

Institutional Strategic Planning Committee
Thursday, December 7, 2006

Present: Bill Dailey, Linda Dielman, Nancy French, Marvis Lary, Dan Nowiski, Wayne Osborn, Orlando Perez, Steve Poe, Roger Rehm, Catherine Riordan (co-chair), Kate Rosier, Brad Swartz, and Marcy Taylor.

Absent: Carol Haas, Mike Leto, Maxine Kent, Carole Richardson, George Ross and Tom Storch (co-chair).

I. Goodbyes

- This is Steve Poe's last meeting. He will be student teaching in the spring semester.
- This would have been Tom Storch's last meeting. His last day at CMU January 15.

II. FY07 Second Round Proposals

- The President accepted the ISPC recommendations concerning the FY07 second round proposals.
- A couple of stipulations were added to make sure the projects were aligning with institutional procedures. To help with communication, one leader was identified from each project as the contact person.
- Collaboration in CMU/Flint project was not as strong as originally thought, but they are now working together with Gear-up and have even submitted a grant together already.

III. ISPC & UBAC proposals – should both be allowed?

- In the past project leaders have been encouraged to apply for both but some see this as double dipping.
- Two different ways of handling this situation:
 - Require indication on application of other places where funding is being sought
 - CMU 2010-one time funding, UBAC-base funding
- Riordan was willing to work with some other members to create a document that clarifies the responsibilities between the two groups.
- The committee agreed to prohibit duplicate applications between these two groups.

IV. Priority Committee Updates

Priority I – Taylor

- The committee is looking at future strategic directions - ongoing projects as well as possible projects. GenEd could be an area to focus on, as well as Enrollment Management and FYE.
- 3 possible proposers attended an open meeting with ideas concerning civic engagement, information literacy and a CNC lathe.
- Taylor circulated an updated first year initiatives chart and minutes from the last meeting.

Priority II – Perez

- The committee's minutes are available online.
- Discussion of proposal 2 and the effect on the committee's work. Powell noted that there should not be any significant impact, CMU can continue to emphasize diversity, but the language will need to be used carefully.

- Report card on diversity – the committee involved in the review and updating of the report.
- No proposers attended open
- Scukanec is thinking about doing a proposal on diverse graduate students or possibly an international residence hall proposal. A project might be coming from Michael Powell's area and Lisa Patterson may submit a project on investigating the diversity environment on campus.

Priority III – Rosier

- KPIs reviewed and some input to give later on in the meeting. Some of the ones chosen are the convenient ones and not the ones that would be the most meaningful.
- Committee feels that the rubric as designed is not adequate. Overall quality of the project is not addressed and neither are the qualifications of the personnel. The rubric could be modified or these items could be included in already existing rubric items.
- Johnson & Rosier are not continuing as co-chairs after the academic year. They are looking for someone from the committee to replace them. The timeline for the review of proposals puts a lot of stress/workload on the chair especially.

Priority IV – Dielman

- The committee is not looking to invest in new things in Public Service, but they want to focus and improve on current areas of service.
- What does regional mean when referring to public service? People coming to campus, statewide, Midwest? This problem will be addressed more at a future ISPC meeting when national prominence is discussed as well.
- Committee members don't feel the need to solicit proposals, but Riordan noted that it is one of their roles. Frank Boles in the Library may submit a proposal.
- The committee discussed the stipulations and KPIs. The committee agreed that only KPIs that are truly measurable should be selected.

Priority V – Rehm

- The committee spent most of year 1 figuring out what the committee was supposed to do, but year 1 initiatives are probably complete.
- The committee has not held any open meetings, but there are stipulations this year and committee is more focused on what needs to be done in order to accomplish what is needed.

