decided to wait until December to make any recommendation for funding.

**II. Proposal Review**

***Center for Software Development*** – Priority I

Comments on Strengths

- The project would offer a good experience for students as well as provide for needs within and outside of the university.
- Students would be able to not only develop new software, but also enhance current software.
- Has potential for revenue generation

Comments on Weaknesses

- The link and impact is weak. Taylor noted that many projects coming from this strategy will usually only apply to a specific area and this project is rather broad when considering the limits of the strategy.
- It is unclear whether the students would just be CPS students, but it should include students from CBA. Students with logistics and SAP experience would be good.
- The student pay is rather high as well as the faculty replacement costs.
- It is also unclear how IT is helping financially with this project. Members questioned how much of this work IT is already doing and whether these students could be hired as interns through IT.
- Evaluation and milestones could be strengthened. No specific companies were mentioned as interested in this type of opportunity.

Stipulations

- Engage more closely with CBA faculty and include students from areas other than CPS. Students in the areas of logistics and SAP would be good. This type of center could help with SAP implementation.
- Revisit the budget, especially the student wage rate and the faculty release amount.
- Funding will be provided for three years, but financial buy in from IT should be sought. If funds are found they should be used instead of CMU 2010.

Voting (14 voters)

- 0% Definitely Fund

- 43% Definitely fund w/stipulations and/or reduced scope/budget
- 29% Probably worthy of funding, contingent on other possibilities
- 21% Probably not worthy of funding at this time
- 7% Definitely not worthy of funding at this time

### ***CMU/Flint Partnership*** – Priority II

#### Comments on Strengths

- The university has identified diversity as important goal, but hasn't really had any significant success; this project could help in this area.
- The project would not only help with the recruiting of students, but would also help prepare students for college as well.
- Project could also been seen under Priority IV as well, since it prepares students for college, no matter where they choose to go. If they choose not to go to CMU though, it would be seen as a negative by some. If the project is funded, recruitment numbers would need to be tracked to be sure the project is successful in the area of recruitment of students to CMU
- This type of project could be expanded to the Detroit area and even statewide in the future with additional funding. This is a pilot project, with plans for state-wide expansion outlined in the proposal.

#### Comments on Weaknesses

- Is this project a replacement for GEAR-UP? No, but it is very similar. The high school mentoring is more expanded than GEAR-UP. There is no mention of GEAR-UP, but there would need to be some networking there. It would also be helpful if a scholarship were available for those students involved in the program who decide to attend CMU.
- The high school match is not significant, only provides a place to work, etc.
- Sustainability was a bit of a question. The program would continue to be funded through a grant. A grant writer from the highly successful high schools group would write the grant.

#### Stipulations

- Program would need to work closely with the Assistant Vice President for Diversity and collaborate with similar programs.
- All students involved in the program should be tracked to see what college they choose to attend.
- If any funding is received for this project it should replace CMU 2010 funding.
- A recommendation will be offered to the president that CMU scholarship money be dedicated to successful students in this program who choose to come to CMU.

#### Voting (15 voters)

- 33% Definitely Fund
- 60% Definitely fund w/stipulations and/or reduced scope/budget
- 7% Probably worthy of funding, contingent on other possibilities
- 0% Probably not worthy of funding at this time
- 0% Definitely not worthy of funding at this time

***The Advanced Materials Research Initiative: Exploiting Synergy to Attain National Prominence in Materials Research at CMU – Priority III***

Comments on Strengths

- Some wondered whether this project would increase CMU's national prominence
- The argument was made that CMU's Physics department is the department CMU is most known for.
- The quality of faculty on this project is a huge strength.
- The project relies heavily on external funding. This will help with national prominence, but if the external funding doesn't happen then the project wouldn't be funded on an ongoing basis.
- The project would be a strong foundation were the department to have a PhD program.

Comments on Weaknesses

- Student learning outcomes need to be addressed and most of the existing outcomes are numerical but not qualitative.
- Why isn't collaboration taking place right now? The funding would provide additional time and grad students. The funding would provide a ½ time P&A, but how would that person make collaboration happen. Perhaps the project leaders should consider a faculty position instead of a P&A.
- The hiring of temporary faculty relieves other faculty of their class load, but not other service requirements which then fall to the regular faculty.
- Although this project will help faculty collaborate, no specific collaboration project was mentioned.
- Benchmarks for strategy 2 are needed.
- The Ph.D. program has not been approved by the provost to proceed through the curricular process.

Stipulations

- Student learning outcomes need to be identified.
- One person will need to be identified as the leader for contact with Academic Affairs and to supervise the P&A position.
- If other funding is found for this project it should be used instead of CMU 2010 funds.

Voting (16 voters)

- 19% Definitely Fund
- 56% Definitely fund w/stipulations and/or reduced scope/budget
- 19% Probably worthy of funding, contingent on other possibilities
- 0% Probably not worthy of funding at this time
- 6% Definitely not worthy of funding at this time

***CMU Center for Driving Evaluation, Education and Research (DEER) – Priority IV***

Comments on Strengths

- This project would be a good combination with the Bridges Center and the Fall & Balance Center.

- Some questioned whether there is demand for this type of center, but others believed that it must be in demand if the center plans on being fully self-sustaining in five years.

#### Comments on Weaknesses

- Project leaders should consider changing the name of the center.
- The simulator is to be funded externally. CMU 2010 funds should not be supplied for this project until the external funds for the simulator have been received.
- The ¼ FTE figure in the budget is not correct and the cost for the graduate assistant may also be high.
- This project does not apply to Priority II strategy 3.
- Proposal developer may be out of compliance with an ORSP guideline, which implies he 'should not university funding.'

#### Stipulations

- The title for the center should be reconsidered.
- In order to receive CMU 2010 funding, external funds for the simulator must be identified.

#### Voting (15 voters)

- 13% Definitely Fund
- 53% Definitely fund w/stipulations and/or reduced scope/budget
- 27% Probably worthy of funding, contingent on other possibilities
- 0% Probably not worthy of funding at this time
- 7% Definitely not worthy of funding at this time

### **III. Overall Funding Recommendations**

Members voted 11 to 3 to not release any information about the ISPC recommendations, not even to Priority Committees. Funded projects will be announced after the president has reviewed the ISPC's recommendations and made the final decision.

In a summary repelling on the proposals to confirm support for the projects, in light of other funding recommendations, the following votes of support were obtained:

- 12 members voted to fund the Center for Software Development project with stipulations.
- Members voted unanimously to fund the CMU/Flint Partnership project with stipulations.
- 13 members voted to fund the Advanced Materials project with stipulations.
- 13 members voted to fund the DEER Center project with stipulations.

Respectfully submitted, Kara Beery, recorder