

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

---

CMU has fulfilled its objective to construct a self-study that candidly and fairly captures the essence of the institution today. This is important not only for the Higher Learning Commission, but also for the campus community. For both groups we have taken the findings from the various chapters and categorized them by topic and presented them in Table 9-1. The number in parentheses indicates the chapter or chapters in which that item is discussed. For the Higher Learning Commission, we hope this will further aid consultant evaluators to gain a comprehensive understanding of the institution as put forth in the self-study. For CMU, we hope this summary will serve to reaffirm our accomplishments as it highlights opportunities for CMU to improve in the future.

CMU is an institution in transition. The nature of that transition is much clearer to us now than when we began the self-study two years ago. We recognized at the start that there were challenges in our efforts to strengthen the learning environment for students and to provide the diverse services our many constituencies desire. At the conclusion of this self-study process, we much better understand the issues before us, know our considerable strengths, and have identified some of the hurdles we will have to cross if we are to achieve our vision. As the process unfolded, we also clarified many things about CMU that were not obvious two years ago, but which consistently emerged as themes in the various committees working on the self-study and in the conversations held with the campus community. In our final analysis, we recognize the stresses and strains typical for any organization in transition but see that overall we are progressing well. In this final discussion, we provide an overview of the institution's strengths, weaknesses and issues for the future, culminating in our request for full re-accreditation.

## STRENGTHS

---

CMU's commitment to seek and continuously improve quality in all that we do is a strength that is reflected in the process of conducting this self-study. Knowing it would not be the easiest route, CMU chose to use the self-study process to put before the institution key data and the resulting analyses of strengths and concerns, undisguised by rhetoric or spin, and to engage the campus in frank conversations regarding these findings as a way to promote a focus on the future. CMU also chose to address in a special emphasis study what we believe to be a key issue in our preparation for the future: the maintenance of our core strengths in teaching and learning, while expanding the engagement of students and faculty in research and creative activity. This approach has already aided the institution immensely, and will continue to provide benefits through the interactions with HLC consultant evaluators and the feedback from the commission in its assurances and consultation. By tackling tough issues, CMU is living its vision to be an institution known for its