V. KPI Recommendations

The committee discussed and voted on the top-level KPI's with the following results:

1.) Level of Academic Challenge

Source: NSSE Owner: IR Metric: Score on 100 pt scale for freshmen & seniors

Strongly Agree	61.54%	8
Agree	30.77%	4
Neutral	7.69%	1
Disagree	0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

2.) Active & Collaborative Learning

Source: NSSE	Owner: IR	Metric: Score on 100 pt scale for freshmen & seniors	
Strongly Agree		38.46%	5
Agree		15.38%	2
Neutral		15.38%	2
Disagree		23.08%	3
Strongly Disagree		7.69%	1

3.) Student-Faculty Interactions

Source: NSSE	Owner: IR	Metric: Score on 100 pt scale for freshmen & seniors	
Strongly Agree		38.46%	5
Agree		23.08%	3
Neutral		15.38%	2
Disagree		15.38%	2
Strongly Disagree		7.69%	1

4.) Enriching Educational Experiences

Source: NSSE	Owner: IR	Metric: Score on 100 pt scale for freshmen & seniors	
Strongly Agree		7.69%	1
Agree		23.08%	3
Neutral		38.46%	5
Disagree		15.38%	2
Strongly Disagree		15.38%	2

5.) Six Year Graduation Rate

Source: IPEDS	Owner: IR	Metric: Percentage Rate	
Strongly Agree		15.38%	2
Agree		30.77%	4
Neutral		23.08%	3
Disagree		15.38%	2
Strongly Disagree		15.38%	2

6.) Student-Faculty Ratio

Source: CMU	Owner: IR	Metric: Ratio	
Strongly Agree		72.73%	8
Agree		18.18%	2
Neutral		0%	0
Disagree		0%	0
Strongly Disagree		9.09%	1

7.) Student-Faculty Ratio

Source: CMU	Owner: IR	Metric: Ratio	
Strongly Agree		69.23%	9
Agree		23.08%	3
Neutral		0%	0
Disagree		0%	0
Strongly Disagree		7.69%	1

8.) Undergraduate Class Size(courses numbered 400 or less)

Source: CMU	Owner: IR	Metric: Averages	
Strongly Agree		46.15%	6
Agree		23.08%	3

Neutral	30.77%	4
Disagree	0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

9.) Employed or going to Graduate School

Source: CMU Owner: Career Services Metric: Percentage

Strongly Agree	23.08%	3
Agree	23.08%	3
Neutral	15.38%	2
Disagree	23.08%	3
Strongly Disagree	15.38%	2

10.) CMU Compared to other Institutions

Source: CLA Owner: AA Metric: Standard deviation from the mean

Strongly Agree	53.85%	7
Agree	15.38%	2
Neutral	23.08%	3
Disagree	7.69%	1
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

11.) Minority Faculty

Source: CMU Owner: HR Metric: Percentage

Strongly Agree	83.33%	10
Agree	16.67%	2
Neutral	0%	0
Disagree	0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

12.) Minority Staff

Source: CMU Owner: HR Metric: Percentage

Strongly Agree	45.45%	5
Agree	27.27%	3
Neutral	9.09%	1
Disagree	18.18%	2
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

13.) Supportive Campus Environment

Source: NSSE Owner: IR Metric: Score on 100 pt scale for freshmen & seniors

Strongly Agree	66.67%	8
Agree	33.33%	4
Neutral	0%	0
Disagree	0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

14.) Minority Students

Source: IPEDS Owner: IR Metric: Percentage

Strongly Agree	83.33%	10
Agree	8.33%	1
Neutral	8.33%	1
Disagree	0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

15.) International Students**Source: IPEDS Owner: IR Metric: Percentage**

Strongly Agree	25%	3
Agree	41.67%	5
Neutral	8.33%	1
Disagree	25%	3
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

16.) Expenditures in Support of Research**Source: CMU Owner: IR Metric: General fund dollars**

Strongly Agree	66.67%	8
Agree	25%	3
Neutral	0%	0
Disagree	8.33%	1
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

17.) Faculty Involvement in Creative Activity**Source: CMU Owner: AA Metric: Publications, Performances, Patents**

Strongly Agree	66.67%	8
Agree	16.67%	2
Neutral	8.33%	1
Disagree	0%	0
Strongly Disagree	8.33%	1

18.) Expenditures in Support of Research Source: CMU Owner: AA Metric: CMU 2010 \$

Strongly Agree	33.33%	4
Agree	25%	3
Neutral	25%	3
Disagree	16.67%	2
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

19.) External Grants**Source: CMU Owner: ORSP****Metric: # Submissions, \$ Requested, # Funded, \$ Awarded (3 year average)**

Strongly Agree	66.67%	8
Agree	16.67%	2
Neutral	16.67%	2
Disagree	0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

20.) Graduate Student Productivity**Source: CMU Owner: Graduate Studies Metric: Count**

