

BOARD OF REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING

Minutes - 11:30 a.m., Thursday, April 11, 2013

Conducted via Teleconference

Originating from the 1st Floor Boardroom, 39 Woodland Street, Hartford, CT

SPC MEMBERS via Teleconference

Dr. René Lerer, Committee Chair

Dr. Merle W. Harris

Michael E. Pollard

OTHER BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

None present

SPC MEMBERS PRESENT

Matt Fleury

BOR STAFF

Elaine Clark, Vice President for Real Estate, Facilities and Infrastructure Planning

Gail Coppage, Director of Innovation and Outreach/Workforce Development

Annie Davis, Executive Assistant, Office of Policy & Research

Colleen Flanagan Johnson, Director of Public Affairs & Marketing

Braden J. Hosch, Director of Policy & Research and Interim Director of Academic Affairs

Committee Chair R. Lerer called the meeting to order at 11:32 a.m. and gave a brief statement of what was expected at today's meeting as well as state that there were some concerns regarding Goal 4/Innovation and if we had adequate representation made in this goal. B. Hosch stated that there are three recommendations in front the Committee today, i.e. accept the report, identify definitions for Goal 4, and agree to distribute the report for comment.

Approval of September 10, 2012 minutes - On a motion by M. Fleury, with a second by Michael Pollard, the meeting minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

Review Metrics Report – B. Hosch provided a brief overview of the charges of the Strategic Planning Committee. A metrics workgroup was formed and met in November, December and February; the five strategies work groups have not yet been formed; members for these groups will be identified over the summer for convening in August. As the metrics groups evaluated potential metrics for the Board to evaluate progress on the strategic plan, they used criteria that the metrics should be meaningful, be indicative (not comprehensive), be valid, be reliable, have available benchmark data, and be sensitive to institutional actions.

Dr. Hosch provided a brief overview of the metrics. Discussion on specific areas ensued.

Goal 2 – Student Success

Committee members observed the absence of a metric on employment outcomes and earnings following graduation. B. Hosch indicated that while a measure of this sort had been considered by the work group, it did not rise to the top few they recommended to the Board, in part because of the limitations with the metric. The general sense of the Committee was that employment outcomes and earnings should be included.

M. Harris commented that there should be more of a connection to the workforce. Chairman Lerer reiterated to the group that he recommends the report be accepted and we can add a list of comments and concerns to include in the distribution. We would then reconvene to come up with a finished product. Braden Hosch also suggested adding a recommendation to prepare for future study as it is important to the CSU mission.

Goal 4 - Innovation and Economic Growth (identifying definitions; what we are trying to achieve) –

Dr. Hosch observed that the metrics work group had difficulty interpreting the Board's intent on this goal. The metrics focus more on economic growth and the explanatory statement in the goal to "prepare students for success in a fast changing world" than innovation, which has a metric primarily related to research. The group grappled with questions like: How does one define innovation? How does one know if innovation has occurred?

A discussion ensued regarding innovation, how to measure innovation, system-wide strategies for innovation. G. Coppage provided information from her area in Innovation and Outreach about partnerships and programs, including the manufacturing centers and grant activity. TAP and STEM, measuring competencies, how innovation has made changes (using technology to track online courses for example). M. Harris indicated that student performance on TAP competencies did not capture "innovation." M. Fleury commented that we must produce innovative students who will contribute successfully in an innovative environment. Discussion moved to discussion of innovative services, approaches, and programs. E. Clark commented that networking, collaborating, marketing, and business partnerships all contribute to innovation. Creating an environment in which institutions can access one another could prompt innovation. R. Lerer indicated that offering firm definitions for innovation may actually stifle what the Board is looking to promote – a broad definition with an example could be more productive. Institutions should be able to bring examples of what they have done on their campuses that is innovative. There should be the ability to identify innovative approaches on campuses for problem solving, i.e. using IT programs. G. Coppage also referenced a plan considered before departure of the previous administration to offer almost a million dollars in additional grants to faculty for research and innovation, including partnerships.

The group finally came to some agreement that the best vehicle to capture Board intent was an institutional report on innovation and innovative practices rather than a outcomes metric. R. Lerer suggested we look at the metric language and incorporate it.

Development of Metrics - Other items discussed were economic growth, local and state appropriations was determined to be too technical and instead should read "non-federal governmental support."

The committee also requested some consideration of fundraising or development as a metric. B. Hosch will take a look at the language for the appropriate line or line from financial reports to capture this activity.

M. Pollard expressed interest in a metric to describe cost per credit/degree, which resulted in a discussion. R. Lerer wasn't sure how one would create a metric concerning this; perhaps approach it as out-of-pocket expenses. B. Hosch offered to run data regarding this, however, he reported it would likely not provide meaningful or actionable information. M. Pollard stated he would give his concern/question more thought and bring it back to the committee at the next

Strategic Planning Committee – Special Meeting

April 11, 2013 Meeting Minutes

Page 3

meeting. M. Fleury mentioned that we are on a good track to measure cost, price, and affordability.

Management Updates – R. Lerer and B. Hosch met with individuals from two campuses to discuss individual campus missions. They want to be integrated into the process. There was good discussion. The FAC may suggest some tweaks to existing language in the mission statement. Mission statements from the BOR constituent units were shared.

Future Meetings – Future meetings will be determined and sent out to committee next week.

Chairman Lerer thanked everyone for their participation.

With no further business to consider, the meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Submitted,

Annie Davis