Table 9-1. Summary of Findings by Key Areas

Area	Findings*
<b>Mission and Vision</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CMU has a comprehensive set of mission documents. (3)</li> <li>There has been some lack of understanding of the components of the mission documents, partly caused by past lack of consistent use of terminology as well as terminology at odds with traditional practice. (3)</li> <li>Some faculty members do not believe that the current vision aligns well with the focus needed at CMU. (3)</li> <li>As CMU moves toward its vision of an institution with greater research and national prominence, it must determine what will be used as measures of national prominence (which may not be easy to identify). (8)</li> </ul>
<b>Integrity:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrity has been adopted as a specific institutional priority and key performance indicators have been identified. (3)</li> <li>CMU's policies and procedures for addressing complaints have been in place and working well for many years. (3)</li> </ul>
<b>Budget</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Despite reduced state allocations, CMU remains fiscally sound as a result of careful planning and budgeting. (4)</li> <li>CMU has demonstrated an ability to react to critical budget issues in a coordinated and timely manner, as shown by the budget reduction process for the 2004 and 2005 fiscal years. (4)</li> <li>While CMU remains fiscally sound, the loss of revenue and budget reductions has affected its ability to address institutional priorities. The possibility of future state-imposed restraints or reductions in state support is an ongoing concern. (3, 4)</li> <li>Operating costs new buildings have placed additional strain on the budget. (4)</li> <li>CMU has increasingly come to rely on income from Auxiliary and Residence Life, ProfEd, University Recreation, Parking Services and other nontraditional revenue sources to balance the budget. (4)</li> <li>Budget challenges are affecting our ability to maintain and improve our current service levels. The resources needed to do the job well must be provided, and if funding remains limited, we will need to focus on areas of greatest priority and eliminate others. (3, 7)</li> </ul>
<b>Revenue Enhancement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The investment in private fundraising efforts has produced significant increases in alumni relations activity and private support. (4)</li> <li>There have been significant increases in grant proposal submissions and in grants awarded in the past five years. (6)</li> <li>CMU's governmental relations efforts have increased and have made gains in protecting CMU's interests and in securing funding. (4)</li> </ul>
<b>Governance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A shared governance matrix was developed to help describe how decisions are made on campus. A statement on shared governance principles was adopted by the Academic Senate. (3)</li> <li>There are different views on the purpose of the shared governance matrix. The issue of whether it is descriptive or prescriptive needs to be resolved. (3)</li> </ul>
<b>Planning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has been a lack of formal centralized, comprehensive, long-term and strategic planning efforts. In March 2005 the Board of Trustees approved a strategic planning process, <i>CMU 2010</i>, which should begin to meet the university's needs in this area. (4)</li> <li>Maintaining competitiveness in an increasingly competitive marketplace for talented students, faculty and staff and educational services needs to be part of CMU's long-range planning. (4, 7)</li> <li>CMU needs a formal long-term enrollment management plan. (4)</li> <li>There is the potential for duplicating services or offering competing programs because of the lack of centralized planning and coordination. (7)</li> <li>Lack of a comprehensive long-term planning process inhibits systematic development of programs to meet future demands. Instead, immediate problems become the primary focus. (7)</li> <li>CMU lacks a formal process for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of new initiatives to ensure the appropriate allocation of fiscal resources. (4)</li> <li>There has been a lack of willingness and expectation to discontinue low-impact academic and non-academic programs and services in order to reallocate resources to more critical and successful ones. (4)</li> <li>As CMU moves toward its vision of an institution with greater research and national prominence, it must determine how to align our budgeting with agreed-to institutional priorities, which involves both how to increase revenue and how to make difficult reductions. (8)</li> <li>The nature of our academic decision-making processes makes it difficult to react quickly to changing markets when developing and delivering programs. This is a particular problem for programs delivered off-campus. (5)</li> </ul>
<b>Communication and Data Management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communication and relationships with external constituencies, including the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe, have improved considerably over the past five years. This has facilitated the development of a variety of cooperative programs with outside entities. (3, 7)</li> <li>As CMU moves toward its vision of an institution with greater research and national prominence, it must determine how to enhance communication and trust between the involved stakeholders. (8)</li> <li>Relevant institutional data are often not reviewed or available when making decisions, usually because of insufficient time, personnel and/or accessibility. (4)</li> <li>CMU lacks a systematic evaluation process to determine how we are doing and a dissemination plan to share that information with the campus. (7)</li> <li>A compendium of key policies, procedures, and resources for faculty is needed to facilitate compliance with university expectations. (6)</li> </ul>

\*Note: Chapters in which findings are discussed appear in parentheses.

Table 9-1. Summary of Findings by Key Areas (continued)