Strongly Agree	16.67%	2
Agree	25%	3
Neutral	16.67%	2
Disagree	41.67%	5
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

21.) Number of Students Engaged in Faculty Sponsored Research**Source: CMU Owner: FID Metric: Undergraduate, Masters, Specialist, Doctoral**

Strongly Agree	41.67%	5
Agree	25%	3
Neutral	16.67%	2
Disagree	16.67%	2
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

22.) Faculty Public Service Activity

Source: CMU Owner: AA Metric: Percentage as reflected in FID

Strongly Agree	45.45%	5
Agree	27.27%	3
Neutral	9.09%	1
Disagree	9.09%	1
Strongly Disagree	9.09%	1

23.) CMU has "...contributed to your knowledge, skills and personal development...regarding contributing to the welfare of your community" Response:

Quite a bit/Very much

Source: NSSE Owner: IR Metric: Freshmen, Seniors

Strongly Agree	45.45%	5
Agree	9.09%	1
Neutral	9.09%	1
Disagree	36.36%	4
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

24.) "during the current school year, about how often have you...participated in a community-based project as part of a regular course" Response: Often/Very often

Source: NSSE Owner: IR Metric: Freshmen, Seniors

Strongly Agree	54.55%	6
Agree	27.27%	3
Neutral	0%	0
Disagree	9.09%	1
Strongly Disagree	9.09%	1

25.) Before you graduate, "...have you done or do you plan to do ...community service or volunteer work?" Response: Freshman=done, Senior=plan to do

Source: NSSE Owner: IR Metric: Freshmen, Seniors

Strongly Agree	45.45%	5
Agree	36.36%	4
Neutral	0%	0
Disagree	9.09%	1
Strongly Disagree	9.09%	1

26.) People/households/counties reached through outreach activities

Source: CMU Owner: Priority IV

Metric: Percentage reached compared to total percentage

Strongly Agree	18.18%	2
Agree	18.18%	2
Neutral	9.09%	1
Disagree	27.27%	3
Strongly Disagree	27.27%	3

27.) Staff satisfaction at CMU “I trust CMU’s management/administrators to make good decisions”

Source: Internal Survey Owner: HR

Metric: Mean where mean is 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree

Strongly Agree	36.36%	4
Agree	9.09%	1
Neutral	36.36%	4
Disagree	18.18%	2
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

28.) Staff satisfaction at CMU “I would recommend CMU as a good place to work”

Source: Internal Survey Owner: HR

Metric: Mean where mean is 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree

Strongly Agree	36.36%	4
Agree	0%	0
Neutral	27.27%	3
Disagree	27.27%	3
Strongly Disagree	9.09%	1

29.) Climate Survey – Staff “CMU is an institution of integrity”

Source: Internal Survey Owner: Priority V Metric: Response: Agree/Strongly Agree

Strongly Agree	27.27%	3
Agree	45.45%	5
Neutral	0%	0
Disagree	27.27%	3
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

30.) Climate Survey – Students “CMU is an institution of integrity”

Source: Internal Survey Owner: Priority V Metric: Response: Agree/Strongly Agree

Strongly Agree	45.45%	5
Agree	45.45%	5
Neutral	0%	0
Disagree	0%	0
Strongly Disagree	9.09%	1

31.) Climate Survey – Faculty “CMU is an institution of integrity”

Source: Internal Survey Owner: Priority V Metric: Percentage as reflected in FID

Strongly Agree	63.64%	7
Agree	9.09%	1
Neutral	18.18%	2
Disagree	9.09%	1
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

32.) Student Academic Integrity

Source: CMU Owner: Ethics Center Metric: ???

Strongly Agree	54.55%	6
Agree	27.27%	3
Neutral	0%	0

Disagree	18.18%	2
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

33.) Faculty Academic Integrity

Source: CMU Owner: Ethics Center Metric: ???

Strongly Agree	45.45%	5
Agree	45.45%	5
Neutral	0%	0
Disagree	0%	0
Strongly Disagree	9.09%	1

34.) Fiscal Integrity

Source: Balance Sheet Owner: FSR Metric: Composite Financial Index

Strongly Agree	45.45%	5
Agree	45.45%	5
Neutral	0%	0
Disagree	9.09%	1
Strongly Disagree	0%	0

Respectfully submitted
Kara Beery, recorder