

CMU 2010 Retreat
Discussion Notes
Friday, March 23, 2007

Present: Linda Dielman, Mike Fields, Nancy French, Carol Haas, Merodie Hancock, Tim Hartshorne, Maxine Kent, Kathy Koch, Marvis Lary, Sue Ann Martin, Amy McGinnis, Dan Nowiski, Wayne Osborn, Orlando Perez, Michael Rao, Roger Rehm, Carole Richardson, Catherine Riordan, George Ross, Gary Shapiro, Brad Swartz, Marcy Taylor and Wei Zhou.

I. Opening Remarks – Gary Shapiro

- Provost Shapiro opened the retreat by thanking everyone for the work they do as individuals in their unit on campus as well as the work they do on the CMU 2010 committee they serve on or lead.
- Shapiro expressed that CMU 2010 has been a good thing for the university.

II. Background – Catherine Riordan

- The birth of CMU 2010 came from the accreditation process as well as a call from the business division for a need to come up with a process that helps CMU progress strategically.
- The development process of the plan gathered input from the entire campus on CMU's priorities.

III. Progress to Date – Amy McGinnis

- FAS has created an electronic infrastructure to report progress and goals.
- The performance management system includes the priorities.
- Division planning aligns with CMU 2010.
- National presentations: NACUBO, HLC.
- CMU serving as a model and reference for others.

III. Projects & Initiatives – Carole Richardson

- Richardson reviewed select projects funded through CMU 2010 funds. She also highlighted some initiatives that align with CMU 2010 priorities that were funded by individual units.

IV. Round Robin

- Taylor – Writing Center has been effective in the number of faculty reached.
- Rosier – Priority III Committee has recommended 2 major research proposals for funding - both have been funded. Committee members have high standards and the committee has not been afraid to send proposals back for resubmission and improvement. The committee always has a good time.
- Haas – Getting the UBAC together to review budget requests and taking into account the strategic plan has been a great step forward.
- Nowiski – SGA advocates strongly for the priorities with the BOT, the president and the UBAC. They are asking questions to make sure the funding is going to things that will make CMU effective.

- French – Communications and PR & marketing are focused on getting the word out effectively and accurately.
- Zhou – Looking to do even more national surveys. Looking into an exit survey.
- Lary – CMU 2010 has caused the college to look at the possibilities and work together to get funds. Looking at how the college can fund things even with soft funds. CMU 2010 has been a great way to get people thinking and find ways to work together. All college and department goals follow CMU 2010.
- Hartshorne – It has been great to see projects that came forward for CMU 2010 funds that didn't get funded, but funds were found elsewhere. Great to see the progress in the Honors Program as a result of CMU 2010.
- Fields – CBA goals – aggressively seeking to hire for the fall and 6 out of the 10 hires have been from diverse classes. Process – CBA has established a strategic assessment task force and developed KPIs that will drive the college. Looking to measure the KPIs to establish a benchmark and move from there.
- Dielman – The priority committee has been able to work with proposers on developing well written proposals. Might need to focus more on getting people to write well written proposals.
- Kent – CMU 2010 has made the FAS division figure out how they fit into the 5 priorities. It makes people focus – went from 40-50 goals to about 5 that everyone has agreed on and is working towards.
- Koch – CEHS is really focused on getting proposals submitted for CMU 2010 funding. Response has been good and any feedback has been very helpful.
- Swartz – coming from CDO and involved in Priority IV, it has been really nice to see proposals come forward from the Carls center. Volunteer center has come to his attention and hope that future proposals will identify the good work done through that center. Priority IV proposals have been very well received by CMU 2010.
- Osborn – CMU 2010 has helped produce a large number of research projects by students. The discussion about identifying an area where we can achieve national prominence is still needed. Also haven't dealt with giving faculty more flexibility to do the work that they want to do.
- Perez – Glad to see that 2 of the original projects that went to the President's Research Task Force eventually got funded. Priority II has had trouble finding projects, but is very excited about Mary Senter's project and the results that might come from that.
- Ross – FAS has included about 90% of the 500 people in the division in its planning process to see how they fit into the priority.
- Hancock – still figuring out how ProEd fits in – doing well in many areas but not highlighting or leveraging those areas. Developing a project manager as well as a governance structure that is useful.
- Rehm – difficult for Priority V – everyone has a shared responsibility for integrity, not just one office and so it is difficult to guide the process. Better focus this year over the first year.
- Shapiro – Enjoyed the debate in Priority I on the merits of a proposal – enjoyed interacting with faculty and staff. Involved in service as dean and

