

Institutional Strategic Planning Committee
Monday, May 5, 2008
Meeting Minutes

Present: David Burdette, Katie Dykehouse, Tim Hartshorne, Janine Janosky, Sue Ann Martin, Becky Oosterhoff, Orlando Perez, Roger Rehm, Catherine Riordan, Kate Rosier, Brad Swartz, Julia Wallace and Todd Zakrajsek.

Absent: Linda Dielman, Carol Haas, Mike Leto, Amy McGinnis, Carole Richardson and Nathan Tallman.

Guests: Jim Falender, Denise Green, Carl Johnson, Elizabeth Mostrom and Paul Pridgeon.

I. Membership changes in ISPC and Priority Committees

- Brad Swartz will no longer serve on the ISPC and Ray Francis should be added as the new senate chair.
- Priority III recommends David Gillingham (Music) and Brad Van EedenMoorefield (EHS) as permanent members of their committee. Mike Shields (Economics) will serve as a one semester replacement for Mike Pisani while he is on sabbatical. Janosky and Wright will serve as co-chairs.
- Members agreed to these changes and agreed to invite Wright to attend ISPC meetings.

II. Update from Fireside Chats

- Oosterhoff informed the committee that 15 attended the Fireside Chat on April 18th. The chat focused on proposal development and Mary Senter and Jim Hill attended to provide advice on writing effective proposals.
- A Fireside Chat will be held in the fall for proposal writing counseling sessions.
- This summer the Communications Committee will be working on ways to better involve and inform students on how CMU 2010 applies to them.

III. Discussion of CMU 2010 Progress Survey Results

- Members reviewed the results of the CMU 2010 Progress Survey.
- The committee discussed the direction of Priority IV and some possible ideas for improving the outlook of the priority committee. A review of the membership might be needed. The provost has been recommending the institution participate in the Carnegie classification in the future.
- Some priority committees have found this year without an RFP refreshing and have been able to focus on how to advance the priority, but other priority committees found it frustrating to find ways to advance the priority, especially when there is an office on campus that is in charge of that specific priority area.

IV. Strategic Plan for Advancing Diversity

- Green presented a summary of the Strategic Plan for Advancing Diversity including the campus climate framework, institutional contexts and the diversity priorities.
- Green outlined the five diversity priorities
 - Welcoming Climate
 - Diverse Workforce
 - Diversify Student Body
 - Diverse Pedagogy & Curriculum
 - Administrative and Organizational Support

- Green is planning to pool some current committees to create one implementation committee with a subcommittee for each priority.
- What is needed from the ISPC and Priority II to help achieve this plan? Help is needed in setting up the structure around campus and getting buy-in from around campus. What would buy-in look like? Faculty & staff that are not just interested in diversity, but are willing to take some of these steps (diversity as part of performance review, diversity training).
- The group agreed that diversity has been too compartmentalized – it's not just Institutional Diversity or Priority II's problem. One thing that would be helpful is an assessment tool that is available so each department can look at their own area and can see the areas where they can approve.
- Members wondered whether program review included a diversity portion. Riordan confirmed that it does, but it might be an area that could be improved.
- Assistance for minority students and their parents when filling out the FAFSA and improvement in other services at CMU could also be helpful.

V. Outline of CMU 2010 annual report

- Riordan reviewed some of the areas that will be covered by the CMU 2010 annual report to the BOT: KPIs (areas where we are improving and areas where we have been struggling) and Priorities (projects/issues that committees plan to pursue).
- Other areas? Certain funded projects could be highlighted like the Honors Program or the Advanced Materials Research program or the Redbook project. Riordan will check with priority committee chairs for suggested projects.

VI. New Initiatives

Living and Learning Environment

- Burdette informed the committee that part of this initiative will be to improve the ten worst classrooms on campus – paint, flooring, ceiling repairs, lighting, etc.
- Possible improvements to student services will be evaluated – what does the 21st century student going to expect from us?

Sustainability

- 70% of campus heat currently comes from wood. Burdette would like to see this percentage increase and would also like to see an addition of a co-generation plant.
- All residential restaurants will be going trayless this fall, also looking at ways to improve recycling on campus, etc.

VII. University Scholars UBAC Proposal

- Rosier summarized the Priority III Committee's involvement in bringing this proposal forward. It was originally a proposal by Gary Shapiro for CMU 2010 funding.
- The proposal would fund seven awards per year, providing faculty three years of half-time teaching. At least two of the awards would be give to junior scholars – individuals within ten years of their terminal degree. This type of program would help with recruitment and retention of faculty across the university.
- Some members were concerned that the program would create an elite group of faculty that are released from half of their teaching and service load with no requirement to return to the institution. Rosier clarified that the committee was strongly against creating a group of elite faculty and so noted in the proposal that a faculty member would be allowed no more than two three-year terms during their entire career.

- There were concerns among the group that the program wouldn't evenly distribute funding across the university.
- How do you define half-time teaching load? Determined by the committee that would review and award these. Half-time would literally be half of their teaching load (could be two courses for some faculty and four for others). Some were concerned about the variation in half-time between faculty.
- How do you define national prominence - being well known in a rare field or being well known in general? The review committee and external reviewer will need to decide how to define this.
- No funds to go along with it may be more/less helpful for some areas. Maybe have some flexibility in the proposal to vary the amount of release time and funding for travel, equipment, etc.
- Why not just ask for more funding for the deans and the provost to distribute as needed? This would likely create an elite group of faculty which is not the desired outcome.
- Why not start up the research professorship again instead of this new program? This new program would provide more time off (three years) than the research professorship (one semester) would.
- The priority committee is looking for an endorsement from the ISPC. The priority committee will try to address the issues that were raised and the ISPC will review the proposal again at its first meeting in the fall.

Respectfully submitted, Kara Beery, recorder