Area	Findings*
<b>Infrastructure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CMU has made a major commitment to the acquisition and implementation of state-of-the-art technology in terms of the software and hardware it utilizes to successfully carry out its instructional and administrative functions. Whether this level of investment can be sustained is a concern. (4)</li> <li>• CMU's current facilities are in general quite good as the result of recent capital projects. A formal deferred maintenance and a campus plan provide confidence that the university's physical resources will be attractive and capable of serving its constituents well into the future. (4)</li> <li>• The university has developed valuable solid partnerships with external entities. (7)</li> <li>• While CMU has maintained a steady student/faculty ratio, comparisons with benchmarking institutions reveal that this ratio is high relative to other doctoral/research intensive universities. (5)</li> <li>• Little is known about the effectiveness of the instructional technology in which CMU has heavily invested. There is a need to determine how these technologies can best be utilized to improve student learning. (5)</li> <li>• The infrastructure to support grant and contract activity is inadequate to address current and expected increases in activity. (6)</li> <li>• CMU offers an extensive set of educational programs to support the growth and development of its faculty and staff. Budget cuts have weakened the development opportunities for staff. (4, 6)</li> </ul>
<b>Diversity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhancing diversity is an institutional priority and <i>CMU 2010</i> identifies and strategies and key performance indicators. (3)</li> <li>• Emphasis has been placed on international education. The number of CMU students studying abroad is increasing, although still low relative to our total enrollments, while the number of international students coming into the university is decreasing. (6)</li> <li>• Progress toward a more diverse on-campus student body as well as a more diverse faculty has been slow. This lack of progress means that CMU is not meeting its goal to serve all student populations. It also inhibits CMU's achievement of a campus environment that helps students understand their increasingly diverse world. (3, 5)</li> <li>• Campuswide there is little knowledge of how CMU is progressing on the Diversity Plan and data need to be disseminated more effectively. (3)</li> </ul>
<b>Teaching and Student Learning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The university has established teaching and learning as the highest priority and made significant steps to raise academic standards. (5)</li> <li>• CMU has extensively invested in services to improve the teaching effectiveness of its faculty (5)</li> <li>• CMU has put extensive effort and resources into creating policies and needed infrastructure to promote effective learning environments for students with varying needs. CMU has also committed to the importance of multiculturalism in preparing students for the modern world. (5)</li> <li>• CMU offers good experiential learning opportunities that include opportunities developed through partnering efforts with external groups. (5)</li> <li>• CMU students in general are actively engaged in a wide variety of co-curricular activities and view CMU as supportive of these experiences. (6)</li> <li>• CMU's restructured program review process focuses on student learning outcomes and continuous improvement and makes use of external peer review. (6)</li> <li>• CMU's complex curricular structure hinders assessment and advising. (5)</li> <li>• For the general education program, curricular changes have been made to strengthen students' competency in mathematics and writing. There is minimal evidence available on student learning and the existing evidence is discouraging. A review of the program is progressing slowly. The program lacks cohesiveness and its governance and management need revision and increased faculty leadership. (6)</li> <li>• There is a need for improved integration of international experiences into academic programs to enhance students' understanding of global perspectives. (6)</li> <li>• It is a challenge for CMU to coordinate and publicize the many campus events intended to enrich student learning. The large number of opportunities also challenges students to find balance between their co-curricular activities and their academic workload. (6)</li> <li>• CMU's off-campus programs offer excellent access to education for students not able to participate in traditional on-campus programs and they serve a large number of students of color. The off-campus unit has been reorganized to better address student and campus needs. (4, 5)</li> </ul>
<b>Student Learning Assessment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is strong institutional support for student learning assessment as reflected in CMU's effective assessment policy, assessment infrastructure and management, and the increasing participation by departments. (5)</li> <li>• Some programs have not met institutional assessment goals. Available assessment data need to be more widely shared with relevant stakeholders and used for program improvement. (5)</li> <li>• Programs need to do more direct assessment of what students know, are able to do, and value. More feedback from external stakeholders including graduates and employers of graduates is needed to aid in evaluation of academic quality. (6)</li> </ul>

\*Note: Chapters in which findings are discussed appear in parentheses.

Table 9-1. Summary of Findings by Key Areas (continued)