provost – making it possible for others to do their job. In college – providing funds for faculty to present at conferences. As provost – enjoying watching faculty and staff succeed in serving students.

- Martin – College has emphasized interdisciplinary projects. Looking forward in being involved in Mary Senter’s project. Wished the prisons project would have gotten farther – will look into what they can do to improve the project and possibly get funded. IPC bullying conference was very effective.
- McGinnis – FAS looking at narrowing down their goals.
- Richardson – Enjoyed working on communicating effectively with the campus community. Also enjoyed working on the KPIs.

IV. Discussion with President

- Grateful for the work that has been done to narrow down the areas that CMU is diving into.
- The group has been a good steward of focus which has been very necessary and will continue to be essential in the future.

What impact will the budget crunch have on the university’s ability to provide \$1 million/year?

- The funding is something that needs to continue and will continue. It is rather small compared to the entire budget. The committee has recommended multiple year projects – helping this to happen.

The money has already been spent for future years - FY09 really cannot happen without more money - now what?

- Additional money should be requested if so desired. Request should include how much is needed and what good things will come as a result of the money.
- It is not about money, it is about focus and it is about priorities. The budget doesn’t have to effect what the group will do.

If not money – what will help us make greater head way? How would we gradually move toward having everything revolve around the vision?

- Money is an enabler, without it doesn’t mean we can’t do it but we would have to find other ways to do it. We have been very good at accomplishing the priorities with limited funds so far. CMU 2010 is a very small portion of the whole and so our goal is to align all are processes to the strategic plan. All our resource allocations should be geared toward accomplishing our priorities.

“CMU will be nationally prominent” how do you see the projects that have been funded as moving toward this?

- Not enough time yet, too early to measure this. We should strive to have things be at the national caliber, not necessarily national recognition – in some ways that would not be appropriate. Nothing indicates that CMU should not strive toward this.

Priority IV – struggle with whether they should go “national” or “regional” in their projects. Is national prominence something that you take into consideration when you review ISPC recommendations?

- The level at which things should be done is at a national level of excellence – as good as or better than anyone else – 2 or 3 big things that I measure my activity around.

Why would it be difficult for the university to align all of its budget processes to the priorities?

- It is easy to make a vocal statement that everything will align, but operationally is more difficult. Also, individuals will agree on this, but as it gets implemented they worry that their ideas and projects won't get funded – they claim a strong connection to CMU 2010 when in reality the link is rather weak.

Is too much of our emphasis on doing things cheaply when a good education costs money?

- With this process you have money and so you can demand quality and be gutsy and choose specific areas and deny those that just don't fit.
- Don't just look at projects that are related to a priority, but need to look at which project will be more effective, which one will get more bang for the buck. For example, in research KPIs look at quality – things that will lead to national prominence.

Some students think the decisions made by the BOT don't follow the vision. Does the BOT buy into the vision and support it?

- Yes and it will progress over time.

Niche areas have not been determined – the projects that have come forward have not been ones that have been identified by the committee. The university may need to identify those niche areas, and so should be pursuing specific proposals.

- This might be an area where the priority committee makes a recommendation to the president on a way that niche areas can be determined. While those choices have to be made, they should be made by a body that is representative of the entire university. Also need to consider using different measures of success. For example, using the US citation index over the number of publications.
- The market place also has a large effect on the university. Those needs are driving what we are going to do behind the scenes. For example, Math and Science teachers are needed country-wide.

Has a culture of strategic planning been created? If not, what does the ISPC need to do?

