

Strategic Planning Council

Monday, 8/3/09 1:30-3:00

Present:

Larry Daniel, Mauricio Gonzalez, David Jaffee, Marianne Jaffee, Rick Powell, Tom Serwatka, Shari Shuman, Fen Yu, Mark Workman

Mark reminded the Council that we should focus our attention on adding and eliminating the performance indicators based on prior conversations with the President and our knowledge of what measures will likely appear in the BOG-mandated Annual Report (still in draft form).

Tom notified the Council that he was reformatting the original comparison data (no additional data sorts) and adding SUS comparative data. This data will be shared with Terry MacTaggart and others at an 8/26 meeting.

Mark was hopeful that once he met with the President on 8/26, we might be in a position to finalize our performance indicators and begin to set targets. The Council will need to consider how that process will work.

The Council then discussed the current draft of our performance indicators beginning with Goal 1. There was agreement that we should add SAT and ACT scores since we are aware that the President would like to include those measures. There was discussion about whether to retain measures on the number of distance learning courses. The group decided to keep these measures but separate out percentage hybrid DL courses and percentage complete DL courses.

Mauricio raised a concern that some of the important initiatives from Student Affairs and other divisions were not currently reflected in our university-level performance indicators (residence life, career services, etc) and therefore would not be visible enough to raise awareness which in turn would drive more appropriate funding. The Council noted that some performance indicators could be moved to the division level but that with an enhanced software system, division level goals and strategies would link to university indicators which would then drive funding.

The Council discussed in general terms, the prospect of setting realistic versus ambitious targets for some performance indicators such as retention rates. Establishing more ambitious targets would require certain programs with proper funding amounts.

There was discussion on Goal 2 performance indicators that capture women and minority hire and promotion rates. The Council agreed to change the indicators to best match the areas of concern (percentage of minority faculty and percentage of promoted female faculty for example).

Marianne will revise the performance indicator grid to reflect the agreed-upon changes.