

**Institutional Strategic Planning Committee**  
**Monday, April 27, 2009**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Present:** Carol Haas, Tim Hartshorne, Janine Janosky, Becky Oosterhoff, Orlando Perez, Roger Rehm, Carole Richardson, Catherine Riordan (Co-chair), Marcy Taylor and John Wright.

**Absent:** David Burdette, Linda Dielman, Ray Francis, Mike Leto, Amy McGinnis, Paul Pridgeon, Nathan Tallman and Julia Wallace (Co-chair).

**I. Institutional Effectiveness**

- Taylor presented institution-wide learning outcomes that the Priority I Committee has approved.
- These outcomes can be tied to program review, program assessment, program accreditation and institutional accreditation.
- The Priority I Committee is looking for endorsement by the ISPC. These learning outcomes would probably go to the UCC next and then to the Academic Senate.
- The committee agreed to endorse the learning outcomes and believe that the next step is for the Academic Senate to look them over.

**II. Update on Ad Hoc Vision Committee**

- Riordan informed the committee that there was interest by the Board in looking at the vision statement to assure its currency. A group (including a current and past BOT member) was convened by Vice Provost Riordan at the request of Provost Wallace. Each member of the group led an informal focus group on the vision statement.
- The group has recommended to the BOT waiting until a new president is in place before further research and/or action is done.

**III. Strategic Directions and Initiatives Revisions**

- The five strategic directions and their initiatives were presented to the Board of Trustees in draft form. The board was appreciative of the work that has been done.
- Position papers in their original form are available (password protected) on the planning site.
- Riordan will add some narrative for the final version and will make the following changes.
  - The University Scholars program should be included in initiative two under “Staging the Future through Support of Scholarship.”
  - “Market-Driven” may not be the right term – we need to show we aren’t just doing what is popular but we are doing what the state of Michigan and the country needs.
  - “Support” rather than “Pick” in III.3.

**IV. Reflecting on the infrastructure supporting planning: Suggestions for Presidential Consideration**

What have we learned from the implementation of CMU 2010 that would be useful for the next plan? Below are some considerations for the president and ISPC leadership.

CMU is in a different place now than when strategic planning began in 2004. The role of the ISPC should be refined.

- Continued to struggle understanding our role.
- President and VPs really serve as CMU's strategic planning committee.
- There is a need for ISPC and probably not a lot of subcommittees under the next plan.
- Institutional-level planning needed—should not come from BOT; BOT ideas should always be filtered through faculty.
- ISPC's real role got lost in distribution of vision fund—vision fund may not be a good idea next time.
- Could UBAC be a strategic planning committee, with more faculty and longer terms so members could 'get up to speed'?
- Role of ISPC (or other group charged with strategic planning) could be maintaining focus on university-wide strategic directions.

PC Committees

- Should not be in next phase—ISPC should identify EXISTING committees that already have this charge.
- Priority Committee III was the only committee with a unique charge; others duplicated other committees/overlapped responsibilities; no authority.
- ISPC could be populated with 'experts' and liaisons with existing committees.
- Sometimes university does not have a relevant committee on integrity; should it?
- Priority Committee III was a remarkable committee; cross-campus perspective. Could a group like FRCE take on the strategic direction for research? Could another group be established? There is a need for this committee.

How to achieve even tighter alignment and reduce redundancies with other strategic work

- Maybe more top down leadership is needed
- Maybe projects aren't needed at this point
- Did we pick the right projects that would truly move things forward?
- Academic planning is needed—in proactive, future-oriented areas. Academic Planning Council is reactive, and not strategic

Initial plans for continued funding for projects that demonstrated effectiveness got lost in change of leadership

- Should we have been making base funding recommendations?
- Now UBAC is not continuing funding when 2010 funding is running out.

Does any centralized funding make sense given CMU's decentralized budget model?

- Our budget model can undermine some strategic directions (e.g., international minor, interdisciplinary programs, joint appointments). Over emphasis on SCH when actually have little control over SCH.
- Academic planning is needed—in proactive, future-oriented areas.

Next Year

- Monitoring project progress and expenditures should be a staff function (staff function)
- Focus should continue to promote continued progress and to better understand areas where there was little progress on KPIS
- Communications are still needed so ComCom should continue
- Leave timing of transition to VPs and president
- ISPC should still meet, but priority committee chairs will decide when their committees need to meet. This information will be shared with all committee members in a thank you note from committee chairs.

**V. Annual Report and Evaluation to the BOT**

- The annual report will follow the same format from prior years and will be presented to the BOT in July.
- Members suggested including information about the student planner and redbook projects.

**VII. May 18 Meeting**

- The group agreed that the May 18 meeting is not necessary.

Respectfully submitted, Kara Beery, recorder