

Institutional Strategic Planning Committee
Friday, April 27, 2007
Meeting Minutes

Present: Carol Haas, Tim Hartshorne, Marvis Lary, Dan Nowiski, Becky Oosterhoff, Orlando Perez, Carole Richardson, Catherine Riordan, Kate Rosier, Gary Shapiro, Brad Swartz, Marcy Taylor and Mike Zeig.

Absent: Linda Dielman, Nancy French, Michael Leto, Amy McGinnis, Wayne Osborn, Roger Rehm, and George Ross.

I. Role of ISPC and Priority Committees

- Shapiro noted that members of these committees are to be strategic leaders, influencing other people on campus to move things forward. Priority committee members could provide recommendations on how important the strategies are under the priorities. While \$1 million/year is not much when looking at the overall budget the greater role may be to strike up strategic conversations and suggestions to what the university could be doing if they are serious about integrity, or teaching & learning, etc. Communicate with financial leaders, interim provost, deans, Academic Senate chair, etc about what members of the committee feel should be done in that area – strategies under the strategies. Promote discussion and recommend actions.
- The committee discussed the state funding for next year. It wouldn't be very beneficial for priority committees to spend all of their time trying to influencing the vote of the UBAC. The president sees how each project is tied to CMU 2010 when making his decision.
- The ISPC and priority committees should be proactive in supporting and recommending things.
- The university may need to take a harder look at reallocating funds within the university instead of always focusing on additional dollars. Take a look at how to find cost savings in every area of the university – both in terms of money, but also in terms of time.
- Is CMU to the point where increasing the student population is not a financial benefit? There has been a study done, but was rather subjective in some aspects. The study came to the conclusion that 20,600 students is CMU's limit. President Rao has established 3700 as the cap for incoming freshman. The enrollment management committee is also working in this area.
- Off campus programs is one area where CMU can invest more in – the payback would be great and we would also be meeting the needs of many who are looking for this kind of opportunity. Faculty don't like the idea of increasing off-campus programs because the departments aren't necessarily in charge of the courses. There is also the belief that getting courses out there quickly means that the quality of the courses will be diminished. The university will hopefully be having a conversation on reformatting the current situation with off-campus programs and its relation to on-campus, if the university ignores this area they will miss out completely on the developing market.

- Members discussed how CMU 2010 could have a bigger impact on campus – not just about the \$1 million – how will the ISPC and the priority committees be heard?
Suggestions:
 - Don't request additional funds for FY09 so that the focus can be on influencing the campus strategically
 - Create an annual institutional report card – complete and reliable KPI data
 - Reviewed KPIs yearly to make sure that the ones that have been identified are accurate
 - A member of ISPC should sit on the UBAC – 5 members from ISPC are on the UBAC (and should always wear CMU 2010 hat), but the ISPC needs a representative specifically from the ISPC
 - Should Catherine be co-chair of this group or should it be co-chaired by the 2 VPs – Barrie Wilkes and Gary Shapiro? Members confirmed that Catherine should remain as co-chair of the committee.
 - Utilize priority committee chairs in communicating for those 5 areas - with UBAC and other groups
- Members agreed that the ISPC should review the annual reports from the projects that have been funded.
- Catherine will electronically send out some changes to the charges of the ISPC and Priority Committees.
- Many of the projects that have been funded have been good for CMU and good for the students, but they have not really brought CMU national prominence and we have not chosen/identified niche areas. Swartz wished this group would have done that.

III. Additional Funding Request for FY09

- The ISPC agreed to address this further in the fall. This request could be part of a presentation to the UBAC in the fall.

IV. Priority Committee Updates

- Priority III – meeting next Friday to develop some strategic thinking and possibly have some conversations about niche areas. The committee will also need to add a member (female from CEHS) and will consult with Karen Adams about this.
- Priority II – Met April 23 and reviewed the most recent recruitment and retention report. Committee discussed funding issues and the diversity strategic plan review. Members agreed that if diversity is a priority for the university then the money should be behind it. The committee agreed that if one thing that could be improved over the next year it would be the climate. The committee will work with Michael Powell to put its weight behind the goals and strategies for achieving the new diversity strategic plan. Mary Senter's project may not be able to achieve some of the objectives because the budget was reduced.
- Priority I – talked about strategic directions – sent a memo to the academic senate encouraging them to vote concerning the general education director. This item is on the agenda for the next senate meeting. Recommended new members (Alicia Haley, Lana Ivanitskaya, Kathy Koch, Deb Mascardelli, MaryBeth Minnis, Dan Nowiski, Pete Ross). Todd Zakrajsek will serve as the as new chair. ISPC endorsed all membership recommendations.

V. Communications Committee Survey

- It would be beneficial to see the response rate of faculty compared to the response rate of staff.
- It might be good to do a scientific survey through Mary Senter and the CAD lab.
- Reported higher levels of understanding. Campus leaders are reporting an even higher level of understanding than faculty and staff.
- About 90% of the departments/units that participated have had discussions about the importance of CMU 2010.
- The online CMU 2010 newsletter, listserv notices and the President's updates were identified as some of the most effective ways to communicate to the campus about CMU 2010.
- Should the survey be left open to try and get more responses? No
- A pie chart showing the funding levels between priorities should be included in the next newsletter. The committee must be up front and honest with the campus community that right now we don't know whether there will be an FY09 RFP. The communications committee will work with PR and Marketing on creating a message to the campus.

VI. KPIs

- Becky distributed a handout with a more visual display of the KPIs for the 5 priorities.
- The NSSE numbers have improved a bit for Level of Academic Challenge.
- Unfortunately, the student to faculty ratio has increased from 05-06, but this should improve in the next few years as many dollars from the CMU Promise were invested in new faculty.
- There was some discussion about the KPIs under Priority III and whether the figures are accurate. There is also some need of clear definitions - "expenditures in support of research" expenditures by who? Decrease is a result of loss of earmarks?
- Priority IV: Public Service – only measuring seniors – what students have actually done.
- Priority V: Integrity – satisfied with university choice – is this really a good measure of integrity?
- Priority V: Integrity – Fiscal integrity – CMU is at about a 3.5 – good position financially and able to make modest program enhancements.

VII. Summer Activity

- The ISPC will not have any face to face meetings over the summer. They will communicate electronically and will meet at the beginning of the Fall semester.

Respectfully submitted, Kara Beery, recorder