Area	Findings*
<b>Research and Creative Activity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many CMU faculty actively contribute to scholarship in their disciplines through publication, performance, and presentation. (6)</li> <li>• CMU has established a centralized repository of faculty scholarly accomplishment to promote the awareness of, recognition for, and identification of opportunities for greater scholarly activity. (6)</li> <li>• CMU provides strong support for students and faculty to engage in research and creative activities, and recognizes their scholarly achievements. (6)</li> <li>• Appropriate policies and procedures governing research are in place to protect individual and institutional rights and ensure regulatory compliance. (6)</li> <li>• External funding received, the proportion of expenditures dedicated to research, and the number of graduate assistantships fall below those of our benchmark institutions. (6)</li> <li>• The campus needs policies and a committee for biosafety and additional staff for assuring compliance in all research work. (6)</li> <li>• Participation in the faculty information database is uneven. (6)</li> <li>• Most faculty at CMU support increasing scholarly activity, but strongly adhere to the philosophy that the primary role of expanded research is to enhance opportunities for student learning (8)</li> </ul>
<b>Transitions in Faculty Roles</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty face increased tension as the result of increasing demands on their time. Competing priorities include: maintaining effective teaching, increasing scholarly activity and seeking external support, performing effective student learning assessment, implementing instructional technology, and pursuing professional development opportunities. (5, 8)</li> <li>• There are concerns that the increased institutional emphasis on scholarly activity may negatively impact teaching effectiveness and academic excellence. (8)</li> <li>• As CMU moves toward its vision of an institution with greater research and national prominence, it must determine how to provide faculty with more time to engage in scholarly activities, which is crucial for increasing the level of scholarship. (8)</li> </ul>
<b>Service and Engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CMU provides a wide range of valued services and cultural opportunities to the local community, region and citizens of Michigan. (7)</li> <li>• Faculty and staff are dedicated to giving back to their professions and to the community; students are strong contributors to the community. (7)</li> <li>• The Service Excellence Program has increased attention to service. (7)</li> <li>• Most evaluation of service occurs at the program level, rather than through a centralized process. CMU's decentralized process facilitates effective change. (7)</li> <li>• CMU provides high levels of services to students in non-academic areas (e.g. residence life, registrar services, information technology services). (4)</li> </ul>

\*Note: Chapters in which findings are discussed appear in parentheses.

integrity at the same time it is also fulfilling its mission, which calls for the continuous pursuit of quality.

The self-study process itself reflected another key institutional strength — the willingness of many within the CMU community to contribute their time and expertise to improving the institution and its core educational mission. There were over 50 CMU faculty and staff who served on the self-study steering committee and subcommittees and who supported their work in various ways. Many more attended open discussion sessions, provided requests for data and information, or read and provided input on the various drafts of the chapters. The self-study leader stepped out of parts of his role as a professor of physics for two years in order to lead the self-study effort. These contributions were made on behalf of CMU and a desire to help the institution to realize its potential.

From the self-study process emerged the comprehensive, evidence-based and candid analysis of CMU today that is summarized in this document. Most thorough readers of the self-study have come away more impressed with the institution. CMU is a very solid institution, with much it can be proud of and certainly worthy of continuing accreditation. CMU's values and its commitment to the learning of its students have transcended its history and been reaffirmed as the highest institutional priority in the present strategic plan, *CMU 2010*.

Those values and commitments have been evident as CMU addressed some of the toughest budget challenges the institution has faced, which is a fact in which the institution has taken some consolation. CMU's leadership did an admirable job handling severe reductions in state allocations coupled with restrictions on raising tuition. The number of tenure-track faculty was maintained, and even increased, in response to rising enrollments in order not to compromise the institution's core mission. Units' discretionary spending accounts, professional development for staff and faculty, and staff positions across campus suffered in the cuts, but without producing immediate threats to the core mission. The self-study was the first time the campus was confronted so clearly with how poorly CMU compares to its peers in the important areas of student-to-faculty and student-to-staff ratios and how these affect quality. More than ever before, as a campus community, we are unified behind the need to increase CMU's funding levels to ones commensurate with its mission.

CMU's expansive mission is evident in the self-study, which includes educational functions ranging from traditional to contemporary and distinctive. In Mt. Pleasant, traditional age students, living in residence halls or close to the campus, have options to pursue a wide range of academic programs. They have greater opportunities than at many comparable institutions for enriching their learning through applied practice and co-curricular activities. The fact that in tight budgetary times, the richness of this environment has largely been sustained and even expanded in some areas is a credit first and foremost to the faculty and staff who design and offer these activities. Without their dedication, these activities would not exist. It is also a credit to the institution's leadership that even as budgets were drastically reduced the institution's top priority drove those reduction decisions and the institution's sound financial standing has been sustained.

