

**Institutional Strategic Planning Committee**  
**Monday, November 24, 2008**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Present:** Ray Francis, Carol Haas, Tim Hartshorne, Sue Ann Martin, Amy McGinnis, Becky Oosterhoff, Paul Pridgeon, Roger Rehm, Carole Richardson, Catherine Riordan and John Wright.

**Absent:** David Burdette, Linda Dielman, Janine Janosky, Mike Leto, Orlando Perez, Nathan Tallman and Julia Wallace.

**I. Beyond CMU 2010 Sessions – Emerging Themes and Plans**

- The student and faculty sessions were not as well attended as the staff sessions.
- Results from all sessions are available on the planning site.
- The term “Strategic Directions” might be better instead of “Themes.”
- The sustainability theme would have three overlapping areas: Environment, Social and Economic.
- The currently nameless theme would capture research initiatives.
- The term “Priorities” for the areas along the top causes people to ask, “Why isn’t diversity one of them?” A different title might better help people understand – these are the “Mission” of the university.
- “Living/Learning Environment” may also carry baggage with many thinking that it refers to residence life. “The CMU Experience” might be better.
- Operating Principles/Assumptions: could use as a preamble to the next plan that these things are assumed to continue, but are not strategic.
- Recent Systematic Studies (Enrollment management plan, Facilities Master Plan) – reports that are available but not being acted upon.
- Research – the committee discussed whether faculty would react positively to the institution identifying niche areas of research and creative activity. Some thought national prominence resonates with faculty, but finding/choosing niche areas do not.
- Members expressed the frustration of faculty who feel that the administration wants research to be done, but the barriers to actually doing the research are great – giving lip service to supporting research and not the funding to back it up. What are the incentives to do extensive research as opposed to just getting an article published? They are currently rewarded the same – it would be helpful to get additional time off, new computer or other equipment, etc. There is currently no assistance with grant funds management.
- Clarification is needed concerning the expectations from faculty (workload, research, university service, etc) and faculty need to know what the university is going to do to support them. The newest FA Agreement does have clarifying language about workload issues.
- Riordan presented the idea of position papers – one for each area/strategic direction.
- These position papers (5 pages) can be used by anyone looking for more information and could be used especially by PR and Marketing. Main bullet points should be presented to the ISPC on January 19<sup>th</sup> and the first draft will be due on February 6<sup>th</sup>.

**II. Key Performance Indicators**

- Are KPIs direct or indirect measures of success?
- Are improving the KPIs our direct focus or do they improve as a result of our focus on the strategic priorities?

- Priority III is not satisfied with the current KPIs – cannot measure faculty creative or scholarly output, cannot track publications (will improve with OFIS?). Oosterhoff will attend the next Priority III committee meeting in December to discuss possible changes to the KPIs.
- Tracking patents – only includes awarded patents or patents in process? Oosterhoff will check on this and will make any clarifications.
- How are we going to measure the living/learning environment? (# of students using the volunteer center, alternative spring breaks, SAC, etc)
- When the next plan is presented to the BOT, the new KPIs will be included so the KPIs need to be solidified before April. Any good measures should be sent to Oosterhoff.

Respectfully submitted, Kara Beery, recorder