STRATEGIC PLANNING TASK FORCE 2012-17

Meeting #14 October 27, 2011 Student Center, Room 310 8-9:30 a.m.

Members Present: C. Alexander, K. Bales, J. Bott, P. Gestwicki, M. Goldsby, M. Holtzman, R. Howard, E. Kelly, T. King, W. Knight, T. Lauer, K. McGeary, B. McNely, R. Morris, J. Obrycki, J. Palilonis, C. Rhine, F. Sabatine, J. Scheib, C. Sullivan, L. Siktberg, T. Taylor, G. Vasquez de Velasco

Members absent: H. Akin, B. Hannon, K. Lee, T. Proudfoot

Provost Terry King convened the meeting at 8:00 a.m.

The Task Force:

1. Continued discussion from last week on the "elephants in the room."

Are all the "elephants" of equal weight?

<u>Discordance</u> – trust, morale, history of institution, core curriculum. There is a division between faculty and administration. The core curriculum comes up with other task forces as well as department chairs.

There is talk about implementing a state-wide core curriculum, so that a student can go from one university to another and transfer these courses.

Anything that is disruptive or disrupts the way we do conduct business could fall into this category.

- 2. Discussed the four themes from last strategic plan and added two more:
 - Higher Quality Students
 - High Impact Learning Experience
 - High Quality Academic Programs and faculty
 - Vibrant Campus

NEW THEMES:

- Economic Development
- Future Viability (state funding)
- 3. Discussed further the two new themes: Economic Development and Future Viability
 - It is clear the state is looking to the universities to play a larger role in the economic vitality of the state. In the past we've put our emphasis on Building Better Communities (BBC), as a way of making ourselves known around the state. The College of Architecture and Planning's community-based projects and the Bowen Center are two others that bring attention to the university.

- This goes back to differentiation every university thinks they should play a positive role in the state. Purdue and IU have gone a good job because research is an economic driver as far as the legislators are concerned. We do the same, but they are not as visible to the average citizen or to ICHE.
- Pulling out Economic Development as a separate theme adds emphasis. Immersive learning brings us out in the communities to help them sustain themselves. We need to make it more visible to the legislature and the general population.
- Possibly add "community" to Economic Development? Economic is our outside stakeholders, but community is inside. Community development has not made an impact with State government. Somehow you have to convince the general public and the politicians that what we're doing has an impact on the State. The term "civic engagement" is used frequently at other institutions.
- Viability includes how we're rewarding people who work here in such a way that makes it a career for them.
- Community Engagement gets the internal buy-in.
- If we do the first five themes, it would lead to the sixth (viability). Is viability an outcome? If we hit the five points, the State is going to find something to support (our institution)
- Include the word "Indiana" somewhere in the themes. "Economic and Community Development is about Indiana." Could possibly help when legislators see the word "Indiana."
- The Provost elaborated on "viability," which is more than State funding. If you think of the university in terms of a process, then offering a class has a characteristic time of the semester to be offered, offering the classes over the years, and teachers for a career of maybe 30 years. Are we building to where we can survive thirty years down the road? Buildings have characteristic years of 40-50.
- 4. Divided into three groups and took several minutes to discuss the five themes:
 - Group 1 Theme 1: Higher Quality Students
 - Group 2 Themes 2 & 3: High Impact Learning Experience, High Quality Academic Programs and Faculty
 - Group 3 Themes 4 & 5: Vibrant Campus, Economic Development

Applied themes to list of Top Targets to Roll Forward (Attachment #1) that included: 1) Achieved target, 2) Almost Achieved Target, and 3) Did Not Achieve Target.

Group 1: **High Quality Students**

Group 1 marked the following for **High Quality Students**

Achieved Target

- Increase by 10 percent per year the number of students participating in immersive learning experiences.
- By 2012, all departments will offer immersive learning experiences for each graduate.
- Create a continuously replenishing pool of salary funds to address market and other inequities.
- By 2009, achieve 10 percent growth in total graduate student numbers over 2006-07 base.
- By 2012, increase off-campus enrollments by 30 percent over the 2006-07 base.
- By 2012, have 25 nationally ranked or nationally recognized programs.

Almost Achieved Target

- 25 By 2012, increase the number of endowed scholarships to 600.
- By 2012, achieve 80 percent of total incoming freshman class holding academic honors diplomas or equivalent.
- 2 By 2012, achieve 80 percent first-year retention rate.
- By 2012, achieve 15 percent of total enrollment from underrepresented minority populations.

Did Not Achieve Target

- By 2012, achieve 60 percent six-year graduation rate and 6t percent by 2015.
- 5 By 2012, achieve 15 percent of total domestic enrollment from out-of-state, and 5 percent of total enrollment from International origins.

Group 2: **High Impact Learning Experience High Quality Academic Programs/Faculty**

Group 2 marked the following for **<u>High Impact Learning Experience</u>**

Achieved Target

- Increase by 10 percent per year the number of students participating in immersive learning experiences (Comment: 10% still?)
- By 2012, all departments will offer immersive learning experiences for each graduate.

Almost Achieved Target

- 2 By 2012, achieve 80 percent first-year retention rate.
- By 2012, achieve 15 percent of total enrollment from underrepresented minority populations (Comment: maybe to extent diversity improves educational experience.)

Did not Achieve Target

- Increase external funding for scholarly work by 150%.
- 5 By 2012, achieve 15 percent of total domestic enrollment from out-of-state, and 5 percent of total enrollment from international origins.

Group 2 marked the following for **High Quality Academic Programs/Faculty**

Achieved Target

- 41 Create a continuously replenishing pool of salary funds to address market and other inequities.
- By 2012, have 25 nationally ranked or nationally recognized programs.

Almost Achieved Target

2 By 2012, achieve 80 percent first-year retention rate.

Did not Achieve Target

Increase external funding for scholarly work by 150%.

Group 3: **Vibrant Campus**

Engagement for economic development and quality of life (primarily off-campus)

Group 3 marked the following for **Vibrant Campus**

Achieved Target

- Increase by 10 percent per year the number of students participating in immersive learning experiences.
- By 2012, all departments will offer immersive learning experiences for each graduate.
- 41 Create a continuously replenishing pool of salary and funds to address market and other inequities.

Almost Achieved Target

By 2012, achieve 15 percent of total enrollment from underrepresented minority populations.

Group 3 marked the following for **Economic Development**

Achieved Target

- Increase by 10 percent per year the number of students participating in immersive learning experiences.
- By 2012, all departments will offer immersive learning experiences for each graduate.
- By 2012, increase off-campus enrollments by 30 percent over the 2006-07 base.

Other comments from Group 3 regarding Economic Development:

Civic Development

Building a Better Indiana

Community Development/Engagement

Positive Development/Engagement

Improving Indiana

Enhancing Quality of Life for Indiana Residents

"Future"

The meeting adjourned at 9:30am.