Another aspect of this expansive mission and a strength that became even more salient in the self-study process was that CMU's footprint is much larger than the Mt. Pleasant campus. CMU's off-campus programs unit, ProfEd, allows many working adults across the U.S., a large percentage of whom are from groups traditionally underrepresented in graduate education, to obtain graduate degrees as means to further their careers and better prepare them for the challenges of the future. Communities throughout northern lower Michigan and the Upper Peninsula are served by CMU's public broadcasting network of radio and TV stations and the ancillary educational services they provide. The educational options for children in 58 communities in Michigan are expanded by public schools sponsored and supported by CMU's Charter Schools. Fifty-nine percent of the students attending these schools are children of color, seeking richer educational experiences than those otherwise available or affordable in their communities.

More locally, CMU has strengthened its partnership with the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe in a number of ways, including providing access for Tribal College students to educational facilities on the CMU campus that do not exist at the Tribal College. CMU faculty, staff and students

are deeply engaged in communities within the region as volunteers, board members, fund raisers, and professional practitioners. While the existence of all of these activities had been known, the self-study revealed their current scope and the ways they have emerged to meet important needs in Mt. Pleasant, communities across Michigan and beyond.

In recent years, aspects of CMU's mission that call for us to further learning of students and faculty and to contribute to the needs of the state through scholarship have been further expanded. External funding for research, awards to students and faculty for their scholarship, the number of scholarly products appearing in national venues, and the overall quality of the scholarly efforts as a whole have all increased in recent years. These increases have been added to CMU's traditional education functions, and been possible because of the talents and motivation of our students and faculty. In the Special Emphasis, faculty who have been some of the campus's leaders in this transition were asked to step forward and describe the challenges they and their colleagues have been experiencing and to present the institution with key questions, the answers to which will steer CMU's current transition.

Academic facilities are another of CMU's strengths. The joint investments of the state of Michigan, the campus and various private supporters have resulted in striking renovations and new buildings. National recognition has been received for some of these. Their cutting edge classrooms and research areas have not only benefited CMU students but also helped to attract faculty and external funding. Learning environments have been enhanced beyond these buildings, with significant investments in information technologies, particularly in classrooms, designed to promote deeper engagement of students in the learning process.

Through the self-study we came to appreciate how CMU has adapted to its growth and the increasing expectations for public universities by becoming a much more complex organization. In response to changing demands, CMU, like many universities, has significantly expanded its capacities to carry out private and public fundraising, seek support for research, establish and strengthen relations with state and federal government officials, and improve the performance and well-being of its own faculty and staff through professional development. CMU has been strengthened by an increasing focus on the monitoring of quality in our internal processes and functions, whether that be through establishment of a performance management system, regular evaluation cycles using nationally standardized instruments, or the greater expectations for assessment of student learning. CMU is participating in some important national studies that bear directly on educational quality, and is more regularly bringing independent experts to campus to provide frank evaluations of our status and opportunities to improve. Pursuit of excellence in service has impacted every unit on campus. The many areas in which CMU is becoming more externally focused are for the first time summarized for the campus in the self-study.

## CHALLENGES

---

As CMU's strengths have become more evident, the challenges we face also have come into relief. A deficiency echoed throughout the self-study — the lack of centralized, systematic, long-term planning and budgeting — is something we must address, and we have made important steps to do just that. Admittedly, short-term perspectives are to be expected in an environment that has seen midyear callbacks and other unpredictable aspects of a key revenue stream. Nevertheless, the lack of long-term plans limits CMU's effectiveness. The lack of a plan for enrollment management for example weakens planning throughout the university because the work of so many units depends on the number of students on campus. Additionally, while we now have *CMU 2010* and a Strategic Planning Committee appointed by the president, prior experiences with institutional planning lead many to worry if the institution will carry out the plan, including aligning important financial decisions with the plan.