- It is too soon in some ways to see. We are making progress. Take some big steps – organization or functional recommendations on how to align everything to the vision. Also social recommendations – how do we get this to people who have not been interested in this process so far?

V. KPI Discussion

Priority II

- The group could not pick just one KPI. They decided that the most important KPI would be both the minority staff and minority faculty statistics (retention).
- Retention Measures
 - 1) measure climate
 - 2) retention interviews (interview why they left CMU, what would have kept them here, etc)
 - 3) supervisor training (part of their job to make a supportive environment)

4) tie that into performance management

5) clarify what Proposal 2 is and isn't

- Who's responsible? Everyone - HR and FPS, Priority II, Multicultural education center, deans, diversity office
- Advocate? Everyone – BOT, President, Provost, Deans. Needs a domino effect to be successful.
- Measures? Continued climate study to see progress & recognition program
- Proposal 2 should not have a negative impact on hiring diverse people. Encourage deans to pursue this more vigorously.

Priority III

- A good measure of faculty involvement in research & creative activity is needed.
- The FID needs to be kept up to date and the Deans need to work with the chairs to demand this data. Once the data is available, publicize it.
- Faculty need more time – the university could provide time to the most promising faculty on campus to publish or creatively produce. Look for these faculty by their productivity and give them more time (release time and/or new lines). If over time (3-5 years) they cannot show evidence of increased productivity then they lose their time.
- What is the KPI for a promising faculty? The productivity evidenced in the FID – number of presentations, etc. You can't set a specific number for this because a "good" level looks differently in different disciplines.
- The group discussed limiting the amount of time that each faculty member can get – limit of 3 years at a time and at the most 2 times over their career. Some believe that perhaps there should be a different class of faculty researchers.
- Could also emphasize that after their 3 years with internal funding if that faculty member wants to continue doing research, they will need to get funding from an outside source.
- Departments also need some full time staff to handle the everyday paperwork – assessment, program review, etc.
- Committee could look at models of how other institutions do this.

Priority IV

- Most important KPI: Community service/volunteer work done by students before they graduate.
- Committee sees a goal in this area as very important and needed.
- Things to do? Increase opportunities for student learning, collaboration of FaCIT and Volunteer Center
- Who's responsible? Public Service office. Dean of students and registrar (have volunteer hours on official transcript) would need to be involved in this. Many units do work in this priority, but are not working together.
- Advocate? President & Provost, SGA, AVP for Marketing & PR
- Track freshman participation and attitudes toward volunteerism. Track annually. Track number of hours toward this KPI.
- Include ProfEd? Maybe if it was actually done, it could be done on the level of ProfEd as well.

ProfEd

- Move away from “ProfEd” but instead focus on non-traditional students
- Falls under priority I especially, but the other priorities also apply.
- Integrate ProfEd – don’t add strategies to priorities, but look at outcome expectations for non-traditional students. Identify and then measure. Imbed ProfEd into strategies.

VI. Take Aways

- Get a proposal to the President for additional CMU 2010 funds ASAP – for the FY09 proposal process.
- Take items discussed in priority committee groups back to the priority committees and if they agree they should come back to the ISPC and the KPI document should be finalized so that some ideas for proposals could be taken to the deans to provide funding for some of the things that need funding in order to follow through on the ideas.
- Priority committees can be the central repository - be knowledgeable about all areas involved in their priority – identify the gaps or the things that the different areas really need to do.
- Targets need to be set – Priority Committees working with the ComCom to develop these?
- Institutionalize the FAS system – tracking goals university-wide. Are we really there yet? More test driving needed. A plan to roll out this institution-wide would be a good idea.
- Priority committees play more of a role as advocates for plans/proposals that are being developed in their specific areas.
- Formalize discussions about ProfEd – narrative. Catherine will work with Merodie on this.
- Clarify in writing the ISPC’s role as time goes on – reaffirming the original charge.
- Come up with a recommendation to the President on how to identify niche areas in research & creative activity. This may be something that the Priority III committee can work on first.

Respectfully submitted, Kara Beery, recorder