

APPROVED 11.1.10

Indiana State University
Administrative Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate

Minutes of 10.18.2010

Present: Carole Yaw; Feng-Qi Lai; Brian Kilp; Boris Blyukher;
Barbara Skinner; Ed Kinley; John Conant (liaison from Executive Committee)

Absent: Rick Lotspeich; Chris Olsen

Meeting called to order at 12:03

The agenda was by-passed to allow our guest, Karl Burgher, to inform the committee on assessment aspects of the Strategic Plan, in order for AAC to fulfill Charge No. 3 (on examining the Strategic Planning process for the creation of assessable outcomes and the regular publication of outcomes and benchmarks, as well as budgetary consequences with an eye to enhancing the transparency in the process.)

Mr. Burgher introduced himself and described the system in place for Strategic Plan assessment. It is a three-tiered process:

1) assessment of work-plans: this process took place last spring (April) at the Stakeholders' Conference. By then, the seven audit chairs for each of the seven goals of the Strategic Plan put together an audit team for each goal and reviewed the work-plans. Comments were collected at the Stakeholders' Conference, and a content analysis has been performed on the comments and executive summaries compiled. This level of assessment will occur every year, with the help of TaskStream software.

2) Assessing the progress of the work on each initiative for 1-whether the work got done (did the people in place do what they said they would do?) And 2- was it successful? Since August, Mr. Burgher has been meeting with each initiative chair to make this assessment. The goal is to make this part of the assessment a quarterly assessment in order to coincide with the budget cycle. So far, the first assessment occurred June 30, which was just on getting the work-plans in action and allocating funds; it has been decided to wait to file the second quarterly assessment until Dec. 31 in order to have some real outcomes, with discussions beginning in late fall.

3) The final assessment will be on whether the initiatives had a tangible impact. (E.g., did enrollments increase? Did retention increase?, etc.) These reports will become public information.

Mr. Conant directed the discussion toward the concerns of the committee, which was to understand how the benchmarks will be measured to assess the progress and what was the budgetary process. Mr. Burgher distributed spread sheets with existing information on the allocations and expending of funds so far. Basically \$1 million per year is allocated to the Strategic Plan, half in base funds and half in one-time allocations; additionally, \$1 million is given to programs of distinction. Mr. Burgher also has the ability to give limited seed money from a pool of \$50,000 to keep projects alive while other sources of funding are being pursued. Everything regarding the

finances will be posted to the web-site; about 97% is reportable, as some funds remain tied in negotiations on purchasing. The discussions with the initiative chairs also involve fleshing out data in Task Stream to provide information to the stakeholders.

Mr. Kilp inquired whether constituencies lobby for funds, and Mr. Burgher indicated that the same process of application (he distributed a sample Work Budget Request) applied to everyone (i.e., no one was privileged).

Given the need to look through the spreadsheets given to the committee, discussion of recommendations on this charge were tabled until the next meeting.

The minutes of the meeting on Sept. 27 were unanimously approved.

Meeting adjourned at 12:55.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Skinner