There is great interest in the focus implied in *CMU 2010*. The CMU community as a whole does not want to be all things to all people. It does however want to be innovative and continue to improve and develop in key areas. To accomplish all this, especially in tight budgetary times, requires effective decision making. By definition there will be new directions pursued and those left behind. Tough decisions, which will be unpopular with some and sometimes with many, will certainly have to be made and carried out. Those decisions should include thorough analysis and appropriate input from individuals who are given access to the information they need to offer informed input. Once decisions are made, implementation should proceed in a timely manner.

Making such decisions is difficult anywhere, but it is especially so at CMU because there is a sense that institution-level decision-making processes could be improved. A number of indicators of problems with decision making emerged throughout the self-study. These include: the questions raised regarding which campus constituencies should be involved in decisions like those surrounding athletic programs and new facilities; concerns expressed about the slowness and effectiveness of the processes surrounding academic programs, epitomized in the current review of the general education program; and the chronic and pressing questions raised within the special emphasis, which have yet to be addressed systematically, and for which there is not yet a sense of how some of them could or should be addressed.

Underlying the difficulties with decision making is a lack of trust. Although the overall level of trust has been increasing in recent years, distrust can still be particularly acute within certain units and at various points in time. When this exists it undermines communication and sharing, which are cornerstones of effective shared governance, and it limits the effectiveness — or perceived effectiveness — of decision making. It also makes it difficult to revise decision-making processes, resulting in processes remaining in place although they have outlived their usefulness as CMU has grown in size and scope and the demands

for responsiveness to rapidly changing external environments have increased significantly.

Another theme that crystallized through the self-study process is that CMU collects a good deal of information about itself and in comparison to other institutions, but use of and communications surrounding these rich sources of evidence have been limited, meaning the campus does not benefit fully from these efforts. Our staffing levels, limited budgets and institutional culture all contribute to this situation — one which we must move to correct. The self-study provides a perfect example of the kind of focused collection of data and open analysis of it that will benefit CMU in the future. Toward that end, aspects of the self-study have already served, and are now serving, as the foundations for future-focused conversations, plans and actions. The best example of this is the planning process that resulted in *CMU 2010* which was propelled by a finding emerging from the self-study that more comprehensive, systematic centralized planning was needed for the campus. *CMU 2010* builds on the CMU's strengths identified by the self-study, and outlines immediate actions to address some of our identified shortcomings.

The CMU community also needs to remember that plans are not enough. The self-study's discussions of diversity remind us of this reality. CMU has had in place diversity-related priorities and an excellent plan to increase diversity, but our on-campus accomplishments, like the ethnic diversity of the student body and the increase in number of students studying abroad, have been modest. On the other hand, service to diverse populations off-campus have been dramatic through such units as ProfEd and Charter Schools. In fact, the leadership and performance of these units have led to national recognition for CMU. This demonstrates that, although the ethnic diversity of the central Michigan region limits what can be achieved in the Mt. Pleasant area, it does not limit CMU's opportunities to contribute to the accomplishment of statewide and national diversity agendas. Nor does it keep CMU from addressing diversity in its curriculum and programming — in fact, it further compels CMU to do so as we seek to prepare students for life and work in an increasingly global and diverse society and contribute to the education and cultural enrichment of the central Michigan region.

Questions for the future were raised by self-study, particularly as a result of the Special Emphasis. What kind of institution will CMU be in the future? How do we preserve the best of the past while we evolve and prepare for the opportunities of the future? Do we have sufficient trust, communication and integrity during this period of transition to bring about and sustain important changes? Will the institution set a course that will be energize all who must be engaged? Will we have the integrity to truly pursue our mission despite difficulties?

As a result of the self-study and our discussions surrounding it, CMU is already taking on some of the challenges. The directness with which those challenges are laid out within the self-study compels CMU to address them. It is hoped that this same directness will provide the HLC consultant evaluators with a strong foundation for the consultation we

seek on both the validity of our self evaluations and advice surrounding the challenges and transition we are undergoing.

## CMU'S FUTURE

---

As this self-study documents, many transitions are taking place at CMU. Some are intentional changes in emphases, such as raising our academic standards and increasing the scholarly engagement of faculty and students. Some are responses to the changing needs of Michigan's citizens, such as our development of a SmartZone within CMU's Center for Applied Research. Others are responses to the changing needs and expectations of CMU's 28,000 students, such as the establishment of a First Year Experience and residential colleges. CMU's growing pains are evident in the self-study, as are the commitments of dedicated faculty and staff to bettering the institution and the pursuit of CMU's vision of achieving national prominence through its accomplishments in academic excellence, research and creative activity and public service. As we look forward from this self-study process, we are confident in CMU's future because we have demonstrated the capacity to be future-oriented, learning-focused, connected and distinctive — the themes identified by the Higher Learning Commission as characteristic of strong institutions.

### FUTURE-ORIENTED

CMU is increasingly focused on the future. Our stated mission guides everything we do, including most recently accommodating significant budget reductions precipitated by reduced state funding and tuition caps. We increasingly look externally for advice, analysis and predictions regarding future societal trends and the needs of our students so that we can better prepare them for the future.

### LEARNING-FOCUSED

Efforts to continually assess and evaluate every aspect of our operations have been invigorated and are increasingly sophisticated and used in decision-making. As we learn about our effectiveness, we are especially interested in student learning and have specified desired learning outcomes at every level of academic programs. The scholarship of our students and faculty continues to expand, raising CMU's national profile and deepening the learning of students and faculty.

### CONNECTED

Our progress is in part attributable to the strong connections we have built with our regional communities and many stakeholders. CMU has done very well in providing graduate education to adult learners and in serving minority populations through our chartering and supporting of independent public schools. We provide public radio and TV broadcasting and programming for a huge service area, which includes many communities in underserved areas. We provide rich cultural

activities unsurpassed in the region. These partnerships are valued and nurtured and remain a priority within *CMU 2010*.

### **DISTINCTIVE**

These partnerships, combined with the overall size of CMU and scope of our programs, make CMU a truly distinctive university. Our mission to prepare students for life and work in a global and diverse society is challenged continually as the world changes. Our ability to respond will depend on our ability to learn, increasingly using data and an external focus as important ingredients in our decision-making. CMU has always been willing to be accountable to formal external review. Increasingly, we must also be accountable internally, addressing key issues in decision making and trust, being willing to make and carry out tough decisions, to assure that tomorrow CMU will still be the distinctive and valued organization it is today.

As we move forward, CMU's capacities in each of these areas will certainly need to be strengthened and modified, as they need to be at virtually all higher education institutions. CMU is prepared to address those challenges and to more fully realize its mission.

### **OUR REQUEST FOR RE-ACCREDITATION**

With this self-study, provision of other required documents, and hosting of the fall visit by HLC consultant evaluators, we believe CMU will have satisfied the requirements of the re-accreditation process. Chapter 2 summarizes actions taken by CMU relative to the issues raised during our last accreditation visit, most importantly the concerns about governance, assessment and diversity. We believe that the concerns have been addressed. Chapters 3 through 7 summarize the evidence related to the criteria for accreditation, Criterion 1 through Criterion 5. Evidence was provided in those chapters that CMU satisfies each of the criteria and core components for re-accreditation.

Chapter 8 presents the results from our Special Emphasis on the topic "*Making the transition to an institution with increased scholarship and national prominence.*" Our performance here is not essential to our re-accreditation, but it was an essential part of the self-study process because this transition is critical to CMU achieving its vision for the future. We anxiously await consultation from the HLC consultant evaluators on this topic.

Therefore, CMU requests continuing accreditation for the maximum ten-year period.